

# The

Semi-Monthly Organ of the Opposition Group in the Workers (Communist) Party of America

"It is necessary that every member of the Party should study calmly and with the greatest objectivity, first the substance of the differences of opinion, and then the development of the struggles within the Party. Neither the one nor the other can be done unless the documents of both sides are published. He who takes somebody's word for it is a hopeless idiot, who can be disposed of with a simple gesture of the hand."—Lenin

# MILITANT

VOL. 1.—NO. 2.

NEW YORK, N. Y., DECEMBER 1, 1928.

PRICE 5 CENTS

## The Party "Discussion" Opens!

by James P. Cannon

**A**FTER not a little delay, occasioned by the customary cabling back and forth, by cabled appeals of protest by the Foster group which were rejected over the same cables, the statement of the Lovestone-Pepper C.E.C. on our declaration and expulsion was published in the Daily Worker on November 16th.

The statement of the Party majority covers much paper, but it had no space to answer the criticisms of the Opposition on a single point. Our declaration raised principle questions. They answered with an administrative instruction to the party to expel all those who share our views. We said, what everyone knows, that the questions have never been discussed and we demanded a discussion. They replied "the discussion is closed." We said the position of the Russian Opposition has been correct on all important questions; we gave reasons for our statement and demanded the right to defend these views in the pre-convention discussion prescribed by the Party constitution. They disposed of this political proposal with legalistic references to the decisions of the Communist International.

Such, in brief, is the political content of the long-delayed and much labored-over statement of the Lovestone-Pepper faction which, by grace of Bucharin, constitutes the majority of our Central Executive Committee. We might add that, as an extraordinary concession on their part (and considering the fact that the Party members had already read it in *The Militant*) they printed our statement to the Polcom, including even a paragraph, which we, for Party reasons, had thought best to eliminate from publication.

They merely recite that the C.I. has decided against the Trotsky platform—a fact which everybody knew before—and pass that off for an answer to the principle arguments of the Opposition. The merits of the decision of the C.I., which all Communists have a right and duty to discuss and which is the real point of dispute, are not defended by one word in the statement. Thus the pedagogical overseers show their contemptuous estimate of the Party members. They do not consider it necessary for the Party comrades to know for themselves the issues involved. The party comrades are merely informed of the decisions—discussion is not allowed.

The bureaucrats who rule by decree set up a conception of the Comintern which Lenin never knew. Instead of a living body of revolutionaries, generalizing from world experience, as Lenin conceived the Comintern, they want to palm it off as an institution which decides while the Party members need only to be informed of the decisions. The teachings of Marx and Lenin on the centralized international organization of the Communist workers are completely lost in such a conception.

In this caricature of Leninism the Communist who knows for himself and defends his position because he knows is thrown aside in favor of the one who does not know and asks no questions. In such a scheme there is no recognition of the possibilities of errors and no provision for a correction of them. Tomorrow they will go a step further—indeed they have already started on this path—and attempt to establish the same relationship between the Party members and the C.E.C. of the Party. Then the Foster group which is now helping to establish this principle which denies our right to criticize the decisions of the Comintern, will be repaid for "faithful service" in the form of an instruction to cease criticism of the decisions of the C.E.C. regardless of the errors contained in them—the greater the error the less the right to criticize. As for the ordinary worker in the Party ranks who has no faction behind him, his right to open his mouth ceased long ago.

"The Communist Party is not a debating society." Behind this statement, true enough in itself all the bureaucrats who fear discussion seek to hide their incompetence. We Communists are not a

group of interminable debaters. Neither are we an army of voting robots. The automatic hand raiser is no Communist any more than the undisciplined, endless talker. The one of these conceptions is just as far away from Leninism as the other. We hold to the principle of democratic centralism just as firmly as we reject the suppression of discussion and the substitution of official commands for ideological and political leadership.

The great principle questions raised by the Russian Opposition—questions of decisive importance for the whole future of the world proletarian revolution—have never been fairly and fully discussed in any party of the Comintern, including our own party, and, consequently, have been decided wrongly. This is the essence of the matter, which the statement of the Lovestone majority ignores entirely, because it is fatal for their whole case.

The party comrades do not know the issues from all sides and cannot know them for the reason that the material of the Opposition was not published—it was suppressed. There has been no real and serious discussion in the party—it was prohibited. The Communist militants who have had the opportunity to read the documents and learn the truth are not allowed to speak within the party—they are expelled.

The Foster group which had the honor of carrying the "information" against us to Lovestone and Pepper, received their reward in the statement: a condescending pat on the back, which was no doubt appreciated, even if it was accompanied by a rough box on the ear, to say nothing of a number of boots to the bottom.

The difficulties of the Foster group arise out of the contradictions in its position. It is claimed

### Swabeck, Glotzer Join Opposition; Expelled

The forces of the Opposition were immeasurably strengthened last Saturday by the formal adhesion of a powerful group of Communist fighters in Chicago, headed by Arne Swabeck and Al Glotzer. In a statement addressed to all Party and League members these two comrades, the outstanding Chicago leaders in the Party and Young Workers League, declared their unconditional support of the platform of the Opposition and their solidarity with all comrades expelled for these views. On the presentation of their statement at a meeting of the Chicago D.E.C. on Saturday, November 24, they were also declared expelled from the Party together with comrades Mike Zalisko, Sidney Borgeson and Helen Judd. Wholesale expulsions of other comrades in Chicago are being prepared. The Chicago membership has been profoundly shaken by these events.

Comrade Swabeck, as is well known, is one of the foremost American Communists. He is one of the founders of the Party and has been a member of the Central Executive Committee for many years. He is the leader of the Left Wing in the Chicago Federation of Labor and was the director of the mining campaign of the Party. He was District Organizer of the Chicago district from the days of the underground Party till his removal by the Lovestone faction last year. Comrade Glotzer is one of the outstanding leaders of the Young Workers League and a member of its National Executive Committee.

Other sensational developments along this line are expected within the coming week.

that Christ wrought miracles but we do not believe that even he ever succeeded in riding two horses going in opposite directions at the same time. The Foster group took a forward step when it united with us in the fight against the right wing (joint fight against the Panken "maneuver", common platform at the February and May Plenary meetings of the Central Executive Committee, common platform on "the Right Danger in the American Party", etc.) Its failure to develop the international implications of our common opposition stand, its failure to see that the problems of our party and the fight against its right wing leadership are indissolubly bound up with the Bolshevik fight of the Russian Opposition, arrested the forward development of the Foster group and prepared the ground for its disintegration. Its pitiful, if short-lived, attempt to outdo the opportunist leadership in demagoguery against the Russian Opposition and against us only sharpened its contradictions and made its whole position politically impossible. Those who do not stand clearly on principles, foresee their implications and understand their logic are bound to play a sorry role when principle questions are placed on the agenda.

The resolution of the District Executive Committee of New York, under the direct inspiration of the Central Executive Committee majority, demands that the Foster opposition repudiate the statement on "the Right Danger in the American Party" if it really wants to fight "Trotskyism" and logically so. The Lovestone-Pepper group of opportunists represents on an American scale what the opportunist opponents and calumniators of the Russian opposition represent on a Russian and international scale. The Lovestone faction leaders are merely the American representatives of the anti-Trotsky faction in the Communist International and have been imposed upon the party by it. They are not and can never be leaders of our party in their own right. On the other hand, the course of the American Opposition, insofar as it develops consistently, merges with the path of the Russian Opposition. This is the logic of the whole situation. Between these two stools there is no place to sit.

The Foster group, by its present policy, weakens itself, strengthens the right wing leadership and confuses the party. They take part, shame-faced and utterly contemptible, in the obscene lynching campaign against us, saying we have no right to oppose the decision of the Communist International on the Russian questions. The right wing leaders retort: "Very good. We appreciate your help in lynching and expelling Communists by wholesale, but the same rule you are supporting applies to you also. You have no right to oppose the decision of the Communist International on the American question. Your own expulsion is next on the agenda!"

And why should they not speak this way? Is there some secret paragraph of the statutes of the Communist International which says that the decision on the Russian question is sacred and may not even be discussed under penalty of expulsion, while the decision on the American question may be opposed with impunity? These decisions are to a large extent bound together. For our part we are against both and openly say so.

We have no doubt that the overwhelming majority of the supporters of the Foster group—above all its proletarian and non-bureaucratized section—will soon find the right way out of the present dilemma. In the interest of the party, the sooner the better. The first step on this path will be to break with the tactic of trailing after the expulsion policy of the right wing splitters and to take up the struggle against it.

The statement of the CEC majority says: "We feel confident—on the basis of our experiences during the attack of the government in 1919-20, when the party was driven underground—that the core of the party and its leadership are sound."

This can be said only with certain qualifica-

# The Party "Discussion" Opens!

CONTINUED FROM PAGE ONE

tions which, in the interest of historical truth must be mentioned. It is true that the core of the party membership, the expelled Communists among them, held their ground in those days of trial. We, with them, stood at our posts and faced the raids, the arrests and indictments, as the record shows. This is true also of a section of the present leadership. But others of the present leadership—and not the least prominent ones—played the part of cowards for whom the record of that time of trial by fire is a record not of glory but of shame. Those for whom history holds no honor should not write it.

The statement of Lovestone and Pepper entirely evades discussion of the principle issues raised by our stand for the Russian Opposition. It sets up the false theory of the Comintern as a bureaucratic machine. It makes unfortunate reference to party history where silence would have been wiser. But it is the section of the statement dealing with the question of the "Right Danger" which most clearly and obviously stamps the whole document as the work of cynical charlatans—of people who imagine that facts may be turned upside down, that black may be made to appear white, and that any kind of fraud may be perpetrated if only one has a monopolistic control of the party press and if nobody's memory reaches back further than a month or two. With an ironical grin the opportunists declare war on opportunism; the bureaucrats demanded the extermination of bureaucratism.

Our document on "The Right Danger in American Party" which sums up a long struggle against the opportunist policies of the present leadership of our party, deals quite fully and adequately with this question, as will be seen by a study of it. It explains the economic and political basis of the Right danger in the present period and proves the opportunist line of the Lovestone group in its general conceptions and concretely in every field of party work.

Our document does not rest on general assertions. Facts and documents from the party records are cited in each case—minutes, resolutions, ar-

ticles, speeches, etc. One need only refer to the support of the socialist faker, Panken, in the election last Fall; the motion to send comrades into the Socialist Party to "bore from within"; the refusal to support a National Left Wing Conference in the Miners' Union until the strike was a year old and had spent its force; the opposition to the policy of organizing the unorganized into new unions—to mention only a few examples of the systematic opportunism of the party leadership—cited in our document—to show that the struggle within the party, which now takes on a sharper form has not been waged over trifles.

