

All Power to  the Workers!

THE COMMUNIST

*Official Organ of the Communist Party of America
(Section of the Communist International)*

Vol. III. No. 1

APRIL 1921

Ten Cents

THE CRISIS IN THE ITALIAN SOCIALIST PARTY

Comrade Zinoviev's Masterful Analysis of Serratianism or Italian Centrism

"What the Communist International demands of its followers, is the recognition—not in words, but in deeds—that civilized mankind has entered the revolutionary epoch, that all capitalist countries are facing the greatest convulsions and open class war, and that the task of the revolutionary representatives of the proletariat therefore consists in preparing for this inevitable, approaching civil war the necessary spiritual weapons and organized points of support.

"Those Internationalists who consider it possible to work together with Kautsky, Longuet and Turrati, to appear on their side before the toiling masses, renounce in deeds the spiritual and organizational preparation for the revolutionary uprising of the proletariat, altogether apart from the consideration as to whether this may happen in a month or a year, sooner or later."

L. TROTSKY,

in *Terrorism and Communism*.

For some time the comrades of one of the larger cities of Southern Italy approached Serrati asking him to explain his views of the present situation and the tasks of the Italian Socialist Party arising therefrom. Serrati answered them in detail and later published his reply in the periodical, *Communismo*, of which he is the editor. In this article Serrati maintained that the present situation in Italy was undoubtedly revolutionary, and that the revolution could not be averted, and that there were only two paths open to the Italian Socialist Party, i. e. either to enter the government, using lawful means, which would mean co-operation with the bourgeoisie and the betrayal of the proletariat, or to make the revolution.

What, however, does this mean—"to **MAKE** the revolution?"

"*Making the revolution,*" says Serrati, "*means not so much to provoke a decisive act of force (which I believe to a necessary consequence of the whole situation and comes of itself, almost fatalistically) as to prepare those factors which can give us as a party the possibility of utilizing this unavoidable act of force and to attract those Socialist elements who will follow us according to the time, the circumstances, and the surroundings. We are not the ones who make the revolution, or, in other words, accomplish the decisive act of revolution which violently cuts the connection between the past and the future. We are those who are conscious of this new power which has arisen under the desired circumstances, and we must so act as to lead to the successful outcome of the revolution.*

"*The task of the Socialist Party, according to my view, is not so much to lead the masses into the streets—as the romanticists of the barricade think—but above all to prepare all the forces of the Socialist order which are indispensable to establish the new regime and thus assure its eventual triumph.*"

From this hypothesis Serrati draws the conclusion that it is necessary, in order to solve the great tasks that await the proletariat after the seizure of power, not to lose connection with the trade unions and comrades; that the majority of Socialist co-operative organizations of the

party must remain intact; and that since these bodies, which cover the country with the network of their organizations, are now in the hands of the reformists, the relations with these reformists should not be disturbed and the unity of the party must therefore be upheld at any price.

According to this view the unity of the party becomes a revolutionary necessity.

In his letter Serrati has expressed his views with delightful and unexpected clearness. There is, however, much more to be noted. Serrati has attempted to give the principal bases of the tactics of limping behind the advancing masses (a practice followed by the Italian Socialist Party), of the tactics of half-measures, which were mostly half-defeats.

It therefore becomes necessary, if we wish to understand the phenomenon of Serratianism — of Italian centrism — to thoroughly consider Serrati's letter.

The most important point, which illuminates the entire letter, is that in which Serrati claims that the final and decisive act of force comes "*fatalistically—of itself.*" With this the position of Serrati is made absolutely clear. This also establishes the position of the Italian Socialist Party, which in April, 1920, looked on while the revolutionary general strike of the working class was crushed. The Italian Socialist Party again wavered when in June the soldiers mutinied in many cities; when in Ancona the workers fought on the barricades the Italian Socialist Party again hesitated to bring the movement against the Albanian war adventurers to a head by proclaiming the general strike. The Italian Socialist Party re-

remained passive during the great movement of the metal workers, evidently waiting for the revolution which would "come of itself" without needing the party "to provoke a decisive act of force" and "to lead the masses into the streets" as the "romanticists" of Ancona dreamed in their theoretical ignorance, many of whom are now repenting in prison to the extent that they have not paid with their lives.

"The revolution, the decisive act of force, ought to come of itself, fatalistically, as a necessary consequence of the whole situation!"

Before we expose the inner meaning of this sentence, with its scientific coverlet of the materialistic conception of history, we will establish the fact that it bears no relation to historic truth. When Trotsky wrote, "That which characterized the first revolutionary period of our party was the conviction that it had to succeed to power because of the inner logic of events," this did not mean that the Bolsheviks on this account folded their arms and waited until the power would fall to them, "fatalistically—of itself." On the contrary, when Trotsky deals with the description of the deciding events, he writes, "It was the time when we openly proceeded to get ready for the uprising and actively prepared for its organization."

In Italy's present situation Serrati admits that events are leading to armed insurrection with compelling natural necessity, yet he considers it superfluous to consciously prepare for it through organization.

The Bolsheviks, however, go still further than merely preparing for the organization of the uprising. In defiance of all the pseudo-Marxian teachings of international opportunism, they SET A DEFINITE DATE. "The logic of things demands that we appoint October 25, as the date of uprising." (The day on which the All-Russian Congress of Soviets was to meet.)

We will review the generally known facts of the systematic organization of the October Insurrection. The Military Revolutionary Council became more and more the real executive organ of the revolution and from it issued the decisive orders as the drama of events reached its climax. From the occupation of the telephone station at Petrograd to the attack on the Winter Palace, the events, which in their complex we call the October Revolution, came, not of themselves, but occurred through the conscious pre-arrangement of the Military Revolutionary Council, which accordingly had taken upon itself the role of destiny.

What can be established by the revolution in Russia, is also partly true of the

November insurrection in Germany. This also was consciously prepared. Its organizer was the revolutionary committee in Berlin, chiefly composed of the revolutionary leaders of the trades. That, however, the preparation was altogether insufficient; that the leaders of the insurrection—the leaders of the Independent Socialist Party—wavered very much about its execution, was fatal to the German Revolution. Ledebour himself says, "We would have done much better if we had prepared the revolution, if we had rigidly examined everything at the beginning. Because we have committed this sin of omission we have given Ebert and Scheidemann the opportunity of smuggling themselves into the revolutionary fold. Since then it was proved to have been a serious mistake that we did not attack correctly on November 5th."

The uprising of the Paris Commune, on the contrary, came as a matter of fact without such organization or preparation by its leaders, who were rather surprised by events; still we cannot consider this to be especially praiseworthy or led back to theoretical reflections on the "timid and fearful feeling of historical justification" which as Lavrov writes, "was to be read in its proclamation." In its aversion to civil war, which Paris was driven into, the Central Commune persisted in a defensive position," writes Marx in his *Civil War in France*. These two elements of fear of historic vindication and the aversion to civil war, which determined the decisive mistakes at the beginning of the Paris Insurrection and which led to its frightful defeat, are those which characterize the Italian Socialist Party. The first error prevails more among the centrists under the leadership of Serrati; the second, through tradition and the memory of De Amicis, and represents the humanitarian sentimentalism, the sacred right of reservation of the reformists.

Accordingly, what is in Serrati's eyes the spontaneous, unconscious, and unprepared insurrection, can lead to nothing else than a repetition of the results of the Paris Commune; to a repetition of the terrible blood-letting of the West European working class, resulting as in 1871 in the blighting of all hopes of a successful revolution for a long time to come.

Serrati admits this, himself, in his letter, where he says, "The Italian Revolution will be accomplished under infinitely more difficult circumstances than the Russian." This does not lead him to the conclusion, as it should, that the Italian proletariat must be infinitely better prepared for the moment of decisive attack; no, he concludes quite the contrary, that the reformists in the party and the trade union bureaucracy must remain intact.

We know that fearful obstacles will face the revolution in Italy, especially in consequence of the lack of coal and grain; the backwardness of the workers in the Southern Provinces; the powerful coalition of the international bourgeoisie, which in all probability will counter with a blockade. However, does then Serrati believe that those who today sabotage the revolution will work for it tomorrow? Has he then forgotten the executioner's work of Noske and the regrettable betrayal of Soviet Hungary by the Hungarian centrists? However, Serrati is like the phillistines of whom Lenin speaks, who do not believe in the creative force of revolution and are in deadly fear of it. Serrati believes that he cannot dispense with the help of the reformists, and that all organizational and technical conditions must be prepared in advance so that the revolution will be painless.

"They could not understand that the Commune was a barricade and not an administration," writes Lissagary about the leaders of the Paris Commune. The same can be truthfully said of Serrati. He, too, cannot understand that the revolution is decided on the barricades and not in the dim light of the trade union administrations. In that Serrati lays the main emphasis upon the question of armed insurrection. He shows us the goal and wants us to forget the path. He points out Communism to us, and juggles away the revolution.

At the session of the Executive Committee of the Italian Socialist Party, held October, 20th, in Florence, Serrati declared when the first signs of the reaction in Italy became noticeable, "The Italian bourgeoisie becomes less powerless, and they are compelled to provoke a clash of forces if this clash can give them the opportunity, due to a weakening of the proletarian power, to catch its breath. The Italian Socialist Party must, however, lead the proletariat according to Marxist principles, and not with impulsive actions evoked by any Tom, Dick or Harry." What this continual inactivity of the Italian bourgeoisie really amounts to can be seen by the recent events in Italy, the creation of a White Guard in the form of the Guardia Regia (and more recently the Fascisti—Ed.) hardly indicates that the bourgeoisie is becoming powerless. The Italian bourgeoisie seeks ever more to make up for this by a steady strengthening of their material power precisely because of their daily growing economic impotency which is incapable of solving the most vital problems of the country. We will not stress this point. What Serrati says of not artificially provoking an attack as long as this has in view immediate consequences is without doubt correct. What conclusion does Serrati draw from it? The phillistine and altogether self-evident truth

that the actions of the party ought not to be called forth by any Tom, Dick or Harry.

We must not be misunderstood. We are not here speaking of conspiracy tactics. It is clear that the taking by surprise of the ruling class by a small minority (Blanquism) not only is impossible today but does not represent the form of the proletarian revolution, which can only be made by the masses. The task of the Communist Party is to become the general staff of the proletariat and prepare them spiritually and materially so that at the time of inevitable conflict with its enemies it shall have grown and become powerful. The Communist Party must take the initiative itself, and as far as conditions make it possible to make the conflict reach a point which gives the proletariat the best possible chances of success. This sentence must also be taken within certain limitations, as the world war and the economic crisis and therewith the present revolutionary period, were dependent factors altogether removed from our influence, the passage, too, of the general crisis to an acute condition of conflict between the classes depend upon factors the influencing of which to a great extent, lies beyond our control. A political party, however, which controls masses of workers can determine whether a situation can be intensified and brought to head.

Serrati's view of the fatalistic coming of the revolution according to which all who want to make the technical preparation for the revolution are branded as

Utopians and ridiculed as "romanticists of the Barricades," represents a typical opportunist distortion of the materialistic conception of history of which the Social-Democrats of all countries made a fairy wand with which they believed that they could fool the proletariat and conceal their own inactivities. For the theory of fatalism expresses the practice of inaction.

When Pannekoek, in his well known polemics against Kautsky, characterized the position of the latter as "the position of passive radicalism and a theory of inactive expectancy" the position of Serrati could not be made clearer than this. It is this "theory of inactive expectancy" which builds the viaduct by which the purest waters of reformism are conducted to the centrists.

The distinction between Serrati and that of frank opportunism, consists merely in this, that the opportunists still hope to be able to avert the revolution and consequently come out openly against it, while Serrati seeing that the revolution is inevitable now wants to co-operate with the reformists in order to make the revolution a painless process, although he must realize that co-operation with the reformists must divest the revolution of its Communist character.

Nevertheless, how far Serrati has approached the opportunist stand can be seen from the cautious clause appearing in his letter that "*those Socialist followers are to be drawn from the revolution which is possible only according to the times and the surroundings.*" One can readily

understand Renner and Seitz who declared after the November revolution in Austria that the conditions of the times and the surroundings made possible only a coalition with the Christian Socialists. Perhaps Serrati does not mean this in as complete a sense as Renner and Seitz in Austria, and as Turatti and Modigliani in Italy would interpret it. When, however, one is asked by his comrades to explain his views of the position to be taken by the party during a crisis, one should not express himself in the manner of the oracle of Delphi.

After these more or less veiled acknowledgments of opportunist-centrism Serrati still dares to refer to his intransigence as against Lenin's "opportunism" because on the question of the entrance of the Communist Party of England into the British Labor Party, the agrarian question and the colonial and national question he stood in opposition, an intransigence which, nevertheless confined itself merely to England, Asia, and Africa, but led him in Italy to create and lead a faction for the unity of the party with the opportunists.

In this new position, G. M. Serrati is too little known in other countries, which still see in him the unfrightened revolutionist of the war period. Only the right wing of the Independent Socialist Party of Germany properly and readily estimated his worth. At the Congress at Halle Crispian, Hilferding and Dittman continually appealed to Serrati for support and with unerring instinct they made Serrati, the Italian authority for their Kautskyism.

Soviet Russia's Concessions to Capitalism.

By KARL RADEK

WHEN the working class of Russia took over power in November, 1917, neither the bourgeois nor the Socialist world believed that it would maintain the state power for three months, let alone three years and more.

That German imperialism dealt with Soviet Russia in general was but the result of its straightened condition because of the war. It wanted to conclude peace in the East, even with an entirely transitory government, in the well founded belief that when the Bolsheviks disappeared the peasants could not organize a party or a government at any time within sight.

Soviet Russia, however, had to have peace, not only because it had no army but because it could only become a reality if it had a breathing space. At the time of the Brest-Litovsk negotiations Soviet Russia was only a program; it existed

only in the decrees announced by the Council of People's Commissaries.

At that time the underground organs of Czarist absolutism were not completely destroyed, nor was feudal possession rooted out. The forms of Soviet government in country and city appeared still as experiments not as organized realities.

The Bolshevik Government had the choice either of being a government of revolutionary partisans carrying on a guerilla war with the aid of the Allies against German imperialism and permitting Russian capital to accomplish its restoration under the protection of German bayonets, or else treating the Brest road of Golgotha, at the price of national humiliation, to accomplish first of all the work of defeating the bourgeoisie and of organizing the proletariat.

When the fools among the German Independents still speak of an illusory

foreign policy of the Soviet Government (after their own November experiences they ought to keep to themselves the charge of "disorganization" of the Russian army by the Bolsheviks), then indeed, these bankrupt Wilsonians cannot be helped.

That the policy of the Soviet Government, which was based on the conviction that the process of breaking up world imperialism would not be retarded by the Brest peace but would be accelerated, was correct, showed not only its triumph but also that Soviet Russia, though in a position between the devil and the deep blue sea, could so collect and organize itself that one year after the collapse of German imperialism it wrested the acknowledgment from the representatives of the victorious Entente imperialism that "Bolshevism could not be crushed by the sword."

In the measure that the Brest peace despite its robber character was of positive significance to Soviet Russia, in that it ended the great war, Soviet Russia did not extort it by its own power, the workers of Germany did not extort it; the pressure of the Entente army in the West created the Brest peace.

