

# THE COMMUNIST

Official Organ of the Communist Party of America.  
SECTION OF THE THIRD COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Vol. II No. 15.

DECEMBER 15th, 1920.

PRICE 5 CENTS

## Unemployment.

In every large industrial center in America today, thousands and tens of thousands of workingmen and workingwomen have lost their jobs and are tramping the streets. Every day the list of unemployment grows by leaps and bounds. In New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Pittsburg, St. Louis, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago—from Maine to California—and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf—millions of workers are idle and their families are beginning to feel the pinch of hunger and cold.

The railroads, the steel mills, the mines, the textiles, the lumber camps—the automobile and rubber tire factories,—the packing industry, the clothing industry, department stores and the thousand and one factories that produce the necessities of life are closing down or working part time at reduced wages.

A terrific industrial slump has hit this country. Manufacturers claim that they cannot get orders. Bankers claim that money is scarce. Merchants claim that their merchandise is not selling. Railroads claim that freight shipments are decreasing. Farmers claim that they are compelled to sell their products at ruinous prices. Perishable goods are rotting at docks or in warehouses. Stores are stocked up with goods. The farmers crops this year have broken all past records. AND YET, IN THE MIDDLE OF THIS UNPARALLELED PLENTY—INDUSTRIES ARE CLOSING DOWN AND THE WORKERS ARE BEING THROWN OUT ON THE STREETS TO STARVE AND FREEZE!

What is the meaning of all this?

Only recently the capitalist press shrieked that what this country needed to cure it of all ills was "increased production". You were told that the unrest, discontent and the "Red Wave" that was sweeping this country was due to insufficient production. You were told to "speed up" production as the only cure for the post-war economic and political conditions. Well, production has increased and what happened?

You produced so much that the markets are glutted and you are being thrown out of your jobs. Instead of conditions getting better they are growing worse. Instead of higher wages and better conditions many of you lost your jobs and the others are working at reduced wages. Does this really mean that you workers have produced too much?

Not at all. The working class could very easily consume more food, more clothing, more of all the products that they have produced. But under the present capitalist system of production commodities are produced for profit and not primarily for use. The workers get back in wages only about one-fifth of what they produce. The rest, after deducting the portion used by the capitalist class and their henchmen, is held for export to foreign markets. This surplus must be sold for profit to foreign countries.

And now we come to the main cause of the present wave of unemployment and the industrial crisis impending. Europe, which all during the war and after, was the greatest purchaser of American goods, is bankrupt. It has exhausted its cash and credit. Europe is staggering under stupendous war-debts. Its industries are broken down. The European workers are starving, disoriented and threatening to overthrow their capitalist governments. American bankers know this and they refuse to extend them any more credit with which to buy goods. American know that the European Govern-

ments can never repay the principal or the interest of the huge debts they already owe. They also know that the new, working class Governments, when they are established, will repudiate the debts of the present capitalist governments. Therefore the American financiers have closed down on their loans and Europe cannot purchase any more American goods. This is proof positive that European capitalism has broken down and that American capitalism, closely united with the former through the bonds of imperialism, is beginning to feel the effect of it over here.

As for the other world markets, they are also unable to absorb the surplus of American industries. For various reasons. In the first place, conditions are unstable all over the world. The masses are starving and unemployed; factories and farms are idle; many small wars are raging in every part of the globe; small nations and colonies are struggling for freedom from the great Imperialist Powers of Europe. Secondly, there is still some competition to face. Thirdly, the rate of exchange has made the dollar very dear in the international commercial market, although the dollar is very cheap in the home market.

Of course, the big American capitalist do not suffer. They shut down their factories and go off on vacations to Palm Beach and other expensive resorts. But you workers feel it. You suffer. You and your families have to go with insufficient food, clothing and warmth. You get long variations without pay. You get kicked out of your jobs.

But there is another angle to this industrial crisis. THE CAPITALIST CLASS IS DELIBERATELY USING THIS OPPORTUNITY TO REDUCE YOUR WAGE; AND TO DESTROY YOUR LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.

The capitalist class (through their Merchants, Bankers and Manufacturers associations) have come out for the OPEN SHOP. THEIR SLOGAN IS GARYISM.

This is the situation you are facing. THE QUESTION FOR YOU WORKERS TO DECIDE IS—HOW ARE YOU GOING TO MEET IT?

This is a critical moment for the working class of America. The capitalist game is to play he unemployed against the employed. In this way they hope to split your ranks, make you compete with one another for jobs to bring down wages and bring about the Open shop.

Against this vicious attack you must fight hard. You must bring pressure to bear upon your labor organizations to take up the challenge of the capitalist class. If your reactionary leaders and labor fakers stand in the way—YOU MUST GET RID OF THEM AND REPLACE THEM WITH LEADERS FROM THE RANK AND FILE WHO WILL DO YOUR BIDDING!

YOU MUST BRING THE ENTIRE PRESSURE OF THE WORKING CLASS TO BEAR THROUGH MASS MEETINGS—DEMONSTRATIONS—PROTESTS. YOU MUST USE THE MASS STRIKE—THE GENERAL STRIKE—THE POLITICAL STRIKE TO ENFORCE YOUR DEMANDS!

This industrial crisis is the beginning of the revolutionary movement that will eventually lead to the overthrow of the present capitalist government and the abolition of the capitalist system. American capi-

talism is traveling the same road as European capitalism. It is beginning to break down. YOU WORKERS MUST FINISH THE JOB!

Isn't it about time that you realized that you workers can get nothing worthwhile for your class under capitalism?

ALL YOU CAN GET UNDER CAPITALISM IS UNEMPLOYMENT, STARVATION, HIGH COST OF LIVING, DIRTY TENEMENTS OR COMPANY-OWNED SHACKS, POVERTY, MISERY, DISEASE AND WAR. IF YOU DONT LIKE THAT—AND YOU GO ON STRIKE OR PROTEST,—YOU GET POLICEMEN'S CLUBS, INJUNCTIONS, SHERIFF'S GUNS, SOLDIERS, BAYONETS, MACHINE GUNS AND MARTIAL LAW. IF YOU DONT LIKE THAT YOU GET DEPORTED OR JAILED.

Isn't that so?

Just look back upon the history of the class struggle the last two years. The Longshoremen Strike, the Coal Strike, the Steel Strike, the "Outlaw" railroad strike, the "Outlaw" printers' strike, the nation-wide raids, the deportations, the jailings.

Where were the courts? On the side of the capitalists and against the workers.

Where were the policemen, the sheriffs and the soldiers? On the side of the capitalists and against the workers.

Where was the Church? On the side of the capitalists and against the workers.

Where were your labor leaders? On the side of the capitalists and against the workers.

Where was the Government—local, state and national? On the side of the capitalists and against the workers.

Certainly! They all were against you. They always will be—and they will succeed in keeping the workers divided, break your strikes and destroy your labor organizations so long as capitalism exists and the state with all its power, remains in the hands of the capitalist class.

The only way in which you can put an end to this profit system which keeps you in poverty, misery and degradation, and gives all the good things of life to the rich, is TO CONQUER POLITICAL POWER FOR YOUR CLASS, AND MAKE THE WORKING CLASS THE RULING CLASS IN SOCIETY. YOU MUST FIRST DESTROY THE PRESENT CAPITALIST GOVERNMENT AND ESTABLISH A WORKERS', OR SOVIET GOVERNMENT IN ITS PLACE BY FORCE—JUST AS DID THE WORKERS AND PEASANTS OF RUSSIA!

THE TIME HAS COME FOR THE WORKERS OF AMERICA TO CONSIDER THE NECESSITY OF ESTABLISH A SOVIET GOVERNMENT IN AMERICA!

A WORKERS' GOVERNMENT would function for the working class and against the capitalist class. It would build up the WORKERS' CONTROL OF INDUSTRY under its protection and guidance. After it will have accomplished its purpose, during the transition period from capitalism to Communism—after it will have abolished private ownership in the means of production and distribution, after it will have abolished all classes, after it will have crushed and suppressed all counter-revolutionary attempts to overthrow the rule of the workers, after it will have build up the workers' economic administration of industry—THE WORKERS' OR SOVIET GOVERNMENT would itself "die out" and make

(Continued on page 7)

# THE COMMUNIST

Official organ of  
THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF AMERICA  
published by the  
CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Vol. II December, 15th, 1920 No. 15.

## The American Counterparts of Ebert, Scheidemann and Noske.

The recent statement of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party, in which it openly repudiates the Communist International should be final convincing proof of where the Socialist Party stands in the international revolutionary proletarian movement. It is a party of Eberts, Scheidemanns and Noskes, who, if they ever get the opportunity, will prove to be the same willing butchers and hangmen of the workers for their capitalist masters as the Majority "Socialists" of Germany.

The fact that the National Executive Committee (and Debs) categorically rejected all the conditions for affiliation laid down by the Communist International means nothing at all. These conditions were never intended for such a party as the Socialist Party of America. How could a party definitely committed to a policy of social-patriotism, opportunism and compromise—a party which openly rejected the principles and tactics of Communism—even seriously consider any of the 21 points laid down in the conditions? These 21 points presuppose an agreement on fundamentals at least. As far as fundamentals are concerned the Socialist Party and the Communist International are as far removed as the North and South poles.

The answer is, that the Socialist Party did not seriously consider any of the twenty-one points which it so hypocritically denounced. Like its referendum for affiliation with reservations, this statement is intended to continue the deception in the minds of the workers here, and the revolutionary movement abroad, that the Socialist Party of America is a party of the "Centre" and not of the "Right".

It is this attempt to masquerade as a party of the "Centre", and this only, which is responsible for the statement of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party.