Our "factionalism" has consisted of a stubborn daily fight against the opportunist course of the majority in the above-mentioned and in all other cases. In the Political Committee, at the February Plenum, at the May Plenum and at the Sixth World Congress the Opposition fought on this line and proved its indictment of the Right wing leaders to the hilt.

The present declaration of the C.E.C. majority on the question of the "Right Danger" must be taken together with its previous attitude. Before the Sixth Congress and at the Sixth Congress they denied the existence of such a danger. They formed a close unity with all the extreme right elements in the party and defended all their own opportunist mistakes. They claimed that America was "exempted" from the International situation in this respect.

Under pressure of our hammering, our analysis, our elucidation of the problems, the fact of the Right danger was indisputably established and was formally recognized by the Sixth Congress. It might be supposed that such an outcome would create an impossible situation for "leaders" whose calculations had all been directly opposite, who had been following a Right Wing line and firing only against the left. But our adepts in the art of political legerdemain were not even embarrassed. They served the whole problem for themselves by turning around and immediately starting to pull their own right wing rabbits out of our hat.

They forgot, and they expect the party to for-

get, everything they have done and said and written for more than a year. All the opportunist blunders (and worse than blunders) which they have committed or condoned, which we criticized and which they defended or denied, are now admitted and attributed to us as—"Trotskyism, as outright opportunism."

Let the party member who claims the right to read and think for himself turn to our document on "The Right Danger in the American Party", submitted to the Sixth Congress of the Communist International at a time when the opportunist leaders were still denying the existence of such a problem. He will find there a catalogue of all the features of opportunism in our party which are cited in the C.E.C. statement (and many more which it still tries to conceal) with documentary proof in each case of the responsibility of the authors of the C.E.C. statement for these systematic opportunist crimes and mistakes.

The Lovestone-Pepper group of leaders, like their counter-parts in other parties of the Comintern, like all opportunists and bureaucrats, rely on suppression of discussion and expulsion to maintain themselves in power. They want a party without any democratic rights of the members. They want a party with a sterile inner life. They want a party where the voice of the proletarian communist will be silenced. They want a party of passive hand-raisers at the bottom and a petty-bourgeois clique of insolent bureaucrats at the top.

This is the real meaning of our expulsion, of the mass expulsion of rank and file Communists, of the vile calumny heaped upon all those who dare to stand up and challenge them.

The fight against such a regime in the party and in the Communist International is an urgent revolutionary task. The proletarian masses in the party must awaken and take up this fight. They must break through the bureaucratic crust which has formed on top of the party and restore a normal party life in accord with Lenin's teaching. To help bring about this awakening we addressed our statement to the Political Committee with a full realization of the consequences. With the help of the Communist workers in the ranks of the party we will continue to fight along this line until our aims are achieved.

## Wholesale Expulsions from the Party Begin

### MINNEAPOLIS

Copy of a Telegram received from Minneapolis, dated Nov. 18, 1928: "Thirteen Party comrades and three League members were expelled today at the membership meeting for voting for resolution. Letter follows. (signed) VINCENT R. DUNNE."

This is in addition to the suspension on November 14 of five members of the District Executive Committee of the Minneapolis district, Vincent R. Dunne, Carl Skoglund, O. R. Votaw, Oscar Coover and William Watkins for demanding the reinstatement of Cannon, Abern and Shachtman into the Party. As is well known these are the leading comrades of the Minnesota district whose work in the trade unions has been primarily responsible for the achievements of the Party there during the recent years. The group of expelled proletarian Communists in Minnesota includes 5 railroad workers, 4 factory workers, 2 laborers, an electrician, a carpenter, a machinist, and a printer.

### KANSAS CITY

Two members of the D.E.C. at Kansas City A. A. Buehler and Sam Kassen, were expelled on November 8 for declaring themselves opposed to the expulsion of Cannon, Abern, and Shachtman. Both are pioneer American Communists, having been original members of the left wing group formed in Kansas City during the war, which captured the local of the S. P., published a left wing weekly paper, and became the local of the Communist Labor Party on its formation in 1919.

### PHILADELPHIA Y. W. (C.) L.

Three members of the Young Workers League, Morgenstern, Lankin and Goodman were expelled from the League in Philadelphia on November 4 on the same grounds. On November 10, a few days after their expulsion, comrades Morgenstern and Lankin took part in a demonstration against imperialist war and for the release of John Porter before the War Dept. building in Washington. They were arrested and have been confined in jail ever since. Comrade Morgenstern writes from jail as follows:

### CABARET AND DANCE for the benefit of

## The MILITANT

Organ of the Communist Opposition

SATURDAY EVE, DECEMBER 1st, 1928.

323 East 79th Street, New York

Admission: 50c. in advance at the door 60c.

### District Workhouse, Occoquan, Va.

"Dear Comrade Cannon:—

"As you already know we are in jail for parading around the War Dept. for John Porter. We are still doing this revolutionary work. They call us counter-revolutionaries, but that doesn't make it so. I heard that you comrades are keeping up the fight and doing good work. It makes me feel great. With comradely greetings,

BERNARD MORGAN."

P. S.—Note name for correspondence.

### CANADA

Comrade Maurice Spector, member of the ECCI from Canada, whose suspension and removal from all posts was already reported, has since been expelled.

### NEW YORK CITY

Comrade M. L. Malkin, a rank and file Communist fighter in the furriers' Union, one of the defendants in the famous Mineola case under sentence of 2½ to 5 years in prison, was expelled by the N. Y. DEC on Nov. 19, 1928. Charges are pending and trials beginning against other comrades in all parts of the country.

## The "Ideological" Campaign

The "Ideological Campaign" is on in full swing. Resolutions supporting the C.E.C. in its expulsion of Communists from the Party are being adopted in various places.

One street nucleus in Pittsburgh, without defining or explaining a word of a single fundamental issue raised by the Opposition Communists, manages to use such expressions as counter-revolutionary, "social democratic", "menshevik", "renegade", nine times in two sentences totaling 19 lines.

The resolution of the Kansas District Committee does not mention the expulsion of two pioneer Communist fighters, Buehler and Kassen, from the D.E.C. and the Party for fighting the expulsions, but does manage to betray its complete lack of knowledge of the position of the Russian Opposition. For instance, it accuses the Opposition of stating that Socialist construction in the Soviet Union is a myth, "when all facts available prove the steady development of the socialist production." Well, who says otherwise? The issue is: Can the development proceed faster? To what extent? By what means and on what basis is the socialist economy to be developed further? What are the limitations? Can there be the development of

a complete system of socialism, as the Draft Program of the Comintern states, without the aid of the proletarian victory in one or more European countries?

What does the Russian Opposition say on this point?

"The domestic problem is, by strengthening ourselves with a proper class policy, a proper interrelation of the working-class with the peasant, to move forward as fast as possible on the road of socialist construction. The interior resources of the Soviet Union are enormous and make this entirely possible. (Our emphasis). In using the world Capitalist market for this purpose, we bind up our fundamental historical calculations with further development of the world-proletarian revolution. Its victory in certain leading countries will break the ring of the capitalist encirclement, and deliver us from our heavy burden. It will enormously strengthen us in the sphere of technique accelerate our entire development in the city and village, in factory and school. It will give us the possibility of really creating socialism." (The Platform of the Russian Opposition pp. 86-87, "The Real Situation in Russia", Harcourt, Brace and Co.).

We quote the above now only to call attention to the absurd manner in which "Trotskyism" is being "discussed" without for one moment examining the actual economic, tactical and political proposals of the Russian Opposition. Unfortunately they have been largely suppressed. But through the columns of The Militant the American Communists will have the opportunity to judge for themselves. Then we are confident the resolutions will change their tone and character.

—Martin Abern.

## THE MILITANT

Published twice a month by the Opposition Group in the Workers (Communist) Party of America

Address all mail to: P. O. Box 120, Madison Square Station, New York, N. Y.

Publishers address at 340 East 19th Street, New York, N. Y. — Telephone: Gramercy 3411.

Subscription rate: \$1.00 per year. Foreign, \$1.50 5c per copy Bundle rates, 3c per copy.

### Editor

James P. Cannon

### Associate Editors

Martin Abern

Max Shachtman

VOL. 1.

DECEMBER 1, 1928

No. 2.

Application for entry as second class matter pending at the Post Office at New York, N. Y.

# The Results of the Election

By Max Shachtman

**T**HE victory in the election of the Republican Party and its candidate, Hoover, signifies the still growing power—accompanied though it is by sharpening contradictions—of American capitalism, and the grip of the main Party of the bourgeoisie on the masses. This power was sufficient for the Republicans to break through the "Solid South" for the first time since the Civil War, aided by those irresistible economic forces which have been undermining the social-political basis of the traditional Democratic Party for the past decades.

The election of Hoover is undoubtedly a victory for the bourgeoisie. But to become fascinated by the "atmosphere" of this victory, to be overcome by the dominance of its reality, and to see nothing else, is to fall victim to the hopelessness, fear and petty-bourgeois defeatism which characterizes the Nation, or the New York World. Unfortunately, such a tendency exists in the Party and is even given expression in the official Party press. In the article by John Pepper, Class Analysis of the Elections, Daily Worker, November 10, 1928 he says "The New York World is right in stating that the victory of Hoover was 'a conservative landslide,' that it was the result of 'a deep-seated aversion to change.' It was a vote for the present 'republican prosperity'."

This is the attitude which tips its hat politely in ten lines to the increased vote of the Communist ticket, stands in breathless awe before the colossal strength of the bourgeoisie, and assumes that it has thereby given a "class analysis" of the results of the election. It is an attitude which we have encountered many times before, which sees only the strength and forward strides of the enemy on the one hand and the miserable weakness, powerlessness and backwardness of the workers on the other.

Fortunately, an analysis of the elections gives us no cause to adopt such a viewpoint. Let us consider the fortunes of the arch-demagogue Smith.

To speak unconditionally of the "defeat or Smith" is to overlook completely the nature of his popular vote, which was larger (for the defeated candidate) than the vote—with the exception of Coolidge's 1924 vote—for any previous presidential candidate (victorious or defeated) in American history: more than 16,000,000 votes for a Party does not bespeak its destruction. From the new voters who "chose" the president this year, Smith received at least as much support as did Hoover. While Smith received a relative set-back in the Bourbon reactionary South, he made big gains in the industrial North, particularly in the cities where the industrial proletariat is concentrated. Smith had a majority of 55,000 votes out of a total of 6,795,000 votes that were cast in the following fourteen key centers: New York, Newark, Boston, Cleveland, St. Louis, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Baltimore, Buffalo, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Chicago and Detroit. Smith inherited, to a far greater extent than Hoover, the sentiment of the agrarian "revolt" of the Northwest which rallied so futilely around La Follette in the last election. Neither can a serious politician overlook the fact that in the very heart of the textile crisis, Massachusetts, Smith defeated Hoover, carrying, in particular, New Bedford and Fall River; that Smith made powerful advances particularly in the sphere of those coal districts where the class-struggle and the industrial depression has been most severe—Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois and Indiana.