Even if the victorious imperialism of the Entente now concludes a still worse robber's peace, as long as this peace permits Soviet Russia the possibility of existence the main breach will be in the capitalist state system since this peace will be a result of the opposition which Soviet Russia leads with its own forces and with the aid of the world proletariat.

But why should Soviet Russia, which cannot be destroyed by the sword, conclude a compromise peace with the Entente? Why should it not want to wait, with weapons in its hands, until the time when the crumbling Entente capitalism has made such progress that it must hold out an honest peace to Soviet Russia?

The answer to this question is simple. During the World War, which the criminal policy of all imperialist states protracted, a swift catastrophe for world capitalism could be counted on, and the establishment of the power of the workers in many countries where the slaughter permitted them no other solution. At the conclusion of the Brest peace the Soviet Government considered the breathing space allowed by this peace a very short one; either the world revolution would soon come and save Soviet Russia or else it (Soviet Russia) would soon collapse in the unequal struggle, as we thought then. This conception expressed the situation at that time.

The collapses of German imperialism, the inability of the Allies to crush Soviet Russia by military means, and at the same time the fact that the World War came to an end; that the crisis of demobilization was overcome; that the world revolution affects the capitalist world not as an explosion but as a breaking up, and accordingly as a lengthy process,—completely changes the situation and conditions of foreign policy for the Soviet Government.

On the one hand we cannot count on a speedy, mechanical liberation; on an instantaneous mass movement that would drive Clemenceau, Lloyd George, Wilson and everybody connected with them to the wall; and on the other hand, we cannot be convinced with mathematical certainty that the process of capitalism collapsing is making progress rapidly enough to ease Soviet Russia's conditions.

But as it is a lengthy process to be

reckoned with, the question for Soviet Russia is not that of seeking and finding a *modus vivendi* for the states that are still capitalist. If tomorrow the proletarian revolution conquers in Germany or in France the situation of Soviet Russia will be better, because two proletarian states, as an economic and military force, can exercise a greater pressure on the capitalist world; but it will despite this have an interest in concluding peace with the States which are still capitalist so as to begin economic reconstruction.

Soviet Russia will not permit itself to be beaten and we are certain that if the Entente States do not hold out an acceptable peace it will starve and struggle still more and they will be forced later to offer a better peace. The exhaustion of a country with Russia's resources by a blockade demands a period of time which the imperialist curs of the Entente countries will not survive.

But it is clear that if Soviet Russia must struggle much longer it cannot begin economic reconstruction. The war requires that its lessened productive forces be placed in the service of making munitions, its best forces be applied to war manufacture, its ruined railroads devoted to the transport of troops.

The necessity of war demands that the power of attack be centralized in the hands of the state executive, threatens the Soviet system and what is more important, threatens to devour the best elements of the working class. The Soviet Government has accomplished a superhuman task to oppose all this. What it has done in its cultural work, despite all difficulty, already astonishes even honest bourgeois opponents (read Goode's reports in the *Manchester Guardian*) and in two or three years Soviet Russia will add over a hundred thousand new educational organizations and new cultural forces.

How seriously the leaders regard the danger attending reconstruction, the danger of the bureaucracy in a new form, is shown very clearly by the minutes of the debates at the March convention of the Bolsheviks in 1919, which have now been published. But war is war, a gruesome destroyer, and if war can be ended by sacrifice it must be concluded.

Certainly it is indeed bad that the Russian people must allot excellent concessions to English, American and French capitalists, for it could make better use of these concessions itself than to pay tribute. But so long as it must carry on the war not only can it not work its

claims but it must throw its miners into the fury of battle.

Consider the matter in this way: If it were a question of economic, Socialist reconstruction or war against world capitalism, which sets limits to Socialist reconstruction, the correct decision would be war. But matters do not stand so. The question which is to be decided is either Socialist reconstruction within the limits of a temporary compromise or war *without economic reconstruction*.

As early as the spring of 1918 the question of an economic compromise faced the Soviet Government. When Colonel Raymond Robins, unofficial American representative in Russia, left Moscow for Washington on May 2, 1918, he took with him a concrete proposal of the Soviet Government containing the conditions of economic concessions. At the same time Bronski, assistant to the People's Commissar for Commerce and Industry, submitted in his first meeting with the representatives of the German Government practical proposals for the co-operation of the Soviet Government with German capital. Like proposals were communicated to Bruce Lockhart, the English representative to the British Government.

It may be granted that at that time, in the midst of the world war, there was ground for hope that a revolutionary explosion might do away with the necessity for such concessions, but the principal thing is that the policy of granting these concessions had already been arrived at.

As long as the proletariat in all of the most important States has not won; as long as they are not in a position to use all the productive forces in the world for reconstruction; as long as capitalist states exist beside proletarian ones; so long will it be necessary for proletarian countries to make compromises; so long will there be in those countries neither a pure Socialism nor a pure capitalism, but, territorially separated from each other, they will have to make concessions in their own spheres of state authority.

The extent of these concessions, which must be made to capitalism, will depend upon the power of the respective proletarian states. That concessions must be made can be contested by no one who does not at the same time show the means by which the opponents of this policy can achieve immediate victory for the proletariat in all countries.

The International and Unionism.

By Louis C. Fraña.

Perhaps the discussion of Unionism was the most interesting and intense of any discussion at the Second Congress of the Communist International. The small syndicalist group was clearly unable to impress the Congress; but there was another group, of which I was one, who defended a position combining Communism with the peculiar experience of the American and British movement on Unionism. I was appointed by the Executive Committee of the International as co-referee with Karl Radek to open the discussion in the Congress; and I reprint my two addresses in order (1) to inform the Party of my position; (2) to dispose of the slanders of Reed, Flynn & Co. that I represented a conception not in accord with the requirements of the American movement. The minority theses were formulated by myself and J. T. Murphy, of the Shop Stewards of England. Among others, our two chief points were included in the final theses adopted—extra-union organization and our suggestions on the Labor Union International. Another point: Reed, Flynn & Co. declared in Moscow (more hysterically than convincingly) that the theses would be "ruinous" for us. This is nonsense: the theses are ample for our purposes.

The First Address.

AFTER discussion in the Trade Union Commission we found ourselves much more in agreement than expected. The differences that still exist are largely differences of emphasis and practice, and not of principle.

The differences were first developed by the declaration convening a conference to organize an International of revolutionary Labor Unions. Some of the fundamental features of this declaration were totally unacceptable; for example, the condemnation of revolutionists leaving the trades unions was put in such a form as to exclude constructing a new labor organization, which would cripple the American movement, since in our country, where 80 per cent of the workers are unorganized and the trades unions dominated by the aristocracy of labor, the construction of a new revolutionary labor organization is an imperative revolutionary task. Then, the admission of separate industrial unions to the conference is made conditional upon the consent of the Central Labor organization of the country. Moreover, no provision is made for a representative each on the organization committee of the Labor International of the I. W. W. and the Shop Stewards of England—two movements of vital importance in the development of the revolutionary mass struggle.

Our objections to Comrade Radek's

theses (only some of which have been met by his accepting several of our amendments) were, first of all, comprised in the conception of unionism. Radek approached the problem almost exclusively from the standpoint of the masses in the unions to be won for Communism. That, of course, is fundamental. But it is also fundamental to consider the unions as unions in relation to our task—as organs of revolutionary struggle and as factors in the economic reconstruction of society after the conquest of political power. Radek, also, made too narrow and artificial the conditions under which new Labor Unions may be organized. And, finally, it appeared in Radek's theses as if our task is to capture the trades union bureaucracy; there was no understanding of and no provision for extra-union organizations (such as Shop Committees, Shop Stewards, etc.) as means of aggressive struggle against the bureaucracy and mobilizing the masses for action.

In the United States, the approach to revolutionary conceptions has been through revolutionary unionism. These conceptions were: the necessity of extra-parliamentary action to conquer political power, destruction of the bourgeois state machinery, and organizing the proletarian state not on geographical but industrial divisions. These conceptions made it easy for us to understand the fundamental tactics of the Russian Revolution. But at the same time we were compelled to carry on a severe theoretical struggle against the I. W. W. conception that only the industrial unions are necessary to overthrow capitalism, without soviets and proletarian dictatorship. The American Communist movement has done a very important work in merging the old revolutionary conceptions of industrial unionism in the new conceptions of Communism. And a necessary part of our work is to recognize the revolutionary functions of the labor unions.

The I. W. W. in the United States has been a real revolutionary force not primarily because of its agitation for industrial unionism nor because it tried to boycott and destroy the American Federation of Labor; in neither has it been very successful. The I. W. W. has been a tremendous revolutionary force in the American movement because it expressed the awakening to consciousness and action of the great masses of unorganized unskilled workers excluded from the American Federation of Labor. All movements to break the A. F. of L. by leaving the old unions have been a failure; during the war, when the old unions made a partner-

ship with the government, the I. W. W. members were compelled to join the old unions; and these I. W. W.'s by agitating from within developed very powerful revolutionary movements in the old unions.

The American experience, accordingly, emphasizes the necessity of working within the old unions (in the revolutionary sense); but this experience equally emphasized the necessity of constructing new unions (in accord with objective condition) in order to unite revolutionary work within the old unions with work from without.

There is no controversy on the need of working in the old unions. On that we are agreed. For the American Communist movement to reject working in the old unions and adopt the slogan, "Destroy the American Federation of Labor by leaving it," would destroy the Communist movement and not the reactionary labor unions.

The controversy centers on the methods and purposes of working in the old unions. We maintain that the emphasis must not be on capturing the bureaucracy, but on liberating the masses from the domination of this bureaucracy, and mobilizing the masses independent of the bureaucracy.

In the old unions the bureaucracy is practically immovable, imposed upon the masses, and a barrier to action. In the United States the trades union bureaucracy in addition to constitutional provisions, long term offices and parliamentary tricks, uses gunment to suppress rebel opposition in the unions. I mention this not as an argument against working in the reactionary unions, but as an argument against the idea of capturing the bureaucracy; we must fight this bureaucracy in the unions, but it will be impossible to capture or destroy it until the revolution itself or after.

Really revolutionary work in the trades unions has two important aspects.

1) The organization of Communist groups (necessary in all workers' organizations).

2) The formation of extra-union organizations (Shop Committees, Shop Stewards, etc.). These are organizations of the workers in the unions expressing the requirements of the immediate economic struggle of the workers, and their struggle against the bureaucracy and the limitations of trades union forms of organizations does not mean that the workers leave the old unions; on the contrary, the workers stay in the unions but definitely

organize their opposition. Moreover, these extra-union organizations act within and without the trade unions, and if they cannot get the unions to act in a crisis these extra-union organizations act independently of the unions and of the bureaucracy—they are the most adequate means of driving the unions to more revolutionary action and of mobilizing the masses for the aggressive struggle against capitalism. In England and in the United States these extra-union organizations have been produced by life itself, by the experience of the struggle of the workers; it is through the creation of such extra-union organizations that the Communists can best become the leaders of the immediate economic struggle of the working class.

What we insist upon is not leaving the old unions, but organizing an aggressive, decisive struggle in the unions and against the bureaucracy

It is also necessary to carry on this struggle outside of the old unions. This is accomplished by the organization of new, independent unions. It is absolutely necessary that the organization of such unions (and secessions from the old unions) be based upon objective conditions, and express the mass struggle itself. But it is equally necessary not to be afraid of new unions. It is just as harmful to act in general against splits and new unions (where these concern masses) as it is to split in small groups thereby isolating ourselves from the masses. But after all, a split is a decisive, aggressive act, and may accomplish more revolutionary agitation than years of peaceful routine work in the unions. Moreover, by uniting the independent industrial unions with the extra-union organizations in the old unions, we perfect a force that will batter from within and without; and which, inspired and dominated by the Communists, will constitute a powerful factor in mobilizing the masses for action. We are in a revolutionary epoch, and our fundamental task is to liberate the masses for action—we cannot depend upon the peaceful prolonged process of capturing the bureaucracy.

Parallel with this problem of extra-union organizations is the problem of industrial unionism as against the craft form of unionism. This problem has three aspects:

1) Industrial unionism is the organization expression of the unorganized unskilled workers (which in the United States comprise the majority of the industrial proletariat). The construction of new generally implies the adaption of industrial unionism. Industrial unionism is the basis for the development of revolutionary unionism.

2) The agitation for industrial unionism is a necessary part of our work in

the old unions. These unions mostly organized on the antiquated bases of crafts, are, under the pressure of concentrated industry, unable to really unite the workers in the unions and carry on an aggressive struggle. The workers in the old unions revolt against the limitations of the forms as well as the purposes of the trade-unions; and we must urge upon them the industrial union form of organization—an indispensable phase of our struggle to transform and revolutionize the old unions.

3) The unions will, after the conquest of political power, become organs of the administration of industry under the proletarian state. Craft unions cannot, because of their form of organization corresponding to integrated industry, function as means of the management of industry. Industrial unions are necessary, as is proven by the Russian experience. The larger the industrial unions and the understanding of industrial unionism, the easier will be the task of economic reconstruction after the revolutionary conquest of power. This is the conception of unionism developed and formulated by the American movement; and we are convinced that it is an indispensable phase of Communist tactics.

The Second Address

I wonder why comrades Radek and Zinoviev are so wrought up. They insist on emphasizing the necessity of working in the unions—but that is an argument only against the representative of the United Communist Party of America, who is opposed to working in the old unions. But the position of the U. C. P. is emphatically not that of the other comrades who are criticizing comrade Radek's theses. In my opening address I emphasized my acceptance of working in the old unions, not simply because of the arguments made here, but because the whole experience of the American movement imposes that policy upon us. The Shop Stewards—are they against working in the old unions? It would be preposterous to assert that; the Shop Stewards and similar organizations are not a part of the old unions, they are the most adequate expression of the Radek-Zinoviev policy of working in the labor unions. I have said, as concerns the United States, that approximately 80 per cent of the workers are unorganized; but nevertheless it is impossible to abandon the old reactionary unions; and if for no other, because of one particular reason: the majority of the unorganized workers are foreigners, the majority of the organized Americans; we must make our contact with these American workers, since they will necessarily assume the leadership in the Revolution,—not in the theory but in the action of Revolution.

But how are you going to work in the old unions? That is the crucial question—the question of methods and means. When you say, work in the old unions, you say much—and nothing. It is necessary to have Communist groups in the old unions; but what are these to do? Are they simply to preach abstract Communism? Radek answers, no: they must become the leaders of the economic struggle of the workers. Very well; but that requires means; and the means, we insist, do not consist of pacific penetration of the unions, of trying to elect new officials in place of the old, of making a fetish of maintaining the old organizations and forms of unionism; the means consist of aggressive struggle in the unions, of mobilizing the masses against the bureaucracy and liberating them, of the agitation for and construction of extra-union organizations and industrial unions. Comrade Radek recognizes and accepts this, but does not make it a living and pulsing part of his theses; Radek is so absorbed with the problems in Germany, where certain people have issued the slogan "abandon the old unions," that he over-emphasizes the other policy.

And again because of concentration on Germany, Radek treats very gently the problem of organizing new and secession unions. Under certain conditions a split is necessary; it must not be forced; but equally we must not allow a split to be imposed on us, we must not be like lambs, we must possess a policy on new unions that gives us the initiative in the matter and not our enemies. After all, a split is in a measure a revolutionary act; it may accomplish more in driving the masses onward than months and years of ordinary agitation; sometimes it may be necessary, even, to force a split. It is action that we insist upon. It is on the basis of action, and not theoretical divergences, that splits must come.