Naturally, at a time when the Socialist movement of the world is veering sharply to the Left, as evidenced by the split in the Independents of Germany, the major part of whom went over to the Communist International, and the prospect of the same thing happening to the Socialist Party of France next month, as well as the affiliation of revolutionary Socialist parties elsewhere—the Socialist Party of America finds it convenient to masquerade as a "Centre" party rather than reveal itself in its true colors, the American counterparts of Ebert, Scheidemann and Noske.

In other words by pretending to disagree with the "conditions" "imposed" by the Communist International, they hope to distract attention from the real truth—that they disagree fundamentally with its principles and tactics.

But this Hillquitian trick will fool nobody anymore. As far as the revolutionary movement abroad is concerned the S. P., like the Longuetists of France and the Kautskians of Germany will soon find themselves thrown into the arms of the Majority Socialists of Germany, the Brantings of Sweden, and the Vanderveldes of Belgium. The Communist International was never fooled by Hillquit's cheap sophistry. As long ago as 1917 Lenin branded Hillquit for what he is. Even in the conditions of affiliation (which the N. E. C. "conveniently" omitted in its statement when quoting from it, the Communist International stated that it was intolerable that such men as Hillquit among others should belong to the Communist International.

As for the class-conscious workers in this country, they are growing more and

more disillusioned every day. And the Communist Party will leave no stone unturned to complete this task—before the Hillquits and Bergers get opportunity to play the executioners of the working class in the period of revolution.

## Letting the Cat Out of the Bag

It is very seldom that a far-sighted and class-conscious capitalist ever lets the cat out of the bag so unceremoniously as does Paul M. Warburg, former Vice Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, in an article in Times Nov. 14th. In this article, entitled, "Europe On The Brink", the author, who has just returned from a European tour of investigation sets down his impressions and analysis of post-war European conditions in very plain terms. As the title of his article implies, he sees that Europe is on the brink of revolution and he sees that nothing can stop it except the union of "progressive capital and constructive labor". And then he proceeds to let the cat out of the bag in the following manner:

"It is the union of these two constructive factions that may be hoped to save what will prove worth preserving of our old society. Of these two, however, constructive organized labor in Europe has shown itself quicker to recognize its duties and opportunities. Constructive organized labor has found ways to get together across national lines, and it has shown the courage and vision to think and act both nationally and internationally at the same time. IT IS CONSERVATIVE ORGANIZED LABOR IN ITS VARIOUS FORMS—LET US MAKE NO MISTAKE ABOUT IT—THAT HAS SO FAR STEMMED THE TIDE OF BOLSHEVISM IN EUROPE. IT IS ON THE SANITY AND SAGACITY OF THE LEADERS OF CONSERVATIVE LABOR MORE THAN ON ANY OTHER FACTOR THAT EUROPE'S HOPES MUST REST TO-DAY." (Italics ours, editor).

Exactly. For once we agree wholeheartedly with this capitalist spokesman. This is the lesson that the Communist International and its affiliated parties are trying to drive home. This is exactly the basis for the aggressive and ceaseless campaign of the Communists against all "the various forms" of organized betrayal of the working class aspirations in Europe and America. Against the "Socialist" parties of the Second International and the "Centre", as well as against the Yellow Amsterdam Trade Union International.

This has been the ceaseless cry of the Communists to the workers everywhere. That the leaders of the "various forms" of conservative labor organizations (in which are included the yellow Socialist parties) are the labor lieutenants of the capitalist class. That conservative labor is the greater obstacle to revolution. That we must win over the organized labor masses and crush their old labor leaders before we can hope to accomplish the proletarian revolution.

In all the struggles of the Left Wing or Communist parties against their opponents of the "Right" and "Centre", our opponents have never failed to raise the deceitful cry—"Why do you fight us? You are splitting the working class movement. Let us stay united and fight the capitalists who are our common enemies!"

Our answer has always been: "You are the bulwark of capitalism. You stand between the revolutionary movement and its goal. You are the agents of the bourgeoisie in the labor movement. We can never hope to win the victory over the capitalists until we first expel you from the ranks of the workers".

What Warburg has admitted about Europe is equally true of America. "Conservative organized labor in its various forms" (The A. F. of L., the Socialist parties, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, Railroad Brotherhoods etc.) has done more to rehabilitate capitalism in America than the "enlightened capitalists" themselves.

These organizations declared a truce with the government during the war and made America's participation in the world war possible. They became strong links in the chain of governmental machinery to bleed and oppress the workers.

After the war, these same agencies made the transition from a war basis to a peace basis in this country possible for the capitalist class. They strengthened capitalism and permitted the post-war era of black reaction, by connivance, betrayal provocations and silence.

If anything, conservative organized labor (including the "Socialists") is more reactionary in America than in Europe. The Gompers, the Hillquits, the Hillmans, Schlossbergs, the Schlesingers, are all birds of one feather. They are all the servile tools of American Imperialism, the "labor lieutenants of the capitalist class". The order of business which history has set before the Communist Party is—discrediting and expelling these labor fakers, social patriots, opportunists, social pacifists and yellow syndicalists from the ranks of the labor movement as the indispensable condition for the victory of the American proletariat—the destruction of the bourgeois state and the establishment of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in the form of a Soviet Government in America.

## The Yellow Leaders of the I. W. W.

There can be no doubt by this time that the referendum for affiliation to the Communist International in the I. W. W. has been defeated.

This is quite evident even before the vote on the referendum has been announced. It can be observed in certain acts of commission on the part of the yellow leaders of the I. W. W. during the last few weeks.

The first act of commission was the expulsion of the editor of "Solidarity" for showing too much "sympathy" with Communist propaganda.

Their second act of commission, was to reverse their former decision to expel the Philadelphia Local of Longshoremen who had loaded ammunition for General Wrangel.

Their third act of omission, was the failure to remove or discipline John Sandgren for his vicious, counter-revolutionary attacks upon the Communist International and its affiliated organizations both here and abroad.

Never have leaders of a so-called revolutionary organization fallen as low as the present leaders of the I. W. W. They have proven themselves to be short-sighted, incompetent, vacillating and reactionary. They seem to be in a muddle and do not know how to extricate themselves. On the one hand they pretend to be a labor organization pure and simple. Whenever the cry of Communism is raised they fall back on that hoary old fraudulent cry. On the other hand, when an incident such as "Philadelphia" comes up, they pretend that they are a revolutionary organization of the advanced-guard of the workers of America.

These yellow leaders have been vacillating between these two contradictory and wholly irreconcilable points of view as suits their opportunistic policies, which consists mainly in humbugging the "wobblers" of the East that they are a revolutionary organization.

When they found out, through the voting on the referendum, that the Communists, though they raised the most noise, were in a comfortable minority, the yellow leaders became emboldened and forget their first scare. What will happen after all the votes are in and they find that the Communists are overwhelmingly defeated, can be easily conjectured without any sever strain on the imagination. We predict that the slogan of these yellow leaders will be the slogan of the reactionary N. E. C. of the Socialist Party last year—*expulsion*.

But, we predict the yellow and vacillating leaders of the I. W. W. are reckoning without their host. The vast majority of the rank and file of the proletariat in the I. W. W. are revolutionary and class-conscious, though not yet Communist. This referendum is no real test insofar as the membership are concerned. The issue of affiliation to Third International has been deliberately confused by these leaders. The defeat of the present referendum is absolute.

(Continued on page 7)

# The Communist International to the American Socialist Party.

Dear Comrades:

The official notification from the Socialist Party of the United States of affiliation to the Communist International, accompanied by the resolution adopted by referendum, has been brought before the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

We are in possession also of the report of the National Convention of the Socialist Party held in New York in May 1920, containing the resolution upon international relations, adopted by the Convention in place of that previously adopted by referendum—also the resolution presented by Victor Berger.

Since these resolutions will be submitted to referendum once more, it is necessary to examine all three. All that can be said of Berger's Resolution is, first, that it is honestly reactionary; and second, that we are surprised that it could be offered in a convention of a party which calls itself Socialist.

Concerning the minority resolution—which, except for the addition of George Lansbury's opinion of what Lenin thought, about conditions of affiliation to the Communist International, is the same as the resolution adopted by referendum—there is more to say.

It begins with a long preamble condemning the Second International—a formula which has become so common, even to the parties of the Right, that it has ceased to have any meaning. The section dealing with the Communist International reads as follows (italics ours):

"The Socialist Party of the United States, therefore, declares itself in support of the Third (Moscow) International, NOT SO MUCH BECAUSE ITS SUPPORT OF THE 'MOSCOW' PROGRAMS AND METHODS, BUT BECAUSE:

a) "Moscow is DOING SOMETHING which is really challenging to world imperialism.

b) "Moscow" is threatened by the combined capitalist forces of the world simply because it is proletarian.

c) Under these circumstances, **WHATEVER WE MAY HAVE TO SAY TO MOSCOW AFTERWARDS**, it is the duty of Socialists to stand by it NOW, because its fall will mean the fall of Socialist Republics in Europe, and also the disappearance of Socialist hopes for years to come."

The reasons stated for affiliation to the Communist International have nothing to do with Communism, and indeed imply very serious reservations concerning what the author calls "Moscow" programs and methods—by which we take it Communism is meant.

It is of course, very gratifying to have the sympathy of the American Socialist Party because the Communist International is "threatened by the combined capitalist forces of the world". This is, however, hardly a valid reason for a party's wishing to join the Communist International, or for the Communist International to accept such a party, but there is no other reason given except that the Communist International is "doing something" which is "challenging world imperialism" just what the author evidently prefers to conceal from the American proletariat.

This resolution evidently is based on a misconception of the role of the Communist International. The Communist International is in no sense a defensive organization. It is an organ of aggression, the General Staff of the World Revolution, for the forcible overthrow of the capitalist state everywhere, and the setting up of the dictatorship of the Proletariat. Concerning questions of principle and fundamental aims, it is impossible to consider what the American Socialist Party "may have to say to Moscow afterwards".