Smith's big urban vote, his vote in the seething agrarian sections, his vote in the smaller industrial centers, are undoubtedly expressions of the growing discontent of the workers and farmers (as well as of the petty-bourgeoisie) with the rule of finance capital, the eight-year orgy of corruption, brass-browed reaction and imperialist foraging of the Republican wing of capitalism. Votes which would otherwise have been cast for the socialist and even the Communist Parties went this time to Smith on the basis of the belief "that he has a good chance to get in."

The fact that this discontent was expressed, with reactionary consequences and implications, largely through the Democratic Party, is an index to the tremendous backwardness of the political consciousness of the masses.

Does this mean that our thesis regarding the growing radicalization of the working class is false? Does it imply that "the masses are becoming more radical—by going over to the Democratic Party!?" Nothing of the kind.

Firstly, the vote for Smith was a vague, hesitant, partial, confused result and an inaccurate reflection of the growing radicalization.

Secondly, hundreds of thousands and millions of proletarians, whom the process of radicalization affects most deeply, and the most exploited sections of the Negroes, were either disqualified from voting by the class chicanery of capitalist election machinery, or else neglected to vote (foreign-born workers, unemployed and migratory workers, workers terrorized in company towns, etc.)

Thirdly, bourgeois elections are never a completely accurate indication of the sentiment of the masses. The possibilities for gaining the adherence of the mass for day-to-day struggles on concrete issues are practically always far greater than the possibilities of gaining support in elections. For example: not all the workers who responded to the call for a general strike in England are supporters of the Labor Party, but are even members of the Liberal or Tory parties; thousands followed our leadership in the miners', the Passaic and the New Bedford strikes, but only hundreds, or even only dozens, voted for our ticket; thousands support our Party in the needle trades unions and fight the yellow socialists there, and turn about on election day and vote for the latter "because they have a good chance to get in" among other reasons.

Fourthly, the sharpened temper of the masses and their growing class consciousness and readiness to struggle is revealed with far greater clarity in such movements as the Sacco-Vanzetti fight, the strike movement which is developing—at present in isolated forms—throughout the country, and dozens of other phenomena which have often been indicated by us.

What were the results for the Party? The gain in the Party vote and the increased participation of the Party members in the election fight are undeniable. Only a sober estimate of it will enable the party to go forward in such work, and in other fields as well. This cannot be done, however, by the smug and temporarily convenient method of unqualified and uncritical self-praise. One is the method of clarity, the other the method of self-delusion.

The campaign of the Party partook too much of a sectarian-opportunist nature to be labelled a Bolshevik campaign. For months prior to the formal opening of the campaign, the Pepper-Lovestone leadership of the Party hesitated to take the step of placing a Communist ticket in the field. Despite the insistence of the Opposition for a Communist slate as far back as the February Plenum of the C.E.C. (see stenogram of Cannon's speech there, and his article in the Daily Worker demanding the immediate decision to file our own candidates,) the Lovestone majority played around with the idea of setting up a fake farmer-labor party ticket or endorsing one—a repetition of Lovestone's adventurous menshevism in 1924 when he demanded that our campaign be conducted under the banner of the "great class Farmer-Labor Party" of St. Paul (with MacDonald and Bouck) and opposed the entry of our own Party candidates. So much valuable time was lost by this vacillation that the socialist party was enabled to hold its convention, draw up its platform and nominate its candidates weeks before we did.

Other opportunist errors made by the leadership could be mentioned by the dozens. The election platform was shot through with ten cent reformism (the abolition of the Senate, curbing the power of the Supreme Court, etc.); the notorious election instructions sent out by the Party office, which would have made an honest social-democrat flush with shame, and for which Lovestone and Stachel, characteristically enough, tried to make Codkind the scapegoat; the articles in The Communist, Big Business Can't Lose in 1928 (!) by Ben Gitlow which cavalierly dismissed the Communist Party, and the socialist party, by failing to mention them by so much as one word; the unchecked series of articles and stories in the Daily Worker on the Labor Party as a panacea, a series in which the contribution by I. Amter, the Lovestone proconsul in the Cleveland district, reached the peak of opportunism (Daily Worker, August 29, 1928); the organization of the "famous" Belmont County (Ohio) Labor Party fake—another Amter product in the midst of the Communist

campaign; and so on and so forth ad nauseam.

Further: Such a corrupting atmosphere has been created by the factional regime in the Party that during the election campaign, the entire leading staff of the Party, (a delegation of twenty!), including the presidential candidate, was sent to Moscow for the Sixth Congress of the Comintern in the face of needs of the campaign and the protests of Cannon and other members of the Opposition. In most of the districts, the Lovestone machine, following its naive policy of trying to manufacture leaders of the masses by decree or motion in faction-controlled committees, nominated as Party candidates not the outstanding, most capable and better-known trade union and mass leaders, but the leaders of the faction. From one error flow many. In desperation to play up Gitlow as against Foster (see stories and advertisements in the Daily Worker of that period) the Party was dragged by Lovestone-Pepper into the shameful, stupid sensationalism of the Gitlow "kidnapping" in the Arizona desert, from which, like the heroine of a similar successful exploit, he triumphantly emerged without even a trace of sunburn.

The most serious shortcoming of the campaign was the poor success in linking up with the elections the struggles of the workers in the coal fields, textile and similar fields, to mobilize these workers, the Negroes, and the unemployed, to the extent that we could reach them, for active struggle, for demonstrations, to set them in motion—not only in the polling booths—to break through the "democratic" veneer and parliamentary cretinism of the elections with which the bourgeoisie plus the socialists stifle the real development of revolutionary parliamentary work.

Unless these questions, problems and shortcomings of the Party's campaign are seriously understood, discussed and steps taken to remedy the weaknesses, the Party will not avoid but repeat these errors in the future. To do as is done in the article by Pepper, that is, to review the campaign and the Party's role in it without a single critical word, is to mislead the Party membership and lull it into a state of conceit, self-satisfaction and priggishness.

A word is necessary on the role and future of the Labor Party movement which Pepper fails even to mention. For him it is an easy matter either to "discover" or "disperse" a movement with a wave of the hand. In this election, the Northwestern remnants of the big movement that developed in 1922-24 trailed miserably behind the big bourgeois parties. Despite a previous decision of the Comintern to advocate a labor party and not a farmer-labor party, the Party has still continued its flirtations, "maneuvers" and high politics with the Shipstead-Mahoney Farmer-Labor Party gang in Minnesota. The opportunist errors of a number of the best Communist workers in that district flowed inevitably out of the essentially false theory of a two class party, a morass out of which only weeds can grow.

The future of the labor party cannot be guaranteed by mathematical calculations. For our part, however, without wasting any sympathy on the absurd theory of its "inevitability", we see no reason to put aside the perspective of a labor party development in the working class movement. A possible basis for a mass labor party exists and will grow in the development and strengthening of the class unions which are now being formed in the coal, textile and needle trades industries, and which must be formed in others.

The election, finally, demonstrated that it is only the Communist Party that represents the interests of the oppressed millions in the United States and its colonies. The miserable attempts of the socialist party parsons and peanut-stand owners to compete for the petty-bourgeoisie and the labor aristocracy with an expert demagogue like Smith were only an indication of how far this little yellow sect has travelled from the days when it had at least a revolutionary core.

Its departure from everything healthy and radical in the labor and revolutionary movement leaves the Communist Party an open field. Its task is to rid itself of the opportunist adventurers and corrupt factionalists who have usurped its leadership. The fundamental healthiness of our party, its proletarian composition, its basic program are a guarantee that despite the difficulties, the errors, and the shortcomings it will win the masses and fulfill its revolutionary mission.



# THE DRAFT PROGRAM OF THE COMINTERN

A CRITICISM OF  
FUNDAMENTALS

By L. D. TROTSKY

CONTINUED FROM LAST ISSUE

The matter stands quite differently in the new draft program of the Comintern. In accordance with the revisionist evolution of its authors since 1924, the draft, as we have seen, chooses the directly opposite path. But the solution of the question of Socialism in one country in one way or another determines the significance of the WHOLE draft as a Marxian or a revisionist document.

Of course the draft program carefully, persistently and severally puts forward, emphasizes and explains the difference between the Communist and reformist formulation of questions.

But these assurances do not solve the problem. We have a situation something like that of a ship which is supplied and even overloaded with numerous Marxian mechanisms and appliances while its mainsail is raised so that it is purposely opened for all revisionist and reformist winds. Those who have learned from the experience of the last three decades and particularly from the marvelous experience of China during the recent years have learned to understand the powerful dialectical inter-dependence between the class struggle and programmatic Party documents, will understand when we say that the new revisionist sail can turn to naught all the safety appliances of Marxism and Leninism. That is why we are compelled to dwell in greater detail on this cardinal question which will for a long time determine the development and destiny of the Communist International.

## 4.—THE THEORETICAL TRADITION OF THE PARTY.

The draft program used with deliberate intention the expression "victory of Socialism in one country" so as to secure the external, purely verbal, identification of its text with Lenin's article of 1915, which has so ruthlessly, not to say criminally, been misused during the discussion on the question of building up a Socialist society in one country. The draft employs the same method elsewhere by "alluding" to Lenin's words as a confirmation. Such is the "methodology of the draft."

Of the great wealth of Marxian literature and the treasure of Lenin's works—directly ignoring everything that Lenin said and wrote and everything that he did, ignoring the Party program and the program of the Young Communist League, ignoring the opinions expressed by all Party leaders, without exception, in the the entire epoch of the October Revolution, when the question stood categorically (and categorically to what extent!) ignoring what the authors of the program themselves, Stalin and Bucharin, said up to 1924 inclusive—altogether two quotations from Lenin, one from his article on the United States of Europe written in 1915 and another from his unfinished posthumous publication on cooperation written in 1923, have been used in defense of the theory of national socialism which was created to meet the exigencies of the struggle against so-called "Trotskyism" at the end of 1924 or the beginning of 1925. Everything that disproves these two quotations of a few lines—the whole of Marxism and Leninism—is simply set aside. These two artificially snatched out and grossly and epigonically misinterpreted quotations are taken as a basis of the new purely revisionist theory which is unbounded from the viewpoint of its political consequences. We are witnessing the efforts to graft, by scholastic and sophist methods, to the Marxian trunk, an absolutely alien branch which will be grafted but will inexorably poison and kill the whole tree.

