

comrades realize now what they mean by the excuse of "time and money and party resources"? Shall the Communist Party send a delegate or delegates to Europe? Certainly, say the "minority," but the time is premature. Some other time. Now is too soon.

Shall the Communist Party send a delegate or delegates to Europe? Certainly, say the "minority," but we must use our money for building up the party which work is secretarial and administrative purely. Some other time when we have lots of money.

Shall we send delegates to Europe? Certainly, say the "minority," but, we have such few writers and organizers we really cannot spare them at this time. We must wait until, etc. Perhaps when we have established the Dictatorship of the Proletariat they may decide to send some delegates over to Moscow to shake hands with Lenine and give him a few pointers on Communism and its application!

But opposed on principle to the sending of delegates to meetings of the Third International, NEVER! We agree on principle but certain practical considerations keep us back from sending them now.

That is the position of the "minority" on International Relations.

Or, take another incident on this question. When Andrew presented another letter from Comrade Rutgers and a letter from Chabrow to the effect that a meeting of some kind would be held in the near future and requesting us again to send delegates, the "minority" passed a motion in the Chicago Executive Council to the following effect: "That no notification of a meeting of the Communist International be considered valid unless it comes from the Bureau of The International." And since the Amsterdam Bureau was not yet in existence, they could only have referred to one Bureau—the Moscow Bureau!

Think of it! The "minority" expected an embossed credential from Moscow, with the seal of the Third International and signed by Lenine, Trotsky, Bucharin and Zinoviev, calling upon us officially to send delegates to a certain meeting, at a certain time at a certain place!

The former Executive Secretary is quoted in the "minority statement" as having voted for sending Fraina to Europe in November. In going over the minutes of that C. E. C. meeting we find the following motion and votes on it, which seems to disprove the former Executive Secretary quite effectually: "That the Communist Party send a representative or representatives to Europe to make contact with the movement there and to attend the meeting of the Communist International."

Voting yes—Bittelman, Cohen, Birba, Elbaum, Hourwich, Kaross, Tywerowsky and Fraina.

Voting no—Ferguson, Ruthenberg and Schwartz.

So much for International Relations. The "minority" has been smoked out on this issue and stand in no favorable light before the membership.

The "minority" then go on to show that its policy is in harmony with the Third International's and that the policy of the "majority" is not. We are called "super-Bolsheviks who look down with contempt upon the policies of the Third International." How do they show this? By tearing a sentence in an editorial, from its context, and then triumphantly exclaiming, "See! They are opposed to the Third International!"

Unable to distinguish between the spirit and letter of the recommendations of the Third International, the "minority" quickly jump to the conclusion that The Third International recommends mere acceptance of Communist fundamentals as the basis of Communist unity. This is another and crushing example of the Centrist character of the "minority."

The Executive of the Amsterdam Bureau, in its thesis published elsewhere in this issue state the following on unity: "The only, real, living and efficacious unity is the one which has for its base not only the formal acceptance of the Communist principles and theory, but above all the revolutionary practice arising out of this theory."

Does this look as if the "majority" disagrees with The Third International?

Or, let us quote from Fraina's report, published in the last issue of the Communist on Communist unity: The Communist International "rejects the concept of Communist unity in general, urging that unity must be based not upon formal acceptance of general principles but agreement upon fundamental action."

Does this look as if the "majority" disagrees with The Third International?

As a matter of fact, the whole gigantic struggle between the Centrist "reconstructionist" bloc which is attempting to join The Third International (see thesis from Amsterdam Bureau) and the Communist forces of The Third International, is exactly on this question of whether mere acceptance of Communist principles is sufficient to effect Communist unity! The Communist International rejects unity based on words without deeds. The Communist International insists that there must be not only acceptable but revolutionary practice as well.

It is the "minority" who play with words without understanding their meaning, who use Communist phrases without being able to distinguish between the spirit and letter contained in them. In their ignorance and opportunism, they would drag Communist principles and policies down to a plane where the undesirable elements of the Second International and politically immature workers can accept them and join the party, thus destroying whatever effectiveness it may possess. That is at the bottom of the "minority's" distortion of the recommendations of The Third International.

Mass Action.

It is amusing to note that every question of principle is introduced by the "minority" with a mass of irrelevant matter which can have no other purpose than to confuse the real issue. On this question of Mass Action, they bring in the Michiganites and an unwarranted assertion that the "majority" attempted to organize a "legal" party at the convention.

The "minority" forget that the Michiganites were answered in a masterly fashion at the convention on the question of Mass Action. We challenge the former Executive Secretary to produce the records of the conventions on this point. As to why the discussion was not more general, the answer is, that one of the "minority" (Comrade Isaacs) made an unauthorized motion (which the convention discovered later) to proceed to the election of party officials BEFORE THE DISCUSSION OF PROGRAMS. This motion prevented general discussion, which might have benefited the "minority" a great deal, as it now appears.

But we may ask in return, why did not the "minority" (who seem to have had some mental reservations with respect to Mass Action) enter the discussion? Why were they silent? Or, did they prefer to keep silent until after the convention, knowing full well that if they exposed their position on Mass Action and other vital principles and policies, THEY WOULD SURELY HAVE BEEN DEFEATED FOR ANY POSITION OF TRUST IN THE COMMUNIST PARTY?