On the contrary, the Communist International has something to say to parties desiring to affiliate, BEFORE they are accepted.

The Communist International is not "Moscow" but a centralized and disciplined organization now comprising the great majority of the revolutionary working class parties of the world. The Second Congress, just ended, contained representatives of the revolutionary vanguard of the workers of all countries. There were also present delegates of the French Socialist Party and the German Independent Social Democratic Party, which only a few months ago were engaged in trying to form the "Two-and-a-half" International, by means of a conference at which the centrist parties would dominate, which would establish a basis for resistance to Communism, a center of sabotage of the World Revolution. It is this idea which animates the Hillquit, or majority-resolution adopted by the Socialist Party Convention, with the exception that neither the Germans nor the French Party have ever dared to declare themselves against the Dictatorship of the Proletariat as has been done by the Socialist Party of the United States.

This scheme has failed, because the working class of the world is in favor of playing itself under the leadership of the Communist International and the leaders of the centrist

parties, pushed onward by pressure of the masses, now come to us desiring admission to the Communist International. This is even more true of the Hillquits and Lees of the American Party, who even while they declare themselves opposed to the principles of the Communist International, yet do not dare to withdraw from it.

And to all these parties the Communist International replies:

The Communist International is not a hotel, where travellers may come with their own baggage and vary on their private affairs. The Communist International is an army in wartime; volunteers who join the Army of revolution must adopt its principles and obey its orders, submit to its discipline. None but revolutionary Communist Parties are accepted in the Communist International. They must adopt as their program the program of the Communist International—open revolutionary mass-struggle for Communism, through the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, by means of Workers' Soviets—accepting as binding all resolutions of the Congresses and Executive Committee of the Communist International. They must create a strongly centralized form of organization, a military discipline; all Party members in public office, in the Labor Unions, in all forms of public activity, must be absolutely subject to the full-powered Central Committee of the Party, which is the supreme organ directing all the phases of Party work.

They must constantly denounce bourgeois democracy and social patriotism, and also the falsehood and hypocrisy of social pacifism; they must systematically demonstrate to the workers that without a revolutionary overthrow of the capitalist state no talk of disarmament, no international arbitration, no League of Nations can save mankind from new imperialist wars.

They must immediately break with reformism and the policy of the centrists; they must expel from their ranks all non-revolutionary elements, all opportunist leaders; they must sever all connections with the petty-bourgeoisie, and prepare for revolutionary action, for merciless civil war.

The report of the May Convention of the Socialist Party proves very clearly that this party is very far indeed from specification above outlined.

The Declarations of Principles is an affront to the working class. It alone, if endorsed by the membership, is sufficient to separate the Socialist Party of the United States from the revolutionary movement.

The rejection of the resolution endorsing the Dictatorship of the Proletariat is of course inadmissible in any party seeking to join the Communist International. And we do not know a single Socialist Party in the world which has equalled the Action of the American Party in ABOLISHING FROM ITS CONSTITUTION TWO YEARS AFTER THE WORLD WAR, THE PROVISIONS FORBIDDING LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVES TO VOTE FOR MILITARY APPROPRIATIONS.

Up to the present, the American Socialist Party has been considered a centrist party, but it definitely abandons all Socialist pretensions, it definitely enters the ranks of the bourgeois reform parties, with the adoption of the following declaration:

"Its (the Socialist Party's) ULTIMATE AIM in politics is to secure a majority in Congress and in every state legislature, to win the principal executive and judicial office to become the dominant and controlling political party of the country, in order to accomplish Socialism"

If this childish and antiquated conception of the task of a Socialist Party, which even the yellow Second International—from which the American Socialist Party has indignantly withdrawn—did not dare openly to proclaim is the actual honest attitude of the membership of the Socialist Party of the United States, after all that has happened, after the World War the Russian Revolution, and in particular after the year of black reaction in the United States, the persecution of revolutionists, the expulsion of the Socialists at Albany—then we must not understand why the American Socialist Party wishes to enter the Communist International, why it does not endorse the League of Nations, as Meyer London advocates.

The centrist parties, the German Independents and the French Socialists are not yet acceptable, for entrance into the Communist International. Yet they accept the program of Mass Action and Dictatorship of the Proletariat based on the Soviets. Any party which still advocates political democracy is a thousand times worse than these Parties. It is a counter-revolutionary, a Scheidemann Party.

The Convention was dominated by centrist and reactionary elements. By the yellow "reformist-politicians", Hillquit, Lee, Stedman, C'neal, Block, Panken; by the "one-hundred percent Americans", Meyer London, Solomon; by

the "State Socialists" and inverted social patriots, Victor Berger; by Cannon and Saltz, Karlin and Berlin—all of whom have no place in a party affiliated to the Communist International. There was a "Left Wing"—Engdahl, Kruse, Tucker, Holland, etc.—which demanded affiliation to the Communist International and a revolutionary restatement of Party principles; but this group was a pitiful minority, its ideas were confused, permeated by cowardly compromise and petty bourgeois prejudices, in all the convention not one Communist voice was heard.

But perhaps the most significant action of the reactionary machine, was to stifle debate and refuse to answer questions concerning the defense of the Socialist assemblymen expelled at Albany.

For example, the testimony of assemblyman Louis Waldman—still a member of the Socialist Party—shows that he declared himself opposed to the establishment of a Soviet Government in the United States, that he preferred the Government of the State of New York—which is a "people's government"—to the Soviet Government; that he urges all workers to take part in a war of defense; that he would vote for military appropriations etc.

This, however, is only the statement of an individual member. Take the official defense of the Party, the "Brief for the Socialist Assemblymen". It apologizes for the presence of foreigners in the Party by calling them "potential voters, and hastens to explain that a new rule requires all Party members immediately to become citizens. It rejects the general strike as a political weapon, on the ground that if there are enough workers to strike for a political reform, there are enough to win it by voting. "The Soviet form of government", it says, "seems to be good for Russia. The parliamentary form of government seems to be good for the United States. . . ." But the most base betrayal of Socialism occurs in the passage explaining why the Socialist Party supports the Soviet Government:

"We sympathize with the Russian workers, the Russian peasants, the Russian Socialists, the Russian Communists, in maintaining their Soviet Government—NOT BECAUSE IT IS A SOVIET GOVERNMENT, BUT BECAUSE IT IS A GOVERNMENT OF THEIR OWN CHOOSING. SUPPOSE THEY HAD ADOPTED A DIFFERENT FORM OF GOVERNMENT, SAY ONE THAT HAD SPRUNG FROM THE CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY, WE SHOULD NOT SUPPORT IT ANY THE LESS."

Is this, perhaps, what the American Socialist Party "will have to say to Moscow afterwards?" Nosko and Mannerheim, Lloyd George and Wilson could endorse this treacherous logic with a clear conscience.

The "Socialist" aldermen of New York, who voted for the Liberty Loan, who voted for money to erect the Victory Arch, the "Socialist" congressman Meyer London, who congratulated the King of Italy upon his birthday, who voted for the war credits; the "Socialists" legislators at Albany, who declared publicly against Communism, the "Socialist" district-attorney at Milwaukee who imprisoned workingmen for breaking up a religious meeting; the "Socialist" officials who called the Chicago police to expel the Communists from the 1919 Convention—all these "comrades" are still members of the Socialist Party of the United States: in fact they controlled the May Convention.

It will be pointed out that the selection of Eugene Debs to presidential candidate proves that the American Socialist Party is a revolutionary party.

It is a characteristic tactic of centrist parties to make use of revolutionary phrases, of revolutionary personalities, to deceive the working masses, to persuade them to follow opportunist leaders.

Comrade Debs has a fine revolutionary record. All the more shame to "Socialist" leaders of the American Party, who have exploited the imprisonment of Debs for their own selfish, non-revolutionary purposes, and who, in nominating him for president, once more attempt to cover up and justify their compromising and cowardly attitude—at the same time refusing to consider comrade Debs's proposal for unity with the Communists.

Nowhere in the world is the persecution of Communists, of true Socialists, more bitter than the part of the capitalist class. Thousands of our comrades have been deported, imprisoned for long terms, tortured and beaten, in the United States. In America—alone, out of all the non-revolutionary countries, the Communist movement is illegal, must function underground—those who are Communists remain so at their risk of their liberty, their lives.

(Continued on page 8)

# Terrorism and Communism.

By V. BYSTRIANSKY.

Thanks to the pen of the well-known renegade, Karl Kautsky, a new work against Communism has just appeared, entitled "Terrorism and Communism".

To this work, whose author is forever excluded from the ranks of the Marxists, Lenin has devoted an article in the 5th number of the "Communist International", entitled "How the Bourgeoisie Utilizes the Renegade". The Russian counter-revolutionaries of the "Rousskaja Jlan" appearing in Helsingfors, do not permit an advantageous exploitation of this last outburst of the renegade.

Undoubtedly, Kautsky has more than once intrenched himself behind the authority of Marx in order to excuse his attacks against Bolshevism; nor has he abstained this time from making any appeal to the shadow of the great master in order to justify the principal thesis of his work.

Those who pin their faith in the Political Revolution are in error in Kautsky's opinion. Do you want to know the arguments he advances in support of his allegations? A revolution such as has been achieved in Russia, if extended to Europe would enroll the entire world in civil war for a whole generation, and this Civil War would not be a struggle between the classes, but what is more, a fratricidal war between the proletarians!

Let us analyse in our turn the opinions of Marx concerning the Proletarian Revolution in order to establish whether he conceived it in any other form than that of civil war. This shall be our subject-matter.