At the Seventh Plenum of the E. C. C. I., Stalin declared (not for the first time):

The question of Socialist economic construction in one country was for the FIRST time advanced in the Party by Lenin in 1915." (Stenographic report of the Seventh Plenum. Our emphasis).

Thus it is admitted here that prior to 1915 the question of Socialism in one country was unknown. Stalin and Bucharin do not venture to encroach upon the entire Marxian tradition on the question of the international character of the proletarian revolution. We will take note of this.

However, let us see what Lenin said "for the first time" in 1915 in contradistinction to what

Marx, Engels and Lenin himself had said prior to that. In 1915 Lenin said:

"Uneven economic and political development is an unconditional law of capitalism. From here it follows that the triumph of Socialism is, to begin with, possible in several or even in only one individual capitalist country. The victorious proletariat of that country, having expropriated the capitalists and ORGANIZED SOCIALIST PRODUCTION, would be up in arms against the rest of the capitalist world, attracting oppressed classes of the other countries to its side, causing insurrections in those countries against the capitalists and the acting in case of need, even with military power against the exploiting classes and their governments."—(Vol. 13, page 133. Our emphasis).

What did Lenin have in mind? That the victory of Socialism, that is, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, is possible at first in one country, which, because of this very fact, will stand up against capitalism. The proletarian State, in order to be able to resist an attack and to undertake a revolutionary offensive on its own, will at first have to "organize Socialist production", i. e., it will have to organize the operation of the factories taken from the capitalists. That is all. The "victory of Socialism" was, as is well-known, first accomplished in Russia, and the First Workers' State, in order to defend itself against world intervention, had first of all "to organize Socialist production." By the victory of Socialism in one country, Lenin consequently did not cherish the fantasy of a self-sufficing Socialist society, and in a backward country at that, but something that was much more realistic, namely, that which the October revolution has accomplished in our country in the first period of its existence.

Does this, perhaps, need to be proven? There are so many proofs for that, that the only difficulty we have is in choosing the best.

In the theses on war and peace (January 7, 1918) Lenin spoke of the

"Necessity of a certain period of time, AT LEAST SEVERAL MONTHS, FOR THE VICTORY OF SOCIALISM in Russia..."—(Vol. 15, page 64).

At the beginning of the same year, i. e., 1918, Lenin wrote in his article entitled "As to Left Wing Childishness and Petty Bourgeois Tendencies," directed against Bucharin, the following:

"If, let us say, State capitalism could be established here within six months, that would be a tremendous achievement and the surest guarantee that within a year SOCIALISM will be definitely established and have become invincible."—(Vol. 18, part 2, page 8. Our emphasis).

How could Lenin set such a short period for the "definite establishment" of Socialism? What material-productive and social content did he put into these words?

This question will at once appear in a different light if you recall that on April 29, 1918, Lenin said in his report to the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of the Soviet Government:

"It is hardly to be expected that our next generation, which will be more highly developed, will effect a complete transition to Socialism."—(Ibid., page 240).

On December 3, 1919, at the Congress of Com-munes and Artels, Lenin spoke even more definitely, saying:

"We know that we cannot establish a Socialist system at the present time. It will be well if our children and perhaps our grandchildren will be able to establish it."—(Vol. 16, page 398).

In which of these two cases was Lenin right? Was it when he spoke of the "definite establishment of Socialism" within twelve months, or when he left it, not for our children but our grandchildren to establish the "socialist order"?

Lenin was right in both cases for he had in mind two entirely different and incommensurable stages of Socialist construction.

By the "definite establishment of Socialism" in the first case Lenin meant not the building up of a Socialist society within a year or within "several months," that is, he did not mean that the classes will be done away with, that the contradictions between town and country will be eliminated; he meant the RESTORATION OF PRODUCTION IN THE FACTORIES IN THE HANDS OF THE PROLETARIAN STATE, and the possibility to exchange products between town and country. The very shortness of the term is in itself a sure key to an understanding of the whole perspective.

Of course even for this limited and immediate

task too short a term was set at the beginning of 1918. It is this purely practical "miscalculation" that Lenin derided at the Fourth Congress of the Comintern when he said "we were more foolish then than we are now." But "we" had a correct view of the general perspective and did not for a moment believe that it is possible to set up a complete "Socialist order" in the course of twelve months, and in a backward country at that.

The attainment of this main and final aim—the construction of a Socialist society—was left by Lenin to three whole generations—ourselves, our children and our grandchildren.

Is it not clear that in his article of 1915 Lenin meant by the organization of "Socialist production," not the setting up of a Socialist society but an immeasurably more elementary task which has already been realized by us in the U. S. S. R.? Otherwise one would have to come to the absurd conclusion that, according to Lenin, the proletarian party, having captured power, "postpones" the revolutionary war until the third generation.

Such—that is, truly said—is the position of the main stronghold of the new theory as far as the 1915 quotation is concerned. However, it is even more sad when we know that Lenin wrote this passage not in application to Russia. He spoke of Europe in contradistinction to Russia. This follows not only from the content of the quoted passage dedicated to the question of the United States of Europe, but also from Lenin's entire position at the time. A few months hence, November 20, 1915, Lenin wrote specially on Russia, saying:

"The task of the proletariat follows obviously from this actual state of affairs. That task is a relentless heroic revolutionary struggle against the monarchy (the slogans of the January conference of 1912—'three stages'), a struggle which would attract all democratic masses, that is, first and foremost the peasants. At the same time a ruthless struggle must be waged against chauvinism, a struggle FOR THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION IN EUROPE in alliance with its proletariat. . . . The war crisis HAS STRENGTHENED the economic and political factors driving the petty bourgeoisie, including the peasantry, towards the Left. Therein lies the objective basis of the absolute possibility of a victory of the DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION in Russia. That the OBJECTIVE CONDITIONS FOR A SOCIALIST REVOLUTION HAVE FULLY MATURED IN WESTERN EUROPE there is no need to prove. This was recognized before the war by all influential Socialists of all advanced countries."—(Vol. 13, page 212. Our emphasis).

Thus, in 1915, Lenin clearly spoke of a democratic revolution in Russia and of a Socialist Revolution in Western Europe. In passing, as of something which is self-evident, he mentions that in Western Europe, distinct from Russia, in contradistinction to Russia, the conditions for a Socialist revolution have "fully matured." But this quotation—one of many—which squarely and directly refers to Russia, the authors of the new theory, the authors of the draft program, simply ignore as they ignore hundreds of other passages, as they ignore all of Lenin's works. Instead of taking notice of this, they, as we have seen, take another passage which refers to Western Europe, ascribe to it a meaning which it cannot and does not mean to have, attach this ascribed meaning to Russia, a country which the passage did not have in mind, and on this "foundation" they build their new theory.

What was Lenin's position on this question immediately before the October period? On leaving Switzerland after the February revolution in 1917, Lenin addressed a letter to the Swiss workers in which he declared:

"Russia is a peasant country, it is one of the most backward countries of Europe. Socialism cannot be IMMEDIATELY triumphant there. But the peasant character of the country with the huge funds of land in the hands of the aristocracy and landowners, CAN, on the basis of the experiences of 1907, give a tremendous impetus to the bourgeois democratic revolution in Russia and make our revolution a PRELUDE to the world Socialist revolution, a STEP towards it. . . . The Russian proletarian party cannot by its own forces VICTORIOUSLY COMPETE the Socialist revolution. But it can give the Russian revolution dimensions such as will create the most favorable conditions for it, such as will in a certain sense BEGIN it. It can facilitate matters for the entrance into a decisive battle on the part of its MAIN and most reliable ally, the EUROPEAN and American socialist proletariat."—(Vol. 14, part 2, page 407).

All elements of the question are contained in these few lines. If Lenin believed in 1915, in time of war and reaction, as they try to convince us

## FOREWORD

With this issue The Militant prints the second installment of "The Draft Program of the Communist International: A Criticism of Fundamentals" by L. D. Trotsky. This document, a masterpiece of Marxist-Leninist literature was submitted by comrade Trotsky to the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International which finally adopted the draft program drafted by comrades Bucharin and Stalin, without any important changes. The entire validity of this timely and fundamental criticism remains in spite of the fact that it was kept from the Congress and never discussed by the delegates. The sole attention accorded it was its distribution to members of the Program Commission and a report on the document to the "Senioren-Konvent" of the Congress which immediately "settled" the issue without discussion.

A rigid control on this document was established forthwith and the few copies of the document which were distributed were recalled by the Secretariat. Our publication is an authentic copy which we have just received. It deals chiefly with the role of American Imperialism and the prospect of new revolutionary situations, the revisionist theory of "Socialism in one country," with the Chinese revolution and its lessons, and with the formation of workers and peasants parties which Trotsky, in line with Lenin, condemns in principle. Trotsky's comment on the "Third Party Alliance" with La Follette, the fight against which was led by him, will be especially interesting to American communists. The entire document will be printed in full consecutively in this and the forthcoming issues of The Militant without any changes. Its basic importance for the international revolutionary movement and the unanswerable correctness of its position on the burning problems of the Communist International make it an invaluable contribution to the Bolshevik literature of our period.

—Editor.

now, that the proletariat of Russia can alone build up Socialism so as, when it will have accomplished this work, to be able to declare war on the bourgeois States, how can Lenin, at the beginning of 1917, after the February revolution, speak so categorically about the impossibility for backward Russia to build up Socialism with its own forces? One must at least to some extent be logical and, to be candid, have some respect for Lenin.

It would be superfluous to add more quotations. To give an integral outline of Lenin's economic and political views conditioned by the international character of the Socialist revolution, would require an independent investigation which would include many subjects except that of building up a self-sufficing Socialist society in one country, for Lenin did not know this subject.

However, we feel compelled to mention here one more article by Lenin—that "On Cooperation"—as the draft program seems to quote it extensively, i. e., uses some of its expressions with a purpose which has nothing in common with that of the article. We have in mind the fifth chapter of the draft program which says that the workers of the Soviet Republics

"possess all the necessary and sufficient MATERIAL prerequisites in the country . . . for the complete construction of Socialism."—(Our emphasis).