As to the organization of a "legal party," it looks as if that question was injected to give some semblance of justification for their repudiation of the idea of propagating Mass Action to the workers systematically. They ask, "if this was a good reason (organizing a "legal party") for silence at that time, can we now bind those of our members who have been arrested and indicted for their activities during this period of "legality" not to take the same position?"

But what is the truth in this case? First of all, the "majority" even suggested before the convention opened, that the convention be held behind closed doors. The "minority" were opposed to this. Secondly, if the "minority" mean that the convention adapted Communist principles to the "legal" party existence, we emphatically deny such a charge. The convention adopted the principles of the Manifesto of The Third International in its program—which is sufficient refutation in itself.

If we take their miserable apology at its face value,—that they wish to save some of the arrested and indicted comrades,—isn't that in itself sufficient proof of their Centrist character? And what kind of Communism is it, that judges the correctness or incorrectness of basic principles from the point of view of "saving" a few individuals from persecution by the capitalist state?

Indeed, if the vast majority of the arrested and indicted members could speak for themselves, THEY WOULD INDIGNANTLY REPUDIATE SUCH TEMPORIZING TACTICS EMPLOYED IN THEIR NAME.

As for the few who came in under false colors, and have been arrested and indicted, we feel sorry for them. BUT THE COMMUNIST PARTY CANNOT AND WILL NOT ADOPT ITS POLICIES AND PROPAGANDA

FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THEIR SAFETY.

Our enemies in the opportunist camps (S. L. P., S. P., C. L. P. and I. W. W. together with the liberals and radicals) make the charge that "agent-provocateurs" wrote those planks in our program which has brought the Department of Justice down upon the heads of thousands of unsuspecting comrades. The "minority" echoes this cry by trying to prove that we aimed to establish a "legal" party. There seems to be a striking similarity between the opportunists outside of the party and the "minority" who now talk "legalism."

The "minority statement" then goes on to say in characteristic fashion, that the foregoing was the only way in which the question of Mass Action came before the Central Executive Committee. The "minority" does not like "the smoking out process" and would like to go back under cover. They are very uncomfortable discussing principles and policies. They are more at home when they can confuse the issues. But having been "smoked out" we'll keep them out in the open discussing principles.

The fact is, that the first leaflet, entitled "What Communism Means" precipitated the controversy on Mass Action, and the "minority" used the very same arguments here presented in an effort to KEEP OUT ALL REFERENCE TO MASS ACTION AND THE USE OF FORCE IN THAT LEAFLET.

The "minority" state in bold type that "they are ready to put into the program of the party a definite statement that Mass Action culminates in open insurrection and armed conflict with the capitalist state." The "minority" word-juggles are willing to put it into the program, but... Like the S. P. that would like to ally itself with The Third International, BUT...

As we have had to point out in innumerable occasions, the "minority" subscribe to words but are OPPOSED TO REVOLUTIONARY PRACTICE.

They themselves point out that there is a vital difference as to "when the idea of arming themselves and armed revolt shall be projected to the masses of the workers."

They are right. Here is the very crux of the difference between the "majority" and the "minority."

The "minority" attempt to harmonize their position with that of the Third International, by quoting from its Manifesto a statement that bears no relation to the controversy and incidentally are guilty of deliberate distortion of the term "Mass Action" into "Mass Actions."

However, since they are so quick to "quote" even Lenine in their behalf, we shall make them swallow a very bitter pill from the pen of Lenine, on just this question when the idea of projecting the USE OF FORCE to the workers shall be undertaken, and see whose position approximates that of Lenine, the "majority's" or the "minority's."

In his State and Revolution, page 25, Lenine says:

"We have already said above and shall show more fully at a later stage that the teaching of Marx and Engels regarding the inevitability of a violent revolution refers to the capitalist State. It cannot be replaced by the proletarian State (the Dictatorship of the Proletariat) through mere "mithering away," but, in accordance with the general rule, can only be brought about by a violent revolution. The hymn of praise sung in its honor by Engels and fully corresponding to the repeated declarations of Marx (see the concluding passages of the Poverty of Philosophy and the Communist Manifesto, with its proud and open declaration of the inevitability of a violent revolution; also Marx's Criticism of the Gotha Program of 1875, in which, thirty years after, he mercilessly castigates its opportunist character)—this praise is by no means a mere 'impulse,' a mere declamation, or a mere political sally. THE NECESSITY OF SYSTEMATICALLY FOSTERING AMONG THE MASSES THIS AND ONLY THIS POINT OF VIEW ABOUT VIOLENT REVOLUTION LIES AT THE ROOT OF THE WHOLE OF MARX'S AND ENGELS' TEACHING. AND IT IS JUST THE NEGLECT OF SUCH PROPAGANDA AND AGITATION BOTH BY THE PRESENT PREDOMINANT SOCIAL-CHAUVINISTS AND THE KAUTSKIAN SCHOOLS THAT BRING THEIR BETRAYAL OF IT INTO PROMINENT RELIEF."

Does this look as if the "minority" agree with Lenine, whom they, in their blissful ignorance so fondly quote, or, do they not rather belong