

THE COMMUNIST

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

Vol. 2 October 1st, 1920. No. 11

Hillquit's Attack on the Communist International.

We can accord a certain amount of sympathy to a self-confessed bourgeois pacifist like Bertrand Russell. He tells you quite openly what he doesn't like. One feels, reading his articles, that he is genuinely horrified at some of the things he witnessed in Russia. Particularly is he dismayed at the manner in which the Russian Communist Party wields its stern power over the institutions of Soviet Russia. The Third International—the organized, revolutionary proletarian vanguard of the world,—is to him anathema.

But when a hypocritical, petty-bourgeois reformer, masquerading as a revolutionary Socialist, like Morris Hillquit, spews his venom upon the Third International—it is nauseating. It makes one sick to one's stomach to read his thinly-veiled but vicious attack as printed in the N. Y. Call of September 23rd. An Ebert, or Noske, turning Junker machine-guns upon the revolutionary workers are honest men by comparison.

His article is compound of the fulminations of a fool, and a scoundrel. There is not a single note of sincerity throughout. He whines apologetically, with his tongue in his cheek, as when he bemoans the fact that "for some reason, I have had the misfortune of incurring the particular wrath of the autocrat of the Communist International, and have been repeatedly held out as one of the horrible examples of Socialist apostasy." (Italics ours) Think of it! This intellectual prostitute, who, as the recognized leader is responsible for every act of commission and omission of the Socialist Party ever since its inception, wonders why He has incurred the particular wrath of the "autocrat of the Communist International"! This renegade, who joined the Socialist Party to the bourgeois pacifist outfit during the war, merging with the Peoples Council—this traitor, who congealed by his silence and acts the social-patriotic activities of Meyer, London, Daniel Hoan, Algeron Lee, and others;—this scoundrel, who issued the ukase leading to the expulsion of all Left Wing elements from the S. P. last year—this "heroic" defender of the ousted Assemblymen at Albany whose defense brought down upon his head the denunciation and condemnation of every member of his own party with a shred of self-respect left—this reactionary leader who, at the last convention of his party forced the elimination of the clauses from the constitution forbidding Socialist legislators to vote for war appropriations and compelling Socialist candidates to place their signed resignations in the hands of the party,—in order to make the party sufficiently respectable to sit with Sweet & Co. in the State Legislature—this opportunist who brought down upon his head the denunciation framed the most conservative program in the same convention—this intellectual pervert the program of the so-called Lefts who wanted to bring in an innocuous clause stating that all power during the transition period must be in the hands of the workers—this unspeakable caricature of a Socialist dares to whine publicly that for "SOME REASON" he has incurred the particular wrath of the Third International!

As if Hillquit is not sufficiently acquainted with Socialist philosophy to know that he is not being attacked as an individual but as a recognized leader and exponent of opportunism and reformism in the United States, like Kautsky in Germany, Longuet in France, MacDonald and Snowden in England, etc.,

Or, take another attempt of his to cover up his treachery to the working class in explaining "While the Socialists of England, France and the United States and the independent Socialists of Germany rallied wholeheartedly to the defense of the Soviet Government in the face of vilification and attacks

of practically the whole body of their non-Socialist countrymen, the official spokesmen of the Moscow International expressed their appreciation of this manifestation of international Socialist solidarity by publicly denouncing them as renegades and traitors".

In what way has the "wholehearted defense" of Soviet Russia by the Socialist Party differed from the defense of Soviet Russia by bourgeois liberals? No amount of hypocritical laudation by the S. P. over an accomplished proletarian revolution abroad can cover up its treachery to the revolutionary movement at home.

Lenin's castigation of these social-patriotic "sympathizers" with the Russian revolution exposes Hillquit's hypocritical pretenses:

"All the scoundrel-leaders of the Berne International" have on their lips declarations of their "sympathy" toward revolution in general, and toward the Russian revolution in particular. But only hypocrites and fools cannot understand, that the exceedingly rapid successes of the Revolution in Russia are the result of the work of many years of the revolutionary party in the direction, of the building up systematically for years of an underground (illegal) apparatus for the leadership of demonstrations and strikes, for the work among the troops, of the study and creation of underground literature, summing up the results of their experiences, and educating the whole party to the idea of the necessity of revolution, training and preparing leaders of the masses for such occasions, etc. etc."

Furthermore it must be remembered that KERENSKY and not Lenin was the God of Social-Democracy the world over, in the early days of the revolution. The N. Y. Call referred to the Bolsheviks as "anarchists" in those days. And the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party waited months before endorsing the Soviet Government, and only then after its membership compelled it. What a convenient memory Hillquit possesses!

One of the main reasons, according to Hillquit, which impelled him to attack the Third International, is his desire "to clarify the issues between Socialism of the Western type and the new doctrines from Moscow". Notice how cleverly he lets the reader infer that there is only one kind of Socialism—his kind—while the "new doctrines from Moscow", well—they may be anarchism, or Blanquism, but they are not Socialism.