If the article dictated by Lenin during his illness and published after his death really says that the Soviet State possesses all the necessary and sufficient MATERIAL, that is, first of all PRODUCTIVE, prerequisites for an independent construction of complete Socialism, one would only have to surmise that either Lenin slipped in his dictation or the stenographer made a mistake in deciphering her notes. The one or the other is at any rate more probable than Lenin's abandonment of Marxism and his own teachings in two hasty strokes. Fortunately, however, there is not the slightest need whatever for such an explanation. The remarkable, although incomplete article "On Cooperation," bound up by unity of thought with the other no less remarkable articles of his last period which constitute, so to say, a chapter of an unfinished book dealing with THE PLACE OCCUPIED BY THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION IN THE CHAIN OF REVOLUTIONS IN THE WEST AND EAST, does not by any means speak of the things which the revisionists of Leninism so light-middly ascribe to it.

In that article Lenin explains that the "trading" cooperatives can and must entirely change their social role in the workers' state and that by a correct policy they may direct the merging of private peasant interests with the general state interests along Socialist channels. Lenin substantiates this irrefutable idea as follows:

"In reality, power of the state over all large scale means of production, state power in the hands of the proletariat, an alliance of that proletariat with the millions of small and dwarfish peasants, security of proletarian leadership in relation to the peasants—is this not all that is necessary for the cooperatives, the cooperatives alone, which we have formerly treated as mere traders and which, from a certain viewpoint, we still have the right to treat them as such even now under NEP, is this not all that is necessary for the complete construction of Socialist Society? It is not yet the construction of Socialist society, but it is all that is necessary and sufficient for this construction."—(Vol 18, part 2, page 140).

Text of the passage which comprises an unfinished sentence ("of the cooperatives alone") irrefutably proves that we have before us an uncorrected draft which was dictated and not written. It is the more inadmissible to cling to a few individual words of the text rather than trying to get a general idea of the article. Fortunately, however, even the LETTER of the cited passage, and not only its SPIRIT, grants no one the right to misuse it in the manner it is being misused by the authors of the draft program. Speaking of the "necessary and sufficient" prerequisites Lenin strictly limits his subject in this article. He deals in it only with the question as to the ways and means by which we will reach Socialism through the numerous and disjointed peasant enterprises without new class upheavals, having the prerequisites of the Soviet regime as our basis. The article is entirely devoted to the SOCIO-ORGANIZATIONAL FORMS of the transition from small private commodity economy to collective economy but not with the MATERIAL PRODUCTIVE conditions of that transition.

If the European proletariat were victorious to

day and would come to our assistance with its technique, the question of cooperation raised by Lenin as a socio-organizational method of coordination of private with social interests would still retain its significance. Cooperation points the way through which advanced technique including electricity can reorganize and unite the millions of peasant enterprises under the Soviet regime; but cooperation cannot be substituted for technique and does not create that technique. Lenin does not merely speak of the necessary and sufficient prerequisites in general, but, as we have seen, definitely enumerates them. They are: 1) "power of the State over all large scale means of production" (an uncorrected phrase); 2) "State power in the hands of the proletariat"; 3) "an alliance of that proletarianat with the millions of . . . peasants"; 4) "security of proletarian leadership in relation to the peasants" . . . It is only after the enumeration of these PURELY POLITICAL conditions—nothing is said here about material conditions—that Lenin arrives at his conclusion that "this" (that is, the enumerated) "is all that is necessary and sufficient" for the building up of a Socialist society. "All that is necessary and sufficient" FROM A POLITICAL ASPECT, but no more.

But, adds Lenin right there and then, "it is not yet the construction of Socialist society." Why? Because political conditions alone, although they be sufficient do not solve the whole problem. The cultural question still remains. "ONLY" this—says Lenin—emphasizing the word "only" and putting it in quotation marks in order to show the tremendous importance of the prerequisites which we do not have. That culture is bound up with technique, Lenin knew as well as we. "To be cultural"—he brings back the revisionist to earth—"a certain MATERIAL basis is necessary." (Ibid., page 145).

It will suffice to mention the problem of electrification which Lenin, we will mention in passing, purposely linked up with the question of the international social revolution. The struggle for culture with the possession of the "necessary and sufficient" political (BUT NOT MATERIAL) prerequisites, would exhaust our work were it not for the question of the uninterrupted and irreconcilable economic, political, military and cultural struggle of the country which is engaged in the building of a Socialist society on a backward basis with world capitalism which is on its decline but is technically powerful.

"I am ready to state"—emphasizes Lenin particularly towards the end of the article—"that the center of gravity for us is being transferred to cultural work were it not for the international relations, were it not for the duty to fight for our positions on an international scale."—(Ibid., page 24).

Such is Lenin's real idea if we analyze the article on cooperation, even if isolated from all his other works. How else can we style, if not as a falsification, the formula of the authors of the draft who deliberately take Lenin's words about our possession of "necessary and sufficient" prerequisites and add to them the basic material prerequisites although Lenin definitely speaks of the material prerequisites in parenthesis, saying that it is just what we do not have and what we must still gain in our struggle "for our position on an international scale," that is, in connection with the international proletarian revolution?

That is how matters stand with the second and last stronghold of the theory. We purposely did not take here those articles and speeches written and uttered during the entire course of 1905-1923 in which Lenin says and repeats most categorically that without a victorious revolution we are doomed to failure, that it is impossible to defeat the bourgeoisie economically in one country, particularly a backward country, that the task of building up a Socialist society is in its very essence an international task from which Lenin drew perhaps "pessimistic" conclusions for the promulgators of the new national reactionary utopia but which are sufficiently optimistic from the viewpoint of revolutionary internationalism. We concentrate our argument here only on the passages which the authors of the draft have themselves chosen and which are supposed to create the "necessary and sufficient" prerequisites for their utopia, and yet we see that their whole structure collapses. All one has to do is but touch it.

However, we consider it in place to present at least one of Lenin's direct statements on the question under consideration, which does not need any

comment and will not permit any misinterpretation.

"WE HAVE EMPHASIZED IN MANY OF OUR WORKS, IN ALL OUR SPEECHES AND IN THE WHOLE OF OUR PRESS that matters in Russia are not such as IN THE ADVANCED CAPITALIST COUNTRIES, that we have in Russia a minority of industrial workers and an overwhelming majority of small agrarians. The social revolution in such a country can be finally successful only on two conditions: First, on the condition that it is given TIMELY support by the social revolution of one or several advanced countries. . . . Second, that there be an agreement between the proletariat which establishes the dictatorship or holds State power in its hands and the majority of the peasantry."

"We know that ONLY AN AGREEMENT WITH THE PEASANTRY CAN SAVE THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN RUSSIA SO LONG AS THE REVOLUTION IN OTHER COUNTRIES HAS NOT ARRIVED."—(Lenin, Vol. 18, part 1, pages 137-138. Our emphasis).

We hope that this passage is sufficiently instructive. Firstly, Lenin himself emphasizes in it that the ideas which he advanced have developed "in many of our works, in all our speeches, and in the whole of our press"; secondly, this outlook was uttered by Lenin not in 1915, two years before the October Revolution, but in 1921, the fourth year after the October revolution.

As far as Lenin is concerned, we venture to think that the question is clear enough. One only has to ask now—what was formerly the opinion of the authors of the draft program as to the basic questions now in hand?

On this question, Stalin said in November 1926:

"The Party always took as its starting point the idea that the victory of Socialism in one country means the possibility to build up Socialism in that country, and that this task can be accomplished with the forces of one country."—(Pravda, September 12, 1926).

We already know that the Party NEVER TOOK THIS AS A STARTING POINT. On the contrary "in many of our works, in all our speeches and in the whole of our press," the Party proceeded from the contrary position which found its highest expression in the program of the C.P. S.U. But one would hope that at least Stalin himself "always" held this false view that "Socialism can be built up with the forces of one country." We will see.

What Stalin thought of this question in 1905 and 1915 we have absolutely no means of knowing as there are no documents on the matter whatever. But in 1924 Stalin gave an outline of Lenin's views on the building up of Socialism, as follows:

"The overthrow of the power of the bourgeoisie and the putting up of a proletarian government in one country does not yet guarantee the complete victory of Socialism. The main task of Socialism—the ORGANIZATION OF SOCIALIST PRODUCTION—still remains ahead. Can this task be accomplished, can the final victory of Socialism in one country be attained, without the joint efforts of the proletariat of several advanced countries? No, this IS IMPOSSIBLE. To overthrow the bourgeoisie, the efforts of one country are sufficient—the victory of our revolution bears this out. For the final victory of Socialism, FOR THE ORGANIZATION OF SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION, THE EFFORTS OF ONE COUNTRY, PARTICULARLY OF SUCH A PEASANT COUNTRY AS RUSSIA, ARE INSUFFICIENT. For this the efforts of the proletarians of several advanced countries are necessary . . .

"Such, on the whole, are the characteristic features of Lenin's theory of the proletarian revolution."—(Stalin, "Lenin and Leninism," Russian 1924 edition, pages 40-41).

One must admit that the "characteristic features of Lenin's theory" are outlined here quite correctly. In the later editions of Stalin's book this passage was altered to read in just the opposite way and the "characteristic features of Lenin's theory" were developed within a year as . . . Trotskyism. The Seventh Plenum of the E.C.C.I. passed its decision, not on the basis of the 1924 edition but of the 1926 edition.

That is how the matter stands with Stalin. It could not be any sadder than that. One could, it is true, reconcile himself with this, were it not for the fact that matters are just as sad with regard to the Seventh Plenum of the E.C.C.I.

There is one hope left and that is that at least Bucharin, the real author of the draft program, "always proceeded" from the possibility of the realization of Socialism in one country. We shall see.

TO BE CONTINUED

**This Page Intentionally Blank**

# Spector's Statement to Canadian Party

Toronto, November 6th, 1928.

To The Political Committee,  
Communist Party of Canada,

Following upon the motion at yesterday's session of the Polcom to endorse the expulsion of the three comrades J. P. Cannon, Max Shachtman, and Martin Abern, from the Workers Party of America for their stand on behalf of the opening of a serious discussion of the fundamental problems of the Communist International, a motion which I was unable to support, certain questions have been directed to me by the Polcom as to my own position. These may be boiled down to the following:

First whether I believe that the ideological line of "Trotskyism" is correct and whether I am prepared to carry on an aggressive campaign against Trotskyism and the comrades who have been expelled from the W. P. for their solidarity with the platform of the Russian Opposition.