Moreover, we insist upon recognition of the new forms that are developing in unionism. Particularly in England and America, this development is of the utmost importance. We must objectively study these developments, learn from them, adapt our theory to the peculiar variations and forms of life itself. That is revolutionary practice; that is what is necessary, particularly on problems of unionism.

We must liberate the masses in the unions for action. Through their economic struggles, through understanding and adapting ourselves to the variations they develop in forms of organization and action, we mobilize them for the Revolution. We must not be abstract, or doctrinaire; we must always realize that it is the action of the masses potentially that develops the means and the forms of the final revolutionary struggle.

I repeat again: our differences with Comrade Radek are not of principle but of emphasis. But the Russian comrades must realize the new and variegated forms of unionism that are developing; must realize that in our country unionism is a much more vital factor in the Revolution than in their Revolution. I feel that at the next Congress we shall agree.

The Minority Theses on Unionism

I.

The Communist International must consider the question of Unionism not simply from the standpoint of winning the masses in the unions for Communism, as a field for Communist propaganda; we must also formulate a Communist conception of the forms and functions of the Unions as Unions.

It is a mistake to think that the labor union organizations alone can conquer capitalism, and that a Communist Party is unnecessary.

It is equally a mistake to regard the unions as merely appendages of the Party (although the Party should dominate).

The unions, particularly as industrial unions, can become active means of revolutionary struggle and organs of the reconstruction and management of industry after the conquest of political power.

II.

The Communist conception of unionism develops itself as a three-fold problem:

1. The mobilization of the masses for revolutionary action — to liberate the masses from the petty bourgeois ideology and practice of trade unionism

2. The struggle against the union bureaucracy—to break the power and apparatus of this bureaucracy.

3. To reconstruct the unions as industrial unions—either by transforming the old or building the new, as determined by objective conditions—to adapt Unionism to the integration of industry and the tasks of industrial management after the conquest of power.

III.

The manner in which this problem is to be solved depends upon the stage of the development of unionism and the revolutionary struggle itself.

But although the revolt of the workers takes varied forms, in general this revolt expresses itself at first in economic action and the economic organizations. It is on the basis of this fact that the Communist Party must act in order to secure influence over the masses and direct them to larger revolutionary action.

1. The Communist Party must work

within the old unions, conducting an agitation for Communism and mobilizing the revolts against the trades union bureaucracy and the limitations of trades union structure.

The attempt to revolutionize the trades unions merely by the capture of the bureaucracy, which is practically immovable, imposed upon the masses and a barrier to action, even if successful, would not necessarily transform the trades unions into organs of revolutionary action.

The re-creation of the unions, in tendency now apparent in the agitation for and construction of industrial unions, will be completed in the Revolution and after, under the centralized direction of the Communist Party and facilitated by the proletarian state.

2. In addition to the general Communist agitation it is necessary to create means within the Unions for action independent of the bureaucracy and union limitations.

This takes the form of extra-union organizations (Shop Committee, etc.), which can not only carry on the struggle against the bureaucracy and wage the daily fight of the workers against their employers, but also familiarize the workers with the industrial union form of organization and provide means for the direct expression of the mass revolts of the proletariat.

During the period of the revolutionary crisis and struggle, when the capitalist sabotage production in order to disorganize the working class by means of starvation and unemployment, the Shop Committees, while emphasizing their character as means of struggle against the union bureaucracy and union limitations, also express the demands of the workers for control of industry. There arises an open struggle against the employers for control in the factories, during which the Shop Committees usurp functions of management. The bourgeoisie energetically oppose this movement, and the struggle for workers' control over production necessarily leads to the seizure of political power by the proletariat.

After the seizure of power the Shop Committees become the first managers of industry, force the development of the unions until they are merged in the structure of industrial unions, the organs for the management of industry.

3. The movement of the masses toward industrial unionism, caused primarily by the construction of industry, is now assuming a greater importance because it expresses the crisis in the old unions and facilitates the mobilization of the masses for revolutionary action.

The revolt of the masses against the

limitations of the old unions, is expressed not only in the formation of extra-union organizations, but also in the creation of industrial unions, whether independently or by mass-splits in the old unions. The industrial unions co-ordinate with the extra-union organizations for united action. These tendencies must be expressed and used by the Communist Party in accordance with the objective conditions and the maturity of the revolutionary struggle.

IV.

The Communist Party, while its object is the conquest of political power, realizes that the means developed out of the economic action of the workers. Under the pressure of a general crisis, this action assumes the form of general political strikes, developing the direct revolutionary struggle for power.

Therefore:

1. The Communist Party must organize Communist groups or branches in the shops, mills and mines.

2. The Party must have Communist fractions within the trades Union branches, committees, etc., the extra-union organizations and the industrial unions. These fractions, while relentlessly carrying on the Communist agitation in general, must particularly express the requirements of the immediate struggle of the workers; they must participate in and develop all movements calculated to break the power of the union bureaucracy, and re-create the union as means of revolutionary struggle and organs for the management of industry.

3. The Communist Party should, where conditions permit, build its district organizations, according to the geographical distribution of industry, that is to say, a district organization groups itself around a particular basic industry (while not neglecting ample and intense contact with the general mass of the exploited).

This does not mean that the Party becomes an industrial organization, but that it concentrates its agitation upon the proletariat in the basic industries, the action of which determines the action of the masses as a whole.

The industrial district basis of the Party organization allows:

a) Making our agitation direct to the industrial proletariat (as against the old Socialist appeal to the "public").

b) Feeling and responding immediately to the development of the struggle in the basic industries as a means of unifying and developing the general struggle.

c) Preparing special programs of immediate action to reach basic industry

(in addition to the general Party program).

d) Facilitating the choice and control of Communist candidates for positions in the labor organizations, and contributing to develop Communist Party leadership in the labor movement.

V.

This industrial activity, as all other activity of the Communists, must be unified and centralized in the Communist Party—a party of rigorous discipline, the conscious expression of all phases of the proletarian struggle and of the Revolution. The labor organizations, vitalized and developed by the Communist Party, are means of revolutionary action but not of proletarian dictatorship. The dictatorship of the proletariat expresses itself in the Soviet system, dominated by the Communist Party. It is indispensable that all phases of the working class struggle

should come under the direction and control of the Party.

VI.

Just as it is necessary to make the Communist Party in each country a Party of the struggling masses, closely in touch with the labor organizations—to reconstruct the forms of unionism, and break the power of the trades union bureaucracy—so must the Communist International break the yellow Amsterdam Trades Union International, and draw the masses into an International of Revolutionary Labor Unions under the leadership of the Communist International for waging the international class war.

For this purpose the Communist International must convene a new International Congress of Labor Union organizations, which should establish the new revolutionary International of the Unions. The Bureau of the new Labor Union Inter-

national and the Executive Committee of the Communist International should be united by means of reciprocal representatives.

The First International Congress of the Revolutionary Labor Unions should include not only delegates from the central labor federations of each country, but also delegates of the organizations composing such federations; Syndicalist and independent industrial unions; bodies such as the Camera del Lavoro in Italy and the Bourse du Travail in France; extra-union organizations such as the Shop Stewards and Workers' Committees in England (even should such extra-union organizations exist in Labor organizations represented in the International). The conditions for admission being the acceptance of the class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

World Congress of the Revolutionary Working Class Youth

By WILLY MUNZENBERG

ALL former international congresses of the Socialist and Communist proletarian youth were nothing else than more or less well attended conferences. None of the previous international gatherings united a greater number of representatives of all proletarian young peoples' organizations. Even at the congress that founded the International Union of All Socialist Young Peoples' Organizations in Stuttgart in 1907 only about 15 delegates took part, who at the most represented only a fraction of the young peoples' organizations existing at that time. The participation in the latter international gatherings in Copenhagen, 1910, and Basel, 1912, was even weaker. The International Conference of 1915 in Berne, too, which was of the greatest significance for the political development of the Young Peoples' International united no more than did the former meetings. Even the International Conference held in Berlin in 1919 counted no more than 20 delegates who represented 14 organizations.

This must be changed. The future international congresses of the Communist Youth must be real congresses, i. e., international gatherings which unite the greatest possible number of representatives and delegates of all the existing Communist Young Peoples' Organizations. The accomplishment of this is above all necessary for the Second Congress of the Communist Youth called in the early part of 1921. The Second International Congress of the Communist Youth must solve a great number of extremely important questions of the utmost significance for all

Communist Young Peoples' Organizations. The resolutions decided upon by that conference will directly exercise a definite influence on the organized form and on the political effectiveness of the Communist Young Peoples' Organizations.

Like the Communist Parties most of the Communist Young Peoples' Organizations have also passed through the first phase of the Communist movement (Conduct of Communist propaganda), and have now organized themselves and face the task of forging ahead. The Second International Congress of the Communist International of Youth in the setting up of an economic program of action for the last phase of the proletarian class struggle, i. e. for the phase shortly before the taking over of power and after the taking over of power, must create uniform alignments for the practical international struggle of all young peoples' organizations. Not less important is the deliberation of the standing question of the relation of the Communist Young Peoples' Organizations to the economic young peoples' unions, to the existing syndicalist young peoples' organizations in Holland, France, Italy and other countries, and the young peoples section of the trade unions widely spread chiefly in Germany. In recent times the question of the relation of the Communist Young Peoples' Organizations to the Communist Parties has also become of real importance. Then, too, comes the question of the Communist youth and child education, the position of the Communist Young Peoples' Organizations to the school and student leagues, etc., and

a number of important organizational innovations.

The standing order of business to be considered (if only because of its importance and significance) demands the convocation of a congress of all the organizations united into the Communist International of Youth. To do this, the Executive Committee of the Communist International of Youth have given such early notice of the calling of the Second International Congress of the Communist International of Youth that all organizations have the opportunity of seasonably sending delegates to the congress. Despite the difficult methods of travel, it should be possible this time to get representatives of many Communist Young Peoples' Organizations to participate in the congress. The active Communist Young Peoples' Organizations as far East as Armenia, Persia, Turkestan, Bokhara, etc., must be represented as well as those as far west as Mexico, Canada, Argentina, etc. It is their duty, in order to obtain representation to send their delegates at once. It is of more importance that each organization send a greater number of delegates. It is of no concern that great organizations counting tens of thousands send one delegate. Even the most endowed and erudite young comrades are not in a position alone to bind their organizations in the consideration of standing question. In this respect the developments of last year have shown that it only leads to an insupportable condition when the Young Peoples' International is directed by a few comrades of one country. In consequence it is absolutely necessary that at last at

the International Congress the advance reports on the conditions of the individual organizations be extended and supplemented by co-delegates. And as difficult as it may be for single organizations—not to speak of the material difficulties—to spare their best and most active workers for some weeks, yet they must place the International before all other work.

But the preparation for the congress should not be limited merely to the organizations already members of the Communist International of Youth. It is of more value to invite all those organizations whose members only on occasion grope and seek to be in line with the Communist International of Youth. This applies above all to a number of *Economic Young Peoples' Leagues and Young Peoples' Organizations*. It is certainly valuable for clarification in these circles that delegates of these organizations get together in conjunction with the representatives of the Communist Young Peoples' Organizations of the whole world. For this reason the Executive Committee of the Communist International of Youth has decided to invite to the Second International Congress of the Communist International of Youth the economic unions of young workers in Holland, the individual circles of trade unions, young peoples' groups in Germany, etc.

The same must apply to the present centrist young peoples' organizations, whose leadership has hitherto placed as the central point of their discussion with the Communist International of Youth, the non-invitation and non-admission to the Berlin Congress, and so sought to cloud and efface the fundamental political opposition. Above all this concerns the Union of Social Democratic Workers Youth of German-Austria. We are of the opinion that this union should be admitted if only so as finally to put an end to the ridiculous argument of its centrist leadership that its non-admission to the Berlin Congress is the sole reason why it cannot be in accord with the Communist International of Youth. The leaders of this Social-Democratic Union must be given the opportunity of showing their colors and declaring their political and basic conception on the international revolutionary peoples' movement before the forum of the Second Congress of International Youth, i. e., before the eyes of the working class youth of the whole world. The same thing applies to the rest of the Socialist Proletarian Youth of Germany. Its leaders Braner and Schraeter have repeatedly announced that they would not merely apply to the Executive Committee of the Communist International of Youth for admission, but to the International Congress of Youth. The Executive Committee of the Communist In-

ternational of Youth supports this demand. The Communist International of Youth is now building with its, in round numbers, 900,000 members comprising almost 40 organizations such a firm, revolutionary bloc that any danger of its revolutionary principles being sandbagged or watered by the admission to the International Congress of representatives of Centrist Young Peoples' Organizations with voice but no vote, is nullified. Nothing else can result from it, than that the same will be said to the Centrist delegates by the representatives of the Communist Youth of the whole world, that the Executive Committee has hitherto told them in its message and that their activity in retarding the revolution will again be clearly disclosed and scourged before the proletarian youth of the whole world. It is only to be hoped that the leadership of these organizations conform to their desire and accept as a matter of fact to explain their position before the forum of the proletarian youth.

Last year's most intense revolutionary propaganda and activity of necessity led to a neglect in some countries of less important and less vital problems of the proletarian youth and the Communist Young Peoples' Organizations. Of this kind are the building and founding of children's groups and Sunday schools. The rather long breathing space in the proletarian revolution of West Europe at present permits, nay, demands, that the Communist Young Peoples' Organizations, again to pay closer attention to these problems. And already more Communist Young Peoples' Organizations have taken up the task of founding Socialist children groups as in Germany, Bulgaria, Jugo-Slavia. In other countries such as Switzerland, England, Sweden, to some extent also in Norway and Denmark, there are special organizations for forming Socialist children groups, the leadership of which stands politically whole heartedly on the program of the Communist International of Youth. To attain successful and fruitful results in this field it is necessary to

interchange mutual experiences, to work along uniform lines, and to create an international information and adjustment bureau. This question, too, the question of Socialist children groups and Sunday schools, is up for consideration at the next International Congress of Youth.

Added to that there are still the particular groups of Communist pupils and students, few in numbers but in spite of that advancing in some countries. In order to finally determine the relation between these groups and the Communist Young Peoples' Organizations and, as we hope, eventually liquidate these particular organizations of Communist students, the Executive Committee has extended an invitation to the Congress to these groups.

In our fundamental declaration and political articles we have left no doubt that every pause between the revolutionary waves in the proletarian revolution should be utilized by the young peoples' organizations to internally 'consolidate their organizations, to deepen the movement and for comprehensive education of their members. Because of this, however, we must not forget that it is not enough to train a small group of highly developed fighters, but that it must be the business of the Communist Young Peoples' Organizations to fuse together in their organizations the great mass of young workers, the many millions of young students, the youthful proletarians of the whole world; to raise the spirit of the proletarian youth to as high a level as possible; to fill the largest possible numbers of the proletarian youth with revolutionary fire and elan. The Communist Young Peoples' Organizations must become mass organizations, without in the least losing their clarity of principles, their revolutionary tactics, their revolutionary readiness for struggle and activity. The Second Congress of the Communist International of Youth which must become a world congress of all revolutionary young proletarian is a step in that direction.

The Unity Convention of The Communist Party of Austria.

Vienna, February 8.

