

The MILITANT

Semi-Monthly of the
Communist League of America
(Opposition)

VOL. II. No. 12

NEW YORK, N. Y., AUGUST 1st, 1929.

PRICE 5 CENTS

War Clouds in the East China Provokes Russia

China's seizure of the Chinese Eastern Railway in Manchuria, jointly owned by China and the Soviet Union, and the brutal arrest of Soviet citizens, mark a criminal attempt by the Chinese counter-revolution to provoke a war against the Workers' Republic.

The Soviet Union was the first country in the world to renounce all rights of extra-territoriality in China and to return all the concessions extorted by carism from the Chinese people — a step taken by none of the imperialist powers. In 1924, the two countries reached an amicable agreement on the joint control and administration of the Chinese Eastern Railway, built by czarist Russia. The movement for Chinese liberation from imperialism has always found the warmest response from the workers and peasants of Russia. Now, taking advantage of Russia's deliberate policy of peace, the Chinese government has taken this provocative step designed to outrage the Soviets and force them to war.

The seizure of the Chinese Eastern Railway is the logical outcome of the counterrevolutionary course pursued by Chiang Kai-Shek and the other leaders of the Kuo Min Tang. The Russian masses must now pay for the menshevik policy applied in the Chinese revolution of 1925-27 by the Stalin-Bucharin controlled Executive of the Comintern which served as a brake on the revolutionary movement of the workers and peasants, chained them and the Communist Party to the chariot of the bourgeois Kuo Min Tang, and facilitated the victory of Stalin's allies, the counter-revolutionary generals of Chiang Kai-Shek's stripe. The result of this policy — the setting back of the Chinese revolutionary movement for years, and the triumph of reaction — has made it possible for Chiang Kai-Shek to proceed against the Soviets with such brazen cynicism without encountering substantial resistance by the Chinese masses.

This resistance must be made to China's provocation by the workers of the entire world. The Soviet Union remains the fortress of the world revolution, a source of strength to labor everywhere, and the working class throughout the world must rally to its defense immediately. The workers must be on their guard against all possible developments on a larger scale. Up to the present time, there are few signs that the Chinese action is being supported by foreign imperialism. This is not because the imperialists love Russia more and Chiang Kai-Shek less. It is because they fear the establishment of a precedent that the present Chinese rulers would use against the concessions and extra-territoriality rights that England, France, Japan and others took from China by force. It is because the imperialistic powers are now striving against each other for Russia's trade. Credits from Germany, coming recognition from England and the United States and similar signs, are all indicative of this. That explains the peculiar "neutrality" or Soviet "friendliness" of the world imperialist press. The Japanese press has condemned the action of the Chinese, because they fear similar action against their properties in Manchuria. The Daily Worker reports that the most influential German papers have attacked China. The French, and the American press, led by the New York Times, have adopted a "neutral" or "favorable" attitude. The leading organ of the British imperialism in China, the Peiping and Tientsin Times, regards the action as "a flagrant violation of a solemn international agreement" and warns China against attempts at war.

And both Secretary of State Stimson and the French foreign minister, Briand, are calling attention to both parties that they are joint signatories to the Kellogg Pact! Russia's signature of the Kellogg Pact, that smoke-screen for imperialist war preparation, is not standing it in very good stead, as we pointed out some time ago.

In spite of all this, the workers must bear in mind the possibility of a highly dangerous situation developing. The fundamental antagonism between the Soviet Union and world imperialism remains. Should the Chinese counter-revolutionists and the Russian White guards proceed to large-scale military attack, necessitating the withdrawal of Russian forces from the Western frontier, the Baltic tools of European imperialism, led by Pileudski, may use the opportunity for a counter-revolutionary assault from the west. The imperialists want Russian trade, but if the possibility is given them, they want the complete overthrow of the proletarian dictatorship even more.

Every worker on guard! Now more than ever is the united strength of the working class imperative. Now more than ever must there be the unity and consolidation of Russia's revolutionary forces against the reactionary elements inside and outside the Soviet Union. Now more than ever is the return of the expelled and exiled Bolshevik-Leninists necessary for the Communist Party. Now more than ever is it necessary to recall L. D. Trotsky to his rightful place as leader of the invincible Red Army.