Leaving aside his perversion of Marx's definition of the transition period, leaving aside his corruption of Zinoviev's statement that the recognition of the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat is the general unifying program and the main difference between the Communists and social-patriots and traitors of all brands, Hillquit draws the following conclusions as constituting the difference between "Socialism" of the Western type and the new doctrines from Moscow:

1. France, England, Germany and the United States have not entered upon the period of active Socialist transformation".
2. "We all accept the Marxian assertion that the political form of the "transitional" state must be a 'dictatorship of the proletariat'." but, "our differences arise only on the proper interpretation of the term 'dictatorship' in the above phrase."
3. Opposition to Soviet power, and favoring a Constituent Assembly.
4. There is no Third International.

Reduced to plain language Hillquit means that he is opposed to the proletarian revolution, that he is opposed to the dictatorship of the proletariat, that he is opposed to Soviet power, that he is opposed to the Third (Communist) International.

Hillquit's "Socialism of the Western type" turns out to be nothing else than phrasemongering of the Second International. What Lenin said to MacDonald can be very aptly applied to Hillquit.

"The most dangerous coming from the Berne International—is the LIP-SERVICE recognition of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. THESE MEN ARE APT TO RECOGNIZE ANYTHING, TO SIGN ANYTHING, IN ORDER TO REMAIN AT THE HEAD OF THE WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT. Kautsky already

says that he is not opposed to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. French social-patriotism and "Centrists" also sign under the resolution for the Dictatorship of the Proletariat (so does Hillquit.)

"They do not deserve any confidence whatsoever."

"Not lip-service recognition is necessary, but the actual rupture with the policies of reformism, with the prejudices of bourgeois freedom, bourgeois democracy, the actual CARRYING ON THE POLICIES OF THE REVOLUTIONARY CLASS STRUGGLE."

"They attempt to recognize the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in words, in order secretly to read into it the "will of the majority", "general suffrage" (Kautsky precisely is doing this thing) bourgeois parliamentarism, the refusal for the complete destruction of the bourgeois state machinery. We would guard ourselves against these new tricks, against these new lackeys of reformism more than anything else".

Intellectually and spiritually Hillquit still belongs to the Berne International. The leopard cannot change its spots. The Second International is his god and Kautsky is his only prophet.

The I. W. W. Moves to the Left FOREWORD.

The following resolutions, reprinted from the ONE BIG UNION MONTHLY for September, which are being submitted to the membership of the I. W. W. for referendum vote is a clear indication that the rank and file of the I. W. W. is waking up. The Communist agitation is beginning to bear fruit. However, it is too much to expect that the resolution favoring unreserved affiliation with the Third International will be carried. Most probably the second resolution, in favor of an Economic Industrial International will be carried instead. This only means that we must redouble our propaganda to the rank and file of the I. W. W. Members of the Communist Party who are members of the I. W. W. should take constructive action by organizing a Communist section in the I. W. W. similar to the Left Wing Section in the S. P. before the split of last year and supplement the outside Communist agitation by direct internal intensive agitation and pave the way for capturing the next general elections of the organization. (Editor, the Communist.)

1. Moved by McClellan, Seconded by Mashlykin.

That we endorse the Third-International. Motion lost.

For: McClellan, Mashlykin. Against: Brown, Nordquist, Lessig, Sullivan and Fisher.

2. Moved by Brown, Seconded by Sullivan. That we do not endorse the Third International officially, and that we notify the Third International that our position makes it impossible to endorse same as it is outlined in the Zinoviev appeal to the I. W. W., and that we are in favor of an Economic Industrial International. Motion carried. For: Brown, Lessig, Sullivan, Nordquist. Against: Fisher, McClellan, Mashlykin.

3. Moved by Lessig, Seconded by Nordquist. That we endorse the Third International with reservation, as follows: that we reserve the right to develop our own tactics according to conditions prevailing. Motion carried. For: Nordquist, Lessig, Sullivan, Fisher. Against: Brown, McClellan, Mashlykin not voting.

4. Moved by McClellan, Seconded by Mashlykin that the three above propositions be submitted to the membership for a referendum vote. Motion carried.

The syndicalist attempt at revolution in Italy has fizzled out, as was to be expected. This tragic defeat of the Italian workers exposes glaringly the fallacy and impotency of the syndicalist and I. W. W. theory and tactics. The Italian situation contains a very valuable object lesson of the futility of "seizing the industries and locking out the bosses", while leaving the capitalist state intact, and throws into bold relief the program of the Communist Party—the organization of the revolutionary proletarian vanguard into a highly centralized political party, the destruction of the bourgeois state machinery by means of mass action (armed insurrection and civil war), and the establishment of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in the form of a Soviet Government as the ONE mass of ushering in the Communist society.