IN the hall of the Baumgartner Casino, in Vienna, gorgeously decorated with red flags and banners, the Unity Convention of the Communist Party of Austria, the expelled Left Wing of the Social-Democracy and the Tschech Communists, met. There were present 118 delegates of the Communist Party, 50 delegates of the Left Wing and 6 Tschechs. The foreign parties represented were as follows: The U. C. P. of Germany, and the Communist

Parties of Bulgaria, Jugo-Slavia, and Hungary. After an address of greeting by Wertheim, a manifesto to the international proletariat, a resolution of solidarity against the White Terror of Horthy in Hungary, and a resolution on the victims of Austrian class-justice were passed.

Greeted by thunderous applause, Comrade Stocker in the name of the half million Communists organized in the U. C. P. of Germany, greeted the convention. He

spoke about the fraudulent manoeuvres of the Austrian bourgeoisie and Social-Democracy in the question of union with Germany. "In Germany there prevails such poverty, such unemployment, such food and financial distress that we face a catastrophe exactly as you do. We, the German Communists will firmly and faithfully fight with you in your battles. The new If-and-but-International of the Mensheviks will not live long. It is incorrectly said that Austria will play no part in the emancipation struggle of the working class. In the great struggle between revolution and counter revolution in Central Europe, the great decisive battles will probably be fought here in Austria."

Comrade Schlesinger spoke as the representative of West Hungary and described in a gripping manner, the sufferings of the Hungarian proletariat under the Terror of the Horthy bandits, and closed with the call, "The Hungarian Soviet Republic has fallen! Long live the Soviet Republic of the World!"

Comrade Tomann spoke on point 1 on the order of business: "The immediate tasks of the party." "It is the task of the Communist Party of Austria to oppose the opportunist leaders of the Social-Democracy, with all possible means, in all the trade unions, workers' councils and factories, everywhere where workers are. The unity with the Left Wing lays the foundation for a Communist mass party." He pointed to the necessity of correlating the daily anxieties of the masses with the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat; of arousing the country proletariat; of fighting for the control of production; accomplishing the support of Soviet Russia through the control of arms and munitions transport; of strengthening the agitation among the transport and railroad workers.

After the detailed resolution on the immediate tasks of the party was passed after a short debate, the creation of country-secretariat decided upon (he it noted that the convention did not at all occupy itself particularly about the position of the Communist Party of Austria on the agrarian question in Austria) the question of union with Germany and the West Hungarian question came up. After a short debate by Franz Koritschonen, the resolution of the U. C. P. of Germany on the question of union with Germany and the resolution of Koritschonen on West Hungary were passed. The former declined participation in the "union with Germany" movement led by the Social-Democrats as illusionary and closed with the words:

"With or without formal union, German-Austria is already drawn into the sphere of interest of the German counter revolu-

tion. The vindication as well as the extension of the German and of the Austrian revolutions, the vindication of world revolution with its vanguard, Soviet Russia, impose upon the German-Austrian and German proletariat alike, a series of concrete tasks which demand the closest co-operation of both parties."

"Accordingly, the Communist Party of Austria proposes to its German brother party, for the purpose of closest co-operation in all common problems, to create a common commission whose competency, position, etc., shall be determined in agreement with the executive of the 3rd International."

"However the Communist Party of Austria cannot overlook in considering the common tasks of its own and the German proletariat that in view of the geographical position of its country which faces toward the Balkans, Hungary, Czecho-Slovakia and Italy, their special tasks in the further course of the world revolution point to the supporting of the revolutionary movements in these countries as their first duty."

The resolution on West Hungary demands that the Communist Party give its support to the "union with Austria" movement in West Hungary whose proletariat has at present no possibility of existence in West Hungary.

The proceedings of the second day began with a report by Comrade Friedlander on the workers' councils in German Austria. According to his opinion, the workers' councils in Austria in contrast to those of Germany are not transitory phenomena of the revolution, but a concession extorted with difficulty from the capitalist state. They have firmly established themselves and are a factor making for

disintegration in the otherwise hard-shelled Social-Democratic Party. The interests of the Communist lie in energetically working with them and by stern reality to convince them. In the next struggles, the workers' councils will be the most important instrument of the Communists. A resolution in this direction was passed. The matter of organization was next on the order of business, and after that, the press. The conviction that we will succeed in breaking and thorough report on the work in the trade unions and the tasks of the factory councils. On the trade union question Comrade Glass, who presented the report, represented the viewpoint of the Third International, the capture of the trade unions from the Communist movement. He closed as follows: "I believe that today's unity convention has at its disposal just in this question a number of sound comrades within the trade union movement, comrades who have been closely bound up with the trade union for decades, and who are conscious of their duties as Communists. I am of the firm conviction that we will succeed in breaking up the autocracy within the trade union movement, but that it will be necessary that the single factory workers be active not only among the circle of forces in their shop or factory but they must extend their activity outside of their factory to the locals. The first break has been made. The warring activity of the trade union committee has shown that we already control a number of locals, that it is only necessary that we set to work with renewed energy that we may succeed in welding the proletarian organizations into proletarian organizations for battle, which will lead us to the victory of Socialism."

The convention closed with the elections to the Central Executive Committee.

Speech of Paul Levi at the Unity Convention of the Left Independent Socialist Party and the Communist Party of Germany.

DO NOT take it amiss if I greet this convention with intense feeling, for this convention is the climax of a long and bitter struggle. The events which led up to this convention are marked with blood. It is an important episode in the history of the proletariat of the world. It is an occasion for profound emotion that we again meet together with many comrades with whom for a long time we were bound to work but from whom we were separated because we and they believed that the same could be reached by different paths.

We, the members of the Communist Party, have trodden a thorny path. Our struggles with bourgeois illegality, which

drove the movement under ground, brought us the severest trials. And not only did we have to fight against the bourgeoisie. During our illegal existence we were obliged to carry on a struggle which resulted in a split in the party. We have taken this upon ourselves but we have worked with the consciousness of being of service to the working class in that we have sought to formulate a tactical platform upon which the revolutionary proletariat might stand.

The comrades of the Independent Socialist Party took another path. They could remain in a mass party. They could step into the struggles with great masses while we could only direct it. In the

history of the Independent Socialist Party it can be seen how the German working class, from unpreparedness, filled with the illusions of November, 1918, struggled through to the Communist position. There was probably not one of us who had the feeling that the masses who struggled toward the same goal as we did, though differently, had eventually to find themselves again with us. That time has come and here unity should be consummated.

It is no accident that the path to this unity led through Moscow. Many will once more say that it is but the dictatorship of Moscow that has created our party. That is not true. That the revolutionary proletariat of Germany has achieved unity with the help of Moscow is but an expression of the fact that Soviet Russia today is the leader of the world proletariat. Every movement, every defeat, every victory of Soviet Russia reacts on the proletariat of the whole world.

Thus the example of the German working class movement is not without effect. Today we accomplish the unity of the German Communists. In eight days Switzerland, in fourteen days France, and five days later Italy will follow our example. The uniting of the German Communists is a link in a chain which surrounds the whole world; forged by the German proletariat, it will play its part in the world revolution. So we need not limit ourselves to contemplation of events in Germany from the viewpoint of the German proletariat. We must seek to evaluate the German unity from the viewpoint of international affairs.

When in November, the proletarian tide ebbed, many were of the opinion that if only we were again settled then the wheel of fortune would turn as in 1914. The restoration of pre-war conditions was perceived as salvation. As in Germany, so it was internationally. The proletariat on the other side of the trenches believed, as was told them, that they were victorious, and had defended democracy, had safeguarded the freedom of the world. They came home, after all the blood and dirt, longing to live as they had lived before. And it appeared that it was possible. But the scarcity of commodities was great; almost the whole world was famished, denuded of all the necessaries of life. The machine could produce only so much and when the product was issued it was swallowed by the commodity hunger of the world.

One day there came an end to it. The economic crisis began. This crisis had a different character than the crises which capitalism formerly went through periodically. Those crises were brought about by the setting in motion of ever new means of production. An ever greater

mass of commodities was produced until the market was clogged. Now the crisis begins with a "buyers' strike." And why do the buyers stop buying? Have their wants become fewer? No, what we see is no conscious strike of buyers; it is the poverty of the masses which today prevents them from buying commodities which they imperatively need. From a buyers' strike the crisis rolls back. The buyer cannot buy, the merchant in consequence cannot draw upon commodity stocks, the manufacturer cannot produce any more. Factories close and the proletarians, who were unable to buy to the extent of their needs before the crisis, are thrown into the streets.

How does capitalism hope to extricate itself from this crisis? In Germany, as in all Europe, the idea prevails that the savior of the system in its dire distress is a rich uncle, and that uncle is America. This idea masters the bourgeoisie and adds to the followers of Breitscheid and Hilferding. Certainly, America has become a wealthy country. Hitherto the debtor, today it is the creditor of Europe. Before the war America owed Europe \$6,000,000,000; today Europe owes America in public loans alone, \$10,000,000,000. In addition to this, American demands upon Europe amount to \$5,700,000,000. How can these colossal loans be redeemed when one remembers that in the whole world there only exists \$6,000,000,000,000 in gold? Redemption of the debts can only be possible by the exportation of finished products to America.

Here, however, a basic transformation has taken place. America today is not the great exporter of raw materials and consumer of industrial products it was before the war. A report of the New York City bank shows that America today is an importer of raw materials and that half of its export duties are collected on finished manufactures. The war so enlarged the productive machinery of America that today it is the image of what the industrial countries of Europe were before the war. From this follows the impossibility of redeeming Europe's debt in commodity supplies. From this follows also, the impossibility of America's relieving European bankruptcy with credits.

America, too, is in the throes of a severe economic crisis. This is seen in the fall of the price of cotton. In six weeks the price fell from 40 cents to 15 cents on the English market, and even now no cotton is sold in the American market. We see in America the same industrial conditions as here, the so-called buyers' strike, unemployment, the complete image of the capitalist order as we have come to see it after the war.

America is economically separated from Europe and seeks other outlets for its products. From the report of the same New York bank it is shown further that an enlarged supply of industrial products goes from North America to Central and South America, to Asia, Africa and Australia. This supply is now four times greater than before the war. The gift of America, the gift of Wilson, the gift of Hilferding, which was to have saved the European economic situation, is dissolved in noise and smoke. Europe is thrown back upon itself.

Politically this was clearly expressed in the last American presidential election, the result of which was an emphatic protest against all interference on the part of America in European affairs. "America First" was the slogan with which both great parties went into the election campaign. Even the League of Nations must do without America's help and consequently be less influential.

In Europe there are two powers which, so to speak, seek to control European politics—France and England. When one compares the operations of practically victorious France in 1918 with the operations of victorious France in 1800 and after a remarkable similarity is apparent. The results of the victory of 1800 were seen in a ring of buffer states around France. Today, too, we see boundary states arise, though not Rhine league states; they extend from the Baltic Sea over Poland, Hungary and Roumania to the Black Sea, where Wrangel made his last stand.

England now defends India, the central point of her world empire, and for this purpose England, too, has created buffer states which stretch over Mesopotamia and India to the Himalayas. All these buffer states turn toward Soviet Russia. The purpose of this great girdle of English and French vassal states is to stifle Soviet Russia. Each great front, however, has its weak point and as Ludendorff in 1918 directed his March offensive against the point where the English and French fronts met, of necessity the greatest activity of Soviet Russia is directed against the point where the English and French spheres conflict, against the countries bordering on the Black Sea, the provinces of the former Turkish Empire.

With the fall of Wrangel the wall which the Entente built in the Balkans against Soviet Russia collapsed. How such an apparently trivial event could have a world political effect of the highest significance was shown by the last Greek parliamentary elections, which overthrew Venizelos, agent of the Entente in Greece, and gave an impetus to the collapse of the treaty

Continued on page 21.

The Communist

Official Organ of the
COMMUNIST PARTY OF AMERICA
Issued Every month by the
CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Vol. III No. 1.

April, 1921

The Socialist Party and Eugene V. Debs

The Socialist Party of America, torn from its moorings in the Second International, where it properly belongs today, is a derelict adrift in the stormy seas of the proletarian revolution. Rudderless and captained by philistines and sycophants—Hillquit, Lee, Berger, and Co.—it is a menace to the working class movement in America. The old craft is splitting on the rocks of the Communist International. Every so often we read of new elements splitting away.

Just now there comes to hand a copy of a new publication, "The Workers' Council", bearing the signature of Benjamin Glassberg and Walter M. Cook, former State Secretary of the N. Y. Socialist Party. This paper calls itself, "An organ FOR the Third International" and calls upon "the class-conscious elements of the workers to rally to its support". We cannot yet tell just whom this paper represents or what they intend to do, but it seems that it is engaged in the attempt to salvage the old hulk of the American Socialist Party, and save some of the wreckage FOR the Third International. They evidently intend to operate outside of the S. P.

Another group is working within the Socialist Party and calls itself a "Committee ON the Third International" and states "that the actual processes of disintegration that our party is going through can only be arrested by the party's adopting as guidance for its action the principles enunciated by the Third International". This "committee" is headed by J. Louis Engdahl and Steven Bircher and expects to bring the leaking, filthy old S. P. safe into the harbor of the Communist International, thinking that the C. I. which would not accept Serrati in company with Turatti, Modigliani, et al., will take a Hillquit or a Berger into its ranks.

Anyone may be FOR or impose himself ON the Third International. The Communist International has hundreds of thousands of sympathizers in America.

The ONLY way to get IN the Communist International is to join the Communist Party of America, which is the American section of the C. I. The Socialist Party cannot be saved—it must be exposed and destroyed as an insidious and dangerous enemy of the working class, the last resort and hope of the capitalist state, the blood brothers of the Eberts, Vanderveldes, Dans, Martovs, MacDonalds, Renaudels, Troelstras, Turattis, the world over.

The Socialist Party has one asset and only one. That is Eugene Debs. The cynical and hypocritical leaders of the S. P. have exploited this sincere and mistaken old man to the limit. Eugene Victor Debs once belonged to the revolutionary working class of the world, but now his soft and yielding nature has been molded to suit the sordid purposes of the S. P. leaders. Just before Debs went to jail he wrote in "The Class Struggle":

"The reign of capitalism and militarism has made of all the people inflammable material. They are ripe and ready for the change, the great change, which means the rise and triumph of the workers, the end of exploitation, of war and plunder, and the emancipation of the race. Let it come! Let us all help its coming and pave the way for it by organizing industrially and politically to conquer capitalism and usher in the day of the people. In Russia and in Germany our valiant comrades are leading the proletarian revolution, which knows no race, no color, no sex, no boundary lines. They are setting the heroic example for world-wide emulation.

Let us, like them, scorn and repudiate the cowardly compromisers within our own ranks, challenge and defy the robber-class power, and fight it out on that line to victory or death!

A Protest Protested.

The following letter from an irate comrade of District IV was received by the Party Editor for publication in *THE COMMUNIST*. This comrade has been reading the official organ of the U. C. P. and instead of calling our attention to misstatement of fact appearing in the U. C. P. Communist, hastens to blame us and wants the statement corrected to "rehabilitate the truth".

When we received this protest we looked up our files and found no reference to the Greek movement in No. 12 of *THE COMMUNIST*. We did, however, find in No. 12 of the U. C. P. Communist this statement under the heading "The Communist World";

From the crown of my head to the soles of my feet I am a Bolshevik, and proud of it. The day of the people has arrived!"