In his work, "The Trial of the Communists of Cologne", Marx cites the following declaration that he had made to the Assembly of the Central Committee of the Communist Union, reunited at London, Sept. 15th, 1850, in order to justify his proposition of the abolition of the Union: "We say to the workers: You will have to endure 15, 20, 50 years of civil war and of international struggle, not only to transform the social regime but also to transform yourselves fit to exercise political power"

Marx, as we see him, feared not to embroil whole generations in civil war. Contrariwise, he taught that that was *theoretically* means for the social revolution to obtain victory, and that the promised land of Communism could only be attained by traversing the arid desert of civil war.

And Marx has not renounced this view. In His work "The Civil War in France" 1848-1850, composed of articles published in the "Neue Rheinische Zeitung", Marx wrote:

"The actual situation brings to mind the traversing of the desert by the Hebrews led by Moses. This war ought not only to put an end to the conquest of a new world, but the combatants in it are destined to disappear in order to give place to men whose education renders them capable of living in a new world"

In his 18th Brumaire, written in 1852, Marx contrasts the proletarian revolution with bourgeois revolutions as follows:

"Bourgeois revolutions, such as the revolution of the 18th century, rush onward rapidly from success to success, their stage effects outbid one another, men and things seem to be in flaming brilliant, ecstasy is the prevailing spirit; but they are short-lived, they reach their climax speedily, then society relapses into a long fit of nervous reaction before it learns how to appropriate the fruits of its period of feverish excitement.

"Proletarian revolutions, on the contrary, such as those of the 19th Century, criticize themselves constantly; constantly interrupt themselves in their own course, come back to what seems to have been accomplished in order to start over anew; scorn with cruel thoroughness the half-measures, weaknesses and meannesses of their first attempts; seem to throw down their adversary only in order to enable him to draw fresh strength from the earth and again to rise up against them in more gigantic stature; constantly recoil in fear before the undeveloped monster magnitude of their own objects, until finally that situation is created which renders all retreat impossible, and the conditions themselves cry out: *Hic Rhodus, hic salta!*"

Thus does Marx present the proletarian revolution to the brief bourgeois revolution; he conceives it in the form of an entire historic revolutionary movement succeed one another with moments of calm.

Let us now see in what manner Marx comprehended this proletarian revolution.

Precisely in the form of civil war.

"The Civil War in France"—such is the title given by Marx to one of his most beautiful works consecrated to the glorification of

the Paris Commune of 1871, which was precisely an example of this "fratricidal war between proletarians" which Kautsky fears so much. Those proletarians who fought in the camp of Thiers against the Communards were indeed deceived by the Versailles. The whole world knows the inspired pages that Marx dedicated to the memory of the Paris Commune; we shall only quote the following lines:

"The working class did not ask the Commune to perform any miracles. It did not expect to realize complete Utopias prepared in advance by the wish of the people. It ignores nothing in order to obtain its liberty and to attain to superior forms of existence towards which modern society irresistibly tends by reason of a series of historic processes which will transform entirely both men and circumstances".

And thus Marx conceived "this difficult struggle"—the struggle for power of which the Paris Commune was the first act—as a series of historic processes, which signifies according to him the civil war had to extend over an entire epoch.

Such is the essence of true, revolutionary Marxism, whose principles are revealed in the works of the great master and which the miserable charlatans try in vain to falsify. Marx is with us and not with our enemies. Communism is a different thing from revolutionary Marxism realized in practical life during the period of the social revolution.

There was a time, however, when Kautsky himself followed Marx in the question of the duration of the civil war. We wish to speak of the work of Kautsky entitled "The Road to Power", which appeared in 1909 and with good reason styled his swan song.

Then he expressed the supposition that the proletarian revolution might indeed last for several generations. Here are his own words:

"Will this revolutionary period last as long as the revolutionary period of the Revolution of the Third Estate, which began in 1789 and lasted up to 1871—this is what is impossible to foresee.

"It is true that during the actual period all development is made more rapid; but as retribution, the arena of the struggle is immeasurably extended. When Marx and Engels wrote their Communist Manifesto, the arena of the proletarian revolution was represented in their eyes by Western Europe alone. At that moment the field of battle embraced the entire world.

"The proletarian revolution will emerge from the revolutionary epoch, which already begins, and which extends perhaps over the entire length of a human existence, entirely divergent from what it is when it entered".

Such were the opinions of Kautsky at the time when he had not yet broken with Marxism. Would he, taking the pain to observe himself, be able to compare what he has been with what he has become?

In his book "Terrorism and Communism", Kautsky, in the language of the social-patriot, showed how the Bolsheviks always succeeded in doing the opposite of what was their aim. They were forced under pain of death to proceed to executions en masse. According to the "Rousskaja Jlan", Kautsky said further: "The Bolsheviks have borrowed from the story of the Paris Commune its implacable terrorism without taking into account their democratic and humanitarian foundation. Terror exhausts the revolutionary energy of the masses and prepares the country for rebellion; it leads to the destruction of the democratic power which is supported by the will of the people".

"Thus it was with Robespierre—it will be the same with the Bolsheviks" concluded Kautsky. This opinion of Kautsky on the terrorism of the proletarian revolution and that of the Russian peasants is indistinguishable from the opinions on the same subject expressed by Lloyd George and Clemenceau and repeated in every tongue by the bourgeois press in the pay of the financiers.

Let us now see what was the opinion of Marx on revolutionary terrorism.

In 1847, in his article "Die Moralisierende Kritiken und die Kritische Moral", he wrote:

"The reign of terror in France could consequently serve to efface all the feudal ruins as by enchantment under the blows of a terrible mallet. The bourgeois would have lived unscathed for decades without being able to attain this result".

The bloody excesses of the people have served but to shorten its life. (Aus dem Hritischen Nachlass von Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels und Ferdinand Lassalle, Stuttgart 1892, III, 456-6).

In January 1849, the "Neue Rheinische Zeitung" characterizes "the heroic epilogue of the revolutionary movement of the year 1848"—the terrorism of the Hungarian revolutionaries—in the following terms:

"For the first time in the revolutionary movement of 1849, for the first time since 1793, a nation surrounded by superior counter-revolutionary forces has the boldness to oppose the revolutionary passion to the timorous wrath of the counter-revolution (Die feigen gegen-revolutionären Wub die revolutionäre Leidenschaft)."

All of Marx's sympathies were, as we see it, on the side of the revolutionary terror. There was a time however, when Kautsky was capable of judging "Terrorism and Communism" more objectively. We have seen his work on the subject which appeared in 1895, "Die Vorläufer der Sozialismus"—absolving the Communist movement of the past age and of the epoch of the Reformation from all the calumny with which the bourgeois historians had blackened its memory.

The most interesting pages of this work are those dedicated to the Commune of Munster—this "New Jerusalem" of the epoch of the Reformation. At the end of 1539, the Anabaptists, the Communists of that epoch, had seized power at Munster in Westphalia.

Numerous indeed are the accusations against which our historian had to defend himself in his "Precursors of Socialism"—precursors too precocious of the springtime of Communism; he was not able to forbear taking up the question of "the terror".

Kautsky's reasoning on this subject is very important in order to rightly appreciate his real attitude to the Red terror of the Russian Communists: As the sky differs from the earth so do they differ from his true opinions.

Twenty five years ago, Kautsky, with a single stroke had grasped this question in its very essence.

"Above everything else let us not forget that Munster found itself in a state of war since the Bishop had attacked it February 10th. This circumstance, ordinarily, is never taken into consideration by the historians biased towards the Anabaptists.

"One must think that war is a very insignificant circumstance, else how can the fact be explained in this case that the "very thoughtful" historians who discovered with such perspicacity the smallest circumstance bearing any influence on the like action of monarchs, always fail to take into consideration the state of war, when it is concerned with judging the acts of a democratic society fighting for its existence. To convince oneself, it suffices to examine the ordinary, idle tales of the Bourgeoisie on the insurrection of the Paris Commune in 1871 and on the reign of terror during the Great French Revolution.

"The Anabaptists of Munster have the same fate". (From the Russian translation of the "Precursors of Socialism", St. Petersburg 1907, page 356).

At an opportune moment, Kautsky the historian, in his role of publicist, likewise fails to take into consideration "this very insignificant circumstance"—a state of war—when it is concerned with judging the acts of the Russian Communist society fighting for its existence. It is quite natural that the "good intentions" of Kautsky are taken cognizance of by the paper "Rousskaja Jlan", organ of Czarist propaganda.

Let us see again what Kautsky has to say on the same subject.

"If one wishes to understand the insurrection of Munster and the aims pursued by the Anabaptists, he cannot criticize their acts in accordance with standards established in times of peace, but contrariwise, he must bear in mind that a besieged city is in question, and one in particularly trying circumstances. Ordinary military laws did not exist for the Anabaptists; no honorable capitulation was possible for them. The besieged had to make their choice between victory and a terrible death".

"With regard to the rebels the most fiendish punishment was still 'too mild for them; it is, as Luther says, a good thing that the government fell into their hands. If these rebels counted on the many sanguinary acts committed by princely cruelty, one would be better able to infer what outrages are perpetrated in the name of liberty and equality. Such is the logic of our scientific light!"

Kautsky, in his capacity as historian, manifested an analytical and very perspicacious mind; then he remembered what was most important to bear in mind, and took even the most "insignificant circumstance" into consideration.

How then does it happen that now, he forgets that all of Soviet Russia is a mere fortress besieged by the omnipotent imperialists the whole world over? Does he really think that the Russian Communists have had other alternatives than those of the Anabaptists of the 16th century?

We need only remind him of the official orders of the reactionary Generals who threatened all the Communists with death. "Good luck to the Communists" wrote Yudenitch in his appeal published in the first number of the "Trinevsky Kral at Gatchina"—and he will be reminded of the fact that the cruelty of the white "democrats" of the 20th Century fell nothing short of the princely cruelty of the 16th Century.