Long live victory of the Russian proletariat!
Down with the red-handed assassins of the people!

FIRST OF AUGUST!

What will "International Red Day" bring

(This document has been prepared and signed by the editors of the new international Magazine "Opposition" which is soon to appear.)

"The Western European Bureau of the Communist International" has summoned the workers of the whole world to demonstrate in the streets on the First of August. This demonstration has been appointed as an answer to the bloody repression by the German social democrats of the vanguard of the Berlin workers. That the historic crime perpetrated on the First of May cannot and will not remain unavenged — no revolutionist has any doubt of that. The only question is, when and how we can avenge ourselves on the social democracy and its bourgeois boss for the bloody attack upon the May day manifestation of the workers. The method chosen by the Comintern is wrong to the bottom. It is the mere preparation of a new defeat.

The May Day demonstration is a traditional demonstration of the proletariat appointed once and for all to take place upon a definite day of the year — independently of the course of the international and national life of the proletariat. But the whole history of the May Day celebration shows that it never hung suspended above the real course of the worker's movement, but was wholly determined by this movement and subordinate to it. In parties carrying on a peaceful reformist work it was transformed from the beginning into a peaceful manifestation and had lost before the war all its revolutionary feature. In countries where an energetic struggle was in progress for the universal franchise, the May Day celebration was transformed into a constituent part of this struggle. In Russia the May Day celebration was identified with the revolutionary struggle against Czarism and from 1905 on changed with all its changes: from stormy attack to complete quiescence. We saw the same thing in Germany after the war.

The recent May Day celebration naturally reflected those processes which have lately found their

expression in the life of the trade unions, in the municipal and parliamentary elections, especially in England and Belgium, and in many other more trivial manifestations of the life of the working class. The political stabilization of the bourgeoisie during the last six years has found its chief support in the policy of the Comintern, which has guaranteed the defeat of the proletariat in Germany, China, England, Poland, Bulgaria, a weakening of its position in the U. S. S. R., a consistent desintegration of the Comintern and a reviving of the social democracy. The political stabilization of the bourgeoisie has been the necessary premise of its economic stabilization which in turn has weakened the possibility of direct revolutionary activity.

COMINTERN POLICY IN ENGLAND

In its more concentrated form this whole situation has recently come before us in England, where only three years ago the proletariat passed through its revolutionary general strike. In a country where capitalism is suffering a gigantic crisis of decline, and where all the leaders of the workers' organizations have succeeded in disgracing themselves with an unheard of betrayal, the Communist Party has revealed itself at the polls as totally insignificant in size. For quite a number of years the Comintern and the Red International of Labor Unions have been announcing to the whole world that in the movement of the revolutionary minority of the trade unions there are about a million workers who follow the Communist banner. The unemployed together with the grown members of families would give us at least over two million voters. The miners, who have just come through an immense strike and are compelled to work under worsened conditions, would give all most as many. Out of this three or four million it would seem as if at least a decent share ought to have fallen to the lot of the Communist Party. And what happened? Nominating 27 candidates in the districts

CONTINUED ON PAGE SEVEN.

Gastonia in Danger

As the day of the trial, July 29, approaches, it becomes increasingly clear that the southern Bourbons are determined to go through with their plans to "legally" murder the 15 strike leaders who have been indicted in Gastonia, North Carolina, for the major crime of arousing the serfs of the textile barons to struggle. The judicial henchmen of the southern lords want to execute at least some of the 15 workers who defended themselves against the murderous raid of the local fascists. By this punishment they intend to make an example of those workers who dared to challenge the might of their bosses, and particularly of the "Bolsheviks from the North" who organized and led them.

The southern reactionaries rightly see in the Communists the most militant fighters against exploitation, their most dangerous foes. They know that in the recent battles on the textile front in the South, the Communists have done more to arouse a spirit of resistance and independence among the violently suppressed southern workers than have the years of do-nothing "organization work" carried on by the American Federation of Labor payroll boys. That is why the lynching spirit aimed to cow the southern textile workers is aimed most directly at the Communists.