There spoke the real Debs—the Debs of revolution. His revolutionary fire has burned itself out, and he now associates with those whose role will be that of the hangmen of the proletarian revolution in America. Debs has elected to go with the yellow betrayers of revolutionary socialism; whereas his place was in the Communist International fighting side by side with the red soldiers of the revolution. The hand which Lenin extended to Debs has not to our knowledge been withdrawn but Debs has refused to clasp it.

Poor old Debs! It is upon his revolutionary past that the degenerate Socialist Party leans. But the Social revolution is ruthless and sweeps aside the rubbish of the past, crushing parties and men in its onward and irresistible march toward the final goal. Younger and more vigorous revolutionists will pick up the crimson banner where Debs has let it fall, and bearing it onward past every obstacle, will plant it upon the topmost pinnacle of the bastille of capitalism. The social revolution is invincible. The Communist Party is its highest expression. He who is not with us has fallen out of the line of march.

The vanguard of the proletariat—The Communist Party of America—is marching on gaining strength and power with each passing day, while Debs, straining his weak eyes in the direction of the red vanguard of the revolution sinks deeper and deeper in the swamp of social-democratic reform. His once heroic figure will grow smaller and smaller as the proletariat reaches ever higher heights. Debs has gained his liberty and lost his revolutionary soul.

"A Communist newspaper has been issued in Athens under the name of "Kinonia" (Society). Communists ran in the election which took place on November 6."

We are publishing our Greek comrade's letter not only to relieve his justly outraged feelings, but also for the valuable information which it contains and to protest, on our part, against being blamed for the mistakes of the U. C. P.

(MOORE—PARTY ED.)

To the Editor of "The Communist".

Dear Comrade: As a member of the C. P. I beg to protest in the strongest

way against a misstatement published in the No. 12 of our paper, regarding the Socialist movement in Greece, which is the country I came from.

The "Kinonia" (Society) is a yellow paper belonging to the yellow socialist, Yanios, whose party—the Socialist Party of Greece—is advocating a "two-and-a-half" International, and has sent its delegates to the yellow socialists' conference in Vienna.

The above "Kinonia" and S. P. of Greece are constantly disclaiming and insulting the Third International and Communism, advocating at the same time bourgeois patriotism and bourgeois democracy.

The only red organization in Greece in the Socialist Labor Communist Party, 14 Euripides St., Athens, which is a branch of the Balkan Communist Federation, and is the Greek section of the Communist International of Moscow. Its special delegation to the Second Congress at Moscow, headed by the C. D. Lygdopoulos, on its way from Moscow to Greece, has been murdered two weeks ago on board a ship in the Black Sea, undoubtedly by secret agents of the French and English Governments for reasons we do not know yet.

The above party in the last elections polled nearly 120,000 votes, or a third of the votes cast in the industrial centres in Greece. Its official organ is the weekly "Ergaticos Agon" (Workers' Struggle), besides the daily "Rizospastis" (Radical) controlled also by the same party.

I beg you to kindly give the necessary publicity to the above for the rehabilitation of truth.

Yours very truly,
M. P.

TO THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF ITALY

Comrades Bombacci, Bordiga, Taracini, and others.

Dear Comrades:

The Executive Committee of the Communist International expresses itself in fullest solidarity with you and sends you its fraternal greetings. Your party is the only section of the Communist International in Italy. We are confident that the class conscious workers of your country will join your ranks. The union of Serratti and his group with the reformists' section will show to all that the Italian section of the Unitarian Centrists is nearer to the bourgeois reformist elements than to the proletarian Communists. The Communist International will draw the cor-

responding conclusions from this fact. Be firm, comrades, now that all the forces of the bourgeoisie with its many and various agents are mobilized against your party. The Communist workers of all the world are with you. The future belongs to you and not to those who want, in some form or another, through the reformists, to come to terms with the bourgeoisie.

Long live the Communist Party of Italy!

Long live the Italian proletariat!

The Executive Committee of the
Communist International

G. ZINOVIEV, Chairman.

50th ANNIVERSARY OF THE PARIS COMMUNE

To All Parties and Organizations Affiliated
with the III. International

COMRADES:

This spring will be the 50th anniversary of the Paris Commune. Half a century has passed since the Paris workers, for the first time in history, rose against the bourgeoisie and seized power. The Paris Communards have written a page of undying glory in the golden book of the international proletarian movement. They have been the predecessors and forerunners of the present proletarian revolution in Russia and all over the world. In

The Congress, the C. P. A. and Unionism

By LOUIS C. FRAINA

FOREWORD.

The statement in the Communist for February 1st, to which Comrade Fraina objects, as misstating his position on

the trade union question at the second Congress of the Communist International, was written by the former Party Editor, in an article dealing with the Unity Question and criticizing the U. C. P. If Comrade Fraina was misrepresented, as he claims, the fault lies wholly in the reports which we received from Moscow, as published in the Pravda. These reports did not distinguish between the position taken by Comrades L. C. Fraina and J. T. Murphy, but severely criticized the whole Anglo-American delegation without exception. Had Comrade Fraina been more diligent in forwarding reports of his activities in Russia, and of the position which he took, together with important documents necessary to keep his party, the C. P. of A., thoroughly informed, as was his unquestioned duty as our delegate, the present misunderstanding could not have arisen.

The former Party Editor's assumption, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, that Comrade Fraina, "could not and

Paris, which is the seat of international reaction today, fifty years ago the proud red banner was raised, for which tens of thousands of the glorious Parisian proletarians perished.

The Executive Committee of the Communist International appeals to all conscious workers of the world to celebrate solemnly the 50th anniversary of the Paris Commune. The Executive Committee of the Communist International decided to dedicate to this anniversary a special number of the *Communist International*.

The Executive Committee of the Communist International has further adopted the following resolution: The Communist workers of the world, united and represented in the Executive Committee of the Communist International, decide to erect a monument to the French Communards in Paris in the name of the Communist International. The Executive Committee of the Communist International takes the initiative in this matter and appeals to the Communist Parties of all countries to start a subscription for this purpose, and the French comrades are asked to assist in the accomplishment of this task.

The Executive Committee of the Communist International waits to see whether the present bourgeois government of France will dare to hinder the international working class from erecting a monument to the heroes of the Paris Commune.

The Executive Committee of the
Communist International

G. ZINOVIEV, Chairman.

did not represent the party's position" (on the trade union question) at the Second Congress is in part justified by the following statement by Fraina:

"The implication is that I opposed participation in the reactionary trade unions. When I left the United States this was partly true, a relic of my S. L. P. training. But my observations in England and particularly in Germany, prepared me to accept the views of the Russian Comrades in favor of participation, which I did within a week of my arrival in Moscow."

We are pleased to publish Comrade Fraina's reply, first, because it gives Comrade Fraina an opportunity to correct an erroneous impression as to his position on a vital question, and second, because Fraina's reply exposes the non-communist and syndicalist-opportunist position of the U. C. P., proving, if further proof were needed, the contention of the C. P. of A. that the U. C. P. is unfit to lead the communist forces in America. (MOORE—PARTY EDITOR)

IN *The Communist* of February 1, there is an article in which appears the following paragraph:

"To our great sorrow and regret our delegates, Fraina and Stocklitsky, did not and could not represent our position in the Second Congress of the Communist International as they defended in our name a policy which the Communist Party of America had repudiated at its second convention, and upon which the Communist International declared war—the policy of splitting the A. F. of L. and kindred organizations. In this respect our delegates met with the well-merited rebuke of Comrade Radek, who accused them of hypocrisy. That our party was to some extent discredited at the Second World Congress of the Communist International is not altogether our fault; our delegates were out of touch with the latest developments in our party and were elected by the September First Convention; our program, which was adopted at our second convention, before the position taken by Fraina and Stocklitsky on the question of participation in the reactionary trade unions, was not the position of the C. P. A. which was misrepresented by our delegates. The Communist International, judging us by our delegates, who misrepresented us, saw no difference between the views of our delegates and the delegates of the U. C. P. and this doubtless influenced the Communist International's decision to force immediate unity."

If these charges were true, they would seriously compromise Stocklitsky and myself. But they are not true, as the stenographic report of the Congress discussion on unionism will prove

It is a simple question of facts. And the facts are these, on each particular point:

1. That, on the question of participation in the reactionary trade unions, I misrepresented our party (I say "I" because Stocklitsky took no part whatever in the public discussion on unionism).

The implication is that I opposed participation in the trade unions. When I left the United States, this was partly true, a relic of my S. L. P. training. But my observations in England and particularly in Germany prepared me to accept the views of the Russian comrades in favor of participation, which I did within a week of my arrival in Moscow. In the Commission on Trades Unionism I consistently spoke in favor of participation. At the Congress, in my two speeches on unionism, I emphasized, on the basis of American experience and requirements, the necessity of participation in the trade unions. These are the facts.

There were some differences concerning the character of participation, concerned with extra-union organizations, such as Shop Committees, Shop Stewards, etc. In Radek's original theses, based upon the German and Russian experience, there

was no provision for such organizations in pre-revolutionary periods. Comrade Radek saw the point and accepted our amendments.

2. That I favored the policy of splitting the A. F. of L. and kindred organizations.

This is not true. At one of the sessions of the Trade Union Commission, Flynn, of the U. C. P., favored this policy. I made a ten-minute speech against Flynn, severely criticising him and maintaining that his policy would ruin our movement. In one of my speeches in the Congress I said: "To adopt the slogan, 'Break the A. F. of L.' is to break, not the A. F. of L. but the American Communist movement."

I did argue in the Commission for broadening the conditions under which splits may be permitted, and also new unions were organized; and at the end Radek and I were in agreement. Moreover, Radek in the Congress declared that considering the majority of the workers in the United States are not in the unions, special problems were created for the American comrades not covered in his theses.

3. That I was rebuked by Radek and accused of hypocrisy:

Comrade Radek never did anything of the sort. This rebuke was given to some of the other delegates. In fact, in the Congress Radek, while reporting for the Trades Union Commission, admitted that Murphy and Fraina did make some constructive proposals. (J. T. Murphy and I worked together on the union question and independently of the industrialist group, being Communists and not Syndicalists.)

4. That "to some extent" I discredited our party by my attitude on unionism.

Consider the facts: In discrediting the party I would necessarily discredit myself. But I was appointed on a Council of Three to organize the whole trades union work in America; and I wrote the instructions to this Council, which were accepted with one very slight change by the Provisional Executive of the Red Labor International.

I did discredit myself with the U. C. P. delegates. Flynn, MacAlpine and Reed went around saying that I knew nothing about American conditions, and that my accepting the theses would ruin the American movement. Does the editor of *The Communist* agree with the U. C. P. delegates?

5. That there was no difference (or it appeared so to the Russian comrades) between my views on unionism and those of the U. C. P. delegates.

The facts I have cited should amply prove the contrary. When I got the program of the U. C. P. I immediately and particularly criticized its trades union clause. In the credentials commission, when I defended our party against exclusion, I pointed out that this clause showed the U. C. P. was not fundamental in its understanding of Communist tactics, and that the C. P. A. if for no other reason should be recognized by the International. Comrade Zinoviev asked me personally if I agreed with the clause on unionism in the U. C. P. program. I naturally and immediately answered no. Zinoviev said that acceptance of the trades union decisions of the Congress must be made a fundamental condition of unity. I agreed.

6. That my attitude on unionism "doubtless influenced the Communist International's decision to force immediate unity."

Nothing of the sort. When I arrived in Moscow I found that the Executive Committee was absolutely convinced that there must be unity in the American Communist movement, and that nothing would change this conviction. Comrade Andrew tried, slightly, and no argument was paid to his arguments. The decision of the Communist International for unity comes out of the general policy of the International and out of the conviction that the struggle between the two parties is demoralizing our movement. I am on this matter in complete agreement with the International.

I do not know on what evidence the editor of *The Communist* wrote as he did, but surely it was not after knowing the facts as contained in the stenographic report of the Congress. Early in October I mailed my two speeches to the party from Moscow, but while they arrived in New York, for some reason the manuscript never reached the C. E. C. But for this I am not responsible.

Superficially, I was identified with the Industrialist group, but the report will show that my arguments were sharply different from theirs. There was some confusion on this matter; for example, the report states "that the American delegation abstained from voting on the trades union theses," whereas in fact this means the U. C. P. alone, and not Stocklitsky and myself.

The theses on unionism, in my opinion, are fundamentally sound; and their insistence on participation in the trade unions absolutely unassailable. I do have some criticisms; I did propose ideas not incorporated in the theses; but these have absolutely nothing to do with the criticism in *The Communist* (which is one of facts and not ideas) and I shall if granted the

opportunity state my position clearly to the party membership for discussion.

My differences of opinion may be characterized as not in opposition to the trades union theses of the Congress but supplementary to them.

I feel this matter of the criticism very keenly. I was not in touch with the

party; in Moscow I had to determine my position by what I thought would be the party position on the various questions; and the report will show that throughout I did not misrepresent the party on any question, and could not, since I am a Communist and our's is a Communist Party.

ation of all fundamental questions and the principle of elections to all positions from the bottom to the top, etc. At the same time the resolution asserts that these points, without altering the functions of the trade unions in the labor state, cannot solve the fundamental questions of Socialist construction.

*A Summary of the Discussions
on Trade Unionism*

It is more than a month since the address of comrade Trotsky on the role of the Trade Unions in production, delivered on the 24th of December, 1920, started a general discussion on this subject within the party. During that period the discussion passed beyond the mere analysis of the theses advanced by this or that group, and became a kind of a general expression of party opinion. The question was put on the agendas at the meetings of district committees and district and local meetings, where, following reports of representatives of the different platforms, a preliminary vote was taken. This serves to indicate the trend of thought of the active workers of the Communist Party, showing which point of view on the role of the trade unions was the most popular and was becoming the crystalized party opinion on the matter.

It is therefore of importance to summarize and get a general view of this discussion and define its general trend.

The Petrograd organization of the party was the first to express its decision on the question. Here a general meeting of all the city locals took place on Jan. 3rd, 1921, at which comrade Zinoviev presented his point of view and was followed by comrade Bucharin defending the platform of Trotsky. The meeting, with an overwhelming majority, adopted the text of an address to the party declaring that the Petrograd organization was in favor of the position of the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions and was in agreement with the point of view expressed by Comrades Lenin and Zinoviev on the role and tasks of the Trade Unions. This address was later approved by a general meeting of all the members of the Petrograd organization at which out of 4,000 comrades only 20 voted against the address.

In the Viborg district out of 354 members present 334 voted for the address of the Petrograd organization and 19 against. In the second city district 1,000 members participated, out of which only 33 voted against. In the Moscow district 262 members were present out of which there was no vote against, 3 abstentions and 259 for.

The voting in the factories gave similar results. At the Alexandrov mill out of 300 Communists present, 299 voted for the

TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

THE QUESTION OF TRADE UNIONISM AT THE 10th CONGRESS OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY.

Resolution of the "Eighteen"

The draft of a resolution on the question of the functions of the trade unions to be submitted to the forthcoming 10th Congress of the Russian Communist Party has been published over the signature of eighteen comrades—hence the name by which this resolution is known. These comrades are: Trotsky, Bucharin, Andreiev, Djirjinsky, Krestinsky, Preobrazhensky, Rakovsky, Serebriakov, Larin, Sokolnikov, Akovleva, Holsmann, Ivanov, Kasior, Piatokov, Kohn, Averin, and Kin. This draft resolution is a combination of the platforms of what are known as the buffer group and that of comrade Trotsky.