It is curious to note that Kautsky, the historian of the proletarian revolution—explains the necessity of the use of terror by the workmen's commune in the same manner that the impartial historians of the greatest of bourgeois revolutions explain that of the anti-feudal terror of 1793.

Let A. Aulard speak (Political History of the French Revolution, 3rd edition, Petrograd, 1919).

"Up to August 10th, 1792, the revolution had tried to organize a government on the basis of legality and liberty. Then, when the opposing forces of the past had coalesced, provoking civil and general war, when it felt itself attacked in the rear and menaced in its very existence, the revolution interrupted the application of the fundamental principles of 1789 and employed against its enemies the repressive measures of the old regime, since then, always employed against it.

The terror consists precisely in this suspension of the fundamental principles of 1789, which was consummated when the danger reached its zenith, when Paris fully realized this danger and suffered most intensely from it in the months of August and September 1793." (page 245).

"And thus the terror had been called forth by the necessity of the French Republic to defend itself when its revolution was in mortal danger, when France was suffering from foreign invasion, when the Royalists in concert with Girondins, incited insurrection after insurrection in the interior of the country.

"It was then that the word 'terror' entered into daily speech indicating one of the measures employed by the government. Sept. 5th, a deputation, composed of commissaries of 48 sections of Paris and of members of the Jacobin Club, came to declare to the convention 'Legislators! consider the terror as the business of the day'. At the same session, Barriere, speaking in the name of the Committee of Public Safety, employed this phrase in the following place in the discourse:

"Everything indicated, it seems, that a movement was prepared at Paris. The intercepted letters were replete with declarations and the efforts made by the agents of foreign governments and by the aristocracy, to create uneasiness and trouble in the big city, as they call it. Exactly so. They will get what they want; but this uneasiness and this trouble will be organized and centralized by the revolutionary army which will finally carry out the great words uttered by the French Commune: 'Let us consider the terror the business of the day'.

"The reign of terror, in truth, attained the civil rights proclaimed by the revolution. But certain blows directed against individual liberty, were explained by the intensification of the severity of the laws directed against emigrants, laws which become indispensable as a result of the meetings in which arms were furnished to our enemies by the majority of the emigrants" (page 247).

And the terror, at the time of the Great French Revolution, has received its absolution before the tribunal of history!

The old feudal world took up arms against the victorious revolution by allying itself with its enemies in the interior of the country; the bourgeoisie, still revolutionary during that epoch, safeguarded its acquired rights by applying force against the feudal class. Why then should not the victorious proletariat of to-day have the right to employ against the bourgeois world which assails it the very means the bourgeoisie availed itself of during the time it overthrew feudalism?

But let us leave the last word to Kautsky the Kautsky of former days.

In his analysis of the history of the insurrection of Munster, Kautsky emphasizes acts quite new, explaining the necessity of the anti-bourgeois terror employed by the proletarian revolution:

"Rather than the special situation which instigated bloodshed, let us take into consideration the character of the century, which was one of the most sanguinary and perhaps the most sanguinary of all.

"The Anabaptists—living in real peace—nevertheless were systematically pursued as savage beasts, were cruelly martyred. We must

be astonished that, driven by despair, they ended by losing patience and defending themselves with every means; it is astonishing, on the contrary, that it took so long for such a state of mind to develop and that it was not general!!" (page 356-7).

If Kautsky, had not assumed in respect of the Russian Revolution, the attitude of a "partial" historian, he would have reckoned with the character of our own century, which falls nothing short of the 16th century in regard to the war was an imperialistic enterprise for the conquest of new markets and the enrichment of the capitalists, and has exterminated 10,000,000 men and mutilated 20,000,000.

If Kautsky had been ever so slightly objective, in his method, he would have remembered that the Russian Revolution was born of a monstrous military catastrophe and that this circumstance had to effect the character of the civil war, sprung from the imperialist war.

Our historian would have been able to remember the words of one of the greatest historians of all ages and of all peoples, who said that "war leads to the abuse of force". (Thucydide, History of the Peloponnesian War Book 3).

The historian Kautsky would have remembered the callousness of the Germans, the result of the 30 years war, of which the German novelist of the 17th century, Grimmelshausen had given a magnificent description in his celebrated novel "Simplicius Simplicissimus".

Finally, our historian should have remembered the words of Marx in his "Civil War in France", concerning the soldiers who had fired at the Bonapartist generals, Lacomte and Cleant Thomas:

"The military reforms implanted in them by the school of the enemies of the working class, could not be completely eradicated without leaving some traces at the time they went over to the proletarian Party".

The Kautsky of 1895 would undoubtedly have been astonished to find the workers and the Russian peasants so gentle toward their enemies for so long a time; this only resulted in protracting the civil war.

But let Kautsky continue, his description of the "red terror" at Munster.

"A series of fortunate circumstances had placed into the hands of the persecuted and outraged a fortified city when complete discomfiture threatened from without

"How would they act in the circumstances? "After the beginning of the siege, those of the conspirators caught communicating with the external enemy, who however had been in perfect accord with the military laws and the good example of the bishop, had not been put to death. They were simply asked to leave the city. And this is what they call "terror"—what base hypocrisy?"

Terrorist measures of a similar nature were, unfortunately, employed at the beginning by the revolutionary proletariat. In the summer of 1918, K. Arsenoff, ardent defender of liberal journalism, still took cognizance of the fact that "Soviet Power had not had recourse to terror until that moment".

Only iron necessity and the pitiless war that the bourgeois world declared against us forced the workers and peasants to take the path of revolutionary defense.

But continues Kautsky: "At the time of the siege it was necessary to establish severe regulations, and a series of executions took place. But if one will see that they were violations of the laws against the peace of the city; alliance with the enemy, violations of discipline, attempts at desertion or of stirring up trouble in the city. It is beyond doubt that the death-penalty is not a greater cruelty than war itself. It had been imposed upon them, but on every favorable occasion they did not fail to express their pacific sentiments" (page 358).

If our historian had cited events that in his judgment actually transpired in Russia, he would have given an account of only a hundredth part of the objectivity which he manifests in his study of the Commune of Munster; that the Russian revolutionists put to death traitors to the Socialist country, spies of the Entente, all who made attempts against the revolutionary order at the time of one of the most desperate struggles, and those who desert the ranks of the Red Army. The Russian Commune has just as much right in time of a life-and-death struggle to destroy its enemies as the Munster Commune had. And these words of the Kautsky of old, that "the death-penalty is not a greater cruelty than war", than the war imposed upon the Soviet Republic, and that "on every favorable occasion, it expressed pacific sentiments", conform perfectly with the course of the Russian proletarian revolution.

Formerly, Kautsky comprehended very well indeed, the differences between the Red and White terror.

"Terror did not reign only at Munster,

but also in the locality under the control of the bishop, and compulsion was scarcely in favor of the latter. The bishop attacked and the Anabaptists resisted his attacks. The bishop killed for his benefit and the Anabaptists in order not to be slain themselves they fought for their lives. The followers of the bishop avenged themselves by putting the condemned to death. Most often they drowned them or burnt them alive. At Munster they did not torment the condemned; two kinds of death-penalties were in force, employed even in the humanitarian 19th century, capital punishment and running the gauntlet".

At present, Kautsky seems to ignore the fact that terror reigns not only in Soviet Russia, but also in the localities under the control of the counter-revolution. He does not even see the terror, whose victims, the German proletariat, and those executed by Scheldemann and Noske, stand before his very eyes.

Forsyth, the "very thoughtful" historian knows that comparison is not in favor of the white terror—therefore he does not mention a word of it.

Kautsky adds, that the Anabaptists, far from being too cruel, seemed, on the contrary too humane for their time and the circumstances in which they found themselves. Their whole cruelty consisted in not permitting themselves to be slaughtered like sheep; in the eyes of every "very thoughtful" citizen to shoot at the Anabaptists is a very laudable act dictated by the love of one's neighbor; but when the latter in their turn permit themselves to do some shooting, that is something which becomes diabolical "cruelty".

A very well know proverb from the Hotentots says, "I do very well to take the wife of my neighbor, but he does wrong to take mine".

Having become "very thoughtful" to-day, Kautsky finds excuse for the acts of the Russian Communists, acts which he found natural enough on the part of the pioneers of Communism about 400 years ago.

In speaking of the past Kautsky seems willing enough to expose the bourgeois lies: "The accusation of cruelty is closely linked up with the accusation of tyranny. Munster seems to prove where liberty and communistic equality lead" (page 359).

Soviet Russia shows to what the realization of Socialism leads to, cry the silk-stocking Socialists of every country! ..

The Kautsky of old knew, 25 years ago, the real worth of bourgeois tales; now he repeats them without the slightest criticism.

Let us see what our historian replices to the accusations hurled at the Munster Commune:

"A state of siege has always resulted from the abolition of civil rights and of liberty, and of the unlimited right of the military power to dispose of the life and property of the besieged population. And it is so true that the same expression, "state of siege", has become synonymous with the abolition of all the rights of civil liberty. Communism has unfortunately, not yet discovered the marvelous elixir which would be able to obviate these inevitable consequences of the state of siege.

"It is because of this fact that it has not been able to prevent, even at Munster, the state of siege from introducing the military dictatorship. Why then not, end once for all, all talk about the criminal culpability of Communism and of the Communists? (page 360).

Note how many things Kautsky understood twenty-five years ago that he no longer understands to-day!!!

It is hard to furnish better evidence than he has given, or in stronger words, the entire inevitable logic of the development of the proletarian revolution—it is impossible better to refute the accusations of the bourgeoisie against Communism!

But what seemed clear to the historian Kautsky, is now utterly beyond the comprehension of Kautsky the politician.

"The bourgeoisie attribute to the workers all the base acts which they themselves have never failed to commit in the event of victory". Written in 1874, Frederick Engels, in his article, "Bakounists at Work".