In reply to the question whether I am prepared "to wage an aggressive campaign against 'Trotskyism,'" I can assure the Polcom that I am prepared to wage an aggressive campaign for Leninism. Historical Trotskyism was liquidated with the entrance of L. D. Trotsky into the Communist Party and his collaboration with Lenin following his return to Russia in 1917. Trotsky has declared before the Russian Party that in all questions bearing any character of principle at all, in which he had differences with Lenin prior to 1917, Lenin was correct. The revival of the issue of so-called "Trotskyism" by the majority in 1924 and 1925 was an attempt to obscure the real issues by an artificial issue. Zinoviev who was one of the leading comrades in the fight against Trotsky has not only admitted since that the latter was correct in his fight for internal Party democracy in 1923-24, but also that the issue of "Trotskyism" was then invented by himself and a few other comrades for strategical purposes, to link up the current differences with differences that had long passed into history.

The comrades in the vanguard of the fight against "Trotskyism," were most of them further removed from the position of Lenin on his return to Russia and his presentation of the April Theses of 1917, than L. D. Trotsky. Zinoviev and Kamenev, Rykov, Losovsky, etc. were opposed to the insurrection by which the Bolsheviks conquered power and were for a coalition of all the Socialist Parties. Comrade Stalin, prior to Lenin's return had written articles for co-operation with Tseretelli. When so much is made of the differences between Trotsky and Lenin during the course of the revolution itself, it should be borne in mind that all these differences are being exaggerated and distorted for factional ends, and that silence is maintained on the differences that other comrades, Bucharin for instance, had with Lenin but who are nevertheless regarded as one hundred percent Leninists. Comrade Bucharin not only fought Lenin on the Brest Litovsk question but also on a Trade Union question, and on the question of State Capitalism. On the Peasant question he was the author of one of the most dangerous slogans ever put out by a leading comrade; the slogan of "enrich yourselves," the objective significance of which meant a call on the Kulaks to intensify their exploitation of the poor peasantry. The present leader of the C. I., Bucharin, had to be overruled on the question of the validity of partial demands in the Communist Program by the intervention of Lenin, Trotsky and others at the Fourth Congress.

Not only did Lenin during his lifetime deny all slanderous rumors of any differences between himself and Trotsky on the Peasant Question, but up to his last days he considered L. D. Trotsky his closest collaborator as may be seen by the correspondence which passed between these two leaders of the revolution in the letter to the Institute of Party History by L. D. Trotsky. Lenin called upon the latter to defend his views for him on the following questions, the National Question, the Question of Workers and Peasants Control, the Monopoly of Foreign trade, the struggle against Bureaucracy, etc. It is high time that a stop be put to the falsification of Party history that has accompanied the unscrupulous and demagogic campaign against the revolutionist who next to Lenin was the most authentic leader and organizer of the October Revolution, and was so recognized by Lenin himself. Trotsky today stands foursquare for the maintenance of the principles of Leninism, uncontaminated by the opportunist deviations that have been smuggled into the Comintern and U.S.S.R. policy by the present Rykov-Stalin-Bucharin regime and to which the lessons of the Chinese revolution, the economic situation in the U.S.S.R., the situation within the C.P.

We print herewith in part the statement of Comrade Spector to the Political Committee of the Communist Party at its meeting on Nov. 6th, 1928 in response to the demand that he state his position on the expulsion of Cannon, Abern and Shachtman from the Workers (Communist) Party of America and on the issues connected with the expulsion. As reported in the last number of The Militant Comrade Spector was forthwith suspended from the party and removed from all responsible positions. Since then he was declared expelled from the party for refusing to retract his stand.

In view of the great prominence and popularity of Comrade Spector as the outstanding Communist leader in Canada his arbitrary expulsion has made a sensation in the labor movement and has called forth the greatest indignation of the rank and file of the Party. Comrade Spector was elected to the Executive Committee of the Communist International at the Sixth World Congress. He has been for years the Chairman of the Party and editor of its organs, the Canadian Worker and the Canadian Labor Monthly. He represented the Communist Party of Canada at the Fourth and Sixth World Congresses of the Communist International.—Editor.

S.U., and the experiences of the Anglo-Russian Committee bear eloquent witness.

For these latter are the real issues. In retrospect it is clear that the Sixth Congress, meeting after a delay of four years, nevertheless failed to measure up to its great tasks. Eclecticism and a zig-zag line replaced a real analysis of the rich treasures of political experience of the past four years. The discussion of the Chinese revolution, the greatest upheaval since the November revolution, was utterly inadequate. As in the case of discussion of the failure of October 1923 in Germany, the attempt to throw major responsibility for what happened in China on the leadership of a Chinese Communist Party will not down. The responsibility for the opportunist policy of our Party in China lies in the first place with the Ex. Committee of the Comintern and with the formulations of policy of Stalin, Bucharin, Martynov. Lenin at the II Congress proposed a clear line in the Colonial question, for the independence of the Communist Parties and the working class movement even in embryonic form; against the National bourgeoisie, struggle for proletarian hegemony in the the National emancipation movement even when the National Revolution has only bourgeois democratic tasks to solve; constant propaganda of the Soviet idea and creation of Soviets at the earliest moment possible; finally, possibility of the non-capitalist development of backward colonial and semi-colonial countries on condition that they receive support from the U.S.S.R. and the proletariat of the advanced capitalist countries.

Otherwise, Lenin pointed out, the alliance with the national bourgeoisie would be dangerous to the revolution. This alliance could only be affected on the basis that the bourgeoisie carried on an effective struggle against imperialism and did not prevent the Communist Party from organizing the revolutionary action of the workers and peasants. Failure to exact these guarantees would lead to a repetition of the Kemalism of the Turkish national struggle which has made its peace with Imperialism. Nearly every one of these cardinal points of Lenin's revolutionary colonial policies was violated in China. By throwing out the smoke screen that the creation of Soviets would be tantamount to the dictatorship of the proletariat, despite the fact that Lenin proposed the Soviets already as a form of the democratic dictatorship of workers and peasants in the 1905 revolution, the leadership of the Comintern misrepresented the criticism and theses of the opposition and covered up their own opportunist mistakes.

Our Chinese party was subordinated to the National bourgeoisie in the Kuomintang under cover of the old Menshevik Martynov policy of the "Block of Four Classes" (renunciation of right to criticize Kuomintang from the outside, renunciation of the right to criticize Sun Yat Senism, renunciation of an illegal fighting apparatus, and of the creation of cells in the National Army.) The working class movement was subordinated to the Government of the National bourgeoisie (prohibition in certain cases of picketing and strikes, disarmament of the workers, etc.) The C.P. maintained silence at the beginning of the repression period (coup d'etat of Chiang Kai Shek etc.) The enlarged Executive of the C. I. did not subsequently straighten out the line. The slogan of Soviets was issued not when the revolutionary movement was at its height but when the bourgeoisie had already betrayed and the workers and peasants were being decimated. Stalin was making a speech still hailing Chiang Kai Shek as a revolutionary warrior only a few days prior to Chiang Kai Shek coup in a speech, which was criticized at the time by Comrade Radek, and which was of course suppressed to avoid compromising himself.

The opportunist line followed in the Chinese rev-

olution is of course by no means isolated. I have dwelt at some length on the opportunist line followed in the refusal to break with the traitorous British General Council in the Anglo-Russian Committee. The Anglo-Russian Committee was a political block between two trade union centres. The proposal of the opposition demonstratively to break with the General Council was falsely represented as being a parallel to leaving the old unions. Any Communist who reads the resolutions adopted by the Anglo-Russian conferences of Paris, July 1926 and Berlin, August 1926 and, finally of the Berlin conference at the beginning of April 1927 should convince themselves that an absolutely impermissible capitulation line was followed. At the latter meeting the Soviet representatives went on record recognizing the General Council, "as the sole representative and spokesman" of the British Trade Union movement at a time when the traitors of the General Council were suppressing the minority movement. But at the Enlarged Executive of May 1927, Comrade Bucharin sought to justify the Berlin capitulation by the theory of "exceptional circumstances," that is, that it was in the diplomatic interests of the Soviet Union which was under threat of war danger from the provocation of the British Government.

Such an attitude has little in common with the instructions of Lenin to the Soviet delegation that went to the Hague Conference, to ruthlessly unmask the Pacifists and Reformists. By the policy pursued in the Anglo-Russian Committee the British Communist Party developed such a degree of opportunism that it was at first even opposed to the Soviet Trade Union manifesto announcing the treachery of the Left as well as the Right Labor fakers of the General Council and wanted to continue a fight for the re-establishment of the moribund Anglo-Russian Committee. The whole line followed in the Anglo-Russian Committee was, like that in the Chinese Revolution, based on maneuvers with the reformists at the top instead of regard for the unleashing of the mass movement below.

The economic analysis of the opposition on the situation within the U.S.S.R. on the danger of the growth of the Kulak, the Nep man, and the bureaucrat has been swiftly vindicated. Undoubtedly there are Thermidorean elements in the country which are striving to bring their class pressure to bear on the Party. The highest duty of a revolutionist is to warn of these dangers and to propose the necessary measures to combat them. That was always the case while Lenin was alive. The crisis last February in connection with the grain collection proved strikingly the danger of the Kulak. The events in Smolensk, the Don Basin, the Ukraine, etc. proved the absolute necessity not only for such a campaign of self-criticism as Comrade Stalin felt the need to initiate but for effective internal Party democracy. One of the first guarantees of such real Party democracy would be the return of the exiled revolutionary oppositionists and their reinstatement with full rights to their former positions in the Party.

I have been a foundation member of the Communist Party of Canada since its organization in which I took a joint part. I have also been a member of the C.E.C. practically all the time since. Regardless of the immediate organizational consequences, I find myself compelled to make the above statement and to further register the fact that nothing on earth can separate me from the Revolutionary Communist movement. Everything that I have stated flows from my convictions that the deviations from Leninism in the C.I. can and must be corrected by a struggle within the International and its sections.

Long live the Communist International!

Long live the Proletarian Revolution!

MAURICE SPECTOR.

## In The Next Issue

"THE JULY PLENUM AND THE RIGHT DANGER"

By L. D. Trotsky

This Leninist analysis of the present conflict in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has just been received and is now being translated for publication in the next issue of the Militant. The wild rumors in the Capitalist Press and the silence of the official party organs throw no light whatever on the swiftly-moving and momentous developments now taking place in the Soviet Union and in the Communist Party there. Trotsky's article throws a clear and searching light on the entire situation, analyzes the class forces at work, explains the position and role of the conflicting groups in the party and indicates the revolutionary bolshevik policy for the solution of the problems.