The 1922 raid of the Communists in Bridgmann was carried out by the reaction in order to strike a blow against the whole labor movement, against the fighting spirit of the steel, railroad, mine and textile workers. In the same sense, the lynching of the 15 strike militants-Communists and non-Party fighters — is being planned to intimidate the rising labor movement in the South which has broken out in three separate places in as many months: Gastonia, Elizabethton and New Orleans. The south is a huge reservoir of strength and fighting capacity for the whole labor movement of the United States. If the capitalist class succeeds in damning this reservoir and directing its flow into the channel of scabbery, the whole labor movement will suffer. The Gastonia trial is such an attempt.

That is why the American working class everywhere must rally swiftly to the defense of Gastonia. It must march to its aid now, and not when it is too late. It cannot remain indifferent to the fate of its class brothers without endangering its own fate. It must march in united columns. Past experiences have shown the mortal blow that divided and sectarian action has delivered in similar instances. In the Sacco-Vanzetti case, the Boston Committee of socialists and anarchists attempted to mono-

England Bars Trotsky

One of the first acts of the new British Labor Government has been to deny the right of asylum to L. D. Trotsky, the exiled organizer of the Russian Revolution and the Red Army. Definite announcement of this decision was made in the House of Commons on July 11th according to a dispatch printed in the New York Times. The MacDonald Government, which has been issuing daily announcements that it intends to do nothing harmful to the capitalist system of exploitation, list no time in buttressing the promises with a concrete and significant deed.

MacDonald never tired of condemning the Proletarian Dictatorship, which Trotsky symbolizes, on the ground of its lack of "democracy." The exclusion of Trotsky illustrates again what these footmen of Imperialism mean by "democracy." In their subservience to the capitalist masters they cast aside the traditional right of asylum which England once gave to Marx and Mazzini.

The real masters of the British Empire are well pleased with this act of their "Labor" Minister. "Tories cheer Labor Minister's announcement in Commons" says the New York Times. And why shouldn't they cheer? The class conscious capitalists clearly understand what Trotsky represents. The Times editorial says: "Foreign Secretary Henderson definitely stated that before diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia are resumed definite pledges will be required that no Communist agitation in England is to be encouraged or permitted by the Moscow authorities. That is asking a good deal. If they give so much they will expect something in return. The exclusion of Trotsky from a refuge on British soil would be something."

The Times, which interprets the big capitalist point of view unerringly, remarks: "In all this Russian affair, as in others, Prime Minister MacDonald is proceeding with notable and praiseworthy caution." What is needed now is an editorial from the New Leader, explaining how the barring of Trotsky from England proves the superiority of bourgeois democracy over workers dictatorship as a form of government. And — to round out the affair with the unanimous and harmonious agreement of all parties, we need an editorial from the Daily Worker on the subject, applauding the exclusion of Trotsky as a at the counter-revolution. These editorials are

FINISHED ON PAGE

The End of the Cloakmakers Strike

The New York cloakmakers' strike was primarily an expression of the fact that they are beginning to recover from the disorganization, indifference and defeat and aspiring to reconstitute their organization and reestablish the union conditions which were wrested from them. Due to the combined strength of the bosses and the Right wing leaders of the state and city authorities who intervened actively, and thanks to the great errors of the Left wing leadership, this new movement of the workers as diverted for the time being into class collaboration channels and failed of its object.

The strike called by the International Ladies Garment Workers Union was brought to a shameful conclusion by the Right wing union leaders. With the exception of the "closed shop," not a single one of the important demands announced at the beginning of the strike has been achieved in the final settlement between the union and the bosses' association. The socialist pillars of the union, Schlesinger, Ninfo and Co., have not shown improvement over their treacherous record of the past, and the situation is pretty bad when even the yellow New York Forward is constrained to admit (July 17, 1929): "It would be wrong to maintain that the cloakmakers got everything they were entitled to in the present strike and settlement."

Here are the results of the first skirmish in the new period of rise of the Right wing leadership in the ladies garment industry:

There is no provision made in the agreement for an increase in wages for the workers, despite their present straitened conditions, and the assurance of the leaders that the strike would result in a wage raise.

There is no provision made in the agreement for the establishment of the unemployment insurance fund, a burning need for the workers. Like the wage increase, the prospect for it is dangled before the eyes of the workers for some future time when the arbitration commission will deem it necessary and advisable!