Kautsky agreed to expose the bourgeois lies in the past—when it concerned absolving from slander the memory of martyrs of Communism—but he repeats the lying tales of the sycophants of the bourgeoisie at the expense of those who are continuing the work of the Communists of Munster towards the noble goal, of those who are destined to bring about the triumph of Communism.

One is tempted to say to him with the Russian poet: "Awake! Open your eyes, see what you are and what you have become!"

And the revolutionary proletariat, in comparing the Kautsky of our days, for whom revolutionary Marxism was a book fastened with seven seals, will justly stigmatize him along with the rest of the renegades.

# The S. L. P. and the Third International.

It is extremely amusing to watch the intellectual gymnastics of the Weekly People, official organ of the S. L. P. of America, from week to week, particularly on questions affecting the Third (Communist) International. For a narrow, dogmatic, non-Marxian sect, that has been living on its decease since founder, Daniel DeLeon, these last six years, founder and spewing its venom on the Third International and its affiliated parties throughout the world, it has no equal anywhere.

The younger and more revolutionary elements have long ago split away from Peterson's sect and what is left is constantly undergoing the same partition under the sledge-hammer blows of the Third International—just the same as all other official "Socialist" parties formerly affiliated with the Second International. What is left are a few blind worshippers of DeLeon, who never knew the flaw in DeLeon's emasculation of Marxism—and who to-day are incapable of learning anything or forgetting anything.

The Russian Revolution has passed them by and left them—cold. Like the I. W. W. they prate stupidly that they have nothing to learn from the Bolsheviks. The new orientation in the revolutionary proletarian movement in Europe and America has found them fumbling their old shibboleths bequeathed them by DeLeon and hurling anathema at any who would rouse them from their meaningless incantations.

The growth of the Left Wing movement in this country, in response to the betrayal of the principles of revolutionary Socialism by the existing Socialist movement in this country (The S. P. and the S. L. P.), the post-war conditions and the Russian November Revolution which placed the Communist Party of Russia (Bolshevik) in power, called forth the most bitter denunciation from the Weekly People upon the heads of the leaders of this movement and branding them as "anarchists". The Left Wing itself was designated as "scatter-brained" and "anarchistic". Indeed the contest between the Right Wing of the S. P., the syndicalists of the I. W. W., and the envenomed sectarians of the S. L. P., as to who could sling the mud most at the Left Wing can never be decided. All three were equally facile and prolific at this game.

All three hid their traitorous action behind smooth phrases of sympathy for the Russian Revolution (without making it clear which Russian Revolution they meant). As time went on they were compelled to drop their ambiguity and come out openly against Kerensky whom they had defended against the Bolsheviks, and in favor of the Soviet Government, with sometimes a mead of praise for the "muddle-headed" Bolsheviks. But their fury against the Left Wing and the Communist movement rose in inverse ratio.

The first call for participation in a Congress at Moscow for the formation of a new International, was greeted by the S. L. P. with broad hints that this document was a fraud and a forgery hatched in the mind of international spies. From then on every document that emanated from Moscow was branded in the same terms. Sometimes the allusion was open, sometimes it was veiled. But never did the Weekly People credit the Third International with authorship. The gradual counter-revolutionary development of the S. L. P. became more and more pronounced. From fiery denunciation of the revolutionary Socialists at home and "sympathy" with the revolutionary Socialists abroad, they tended logically to a denunciation of the revolutionary Socialists abroad. In their open letters to Presidents, Senators and Attorney-Generals they went so far as to denounce the Left Wing and Communist parties to the Government. The aftermath of the January raids called forth the irrepressible glee of the Weekly People. "The Physical-forcists" had at what they richly deserved. From then on every reference to the Communist Party which had been driven underground for advocating the principles and tactics of the Third International, was "rat-hole Communists" and similar derisive epithets.

Finally the September 1st proclamation of the Executive Committee of the Third International, signed by its chairman, Comrade Zinoviev, was published in various radical, Socialist and Communist organs in America. For a long time the Weekly People paid no heed to it or else denounced it as a "fraud" or a "forgery". From a report of their convention published in their sheet, it seemed as if this proclamation was even debated at the convention but was greatly to be doubted. (It must be noted here that Boris Reinstein, who had eluded the charge to the Stockholm Congress, and also final the Congress of the Third International for the S. L. P. was repudiated by the S. L. P.) After an open letter to Zinoviev, the Weekly People in its wrath against the Third International as well as against the Communist movement in this country in unmistakable terms. They denunciation as the basis for acceptance into the Third International—Mass Action Dictatorship of the Proletariat and Soviet Power. In lan-

guage more intemperate than Hillquit ever used it ranked itself against the Third International and denounced its principles and tactics.

The call for the second Congress of the Third International found the S. L. P. weakly attempting to evade the issue by claiming that it was in no position to send delegates. In this manner it fooled its membership—BUT THE FACT IS THAT IT REFUSED TO SEND DELEGATES BECAUSE IT DISAGREED WITH THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL ON THE SAME GROUNDS AS ALL OTHER "SOCIALIST" PARTIES OF EUROPE AND AMERICA.

Now that the Congress is over and the "Socialist" parties of the Right and Centre have been carefully excluded and the conditions for admission have been promulgated, the Weekly People comes out denouncing the S. P. for not affiliating—but the writer must have had his tongue in his cheek while doing so. While ostensibly an attack against Hillquit and the S. P., more space is devoted to perverting the issue to prove why the S. L. P. could not itself affiliate and in attempting to prove that the reasons which actuated the S. L. P. were different than those which actuated the S. P.

How does it prove its case? By calling the Communist parties which accept mass action and armed insurrection and civil war as "anarchists". Mass Action itself is called an "anarchistic" doctrine. They refused to give up their legalistic and opportunistic theories—they demand the right to preach their own doctrines and "national" autonomy.

The very same position taken by the S. P. But the S. L. P. pretends that its case is different. The hypocrisy of the S. L. P. is so self-evident that it needs no further comment.

In the current issue of the Weekly People (October 9th) the S. L. P. returns to the attack of the S. P. by analysing and proving that the Third International was right in branding Hillquit as a renegade and traitor. It is the first of a series and we have no doubt that the Weekly People will pile up such a mass of evidence that will prove Hillquit's apostasy to the hilt. For Hillquit and the S. L. P. are traditional enemies. They hate each other even long after the causes for hate have disappeared. They are blindly thrusting their spear into the man around whose neck they will yet throw their arms to save them from those "bad, bold Bolsheviks". But this is another story and is yet to be written on the records of history.

What we are more directly concerned with is the fine, maciavellian manner in which the Weekly People traduces the Third International, in contradistinction to the clumsy, slap-stick method of Sandgren and the plodding, stupid sallies of Hillquit.

After quoting some of Hillquit's statements from the Call, the Weekly People introduces its fine Italian hand as follows:

"There is perhaps no more difficult task at this time than attempting to take under consideration statements which come or purport to come from the Third International at Moscow"

The implication is that one cannot be sure of the authenticity of any document that comes from the Third International. And for the following four "reasons":

(1) The accomplishment of Russian Revolution and the three years struggle, and "that nearly the entire previously recognized and leading Socialist movements of the Western countries have either joined more or less openly the camp of the enemies of have damned the Soviets with faint praise, all these and many other circumstances taken together may easily have caused the Soviet leaders to STAND SO STRAIGHT THAT SOME OF THE LESS WELL-BALANCED HAVE COME TO LEAN TOWARDS PHYSICAL FORCE—particularly as they have been fostered under Russian conditions".

(2) The isolation of Russia due to the blockade and the war against her, cutting off Russia from intercourse with revolutionists from other countries which necessarily compelled her to "look at the world with Russian spectacles".

(3) "The news coming from Russia is still garbled and unreliable. So for example, did there appear in the New York Sun of August 31 seventeen "points" purporting to be the authentic demands imposed by the Third International for admission of Socialist bodies.

(4) "So-called "Communist" papers and underground journals of this and other countries are being crammed with "official" documents (as down laws and dictates which have "FRAUD" WRITTEN ALL OVER THE FACE OF THEM".

These are the four "reasons" given by the S. L. P. for its policy of "labor and wait", as THE MEETING OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL CAN TAKE PLACE.

Those who have read Hillquit's attack upon the Third International will certainly admit that this method is crudeness itself compared with the S. L. P. method of attack upon the Third International.

Hillquit's attempt to discuss principles and set up what he calls his "Socialism of the Western type" as opposed "to the doctrines from Moscow" fooled no one. The Marxist type social-patriotism, reformism, opportunism and pacifism, but here we have a different enemy to deal with. There is no attempt to discuss

principles. The four "points" of the S. L. P. are dipped in the distilled poison of DOUBT and SOLICITUDE FOR THE GOOD NAME OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL which is being bandied about by self-appointed "committees" of Communists in Western Europe and even in America, "taking upon themselves the function of speaking as 'Committees of the Third International'."

Mark you, it is the S. L. P. which becomes the "champion" of the Third International against its traducers, The Communist Parties of Western Europe and America! Why, it even champions the Third International against some of its "less well balanced" leaders in Russia! You see, all of them are unbalanced but some are "less well-balanced" than others!

To enter into discussion with such a bunch of scoundrels is a waste of time. Our task is to expose them and leave them to the well-deserved contempt of every honest class-conscious worker.

Point (1) makes the dishonest assumption that there are leaders of the Third International who differ on the question of mass action and the inevitability of a violent revolution to overthrow the capitalist governments of the world.

WE CHALLENGE THE S. L. P. TO PRODUCE THE WRITING OF ANY OF THE RUSSIAN LEADERS OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL, LENIN, ZINOVIEV, RADEK, BUCHARIN, TROTSKY, ETC., WHEREIN THEY STATE THAT THEY ARE OPPOSED TO THE USE OF FORCE IN THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION OR PROPAGATING THIS TACTIC TO THE MASSES!

