

to the menshevik or Kautskian schools of Marxism?

As for their translation of Mass Action to Mass Actions, that is on a par with the sophistry of the C. L. P. that attempted to make it "actions of the masses." It seems that every group or party that disagrees with Mass Action and its propaganda to the workers, finds some new name for it. Hilquit, at the Albany "fiasco" called it "mass action or mass petition." Take your choice of any of these perversions which attempt to camouflage Mass Action as a tactic of the revolution, and the necessity of systematically propagating it to the workers, IT ONLY PROVES THAT THOSE WHO PERVERT ITS NAME—DEEP DOWN IN THEIR HEARTS DISAGREE WITH ITS MEANING AND APPLICATION.

We are not surprised to have our opponents, both within and without the Communist movement to call us "anarchists" and (by implication, as the "minority" does in their last statement) "agent-provocateurs." Such charges are old. They have been flung by the Mensheviks against the Bolsheviks in Russia. The Majority Socialists of Germany flung it at Liebknecht and Luxemburg and the Spartacide movement. The S. L. P. and the S. P. have been flinging it at the Left Wing and the Communist Party in this country. A lawyer speaking in the name of the C. L. P. before the Department of Labor, in an attempt to legalize the C. L. P., has flung the charge against Fraina. Nuorteva, one of the most malignant foes of Communism in America, made open charges to this effect in all papers. We only point out that the "minority" are in good, respectable company, in also flinging such slanders.

We now come to two paragraphs in the "minority statement" which simply reeks with the spirit of opportunism and compromise. We shall quote them in full.

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

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

Erase the name of "minority" and substitute in its place S. P., S. L. P., C. L. P. or I. W. W., and we have a statement that anyone of them or all of them could heartily endorse.

Here again the "minority" are guilty of confusing two entirely different things—calling upon the workers to arm themselves for immediate revolution—and the propagation and fostering of the idea of the inevitability of a violent revolution to the masses of the workers. The "minority" know better, but we believe that they deliberately mistake those two points in order to confuse the issue and thus they will not have to propagate this idea at all. It is a cowardly trick, worthy of Centrists, and one which our enemies have always used against us, to make the masses distrust us and our propaganda.

Obviously, it would not do, from the "minority" point of view, to inculcate the idea of the inevitability of a violent revolution into the minds of the workers,—THEY MIGHT ACTUALLY UNDERSTAND IT BETTER THAN THE HESITATING COMPROMISING VIEWS OF THE OPPORTUNISTS AND CENTRISTS. Or, perhaps better still, the time to preach this idea to the workers, from the "minority" point of view, is when the workers have learnt it themselves from their own bitter experience! Then they could safely pose as "leaders"!

But NOW, in the prerevolutionary epoch of propaganda and agitation of sound Communist principles and the upbuilding of a Communist Party that will actually function in helping to shape and guide the revolutionary forces in the direction of an armed insurrection against the capitalist State (the only method of conquering it) and establishing the Dictatorship of the Proletariat—THAT IS PREMATURE IN THE EYES OF THE "MINORITY"!

A leaflet, such as the one to the railroad "out-law" strike, according to the "minority", must contain only propaganda to meet the immediate objects of the strikers themselves. It is "anar-

chistic" to point out in such a leaflet, the full implication of Communist principles and policies! It is "folly" to explain the strike and link it up with the governmental machinery of the capitalist class! It is a "farce" if we attempt to give it wider meaning and character by teaching the workers to make their purely industrial strikes POLITICAL STRIKES aimed at the Government itself! No need of explaining to the workers why their strikes must fail and pointing out the reasons for such failure. As for expounding the Communist position, proving that all redress for any class of workers under capitalism is a snare and delusion unless the strikes become political strikes aimed at the State itself—AND THAT SUCH STRIKES MUST BE FOLLOWED BY ARMED MASS DEMONSTRATIONS AND CIVIL WAR AIMING AT THE CONQUEST OF THE STATE AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT—that would be similar to "agent-provocateur" work for the Government in the eyes of the "minority"!

We hope that every member of the Communist Party reads their statement carefully, especially those paragraphs on Mass Action. We know what their answer will be.

Finally, their statement on Mass Action ends thus: "if there is any difference between the 'majority' and the 'minority' on this question, it is a difference of tactics."

Here again the "minority" expose their Centrist character and their complete ignorance of Communist fundamentals. The "minority" are not even aware that principles and tactics are inseparable. A difference in tactics as wide as a difference in principles. Those who, accepting Communist principles disagree on their application differ as much as if they differed on the principles themselves. That is just the universal difference between Centrists and Communists. The "minority" talk so naively of a mere difference in TACTICS as if that is a minor question. It seems that the "minority" do not yet know what keeps the Independents of Germany out of the Third International—or the Centrists of France, England, etc. DIFFERENCE IN TACTICS—the difference between acceptance of Communist principles and revolutionary practice, is what separates the Communists from the Centrists. The Centrists (like our own "minority") accept the principles but reject the practice. The "minority" are willing to put Communist principles in the program but in practice wish to propagate the most approved forms of opportunism to the workers. At this stage of understanding and development of Communist fundamentals in America only simpletons or Centrists can attempt to gloss over a difference in tactics as something of no moment or importance!