# The Right Danger in the American Party

CONTINUED FROM LAST ISSUE

The perspective of the Lovestone group is in opposition to that outlined above. Its perspective is based upon an overestimation of the reserve power of American capitalism and an underestimation of the leftward drift of the masses. It is characterized by:

1. Overestimation of objective difficulties and underestimation of the growing favorable opportunities for the proletarian class struggle.
2. Overemphasis of the weakness and smallness of the Party and underemphasis of its great task for leadership in the developing class struggles and its ability to undertake the solution of these tasks.
3. Failure to realize the seriousness of the war danger and the coming of serious struggles as is seen in the failure to build an underground apparatus.
4. Playing down the symptomatic significance of such sporadic struggles among the unorganized as the oil strike in Bayonne, automobile strike in Oshawa, etc.
5. Seeing in the present political situation no signs or promise for political conflict and mass political movements.
6. Revising the perspective for struggle outlined in the February thesis which was forced upon the majority by the minority of the Central Committee. This revision was made in the policies of the Lovestone group since February in articles by Lovestone and Pepper, and in the May resolution of the C.E.C. Plenum. Failure to publish the February Thesis.

These characteristics of the perspective of the Lovestone group lack the outlook for struggle and orientation towards it.

## IV.—Failure to Orientate Towards New Unions and the Organization of the Unorganized.

To organize the many millions of unorganized workers is the major task of our Party. The building of the Party as the leader of the workers in all phases of their struggle against American imperialism depends largely upon its carrying thru vigorously this basic task of organization. With great masses of workers developing moods and movements of struggle, under the pressure of the industrial depression, rationalization, and the capitalist offensive, the organization of the unorganized now becomes the more urgent and possible.

The old craft unions, which are chiefly based upon the skilled and privileged workers, are controlled by ultra-reactionary leaders, and following a class collaboration policy, and which have been undermined and driven out of the basic industries by the employers' offensive, will not organize the great unorganized masses. This can be accomplished only through new unions, militant in character and based upon industrial instead of craft lines. It is fundamentally necessary that our party aggressively take the lead in the formation of these new industrial unions. At the same time the Party shall continue and extend through the trade union fractions, and the T.U.E.L. its revolutionary work in the old unions.

In the organization of the unorganized, the Party must base its orientation upon the unskilled and semi-skilled masses in the basic industries, the most exploited, and decisive sections of the working class. Trustified American capital, with all its economic strength and with all the powers of governmental repression at its disposal, will violently resist the organization of the workers in the basic industries. The new unionism will be established, but only by determined struggle. Hence the Party in its great task of organizing the unorganized must undertake its work with firm determination and with a thoroughgoing mobilization of all available forces.

The line of the Lovestone group in this vital work is a right wing line which liquidates the Party's efforts to organize the unorganized. Its principal defects are: (a) resistance to reorientating the Party decisively in the direction of the building of new unions, and, (b) dilettante approach to the mass organization campaigns and failure to carry them through with the vigor and persistence necessary to this success. The whole American Party was slow in orientating towards organizing new unions, but the Lovestone group is primarily responsible for this, because it has resisted and is still resisting despite the pressure of the Comintern, the Profintern, and the minority of the C.E.C.

Principal causes of wrong Lovestone policies in organizing the unorganized are:

1. Lack of faith in the possibility for effective struggle of the masses resulting from the overestimation of the reserve powers of American capitalism and underestimation of the industrial depression, the capitalist offensive and the developing mood of resistance among the workers.
2. Tendency to orientate upon the organized

The following is the second installment of the document submitted by the delegation of the Opposition in the American Party to the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International, in July 1928 and signed by James P. Cannon, William Z. Foster, William F. Dunne, Alex. Bittelman, J. W. Johnstone, Manuel Gomez and George Siskind.

The Lovestone-Pepper majority has voted to prohibit the publication or circularization of this document in the ranks. We will print it consecutively in "The Militant."  
—EDITORS.

skilled workers rather than upon the unorganized semi-skilled and unskilled workers.

3. Underestimation of the diminishing influence of the skilled workers due to the mechanization of industry and the growing gulf between the skilled and unskilled.

4. Tendency to orientate upon alleged differences in the upper strata of the labor bureaucracy.

5. Underestimation of the crisis in the trade unions, and a tendency to minimize the necessity for new unions. Illusions regarding possibilities of organizing the masses into the A. F. of L. unions. (Articles and speeches by Comrades Pepper and Lovestone).

6. Constant practice of placing the interests of the Lovestone fraction ahead of those of the Party, and the sacrifice of mass campaigns for factional advantage.

7. Tendency to toy with mass organization campaigns instead of pushing them through aggressively.

The majority leadership of the Y.W.L. which is an organic part of the Lovestone faction in the Party, follows the same opportunist line in its industrial work.

Typical examples of these wrong tendencies and policies are:

1. Rejected as dual unionism the proposal made by the C.E.C. minority, in May, 1927, for the calling of an open conference of the left-wing and progressives in the coal industry to wage direct struggle against the Lewis machine.

2. Condemned as dual unionism by a campaign throughout the whole Party the proposal of the C.E.C. minority in its thesis of May 1927, that the Party should "unhesitatingly" establish new unions wherever the old unions are decrepit or non-existent.

3. In the February, 1928 thesis, the Lovestone group simply repeated the year old Comintern decision regarding new unions, although the Comintern was then in the process of developing another resolution, which on the basis of the industrial depression and the deepening crisis in the old unions, laid far greater emphasis on the formation of new unions.

4. Resistance to the introduction of the slogan "Organize New Unions in Unorganized Industries" into the Party national election platform.

5. Failure to push forward vigorously for new unions in the needle industry. In this industry the Lovestone leadership has a craft union ideology and is afflicted with right wing theories that the workers cannot fight the employers and that the unions must cooperate in building up associations of employers.

6. Resistance to open struggle against the Lewis machine and building new union in mining industry.

7. Failure to concentrate Party forces for determined organizing campaign; example, total lack of preliminary work in New England textile industry prior to New Bedford strike.

8. Systematic factional discrimination against comrades capable for trade union work. Placing and displacing of field and district organizers and industrial organizers solely with regard to factional interests, with resultant damage to mass organization.

The correctness of this characterization of a perspective of struggle given by the Comintern in April has been more than justified by developing class struggles and increasing foment among the masses since. (New Bedford and Fall River strikes in textile, continuation of the desperate miners struggle, Bayonne strike in oil, maturing struggle situation in automobile, meat packing, shoe, etc., foment among the farmers, the intensifying political situation, etc.)

## V. Resistance to Orientation of Active Struggle Against Lewis Machine and for Building New Union in Mining Industry.

The most important industrial struggle ever carried through by our Party and its biggest achievement in trade union work is the left wing struggle now being waged in the mining industry. The driving force in the formulation and execution of correct policies and mobilization of Party forces in this campaign was the CEC minority. The policies of the Lovestone group, dictated by an underestimation of the whole fight, definitely militated against the development of the aggressive action necessitated in this crucial struggle and prevented this work making greater success. With the coal industry in a deep crisis (due to the over-development of the industry, use of substitute for coal, etc.) and with the union, weakened by the heavy unemployment and the shifting of the industry to the South, being rapidly torn to pieces under the

impact of the attacks of the employers and the treachery of Lewis, our Party orientation should have been definitely in the direction of an open struggle against the Lewis machine and for the formation of a new union. The policy of the Lovestone C.E.C. majority placed many obstacles in the way of developing and executing such a policy. Among these are:

1. Rejection of the open conference proposed by the CEC minority. This action checked the Party orientation towards a new union and confused and demoralized the miners' left wing and left the miners' movement without a definite perspective and disconnected our Party from the discontented masses of miners who wanted to struggle against Lewis. Renewal of the motion several months later by the CEC minority for an open conference and a direct struggle against Lewis, its acceptance by the Polcom, reestablished our leadership over the masses who were in grave danger of being demoralized by the I.W.W.

2. Failure of the CEC to vigorously combat the deepseated pessimism and systematic resistance against the application of the policy of open struggle, after this policy, upon motion of the minority, had been formally adopted by the CEC. The task of breaking down the resistance of the Lovestone District Organizers fell chiefly upon the CEC minority who were sharply criticized by the Lovestone majority for these actions. The right wing tendencies of these organizers, signalized by reluctance to fight the Lewis bureaucracy and by a general underestimation of the fighting spirit of the miners, were most clearly exemplified by the letters of Comrade Bedacht, District Organizer of Illinois to the CEC.

3. From December 1926 till December 1927, including 9 months of the miners' strike, the Lovestone majority failed to publish a left wing miners' organ. This was due on the one hand to the underestimation of the struggle and on the other to yielding to the demand of the so-called progressives (Brophy, Hapgood, etc.) that no criticism of Lewis should be made during the strike.

4. For six months no efforts were put forth to establish a left wing miners' relief organization and relief campaign, which offered exceptionally favorable means for the left wing to establish mass contacts. This relief organization could only have been built by an open fight against the Lewis machine and the A. F. of L. bureaucracy.

5. Factional juggling in the anthracite districts. This was based upon the established principle of the Lovestone group of keeping minority comrades from key positions. By placing incompetent organizers in charge of the Party apparatus and by carrying on a sharp factional war, the whole campaign in the anthracite was gravely injured.

6. Failure to initiate in time and to prosecute vigorously the campaign to organize the unorganized in Western Pennsylvania prior to the calling of the April 6th Strike and for the formation of a new union.

TO BE CONTINUED

## HELP PUBLISH THE SUPPRESSED DOCUMENTS OF THE RUSSIAN OPPOSITION!

The Editors of The Militant are undertaking the task of publishing all the suppressed documents of the Russian Opposition, a treasure of Leninist literature, in pamphlet form as well as serially in the columns of The Militant. This material throws a Marxian search-light on the historic events of the past five years and draws the necessary deductions for the tactics of the Communists in the great revolutionary struggles which lie ahead. A study of this material, hitherto prevented by its suppression, is indispensable for the education of the Party.

Your help is needed in this revolutionary work. Contribute to the fund for the publication of this material and the maintenance of The Militant. Follow the example of a group of Communist workers in New York in pledging a regular contribution weekly or monthly.

Use this blank.

THE MILITANT,  
Box 120, Madison Square Station  
New York City.

I enclose \$..... for the fund to publish the suppressed writings of Trotsky, Radek and other leaders of the Russian Opposition in pamphlet form and to sustain The Militant.

I pledge a regular contribution of \$..... every.....

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY .....

# Trotsky's Book and its Bourgeois Critics

The Real Situation in Russia, by Leon Trotsky. Translated by Max Eastman, New York. Harcourt, Brace and Company. 389 p. \$2.00 at bookstores or by mail postpaid from *The Militant*.

**I**n this book, written by Trotsky at the height of his powers as a revolutionary fighter and thinker, is to be found, for the first time in English, the authentic platform of the Russian Opposition led by him, and his annihilating reply to the five year campaign of calumny and falsification which has run unchecked and unanswered in the official Communist press of the world.