The general features of this resolution can be summed up as follows: Not only the growth of labor democracy in the unions is necessary, but also a growth of the influence of the unions in industry; the school of Communism lies mainly in the industrial training of the masses and their representatives; it is necessary that there should be an organizational combination and merging of the unions with the economic organs and the subordination of the economic organs and the subordination of the economic apparatus to the growing functions of the unions as mass organizations. The draft resolution contains an explanation of the views of this group of comrades as to the origin of the internal crisis in the trade union movement which caused this question of the functions of the trade unions to be raised at the forthcoming congress of the Party, and also their views on the fundamental tasks of the trade unions.

In point 21 of the resolution, for example, it is proposed that "in order to achieve an internal harmony in the work of the industrial unions and economic organizations" to construct both "on similar economic—territorial lines" i. e. to include in both the organizations the same number of enterprises in accordance with the structure and requirements of the given branch of industry. The resolution continues, "with this aim in view the 10th Congress considers necessary the immediate setting up of a central commission composed of the All-Russian Council of

Trade Unions on the one hand, and the Supreme Council of National Economy, the Commissariat for Agriculture, the Commissariat for Ways and Communications, and others on the other, for establishing the organizational relations between the unions and the economic organs by a corresponding re-grouping of both on the basis of industrial experience."

Considering necessary the calling of simultaneous congresses of the economic organizations and the corresponding trade unions, the resolution declares it necessary that "the compositions of the presidiums of the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions and the Supreme Council of National Economy should be such that the one third or the half of the members of the presidium of the one organization be the same persons as shall hold those positions in the other, and that the same principle be carried out in the other trade unions and economic organs.

All experience in the establishment of unity of management of industrial enterprises and the organization of national economy must be regarded in the light of the solution of the following tasks: To train and bring forward economic administrators from among trade unionists; to bring about an approachment and organizational combination of the work of the unions and the economic apparatus; to indicate the general sections of their work and create conditions for their joint execution; to strive towards broadening the general section of their work until finally it embraces the whole, i. e. until a complete merging of the unions and the economic organs has been completed."

The draft resolution, which differs from comrade Trotsky's original thesis, includes a number of points on the necessity for equality in the sphere of consumption and the preservation of the principle of concentration (on special enterprises or branches of industry, tr.) in the sphere of production; the extension of the rights of the disciplinary courts and the extension of their jurisdiction over the administrative staff, on the necessity for training and drawing the masses into the consider-

resolution of the Petrograd organization and 1 against. The general meeting of the sailor Communists of the Petrograd Naval Base, 299 comrades voted in favor of the resolution and only 19 against. At the inter-district meeting of the active workers of the party on January 16th (following the general meeting at which the final text of the address was adopted), there were 700 comrades present out of which only 40 voted against. At a meeting of Communists of the North-Western Railway Junction out of 250 comrades there were 243 votes for and 7 against. The Communist fractions of the Executive Boards of the Trade Unions voted unanimously for the address. And, finally, in the Petrograd Party Executive only one member abstained from voting, and all the rest voted for.

The figures thus produced can, of course, not be generalized and represent only raw material indicating, however, the trend of party opinion in Petrograd, and showing that the overwhelming majority stands for the point of view advanced by the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions.

Moscow represents a more varied picture in exact report of the results of the discussion in all the districts. But there is already some material at hand from which one can judge the attitude of party circles on this question.

The Moscow Committee of the Communist Party started the controversy at its session where there was a majority of 1 against the Petrograd address with 1 abstention. At the same time the Moscow Executive Committee took up a position approaching that of the Trotsky group. Then on January 2nd, the Executive Committee of the city district discussed the question and unanimously adopted the motion proposed by Comrade Ignatov in favor of the position of the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions and of the address of the Petrograd organizations. On January 12 and 13, there was a meeting of the active workers of the Bauman district at which the general trend of opinion was in favor of the platform of Ten i. e. the position of Comrades Lenin and Zinoviev. The Executive Committee of the Bauman district gave 14 votes for the platform of Ten and one for the Trotsky platform. But in the Zamoskvoretzki Committee the votes divided so that 7 votes were given for the Trotsky platform and 5 for the so-called platform of Ten, while at the general meeting of all the members the Trotsky platform received 74 votes and the platform of Ten, proposed by Comrade Kameneff, received 131 votes. Then comes the Sokolniki district where the platform of Ten received the upper hand, only one fifth of those present voting for the Trotsky platform.

On January 19th the Moscow Committee of the party resumed the discussion on the industrial role of the Trade Unions at an extended session at which the secretaries and presidents of the district committees participated. All the currents of opinion on this subject were represented by Zinoviev, Kameneff, Trotsky, Shlapnikoff, Ignatov, Sapronov, Riazanov, and others. The contest was between the platform of Ten which received 62 votes, and that of Trotsky which received only 18 votes.

On January 21st, there was a general meeting of all the party groups, at which Comrade Zinoviev spoke in defense of his platform and was opposed by Comrade Trotsky. The latter received only one fifth of the votes while all the rest voted for the Zinoviev platform. In the Rogoshsky-Simonovsky district 233 votes were given for the platform of Lenin, Zinoviev, etc., while the Trotsky platform received 23 votes.

On January 26th at the Sverdloff Communist University there was a general meeting of the Communist group of the University at which 1,200 members and candidates of the party were present. Following a discussion on the role of the Trade Unions, the Trotsky and Bucharin platform obtained 115 votes, the so-called "labor opposition," 91. All the rest voted for the platform of Ten, proposed by Lenin and others. There were no abstentions.

On January 28th the Communist fraction of the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions voted on the three platforms—that of Ten, that of Trotsky, and that of Shlapnikoff. The first received 70 votes, the second 23, and the third 21. Thus the fraction adopted the platform of Ten.

The controversy was extended to the province where it was taken up in connection with discussions on the results of the VIII. Congress of the Soviets. Here the platform of Ten was accepted by all the district committees with the exception of Podorsk.

The discussion in the province of Moscow is not yet completed, but one may say that the platform of Lenin and Zinoviev will receive an overwhelming majority, a minority will vote for the Trotsky theses, while all the other currents will hardly get 2 per cent of the vote.

Within the Trade Unions themselves the discussion on their role in industry is carried on in a very lively manner. At the Congress of miners, the platform of Comrade Shlapnikoff made considerable headway, receiving 61 votes as against 137 for the platform of Ten. The Central Board of the Metal Workers Union gave

11 votes for the Shlapnikoff platform of Ten and 7 for that of Trotsky. The printing workers voted 43 for Lenin and 23 for Trotsky.

Information from the province comes in rather slowly but it is evident that the prevailing attitude of the party circles is in favor of the platform of Ten.

The Kharkov party organization expressed itself in favor of the Trotsky theses. At a party meeting in Tula on January 25th, there were 272 votes for the resolution proposed by Trotsky as against 537 votes for the Zinoviev resolution.

At Ivanovo-Vosnesensk the platform of Trotsky and Bucharin received 27 votes, while 900 voted for the Lenin platform. At Tambov the provincial party conference voted on the question as follows: 47 votes for the Lenin platform and 29 for that of Trotsky and Bucharin.

Thus, it is probable that the Russian Communist Party at its 10th Congress will adopt the point of view of Lenin and Zinoviev on the question of Trade Unions.

RUSSIAN TRADE UNIONS

A number of the international organizations of trade unions have finally expressed themselves in favor of the Amsterdam Federation of the Trade Unions. Thus, the international secretariat of the chemical workers has definitely shown its face at its congress in Amsterdam. In the same manner, the secretariat of the building workers has "self-determined" itself at its plenum in Hamburg.

All this raises the question of the attitude of the Russian Unions towards the "yellow" international organizations. The question is whether they, being the followers of the social revolution, should join these organizations, or create Red organizations to oppose them.

The All-Russian Council of Trade Unions, after a discussion of the question, adopted the following decision:

"The All-Russian industrial organizations join the corresponding international organization only in so far as the latter do not express their solidarity with the Amsterdam International and are not affiliated organizations, which adopted the Amsterdam program.

"If the international organizations adopted the platform of the Amsterdam International after the Russian organization had joined them, the latter must immediately leave the ranks of that international organization."

Position of United Communist Party of Germany on the Split in the Italian Socialist Party

STATEMENT OF LEVI, ZETKIN, DAUMIG, HOFFMAN, BRESS ON THEIR RESIGNATION AS MEMBERS of the CENTRAL COMMITTEE of the U. C. P. of GERMANY.

To prevent an unwarranted and possibly malicious interpretation by their opponents of their voluntary resignation from the Central Committee of the U. C. P. of Germany, the undersigned declare:

1. Hitherto the Central Committee has been in agreement and united on all the most important fundamental questions of the party's attitude and policy. Until shortly before they were also united—united in the sense of the resolutions for decision by the Central Committee to the Central Council on their conception of the conditions in the Italian Socialist Party.

2. As hitherto, we are still of the view that the complete rupture with all reformism and opportunism is the prerequisite for membership in a Communist Party and in the Communist International.

Accordingly we approve of the stand taken by the E. C. of the C. I. which in accordance with the decisions of the 2nd World Congress has insisted in Italy upon immediate, open, rupture with the reformists and opportunists, and we recognize that the reformists and the communists are not identical but that the reformists were on the side of the fence of Serrati's group. As to the decisions of the 2nd World Congress and the principles thereof which have hitherto been applied in Germany at the split of the I. S. P., in France, Switzerland, in Norway, there are however working masses in Italy that have been excluded from the Communist International who on account of their revolutionary past and revolutionary will can remain good members of a Communist Party.

According to this viewpoint when a party already a member of the Communist International is split, we do not therein see the attempt—as with the I. S. P., the Social-Democratic Party of Switzerland, the French Socialist Party,—to separate workers from a reformist party so as to win them for communism, but to build purer and more solid Communist Parties through the mechanical process of splits.

An attempt to form a Communist Party in this manner cannot be limited to Italy. The representative of the E. C. in Italy has declared that a precedent has been laid down and has already pointed to the future application in France and Germany.

We declare:

These methods of forming Communist Parties can never lead to the building of communist mass parties, but to the building solely of pure and thoroughly trained parties, to be sure, but because of their numerical weakness, uninfluential in the larger workers' organizations. That which was in the mind of the Communist International, the building of communist mass parties cannot be attained in this way, but only by organic growth and common political experience and struggles of such masses as have found their way in the party on the basis of the conditions laid down by the 2nd World Congress of the Communist International.

We consider this course fatal. We consider it our duty to unite into an ever stronger and more clear fighting host the communists that have come and are coming into the Party through the revolutionary struggles and schools of revolution, a host, not condemned to impotency because of numerical weakness but which on account of its numerical strength is in a position to win such influence on the proletarian masses by reason of its insight and revolutionary determination.

By the acceptance of the resolution of Thelheimer-Stoecker, the Central Committee has approved of the steps taken by the E. C. of the C. I. in Italy. However the vindication of these measures leads, as far as it is conducted in principle, to such propositions that contain serious danger to the future unity of the German Communist Party.

We are firmly convinced that another split in the German Communist Party—apart from splits toward the Right and Left—will not lead to the formation of a Communist Party, full of fighting energy, but will for a long time cause great harm to Communism and the cause of the revolution not alone in Germany, but on that account in Europe as well.

We cannot therefore, as is demanded of a member of the Central Committee, defend this decision. Nor especially can we bear the responsibility for the consequences, which in our opinion will inevitably follow. Accordingly, on these grounds, we resign as members of the Central Committee.

3. The return of the undersigned to the rank and file of the U. C. P. of G. naturally, does not mean that they will withdraw into a quiet and retired spot. On the contrary: as plain soldiers, the undersigned will endeavor to do their

perfect duty and responsibility in the Party, in the struggle of the German proletariat for its emancipation through Communism and within the Third International.

Otto Brass, Ernst Daumig, Adolf Hoffman, Paul Levi, Clara Zetkin.

STATEMENT ADOPTED AGAINST 4 VOTES BY THE CENTRAL COUNCIL UPON THE RESIGNATION OF THE 5.

The Central Council declares as follows on the resignation of the 5 comrades from the Central Committee:

1. The fundamental conception of the Central Council on the formation of Communist Parties in West-European countries is in perfect agreement with that of the 2nd World Congress of the Communist International.

This conception is that of creating in all countries parties of the broad masses whose members are thoroughly permeated with the communist spirit of revolutionary readiness and who are under unified communist leadership.

2. By the decision on the Italian question, the Central Council had not agreed to a new principle on the creation of Communist Parties, but has only asserted that these tactics of the 2nd World Congress of the C. I. are to be maintained in Italy as well as in Germany, and only the necessary separation from the reformists and centrists accomplished. If that led to separation from Serrati's group as well it was because the opportunist leaders of this group constantly wavered about executing the orders of the C. I. and rather broke with the communists than with the reformists of Turatti. By the acceptance of this decision the Central Council manifested, as is self-evident the duty of international solidarity, its fraternal support especially for the young Communist Party of Italy, persecuted by all the counter-revolutionists.

3. The Central Council is far from the opinion that with the acceptance of its decision, it has agreed to the theory of a new party-split in Germany. We are as firmly convinced as are the 5 comrades who resigned that another split in the German Communist Party—apart from split towards the Right and Left—will not lead to the formation of a Communist Party, full of fighting energy, but will for a long time cause great harm to Communism and the cause of revolution not

alone in Germany, but on that account in Europe, as well.

Indeed, the Central Council sees in the mere play with the idea of a new party split in the U. C. P. of Germany, an inconsiderate and dangerous thought, which only excites confusion in our ranks and furnishes comfort to our opponents.

The Central Council considers that the assertion that the tactics applied by the E. C. in Italy must of necessity lead to new splits in Germany, France and the other countries of West Europe as well, is completely groundless and without basis.

The Party Central Council instructs the Central Committee to immediately request a declaration from the E. C., and is convinced that this declaration will justify the position of the majority of the Party Central Council and will prove the minority in error.

4. Harmonious cooperation with the E. C. is indispensable to the execution of the difficult tasks of the International in Western Europe.

5. The Central Council declares that it can perceive no sort of fundamental differences of opinion in this conflict. Accordingly, the Central Council regrets the resignation of the five comrades from the Central Committee.

The Central Committee is of the firm conviction that in a very short time these unpleasant differences will be overcome. The Comrades who have resigned and who have assured their further cooperation will also be convinced that their position was a mistaken one when the official statement of the E. C. of the 3rd International and the march of events in Germany and the other countries will have established our view.

We implore the party comrades not to be disconcerted about nothing, to continue along the path of Communism as members of a united and powerful Communist International.

Both resolutions (translated from the German) are printed below.

The following resolution submitted by the Central Executive Committee of the United Communist Party of Germany to its Central (General) Committee was rejected by a vote of 28 to 23:

On the basis of the report of their delegates to the Leghorn Congress of the Italian Socialist Party and its pronouncements thereafter, the Central (General) Committee of the United Communist Party of Germany declares:

1) That the decisions of the Second Congress of the C. I. on the necessity of purifying all Communist Parties or

such parties as desire to affiliate to the C. I., from reformist elements, is the prerequisite of all communist activity. Communist Parties can neither prepare the revolution nor lead the mass struggle of the proletariat if they retain in their midst, at responsible posts, opponents of the proletarian revolution.