The cheap, sinister, provocative attempt of the S. L. P. to denounce the Communist Party to the Government by using the term "physical force" instead of mass action—which latter is the recognized terminology for this tactic in the Third International—is obviously intended to scare away its membership from discussing and understanding this question.

Point (2) that due to the isolation of Russia she has been compelled to "look at the world with Russian spectacles", is only another but more pernicious way of repeating Hillquit's clumsy phrase of Socialism of the western type versus the doctrines that emanate from Moscow. The implication is clearly defined nevertheless, in this statement as in Hillquit's, that a violent revolution may have been well enough in backward, Czarist Russia, but in the enlightened democracies of Western Europe and America, where "the will of the majority" can be expressed through the ballot—where even capitalist institutions permit of a "lawful", "legal" change, such methods are unthinkable, and uncivilized".

This negation is completely at variance with Marx's own dictum on the origin and function of the state. It exposes the bourgeois-democratic ideology of those who believe that the capitalist state in the form of a democratic parliamentary republic differs essentially from the monarchical form of state, insofar as the class struggle for the emancipation of the working class is concerned.

These "eneuchs of Marxism" try to make the workers believe that the use of force, the wrenching of force, is peculiarly a product of the Russian Revolution and heretofore had no place in Marxist Socialism. Therefore the reference to "Russian spectacles".

It is unnecessary to quote from Marx and Engels to disprove this arrogant lie. Lenin has done it so well in his "STATE AND REVOLUTION", (which look the S. L. P. imports from England but never reads), that most of our readers are thoroughly familiar with it.

Point (3) attempts to confuse the garbled and unreliable news from Russia as printed in the capitalist papers with the authentic and reliable news of the Third International which is disseminated in the Communist papers here and abroad. The Weekly People gives the impression that the documents or theses from the Executive Committee of the Third International are just as garbled and unreliable as the news printed in the capitalist papers. This is the only way in which it can continue to hide its opposition to the principles and tactics of the Third International. But the Weekly People cannot deny that it knows of the "Communist International" magazine, printed in Moscow and Petrograd, in Russian, French and German, which is the OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL!

All the documents, theses, official statements, communications etc., which are printed in the Communist papers here and abroad, and which are credited to the Executive Committee of the Third International, are either taken or translated from this magazine. (The Weekly People itself, in the current issue, reprints an article entitled "The Working Women in Soviet Russia", which is a translation from the No. 9 issue of the Communist International magazine, by Comrade Geleze Blinnina).

This proves that they know of the existence of this magazine and do not doubt its authenticity where ordinary articles are concerned. They begin to doubt it only where the Executive Committee of the Third International issues its official documents, or the thesis of the

Congresses of the Third International. What hypocrites and scoundrels!

Point (1) goes even further and actually proclaims that these documents, reprinted and translated from the official organ of the Executive Committee of the Third International by the Communist papers in America and Europe are "frauds". Zinoviev is a fraud as well as one of the "less well-balanced" leaders of the Third International. So is Lenin, and Trotsky, and Bukharin and Radek and Kamenev. Krassin is a fraud, Litvinoff is a fraud, Joffe is a fraud. The Executive Committee of the Third International itself is a fraud. The Weekly People says so and it must be so.

Strange, how quickly it reprints Lenin's letter to Sylvia Pankhurst from the "Bulletin Communiste" printed in France by the Communist group or party there! Why are there no misgivings about this document, which the Weekly People reprints without a line or phrase doubting its authenticity? Isn't this an oversight on the part of the Weekly People?

But lest the readers think that these documents are considered frauds by the Weekly People forever and forever, we hasten to disillusion you. The Weekly People has an infallible scheme to prove the authenticity of any official document purporting to come from the Third International. It is simple and sufficient for its purpose. Here it is:

"Nevertheless, when a certain specific statement has been generally published and accepted as genuine by the Socialist press of the world and a sufficient lapse of time has been allowed to intervene without a protest coming from Russia, then an important statement may be taken for authentic without fear of going wrong".

Do you see the trick concealed here? It means that when sufficient time elapses without a protest coming from Russia, and after it has been reprinted by the SOCIALIST PRESS of the world, that stamps a document as authentic. Not the Communist press but the Socialist press! Note that! It really means that if a year elapses everybody will forget that the Weekly People and S. L. P., once denounced the document as a "fraud" and a "forgery". Like the Zinoviev proclamation dated September 1st, 1919! More than one year after date the Weekly People condescends to acknowledge its genuineness! A year ago by claiming "forgery" it did not have to take any official action on it. A year later new conditions arise, new official documents are published and the old document is forgotten. As for the latest documents, why they are forgeries until a sufficient time has elapsed without protest from Russia! Therefore no action need be taken on the new ones. A year from now, these official documents published about that time will be out which will distract the minds of the readers of the Weekly People from the present ones.

This is the greatest little scheme for dodging the burning issues of the Third International ever devised by any set of opportunistic, petty-bourgeois politicians for fooling its members and sitting on the fence on all questions.

We commend this scheme to Hillquit and Sanderson in the future. Its got their clumsy antics beaten a mile.

## Unemployment.

Continued from page 1.

way for the Communist Society where all members will freely co-operate for the production, distribution and enjoyment of the necessities, comforts and luxuries of life.

THAT IS EXACTLY WHAT THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT OF RUSSIA IS DOING.

In spite of the Allied blockade—in spite of the counter-revolutions and invasions of Kulebiak, Denikin, Yudenitch, Poland and Wrangel, all financed and operated by World Imperialism—Soviet Russia is slowly build-

ing up the WORKERS' CONTROL OF INDUSTRY AND PAVING THE WAY FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMUNISM.

But Russia alone cannot bring about Communism. This is the task of the workers of all countries. Only the triumph of the world proletarian revolution and the defeat of world Capitalism and Imperialism can accomplish this gigantic task.

The European workers are waking up to this necessity. They are beginning to take lessons from their Russian comrades. The European workers realize the tremendous value of the existence of Soviet Russia and they are solidly behind it. They have notified their Governments that any attack upon Soviet Russia means revolution at home.

In the meantime the European workers are preparing to overthrow their capitalist governments and establish Soviet Governments in their place.

Of course, the European workers have suffered much more than you American workers. They have just gone through six years of the most destructive and fiendish war in the history of the world. They now realize that all the sacrifice and bloodshed and destruction was all in the interest of one of other world groups of imperialist bandits and robbers. They realize now that the "peace" is even worse than the war. Innumerable wars are still going on. The masses are burdened with the war-debts. Industry and commerce has broken down and capitalism is tottering to its fall. The European workers are now face to face—as you workers of America will soon be—with the alternative of starvation and slavery or proletarian revolution.

You workers of America are now going through the same bitter experience. You too were driven into the world war with the slogan "make the world safe for democracy". You too were promised social justice, work and prosperity. Like Wilson's Fourteen Points, they were only promises with which to fool you and were never intended to be kept. In fact, they could not be fulfilled without abolishing the capitalist system. And surely there is no one foolish enough to think the capitalists are going to abolish the very system by which they exploit and rob the workers and reap the golden harvest for themselves?

WORKERS OF AMERICA! Don't let yourselves be fooled by capitalist "promises" any more! You will only be betrayed again. There is only one way out of this misery, poverty and exploitation—you must overthrow the present capitalist government and establish a WORKERS' OR SOVIET GOVERNMENT OF AMERICA!

This is not an easy task. The capitalist government is a machine a national machine which holds the workers by force—through its police powers, its army, navy, courts, bureaucracy, etc. It is the instrument by means of which the capitalist class is enabled to maintain itself as the ruling class in society even though they are a small minority of the population.

The capitalist government cannot be destroyed by peaceful means, such as the ballot-box. The ballot-box is itself an instrument of capitalist domination, cleverly developed so as to fool the workers into believing that they can gain their ends through parliamentary action.

Nor can you abolish the capitalist system by seizing the factories without at the same time seizing the political power.

The workers of Italy have just gone through this experience and they have discovered that without political power—without state power—the workers are bound to lose out.

The only way to overthrow the capitalist government is by means of MASS ACTION, —demonstrations, protests, mass strikes, general strikes, political strikes and culminating finally in open collision with the capitalist state—armed insurrection and civil war.

AGAINST THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE CAPITALIST CLASS THE WORKERS MUST SET UP THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE WORKING CLASS!

You must make your slogans:

DOWN WITH CAPITALISM!

DOWN WITH CAPITALIST GOVERNMENT OF AMERICA!

HAIL TO THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT!

## The Yellow Leaders of the I. W. W.

Continued from page 2.

utely no criterion of the strong tendency towards Communism in the rank and file of the I. W. W.

These yellow leaders have confused political action with the dirty "politics" of the old Socialist parties of the Second International.

These yellow leaders have insinuated and proclaimed that the Communist International and the Communist Party wish to dominate the advanced workers of the I. W. W. for the purpose of subjecting them to its own personal, selfish designs.

These yellow leaders are straddling the fence and are calling for a new "red trade union international", in opposition to the RED TRADE UNION INTERNATIONAL organized by the Communist International—and deceiving the rank and file of the I. W. W. that they mean the Red Trade Union International affiliated with the Communist International.

These yellow leaders have discharged editors who have shown the slightest tendency to sympathize with Communist propaganda and who have had the honesty and fearlessness to publish letters from Communists as well as syndicalists.

We cannot and will not give up the struggle to win the I. W. W. for Communism. We are certain that the local organizations will not heed the orders of the national leaders to expel Communists. We are certain that the rank and file of the I. W. W. sympathize with and are closer to Communist understanding than the yellow leaders suspect.