This reply, after a silence of five years, consists mostly of documentary proofs which completely shatter the edifice of lies and which cannot but make the Communist who has been fed exclusively on official misrepresentation rub his eyes in wonderment. The last letters of Lenin which show that he foresaw the coming struggles and relied on Trotsky to defend his views contain information hitherto unknown by our Party. This information is directly opposite to all we have been told.

The other principle section of the book is the Platform of the Russian Opposition prepared for the Fifteenth Party Congress. Contrary to all Party procedure established under Lenin's leadership, the Platform was outlawed and refused official publication. Oppositionists who attempted to print it illegally were thrown into prison. It has never been published to this day by the Communist International or by any of its affiliated parties.

It is true that our Party, which had never seen it, voted against it "unanimously" as did the other parties, but its validity remains unchanged by these machine-made votes. It is a document of Leninism from the first word to the last. It is the platform on the basis of which alone the Communist Party of the Soviet Union can solve its problems on the revolutionary path. The events themselves which have been transpiring since the outlawing of the platform and the expulsion and exile of its authors testify to this in louder and more insistent tones every day.

We have been told many times that the Platform of the Russian Opposition is "counter-revolutionary", "menshevik", "social-democratic", etc. But, strange to relate, none of these classes and elements, from the big bourgeoisie to its petty-bourgeois and philistine retainers, appreciate it as such. Of course, all enemies of our movement seek to exploit the controversies in our ranks, and the jailing and exiling of the Opposition supporters was no exception. Those who jailed and exiled them—and those whose occupation it is to defend this infamous crime—seek to prove thereby that Trotsky is identified with the imperialist enemies of Soviet Russia and their lackeys. But if we turn to the columns of the bourgeois press to read their sober estimate of *Trotsky's Platform* we find a different, and a highly instructive story.

The authentic organs of Big Capital put their thumbs down on this Platform. And that is not all. The little hangers-on—from the pale, sanitary *New Republic* to the scavenging Jewish *Daily Forward*, from the bourgeois liberal *Nation* to the sex liberal *Modern Quarterly*—all do the same.

The *New York Times*, the most authoritative spokesman of American imperialism, reiterating what it has already said in a score of editorials, says in an unsigned review of "The Real Situation in Russia" by Trotsky and "Leninism" by Stalin, on July 29, 1928:

"Back of Trotsky's political grievance against Stalin is his personal grievance...."

"When we turn from Trotsky to Stalin we find instead of the feverish indignation of a disappointed man the calm and confident arguments of a practical executive who has had no difficulty in adjusting his theories to the daily emergencies of power...."

"The publication of Trotsky's book will doubtless turn some American Communists from Stalinists into Trotskyites. But let us repeat, though it will not make Stalin a hero in the eyes of the sinful bourgeoisie it will probably cause them to rejoice that he and not Trotsky is exercising power in Moscow."

So says the big dog of American imperialism. Let us now turn to the *New Republic* which contains a review of Trotsky's book in its issue of November 7 from the pen of the well-known J. B. S. Hardman (Salutsky), the literary henchman of the labor fakery who rule the Amalgamated Clothing Workers by black-jack and revolver—and expulsion of Communists. We were assured only the other day in the Statement of the C.E.C. that we would be able to rely on the full support of Salutsky in our fight for the platform of the Russian Opposition. But Salutsky seems to have different ideas. In fact, if you make allowances for the differences of style and

manner of expression common to literary people, you will see that his ideas are essentially the same as those of the *New York Times*. He says:

"Trotsky's criticism, obviously overemphasized, will not convince those who are outside the struggle. His repeated claims that he and not the Stalinists are true to the tenets of Leninism will seem queer to the non-orthodox. Indeed, why may not revolutionists occasionally run out of the footsteps of canonized authority? Nor will Stalin be destroyed by pointing to the fact that Lenin had little use for him."

Salutsky goes a step farther and deals a blow at this sentimental nonsense about the imprisonment and exiling of the Oppositionists. He has made editorial defense of the blackjacking of Communists in the Amalgamated Clothing Workers union too many times to have any squeamishness on this point. He writes:

"Trotsky resents the violence which the Stalin regime employs against the Opposition, but Stalin did not father the idea of a one-minded, strait-jacketed party, intolerant of even friendly criticism. Lenin did. Trotsky knows it, and he advanced the argument that 'violence can play an enormous role, but only under one condition—that it is subordinated to true class policy'. But is not Stalin ready to say that his is a true class policy?"

Let the apostles of violence against Communists study the writings of Salutsky. They can get some clever arguments from him. They will also find that this "ally" of Trotsky has a most unique way of "supporting" him:

"Trotsky wishes the party preserved in its revolutionary virginity. He wishes it to remain a party of no compromise, of no trading with capitalism, the enemy. Not so Stalin. He has his ear to the ground. He senses that the early revolutionary zeal is over. Not only the country is tired, the revolutionists themselves are. One may arouse their patriotism for self-defense, but it would be difficult to move them to a crusading march. Hence his theory of 'Socialism in one country'. The Soviet State is a reality. Stalin seeks to preserve it...."

Finally there is the review of Trotsky's book in the "liberal" *Nation* of November 14, 1928, by Albert Rhys Williams, which does nothing but expose Williams as a petty-bourgeois philistine of the grossest sort. For this mere journalist the world-shaking problems raised by the Opposition are resolved into four simple "truths": That the peasant is the real "hero" of the Russian revolution; that the struggle is one between individual leaders; that the documents presented in Trotsky's book have been printed before in the Party press and not suppressed; and that the exiling, imprisonment and disemployment of Opposition workers and leaders is a jocular business which even the Opposition takes in the spirit of good, healthy fun.

Williams declares that the documents printed in Trotsky's book were published and not outlawed or suppressed. This is a conscious, deliberate and typically American journalistic falsehood. The Platform of the Opposition was never, to this very day, printed in the Russian or international Party press. For proof of this turn to *Imprecor*, Vol. 7, No. 64, published Nov. 17, 1927. There in a report of Stalin's speech at the meeting which expelled Trotsky is a whole section which begins "Why did we not print the well known 'Platform of the Opposition'?", and ends "These were the reasons which compelled us to refuse the publication of the 'platform of the Opposition'".

The section of Trotsky's book dealing with the falsification of history by the official apparatus has not been, and is not now printed anywhere in the official Party press. The testament of Lenin, first denied as a forgery but now admitted to be genuine, was not printed anywhere in the Party press. In short, 99 per cent of the material contained in this book of Trotsky's has been either suppressed or outlawed by the machinery and press of the C.P.S.U., the Comintern and its national sections.

So much for Williams' attempt to convince the American Communists that they have already had adequate opportunity to study this material which has never been printed before. But it is in his treatment of the persecution and violence against the Opposition that he reaches the lowest depths of philistinism. According to this shallow "feature-writer" the whole thing was a comradely joke, accompanied by merriment on all sides. He recites that the comrades of one victimized Oppositionist gave him a party on the eve of his departure. For Williams this is proof that exile is a happy event. "A real old time Russian *vecherinka*," says this trifling dilettante. According to him the revolutionist who does not whine under punishment does not feel it. If he had utilized his literary conne-

ctions with our own American revolutionary movement in the days when scores and even hundreds were being sent to prison, he could easily have learned that the last nights of freedom for many of them going off to serve long sentences was made the occasion for parties in their honor at which there was no wailing by the victims, and with equal intelligence he could have passed off the whole affair as a good-natured jest. We might ask this complacent word-juggler, however, to explain the humor in the imprisonment of George Andreytchine and of scores of others who attempted to print the Platform of the Opposition which he says was printed legally. We might ask him for proof that the hundreds and even thousands of Communist workers who were expelled from the Party and simultaneously deprived of employment for supporting the Opposition had absolutely no hard feelings about the matter.

The philistine article of Williams is reprinted from the bourgeois liberal *Nation* by the *Daily Worker* with a eulogistic introduction in which the editor, Robert Minor refers to Trotsky's book as "counter-revolutionary." This, however, does not of itself make Trotsky's case hopeless. It will be remembered that Minor once wrote against Lenin, using for his medium of expression the capitalist press. Minor "changed his mind a little" about Lenin. Why should we not be optimists and trust that he will also learn better in the case of Trotsky?

J. P. C.

## Trotsky, Wolfe and The Forward

In that monstrous swindle which the Party for its own honor will yet repudiate, the booklet by Bertram D. Wolfe on "The Trotsky Opposition. Its Significance for American Workers," the author attempts to prove that among the international "allies" of the Russian Opposition is to be found the yellow socialist Jewish *Daily Forward*. Such an attempt would undoubtedly meet with failure at the hands of ordinary mortals, but for such an expert as Wolfe it seemed to meet with practically no difficulty. After all, we have here an intrepid warrior who once appropriated the Constitution of the United States, the United States Marine Corps, aye, the very battleships themselves, with one fell swoop of his best agit-prop pen....

It is, fortunately, not difficult to find out just where the *Forward* stands. That can be discovered, not by a perusal of Wolfe's romancings—to speak politely—but by clipping the *Forward* itself.

In its issue of Wednesday, November 21, 1928, page 8, it has a leading article by its feature writer, Zivion (Dr. B. Hoffman). Hoffman writes on the expulsion of Cannon, Abern and Shachtman from the Party and greets it gleefully (just as every enemy of the Party will hail the removal from the Party of its revolutionary fighters).

At the same time he is careful to disassociate himself from the political platform and proposals of the Russian Opposition. He writes, literally, as follows:

"And let no one be suspicious that the opinions of Trotsky and his Opposition appeal to me. I have on more than one occasion expressed the opinion that Trotsky's program would be the greatest calamity for Soviet Russia. Because Trotsky's program is a good deal more Communist than Stalin's; and if Soviet Russia is in such a bad condition with Stalin's reformed Communist program, then how much greater would be the troubles in Soviet Russia if Trotsky's consistent Communist program would be adopted?"

The position of the *Forward* is the position of the yellow social-democracy everywhere. It is true that they utilize, as they have done and will continue to do in every such situation, any and every difficulty and difference of opinion that may exist in the Workers State and the ranks of the Communist movement. But on the question of the political content of Trotsky's platform, the *Forward* has been and is following the lead of the *New York Times* and the other authentic organs of the big bourgeoisie who have nothing but condemnation and hatred for it.

Wolfe's attempt to identify the *Forward* with Trotsky is of a piece with his whole compendium of falsehood. Lying about Trotsky, an occupation safe enough when there were no opportunities for refutation, becomes highly dangerous now that the means for the latter are at hand. The sooner Wolfe, who is known for speed, runs away from this danger the better it will be for him.