2) That the Executive Committee of the C. I. acted, not only in accordance with the decisions of the Second Congress, but in complete harmony with its affiliated sections, when it categorically demanded the expulsion of the reformists. The uncompromising insistence on this demand by the E. C. of the C. I. is in perfect accord with the interests of the Italian and the International labor movement. The attitude of the reformists, after the Congress of the C. I. had been held, upon the question of occupying the Italian factories, clearly exposed the social patriotic and traitorous character of the reformist group in Italy.

3) The majority of the Italian Socialist Party under the leadership of Serrati, accepted the 21 conditions for affiliation to the C. I. but demanded for themselves that the methods of carrying them out be negotiated with the E. C. of the C. I. In the first half of the year which had passed since the holding of the Congress of the C. I., Serrati's group did not so much as lift a finger to make any sort of concrete proposals to the E. C. of the C. I. as to carrying out the decisions of the Second Congress. On the contrary, Serrati publicly denied the presence of reformers in the Italian Socialist Party. It therefore became necessary to put before the Serrati group the definite choice of unity with the reformers, or unity with the Communists.

4) That the Serrati group preferred to split the Italian Socialist Party and separate from the Communist International than to split away from the reformists, thereby showing that, in reality, they are not yet a unified, stable Communist fighting group, but contain centrists elements who vacillate between Communism and Reformism.

Nevertheless, the Central (General) Committee of the United Communist Party of Germany recognizes that a section of communist proletarians, who follow Serrati, are possessed of a sincere and honest desire to place themselves upon the basis of the principles and the conditions of organization of the C. I. The Communist Party of Italy (group of Bordiga and Bombacci) having placed themselves on this basis, is therefore the only party in Italy to be recognized by all sections of the C. I. and to be powerfully supported.

5) The Central (General) Committee of the United Communist Party of Ger-

many considers that unity is possible between the Communist Party of Italy and the split off Group of Serrati, who are sincerely determined to form an active fighting group of the C. I., providing they definitely withdraw themselves from all centrist elements and tendencies within their own ranks.

The Central (General) Committee of the U. C. P. of Germany therefore expects the communist proletarians of all groups in Italy to take the initiative in creating unity, and calls upon the E. C. of the C. I. to work toward bringing about an understanding and unity between all communist elements in Italy, the first and most important condition of which shall be the execution of the decisions of the Second Congress of the C. I., and consequently the separation from all vacillating, uncertain and equivocal leaders who would compromise with opportunism under the cloak of the Communist International.

6) The Central (General) Committee of the U. C. P. of Germany castigates the slanders of the Independent Socialist Party's press against the E. C. of the C. I. accusing them of having caused the split in the Italian Socialist Party. We maintain that this was not a split by the ukase of Moscow, but occurred as a result of the execution of an international decision, in the making of which the Italian comrades took part. When the Independents seek to represent the carrying out of this international decision as a manifestation of the dictatorship of the E. C. of the C. I. they show that they stand for an International which will be one only in appearance and which will permit each affiliated party a free hand for the carrying out of opportunist policies. When the Independents represent the demand for the expulsion of open reformists as an injury to the labor movement, they prove that they consider unity with Ebert and Scheidemann, as not only possible but necessary.

♦

On a motion presented by Comrades Stoecker and Thalheimer, the following resolution was adopted by a vote of 38 to 23:

(Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3, of the rejected resolution presented by the E. C. of the U. C. P. of Germany, and)

4) The Serrati Group preferred to split away from the C. I. rather than to separate from the Reformists. Despite the Serrati Group's formal declaration of acceptance of the 21 points it is in fact not prepared to execute and include them in its tactics and program.

5) A sincere and honest desire to remove from the Italian Party the out-

spoken reformist leaders in the party, the trade unions and associations, has not been shown, although six months of discussion in the Italian Party of the political acts of these elements has clearly demonstrated their reformist character.

6) Even now the leaders of the Serrati Group are in opposition to the C. I. on decisive, fundamental questions:

a) On the question of the relations of the party to the trade unions the Serrati Group represents the same position as that taken by the Turati Reformists, the French Reformists and Centrists, namely: the autonomy of the trade unions and their independence of the party.

b) While the Italian bourgeoisie carries on, in fact, the civil war against the proletariat, for which it has organized and is still organizing, the Serrati Group sabotages, in practice, the organization and political preparation of the working class for the waging of the civil war and for defense against the counter-revolution.

c) On the agrarian question, the Serrati Group refuses, in practice, to support the most important and openly revolutionary acts of the farm workers, small peasants, and tenant farmers, which have culminated in the actual seizing of the warehouses. The Serrati Group is opposed to the partitioning of the large estates among the small farmers and peasants, which Italian experiences themselves have shown is historically inevitable in the transitional period.

d) To this day the Serrati Group has not taken a clear-cut position on the National Question.

e) The Serrati Group holds firmly to so-called autonomy in the practical application of the principles and decisions of the Communist International which means the adherence to the basis of an opportunist policy under the shield of the Communist International.

7) All attempts on the part of the representative of the E. C. of the C. I. and of the Italian Communists, to reach an agreement with the Serrati Group on these decisive questions of communist tactics have been shattered. The concessions which the Serrati Group were prepared to make were always only apparent and purely formal.

There are still revolutionary working masses in the Serrati Group who are possessed of the most sincere and honest desire to place themselves upon the foundation of the principles and discipline of

the Communist International. To these revolutionary workers the United Communist Party of Germany announces clearly and definitely, that the Communist Party of Italy (Group of Bordiga, Gen-nari, Missiano) has conclusively decided to place itself upon the basis of the C. I. and that accordingly it is the only party in Italy which is to be considered as the Italian Section of the Communist International and must be powerfully supported by all affiliated parties in the C. I. The creation of a strong, centralized, powerful Italian section of the C. I., is only possible by a determined struggle against the opportunist leaders of the Serrati Group.

The Central (General) Committee of the United Communist Party of Germany, therefore approves of the procedure of the representative of the E. C. of the C. I. at the Congress in Leghorn. Nothing else was possible but a determined rupture with the leaders of the Serrati Group.

who, by all their activities show that they have no understanding of the essence and fundamental tactics of the C. I.

The Central (General) Committee of the U. C. P. of Germany, therefore declares that the winning over of the proletarian masses still under the influence of the Serrati Group to a clearer communist policy, can be brought about only by the Communist International making it impossible for the Serrati Group to hide their opportunism behind the sign-board of the C. I. That the C. I. adopt an attitude of sharpest antagonism to the leaders of the Serrati Group, and in every case where action arises, to put the question of joining the C. I. practically before them in the shape of definitely recognizing and joining the Communist Party of Italy as the only section of the C. I. in Italy, and that the C. I. shall give this Party unlimited support.

Communist Practices in Japan.

By SEN KATAYAMA

WE read in the history of Japan that the rulers—when the people still lived in a primitive way—again and again abolished and prohibited private ownership of land. Almost periodically they confiscated land and property of the rich. Then, the entire land practically and in reality belonged to the people. Legally, however, it belonged to the rulers.

During the feudal regime which lasted about three hundred years, the idea of land ownership took precedence. The right of tenancy was sold and bought by the farmers, although the real owners of the land were the feudal chiefs. There were three kinds of land in Japan distinguished by the nature of ownership: first, cultivated land and forest practically owned by the common people; second, common land which we still possess; third, government land. The cultivated land of the people was fixed quite heavily by the feudal chiefs, but the tax on forest was insignificant. Common land which belonged to a particular village or group or groups of villages was not taxed. This common land played a great part in the village life of the people during the feudal regime. The villagers, under certain regulations, would get as much as they could, such as opening common land, cutting grass or shrub in the spring for fertilization, and otherwise the land was used perfectly free by all. In some places even during the feudal period, we find that the entire land of a village was owned in common and divided for the purpose of cultivation according to the ability of the families. Of course, there were many

incidents of cultivating land and harvesting crops in common which, I am sure, still exist.

Land Tenure in Loo Choo Islands (Okinawa-ken)

Okinawa-ken consists of a group of Islands in the southern part of Kinoshino originally belonging to China but for several centuries governed by the Japanese feudal chiefs. Until very recently these islands were kept on a communistic basis by the villagers living on them. Each villager owned land as a unit and was responsible for the taxes and rent on the land. The land was equally divided among the male of the village for a certain period, and at the end of the period the land was redistributed. The division was executed by lots. There seemed to be no difficulty in that. The people of the island took good care of the land, for they looked upon it as something sacred. The duration of tenure ranges from 7 to 13 years; this differs in each island. Under the communal land system there were no very poor people nor were there any very rich ones. The land was neither salable, transferable nor sublettable. Each island owned a banana orchard as common property, the proceeds of which were set aside for famine. The common ownership of land in villages was abolished only after the Russo-Japanese War, for the government wanted to introduce capitalism into the islands. However, so far as I know, on account of long years of custom to hold land as sacred property of the villages, hardly any farmer would sell his land to an outsider.

We have several such single islands which have been practicing communal life for many centuries. Hotsu Shima (Shima means island), one of those little islands about ten miles from Atami, a fashionable hot spring which is a few hours ride from Tokyo, for many decades there have been living on the island about 32 families. Everything is held in common. Land is owned, cultivated, harvested and granaried in common. The work is done mostly by girls and married women, for the men go fishing. The island owns two big fishing boats and many small ones; all fishermen work in common for common production. They live a most happy life. They are well supplied with things, but rice they import for the island can not raise sufficient for all. It has one grammar school. The population of the island is about 150; there is no room for new families. Thus the children—with the exception of the oldest son and daughter—have to leave the island to get their living on the main island. This arrangement has been kept up for generations and very satisfactorily.

Hatsu Shima is well known to the public as a communistic island. The people on it live a most peaceful and happy life!

Partial Communism Practiced in Inatori and Shirahama

Inatori Mura and Shirahama Mura are two well known villages on the Izu Peninsula, a little farther south of Atami. Both villages are not far from Shimada where Commodore Perry first anchored, in 1868.

These two villages communized the industry of the sea weed. Part of the sea weed grows near the shore, and the women pick and dry it. In many cases the husband stays in the booth while his wife dives all day long to pick out the weed. Thus she earns 4-5 yen a day, while her husband earns only 2 yen, because his work is rather easy; he only has to pull his wife up on the water every three or four minutes. The price for picking is fixed for all the season and each one is paid according to the amount of weed he picked. There are little shacks built along the shore to dry the weed in, pack it, and get it ready for shipment. Thus the common treasury of the village is enriched every year. In the village of Inatori there are 500 fishermen and 300 farmers. The village pays rent and other expenses out of the proceeds of the industry. It sustains a public school and a hospital. Besides those annual expenses it has large tracks of common forests bought some years ago—on which various trees are planted, and sometimes the villagers will get a vast income from it, and it will be utilized among the villagers. Mutual aid and improvement system of the island is so well organized that no

family ever need turn into a loan shark victim or be in need or in distress.

Shirahama Mura is far better governed than Inatori Mura and has a larger yearly income. Thus it can enjoy many more common advantages than the latter. It has a fine public school, hospital and other institutions of public utility. Of course all the business in these villages is conducted on the principle of private ownership so that the richer a village is the more it is benefited. However, the villagers generally get quite a large income on account of the sea weed industry which is carried on on a communistic basis. The profit of the said industry is equally distributed among the members of the village. If sea weed carried on a communistic basis gives the two islands such great benefit, then if rice which the greatest industry in Japan would be carried on a communistic basis, what a great profit it would bring to the entire nation!

There are few other villages which carry on more or less in common the sea weed industry. But those two villages mentioned above are the most successful. As a rule fish industry which is not incorporated under a company is carried

on on the principle of co-operation and profit sharing. For instance, a boat owner furnishes a boat and fishing material; eight fishermen—the number in one boat—do their own work. After the expense for food of the fishermen is taken off, the profit is divided into ten shares; the owner of the boat is given two shares.

Communism is not entirely foreign to the Japanese. It is only under the modern civilization which was introduced about forty or fifty years ago that the idea and practice of private property became prominent in Japan. An older person like the present writer remembers well the happy and easy going village life which prevailed in the middle of the nineteenth century, when the villagers enjoyed a great many of the communal activities. It is true that they had no political rights, but economically the relation between the villagers and the chief ended with the payment of the land rent. For the rest he was left to live an entirely free and contented life. The Communism that exists in Hotsu Shima today is most primitive, but it can be improved and enlarged with results of the modern civilization that will surely over and above excel modern capitalism.

The General Strike in Czecho-Slovakia.

RECENT news from Czecho-Slovakia tells briefly of the general strike. A comprehensive review of the outbreak cannot be given because of the censorship by the government of press, telegrams and letters and the suppression of the Left Socialist papers, *Rude Pravo* and *Revnost*. But from the known facts important object lessons are apparent in the suppression of the 50 per cent. political revolution.

The immediate cause of the strike was the occupation by the Right Socialist Party of the People's House in Prague. The Rights used for their own purposes, during the whole period of the strike, the government apparatus, the party press and printing establishment, the party secretariat and party machinery. At all times they more or less openly supported the brutal crushing of the labor movement by the army.

In the circumstances the collapse of the general strike was a forgone conclusion. But while without doubt the blame for this rests primarily upon the Right Socialist Party it would be a mistake to lay the whole blame for its defeat to their account. Indeed, in view of the developments at the party convention, it was to be expected that they would oppose with all means every revolutionary proletarian movement. When the development

of the class struggle reaches a revolutionary stage, as from an economic viewpoint is the case in Czecho-Slovakia, the issue as well as the entire act of the proletariat depends upon conscious revolutionary political guidance.

The mistakes of a conscious Communist leadership also mark the whole course of the general strike in Czecho-Slovakia. The direct provocation for the strike (the occupation of the People's House by the Right Socialists) could not in spite of the undeniable meaning of the act furnish the basis for decisive political action. The Lefts themselves seem to have seen this and hurried—probably under pressure of the working masses—to deepen the import of the strike by raising economic demands. These demands, however, were not held together by any single, unified revolutionary principle and created confusion. They were: Abdication of the government, 30 per cent. wage increase, factory committees and factory committee control in the workshops, 1,000 kronas Christmas bonus and socialization of the large landed estates.

Small wonder that the revolutionary minded workers in some localities did not acquiesce in these demands but immediately occupied the factories. In Kladno they took the initial steps for the organization of a Red Army. Lacking unified

leadership and support these single acts were bound to be futile, but they seem to point to the fact that the revolutionary consciousness of the proletarian masses had attained a higher degree of development than the Left Socialist leaders realized.

Blood flowed. In the conflict between the military and the workers in Brux five persons were killed and twenty-five wounded. And still more proletarian blood will be spilled unless the class conscious workers form a unified Communist Party, conscious of its goal, which alone will be in a position to establish the Dictatorship of the Proletariat when the revolutionary situation demands it.

The religious faith in the power of "legality" has until now led to a lack of direction to most tactical problems. But the Left Socialists had finally to engage in illegal actions in the effort to retain "legal" possession of the People's House, even as they were forced in much more sweeping measure to adopt armed force when they sought not to lose the confidence of the masses. Nothing is more dangerous than to employ half measures. This is perhaps the most instructive conclusion which can be drawn from the events of the last three months in Czechoslovakia.