The Communists of the I. W. W. must close their ranks. They must organize Communist nuclei in the local organizations and carry on an intensive and more determined struggle with these yellow leaders. These Communist nuclei must become the rallying ground for all Communist propaganda and agitation within the I. W. W.

Our victory in the I. W. W. may be delayed by the tactics and vacillation of the leaders but it cannot be prevented for long.

The revolutionary rank and file of the I. W. W. is with us and against the yellow syndicalist leaders. Organize your ranks and capture control of the I. W. W., and make it an efficient auxiliary for Communist agitation to the masses of workers in the industries and agricultural districts.

## Further Negotiations on Unity

The Unity Committee of the Communist Party in its negotiations with the Unity Committee of the U. C. P. have now reached another stage in the negotiations, and it is necessary to apprise the membership of all the steps taken and reasons for the temporary break. Hardly any comment is necessary, as the various communications speak for themselves. These documents follow in chronological order:

Nov. 13, 1920.

TO THE UNITY COMMITTEE,  
UNITED COMMUNIST PARTY OF AMERICA.

Comrades:-

It is eight days now since we interchanged the last of our communications with you, and since we have been expecting to hear from you as to your further actions and as to another meeting with our Unity Committee.

At that time we understood that you would be ready to give us answer to our last communication and to make another appointment with our committee in about three days. Can you not give this answer and make the appointment now? Or tell us why you can not or will not do that?

We regret that our C. E. C. was compelled to adjourn before the negotiations were brought to a definite agreement, but before adjourning it was decided that in view of the time limit set by the International, and in accordance with the decisions of the Congress we issue the call for a Special Convention, which is to be a Joint Convention with the U. C. P. when final agreement is reached. Copy of our Call is enclosed for your information.

A prompt reply from you will be appreciated. You can communicate with us every day through the same comrade through whom you will receive this letter.

Fraternally,

(Signed) C. Dobin, Exec. Sec. C. P. of A.

Nov. 14, 1920.

TO the Central Executive Committee,

Communist Party,

Comrades:-

In answer to your two recent communications the Central Executive Committee of the United Communist Party, passed the following resolution:

"That in reply to recent letters from the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party, part of the contents of which purport to transmit a recent decision of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, in regard to unity, we state, that we can only rely upon our own means of communication with the Executive Committee of the Communist International and see no reason for altering the provisions for a joint convention on the basis of representation for same."

Fraternally,

(Signed) Paul Holt, Exec. Sec. C. E. C.

(Seal) United Communist Party of America.

November 23, we received word of an appointment to meet their unity committee. When the two committees met, our committee was handed the following document from the Communist International (in Russian).

TO U. C. P. AND C. P.

Resolution adopted September 20th.

The Executive Committee decides:

1) To extend the term for the complete unification of both parties in America to January 1st, 1921.

2) To call the attention of the American comrades to the extreme inconvenience of the systematic arrival of new delegates from America who question decisions already passed in presence of other delegates.

3) The Executive Committee demands as an ultimatum, unity on the basis of the decisions adopted by the Second Congress of the Comm. Intern.

4) Responsible representatives of both Parties, give a pledge to the Executive Committee of the Comm. Intern., to accomplish unity without fail.

EXCERPTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE U. C. P. OF AUGUST 20th, 1920.

Read and accepted. 4) Motion of Comrade Reed in reference to basis of representation at the Unity Congress of the Communist Parties of America:

"Representation at the Unity Congress shall be proportional, and the basis shall be the number of dues-paying members by the 1st of September, 1920, according to the official books of both parties."

Original signed by Kobetzky, copy by K. Scott.

P. S. Decisions of the Ex. Comm. of the Comm. Intern.—name of the unified party to be "Communist Party of America".  
A later decision.

"In the Small Bureau it was decided to take July, August, September and October for the basis. And, in addition, that temporarily, representatives of both parties may take part in the meetings of the Ex. Comm. But this is not important. The main thing is that unity MUST BE carried out, because all Moscow is considering this as a necessary and urgent matter."

(Signed) A. Scott.

Then, without directly agreeing to a Unity Convention on the basis of the decisions of the Communist International, the U. C. P. committee wanted to talk about the representation, whereupon we handed the following:

November 24th, 1920.

NOV. 24, 1920. TO THE UNITY COMMITTEE  
OF THE U. C. P.

Comrades:- The Unity Committee of the C. P. stands ready and is empowered to enter into conference with your Committee for a Unity Convention of both parties, to be held on the basis of the decisions of the Com. Intern., as soon as you are ready and empowered to do so.

(Signed)—Dobin, Allen, Morris,—  
Unity Committee C. P.

In reply we received the following:

NOV. 24, 1920. TO THE UNITY COMMITTEE  
OF THE C. P.

Comrades:- The C. E. C. of the U. C. P. still maintains the position, stated in its previous communications, that the interests of the Communist movement in America imperatively demand a major representation, arbitrarily fixed in advance, for the U. C. P. at the Unity Convention, not only on the ground of its greater numerical strength, but also because its centralized form of organization, every group of which is underground, and its organizational policies have already established the U. C. P. as the major party.

However, now the C. E. C. has received an official mandate for unity from the Executive Committee of the Communist International, as well as a notation that the Small Bureau of the E. C. of the C. I. has fixed the basis of representation on the dues paid during the months of July, Aug., Sept. and Oct. The Unity Committee of the U. C. P. has therefore, communicated this decision of the E. C. of the C. I. and the decision of the Small Bureau, to the Unity Committee of the C. P., and is ready and empowered to take the necessary steps to carry out these decisions, confident that an honest statement of membership by both parties will fully establish the claim of the U. C. P. for major representation at the ratio of at least six delegates for the U. C. P. to four delegates for the C. P.

(Signed)—Alden, Holt, McGee.

This statement was considered sufficiently satisfactory to proceed with negotiations by our committee, in spite of the personal opinions and conjectures contained in the first and last paragraphs of their statement. A date set (November 24th) for the submission of signed statements of membership figures by both sides. On November 24th, both committees met and the statements were presented. (Copies of these statements will be found in the second statement on Unity which has already been published and in the hands of the membership.) The dues paying members as the average for the four months and the U. C. P. 4661 for the same period. The Unity Committee of the U. C. P. demanded then to see the signed statements of the Federations (Russian, Lithuanian and Ukrainian) and on November 30th we presented them, not only with such statements but also the official books of these Federations as well. No serious discrepancies were indicated in the figures submitted by both sides, but instead of settling the final matters preliminary to issuing the joint call, the U. C. P. committee stated that they intended to "investigate on the ground", and stated that their committee

would be unable to meet with ours until a week later.

Here the matter rests for the present. Just a word as to this so-called investigation "on the ground". Either this is intended as a mere formality, in which case we may expect to complete unity in the period specified by the Communist International, or, if the U. C. P. really intend to "investigate on the ground", it is the most hypocritical and deliberate piece of chicanery ever perpetrated. It is quite evident to any one familiar with underground organization, that it is absolutely impossible to verify figures except with the co-operation of our own officials. Even then this would take some months. But for outsiders to attempt a serious, honest "investigation" without the co-operation of our officials (which they did not request and seemed not to want) in the period of a week or so, is manifest fraud. An outsider can comb a whole city without finding out the organization strength of any underground party. Does the U. C. P. intend to use this fraudulent "investigation" to hold up the Unity proceedings?

## The Communist International to the American Socialist Party.

(Continued from page 3)

The Socialist Party of the United States submits to this terrorism; it endeavors to prove itself harmless to the capitalist dictatorship, non-revolutionary—and succeeds rather well. Swallowing the ejection of its representatives from Congress, from the State Legislatures, it praises the government, endorses even more warmly the bourgeois state system helping in this way to escape the consequences of defending the working class against the capitalist system. And the Convention rejects a resolution of sympathy for Larkin and Gitlow, Communist fighters taken prisoners in the class war.

If the majority of the American Socialist Party endorses the decisions of this convention, then we have but one thing to say to those honest workers who still remain within the Party:

You are being deceived. The Socialist Party of the United States is not a working class Party, but an auxiliary organization of the American bourgeoisie, of world imperialism. It is not leading you toward Socialism—it is betraying you to the counter-revolution.

Workers! Leave the American Socialist Party. It is your enemy and ours. Already in America there is a revolutionary Party, the United Communist Party, the American Section of the Communist International. These are our true comrades. Thousands of them have suffered for the Revolution. This is the Party of the revolutionary working class.

JOIN THE UNITED COMMUNIST PARTY!

And to the leaders, officials of the Socialist Party of the United States—the Bergers, Hillquits, Londons, Lees—we have only this to say:

You have disgraced the name of "Socialist". You apply for admission to the Communist International; we answer by declaring war upon you, traitors to the Working Class, who, on the eve of the World Revolution, sold out to the enemy to save your skins.

ISSUED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Editorial Note.

The following document was received in this country as one of the documents printed in the "Russian Press Review", published in Moscow, of the issue of October.

Apparently the last paragraphs of the document, in which is mentioned the "United Communist Party", seems to indicate that it was written at a time when the Executive Committee of the Communist International was laboring under the impression that an overwhelming majority of the members of the Communist Party had gone over to the U. C. P. It will be remembered that this was the lie which the U. C. P. delegates spread in Russia and the Executive Committee had no means of verifying this statement until our own delegate arrived there with the real facts.

Since the arrival of our delegate, the Executive Committee has given the Communist Party full recognition and placed our delegate on the Executive Committee with an equal vote. It also laid down the conditions for accomplishing unity as printed in the last issue, which clearly and unequivocally recognize the Communist Party with full rights in the Communist International.

It is also possible that the Executive Committee was under the impression, when this document was written, that unity had already been achieved in this country as the first mandate for unity was promulgated on August 7th demanding unity by October 10th. It is therefore quite probable that the reference to the United Communist Party was intended to mean the unified and united Communist movement in America.