As to legality

Again the "minority" display their Centrist character in that they cannot distinguish between Communist Party must be implicitly obeyed at it. And to cap their bourgeois ideology they make an analogy between the C. E. C. of a Communist Party (whose only crime charged against them is that of being super-Bolsheviks) with a capitalist government at the time of a proletarian revolution!

We have pointed out in the C. E. C. statement—and proclamations of the Third International have corroborated us—that the C. E. C. of a Communist Party must be implicitly obeyed at all times. Provisions must be made for their withdrawal and removal, but as long as they function as such, disobedience of its authority is disobedience against the Communist Party itself. THIS IS REVOLUTIONARY CENTRALIZATION AND DISCIPLINE IN THE REAL MEANING OF THAT TERM, AND NOT BOURGEOIS LEGALITY. Once establish the precedent that the authority of the C. E. C. can be flouted by any individual or group of individuals any time they may disagree with some of the decisions or the personnel of the C. E. C., or even a majority thereof, and you have a situation that can be repeated at any time, by anybody, on the slightest pretext. A Communist Party can only exist so long as there exists the voluntary self-discipline of the whole membership. Otherwise, we have an aggregation of individuals but no Communist Party.

Splitting the Party

Here again the "minority" display a lack of dialectical understanding in that similar methods under different conditions bear no relation to each other, other than a superficial resemblance; i. e., just as if the counter-revolutionists in Russia against the Soviet Government would accuse the Communists with possessing legal minds in defending the Soviet Government.

New Offensive Against Soviet Russia.

COMMUNICATION OF THE AMSTERDAM SUB-BUREAU OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL, TO THE WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES:

The International Conference of the Communists at Amsterdam has warned you already in February: "World Capital is preparing another attack on Soviet Russia. Behind the peace negotiations and commercial relations there lurks a treacherous aggression."

This new offensive has now begun in the Far East. Japan has concentrated a big army and has taken the offensive. It announces in the world-press that its army is strong enough to annihilate also the reinforcements on their way to the Red Armies to defend the workers' Soviets.

In the meantime, Poland is preparing for a gigantic struggle. Already it has accomplished a move eastward and has, in agreement with the Entente, advanced such demands as everybody knows to be absolutely unacceptable. French and American war material continues to be piled up in Poland.

The Finnish minister of foreign affairs negotiates in London, and Finland will be granted the special honor of attacking Petrograd, whilst Poland advances towards Moscow and Petlura towards Kiev.

But the German counter-revolution, too, must be considered in this light. Up to this day the secret understanding between English diplomatists and Kapp has not been explained. Even now the Entente does not demand the disarmament of the "Junkers," but supports the disarmament of the workers. Already a new "coup" is being prepared by the German military band of robbers and both Austria and Hungary are about to initiate a monarchy by an attack on Russia. Agents of the Entente have already negotiated about the compensations to be allowed to Hungary for attacking the Bolsheviks. Only the wilful blind can believe in peace.

Workers! The fate of the world is now to be decided: enslavement or freedom.

Financial capital cannot forget that it had to acknowledge an initial defeat at the hands of Soviet Russia.

This new and last effort will surpass everything in ruthlessness and cruelty. In this contingency the revolutionary spirit of our Polish comrades is the vulnerable spot of world-capital. Will they allow themselves to be led into misery and death for the sake of their exploiters?

Not if German proletariat gives them hope of a support from the rear, if there is a chance left of Soviets in Western Europe of coming to the rescue of their brothers in the East. This is why the Entente must help German reaction to regain power, under Ebert-Noske if possible, under Kapp-Ludendorff, if necessary, so as to protect Poland in the rear and to provide troops for a second attack if the first onslaught should break upon the unflinching courage of our Russian comrades.

This is why France must make haste to occupy German cities with Black troops, for though Germany will be allowed to act as executioner, France will not let go her prey and the industrial proletarians of Western Germany continue to constitute a danger for the Polish adventure.

And in the meantime the comedy of Polish negotiations continues in Borisoff; the most competent leaders of Russian economic life are invited to Western Europe for "the beginning of commercial relations"; committees of research (or, rather for counter-revolutionary espionage) are talked about.

Workers! All this is so monstrous that you hesitate to believe it. But the offensive has already begun. The attack had to begin in the East in order that a strong Japanese army might be able to draw Russian troops away from the Western frontier. And this beginning has now been made. In due time alarm will be sounded in the capitalist press of the whole world about a Russian offensive against Poland and Finland, and England has already promised its full support to all the border states in such an event. Have we then really learnt nothing during these five years and a half from the monotonous lies of our adversaries? Do the workers not understand even now that Soviet Russia, the Russia of the workers and the poor

(Continued on page 8.)

A split is justified on principles. Splitting away from the old, corrupt S. P. before a convention was not only permissible but necessary. But to use the same methods in the Communist Party, when, by their own admission and the accusations of the "minority" it was merely a question of the personnel of the C. E. C. (for they did not raise the question of principles at all—the "majority" proved that was behind the split) that is absolutely unjustifiable from the Communist point of view.

We are not advocates of "unity at any price" and we consider a split on principles unavoidable under certain conditions, even before a convention. But if, the "minority" hold the same point of view then they convict themselves of contemptible hypocrisy in provoking and maintaining the split on the question of personalities. All their personal slanders are then seen in their true light as Centrist evasions of the issue, or, like the confused C. L. P. convention delegates who split away from the S. P. convention, not on principle but because they were opposed to the autocratic and police tactics of the S. P. officialdom.

(Will be continued next week.)