Until recently there was a great disproportion in the strength and support of the two parties by the Czechoslovakian proletariat. When the course of the strike is better known the dispute over the relative strength will be clarified. However, from the lying official reports some important facts can be gleaned. In Mahrisch Ostrau, where the Right Socialist were heretofore masters of the situation, 26 mine pits or by far the greater number of the whole went out on strike in support of the Lefts.

In the great industrial centers of Reichenberg and Brunn, the general strike was successfully carried out. In Slovakia, where the party leadership took a seemingly hesitating attitude, great demonstrations were held, with partial strike movements and sympathetic strikes of the agricultural workers.

The proletariat has carried out a general strike movement, it has demonstrated its strength and in spite of apparent defeat it has emerged with greater solidarity from its first test. The education through action will lead to the further awakening of revolutionary class consciousness, even as the fight for the possession of the People's House and for the control of the party machinery led them to revolt.

Speech of Paul Levi at the Unity Convention of the Left Independent Socialist Party and the Communist Party of Germany.

Continued from page 11.

of Sevres, through which the Entente ruled the Near East. Without Greek troops in Little Asia the front of the Entente broke in Turkey. With that the policy of Turkey collapsed and thereby was partially attained the goal which our Russian comrades set for themselves when they entered into an armed alliance with the Turkish Nationalists.

The ring around Soviet Russia has been broken at this point. The Entente has been decisively defeated at a vital spot, but they cannot rest under this defeat. They will seek to throw more armies against Soviet Russia. They will send Poland, they will put remnants of Wrangel's force again in the field, they will permit new Balakhovitches to arise, they will send new troops and new munitions. Defeat only spurs them on to a fresh struggle with Soviet Russia.

But Russia does not stand alone. When asked how a world power arises we must say that the decisive mark of its origin is not the extension of its geographical boundaries. Long before the English world empire was geographically outlined England was a world power. These are invisible threads which form a net around the world; supplies of capital; traveling merchants; capitalistic interests which created the world empire of England. When we turn our attention to Soviet Russia I say its influence is not limited to the confines within Russia's geographical boundaries. Around the wide world there is a network of invisible threads. There is no country in which every beat of the hammer, in every sigh of the unemployed, the thought of Soviet Russia does not lie in the background. These are the threads which today unite the proletariat, the oppressed of the whole world, in the most portentous body in the world's history—the international of the oppressed, the Communist International.

Now we see an event the greatness of which is only too little known. In his inaugural address Marx said that with the founding of the First International was laid the cornerstone of proletarian foreign policy. Still, the First International was but the goddess which sprang from the head of Marx. Today the Goddess of Liberty places her helmet on her head. Today she is the great and most feared power of the world proletariat.

Soviet Russia fights against the European imperialism which today oppresses so many named and unnamed peoples. Ireland suffers under the bloody rule of

English imperialism and the Communist International and Soviet Russia fight for her as they do for all the oppressed peoples, whether they live in Turkey, in China or in India. The Communist International seeks to bind these peoples together in a league of the proletarians and oppressed of the whole world. There are tasks of tremendous magnitude which on this account rest today on the shoulders of the Russian workers and peasants. The German proletariat, as a part of the body of the oppressed of the whole world, must remind themselves of the first step of the German revolution, when we were scoffed at even in the ranks of Hilferding and Brettscheid, when we were laughed at as revolutionary romanticists. In those days the unshakable desire for attack, the impatience of the masses who had never fought, their impetuosity, their will for struggle and victory helped us.

In the great frame of world history the situation today resembles that of the developing world revolution. In all countries the resoluteness of the toiling masses effects an awakening and a leading to struggle which the masses will conduct. The guiding head in this struggle is Soviet Russia and without doubt the Entente will ever anew seek to strike off her head.

Soviet Russia is the central problem of the foreign policy of the proletariat of the world. This policy does not consist merely of sympathies, it consists in *struggling with all means against all enemies of Soviet Russia.*

Our convention is no German event; there are no German events in the European, in the world revolution. What we now create is the first strong link of the International beside Soviet Russia; it is the force which is destined to be the arm of the revolution as Russia is the head. That is the world historic significance of our convention, of the founding of our party. It is a work of unheard of difficulty in which we will not despair.

We look back over a period of fierce struggle and defeats; of many glorious deeds; of two years of the most trying events. Yet the spirit of glory arises out of the bloodshed. It is the spirit of Karl Liebknecht and of Rosa Luxemburg that now carries in this hour, in this hall. These great spirits which led us in the first hour of our existence, now call us again to new deeds, and on this account into the Communist Party. Let us then throw ourselves into the struggle and carry on the work for Communism with an iron will to power.

NEXT CONGRESS OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

The Executive Committee of the Communist International has decided to convene the 3rd Congress of the Third Communist International on the 1st of June 1921.

The Executive Committee of the Communist International adopted the following provisional agenda:

Draft of Agenda for the Third Congress of the Communist International.

1. Report of the Executive Committee of the Communist International.
2. The economic world-crisis and the new tasks of the Communist International.
3. Tactics of the Communist International during the Revolution.
4. Transition-period (special-requirements, special actions and final struggle of the Revolution).
5. Fight against the Amsterdam yellow Trade Union Federation.
6. Red Trade Union International and the Communist International.
7. Construction of the Communist Parties, the methods of their work.
8. Construction of the Communist International and its relation to the affiliated parties.
9. The Eastern question.
10. The Italian Socialist Party and the

Communist International. (Appeal of the Italian Socialist Party against the resolution of the Executive Committee.)

11. The Communist Labor Party of Germany and the Communist International. (Appeal of the United Communist Party of Germany against the resolution of the Executive Committee of the Communist International).

12. The Women's Movement.
13. The Young Communist Movement.
14. Election of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. Headquarters of the E. C.
15. Other business.

G. Zinoviev.

1) The Executive affirms its resolution in the Italian question and continues to support the Communist Party of Italy.

2) The Executive protests most determinedly against the support given by one of the presidents of the United Communist Party, Com. Levi, to the centrist fraction Serrati in Livorno and after Livorno. The Executive is firmly convinced that the overwhelming majority of the German sister-party on the Italian question is on the side of the Italian Communists and of the Executive and not on the side of Com. Levi.

3. The Executive declares its agreement with the resolution of the Central Committee of the United Communist Party of February 1st and begs the Central Committee not to recognize any explanations of this resolution which could mean support to the Centrist Serrati fraction and create difficulties to the Italian Communists.

This resolution was *unanimously* adopted by the Executive Committee of the Communist International after an exact examination of the situation. The representatives of the United Communist Party of Germany voted for the points 1 and 3 and against point 2.

Executive Committee of the Communist International.

The Executive Committee declares *once* more that it considers the Italian Socialist Party to be its Italian section and supports the same in its revolutionary struggle by all the means and authority at its disposal. The leaders of the Serrati fraction for the sake of 14,000 pure opportunists have rejected from the party 60,000 communists. The Executive Committee places the appeal of the Italian Socialist Party on the agenda of the Third Congress. Till the decision of the Congress the Executive Committee instructs the small bureau with publishing an open letter to the Italian Socialist Party.

Serious-Minded Revolutionists.

ARNOLD PETERSON, Secretary of the S. L. P., is one of the "serious-minded revolutionists." He stated so himself in an article appearing in the *Weekly People* of January 1, 1921, under the title of the "Lying Burlesque Bolsheviki." His calling himself a "serious-minded revolutionist" is rather amusing. But more amusing is his statement that "...in conjunction with its kith and kin, the S. P. and the I. W. W., it"—the Communist Party of America, Section of the Third International—"acts as a sort of poultice on the labor movement, absorbing a good bit of the impurities that are created in that movement."

How kin or alien the Communist Party is to the S. P. and the I. W. W. could best be shown by quoting and comparing the underlying principles and tactics of the C. P., S. P. and I. W. W. But that would be asking too much from a "serious-minded revolutionist," who is somewhat sleek in the art of mud-slinging, distortion and emasculation of Marxism, as

well as quoting Mark Twain for the purpose of justifying his opportunistic principles and tactics.

Renegades, like crooks, do not like to admit their social standing. If they would like to admit it—the Arnold Petersons of the S. L. P. would openly endorse their comrade renegades, the Hillquits of the S. P., whose kinsmen in principles and tactics they at present are.

Since Peterson did not even attempt to compare the C. P. to the S. P. and I. W. W.—we shall draw a comparison between the S. L. P. and S. P. and the S. L. P. and I. W. W.:

Proof.—The workers "must be trained to use the ballot box to vote out the capitalist and middle classes and to vote in representatives of the workers.... The Socialist Party seeks to attain its end by orderly and constitutional methods.... Violence is not the weapon of the Socialist Party."—S. P., 1920.

"The Socialist Labor Party's insistence

upon the possibility of a peaceful solution of the special problem in this country has repeatedly been misconstrued by its enemies as bowing and kow-towing to 'bourgeois legality.' Nothing can be more ridiculous nor further than the truth. The S. L. P. plants itself upon *civilization*, not upon 'legality.' It says the civilized method of settling disputes is by argument, not by fist fights. Hence the S. L. P. addresses itself to the workers and urges that they meet the capitalist class at the ballot-box and settle the question as civilization has provided." (*Weekly People*, November 27, 1920.)

"The Socialist Party is opposed to the general strike for political purposes."—Morris Hillquit.

Mr. "serious-minded revolutionist," what after all is the difference between the S. P. attaining its aim by constitutional and orderly means, and the S. L. P. attaining its aim by meeting the capitalist class at the ballot box and settling the question as civilization has provided? Any kinship between the two?

So much for the S. L. P. being the kin of the S. P.

Now as to the S. L. P. being the kin of the I. W. W.:

From the I. W. W. Preamble: "By organizing industrially we are forming the structure of the new society within the shell of the old."

Weekly People, November 13, 1920: "In this organization...the new, class conscious unionism, industrial unions, harmonious with the lines drawn by modern industry—concretely the Workers' International Industrial Union—in this organization we see a very concrete development and formation already under capitalism of the American 'Soviets,' the Councils of Labor in the future Republic of Labor."

Where, Mr. "serious-minded revolutionist" is the difference between the two above quotations? There is none. The S. L. P. is in agreement with the I. W. W. in its industrial conception. The S. L. P. is in agreement with the S. P. on the political field; the S. P. seeks to attain its end by training the workers to use the ballot box to vote out the capitalists and middle classes by orderly and constitutional means, while the S. L. P. believes in the same way but expresses it in different words, that is, it addresses itself to the workers and urges that they meet the capitalist class at the ballot box and settle the question "as civilization has provided." And since there is no difference between the S. L. P., the S. P. and the I. W. W., then your own terminology is now quite in place: The S. L. P. "in conjunction with its kith and kin, the S. P. and the I. W. W. acts a sort of poultice on the labor movement, absorbing a good bit of the impurities that are created in that movement." The existence of the S. L. P. with its Petersons, the S. P. with its Bergers, Hilquits, and Co., is proof to the effect that the Communist Party is *not* a "poultice on the labor movement," that it does *not* absorb the "impurities created in that movement."

Listen to this repudiation of all in one—the general strike, mass action, armed insurrection and the dictatorship of the proletariat—by Arnold Peterson in the *Weekly People* of January 1, 1921: "But by 'physical force' we do not understand 'street riots,' or 'general strike'...nor do we mean 'armed insurrection,' nor any other such tomfoolery.... By 'force' we understand the integral industrial union—revolutionary in scope and purpose. A union, ready to take and hold, after the workers at the hustings have declared for Socialism.... But if the counter-revolution class, industrially organized, will crush it should raise its head, the same working and more effectively than any so called 'dictatorship of the proletariat' could do

it."

Could any bourgeois agent do better than their flunky, Peterson, who wants to substitute the destruction of the bourgeois state machinery, instead of by mass action culminating in armed insurrection and civil war, by an integral industrial union a la bourgeois Peterson?

To attain Socialism, according to Peterson and his co-renegades of the S. L. P., all what the workers will have to do will be to declare for it at the hustings! Fine!

The imperialistic counter revolutionary bandits ought not to be suppressed by the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of a Soviet Government, thus whisper the bourgeoisie. And their lieutenants, the Petersons, say: "But if the counter revolution should raise its head, the same working class, industrially organized, will crush it and more effectively than any so-called 'dictatorship of the proletariat' could do it."

Continuing, Peterson states: "Marx once said that force is the midwife of revolution. Exactly. But...Time and circumstances will determine what kind of a midwife you want. Here in America we know (get that, *we know*) that Industrial Unionism is the only 'midwife' conceivable...." How Peterson acquired the art of bourgeois servitude can be observed by his first quoting Marx, then agreeing with him by saying 'exactly' and finally by disagreeing with him by adding a 'but' to it. What Marx said is this: "That force plays another role in history, a revolutionary role; that force is the midwife of the old society that is pregnant with the new; that force is the instrument and the means by which social movements hack their way through and break up the dead and fossilized political forms." This passage by Marx is very specific and clear, yet Peterson is substituting for it this indefinite term: "Time and circumstances will determine what kind of a midwife you want"—as though Marx would have never definitely stated that force *is* the midwife. Having abjured Marx to such an extent, he concludes: "Here in America we know (get that *we know*, again) that Industrial Unionism is the only 'midwife' conceivable...."

In other words, here in America *we*—bourgeois lieutenants of the S.L.P.—know what Marx said, that force *is* the midwife of the old society that is pregnant with the new; that force *is* the instrument and means by which social movements hack their way through and break up the dead and fossilized political forms,—get that, *we know it*,—and yet we deliberately substitute Industrial Unionism as the only midwife conceivable.

The S. L. P. has completely renounced Marxism since, in its issue of the *Weekly People*, Nov. 27, 1920, it stated the following: "The S. L. P. plants itself upon

civilization.... It says the civilized method of settling disputes (meaning the class struggle) is by argument, not fist fights. Hence the S. L. P. addresses itself to the workers and urges that they meet the capitalist class at the ballot box and settle the question"—read the class struggle—"as civilization has provided." The officialdom of the S. L. P. must have forgotten that in the Communist Manifesto, which is published by them, there is this:

"The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles...."

"The modern bourgeois society that has sprouted from the ruins of feudal society, has not done away with class antagonisms. It has but established new classes, new conditions of oppression, new forms of struggle in place of the old ones...."

"Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other: Bourgeois and Proletariat...."

"In depicting the most general phases of the development of the proletariat, we traced the more or less veiled civil war, raging within existing society, up to the point where that war breaks out into open revolution, and where the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie, lays the foundation for the sway of the proletariat...."

"The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.

"Working men of all countries, unite!" The Communist Party of America, Section of the Third International—the living expression of Marxism—the Communist Party of America does not "forget" the class struggle, as the S. L. P. and S. P. do. Nor does the Communist Party of America substitute the class struggle for a few bourgeois pacifistic phrases about "settling the question by civilized methods," etc., as the S. L. P. does. The Communist Party of America maintains that the class struggle is essentially a political struggle, that is, a struggle to conquer the power of the state; destroy the bourgeois state machinery by mass action culminating in armed insurrection and civil war, and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of a Soviet Government as the ONLY means of introducing the Communist Society.

The most fitting name for the officialdom of the S. L. P. and that of the S. P. who are thrown into wholesome paroxysms by the expressions "illegal activity," "general strike," "mass action" and the "dictatorship of the proletariat"—the most suitable name for their actions is: Serious-Minded Counter Revolutionists.