FACTS ABOUT THE SETTLEMENT

There is no definite and unmistakable abolition of the malevolent piece-work system, and no guarantees are established for wiping it out of the industry. Promises on paper serve as guarantees only for the bosses.

There is no positive assurance of the institution of the 40-hour week (5-day week) in the industry.

The infamous "reorganization" right is still granted to the bosses in the new agreement. What is even worse than this is the right granted to the bosses by the union to discharge any worker — except for reasons of "union activity" — subject to appeal to the "impartial" commission. The Right is trumpeting this point as a victory for the workers, when in reality it is aimed directly at the workers, and at the militant, class conscious workers in particular. "Union activity" under the regime of the Schlesingers, as the workers have learned to know, is limited to activity against the opponents of the bureaucracy. The discharge right is aimed at those workers in the shop who fight for the rights and interests of the cloakmakers, who dare to tell the boss where to get off at, and above all, at those workers who dare to express any criticism of the leading clique of the union and its misdeeds. The discharge right signifies joint control by the bosses and the union bureaucrats over the job of the workers who can henceforth open his mouth only at the risk of having to look for work elsewhere. It is the old game played by Lewis and the operators against the militant miner, by Hillman and Co. against the Left wing tailor, and by Schlesinger, Sigman and Co. when they were at the helm in the past. Many have been the workers who were left breadless or driven out of the industry after such a "victory" as this.

To cap the betrayal of the workers by Schlesinger is the unconcealed spirit of class collaboration that characterized the course of the strike and that is now fastened on to the backs of the cloakmakers through the settlement. The entry of the Lieutenant-Governor Lehmann and Mayor Walker, two of the best wheel-horses of Tammany Hall, into the strike as "arbiters" of the dispute was gleefully hailed by these "socialist" leaders who have long ago dumped the class struggle from their train as excess baggage. The workers were asked to offer up thanks to these Tammany Hall standpatters as the saviors and patrons of the oppressed. Furthermore, the settlement calls for the establishment of a permanent "impartial arbitration" commission to which all disputes will be referred. The "impartial" chairman who will sacrifice himself to this work at the miserable salary of \$25,000 a year is Mr. Raymond Ingersoll, another Tammany hack.

ORGANIZING THE BOSSES

Worst of all, the union obligates itself to force all independent bosses to join the bosses' associations. That is, the union of the workers is supposed to become the agent, the organizer for the unions of the bosses. The workers are to become the instruments for forging a solid, united front of the bosses so that they may the better be able to break the unity of the workers, Schlesinger in the role of a procurer for the manufacturers' Industrial Council — that is a living portrait of the "socialist" trade union leader in his prime.

There is not the faintest excuse for this treachery to the workers. At least 20,000 workers — the decisive majority — responded to the call of the Right wing union. A few thousand others went down in reply to the call of the Left wing Industrial Union. The Right wing was in the position to hold out for the demands of the workers, to gain a far better settlement than they did — if they had been inter-

industry will convince the veriest child that this is not the case.

Why was the Right wing able to carry through their betrayal with such comparative ease? The explanation is not entirely with the answer that they were in a shameless united front with the machinery of the capitalist state (Tammany Hall, from Albany to the City Hall) and the cloak bosses. That was undoubtedly a powerful factor. But the other factor that contributed mightily to the success of the Right wing fakery was the enormous errors of the Left wing. These errors must be condemned precisely because they played into the hands of the Right wing and strengthened the latter.

ERRORS OF THE LEFT WING

In the first place, the Left wing — and we speak specifically of the Communist Party which acted through the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union — displayed eminent confusion; where it did have a policy it was the wrong one. The Left wing showed no initiative in the struggle. Its position was that if the Right wing called a strike then the Left wing would transform it into a real strike. By this act alone they automatically gave the Right wing the first word; they surrendered the head of the movement to the Right and left themselves the role of tail end.

The Left wing did not issue the slogan of unity in the struggle, and it was under this slogan that the Left wing gained its big strength among the needle trades workers, reaching its height in 1926-27. Instead of the slogan and practice of unity, the only demand of the Left was an appeal to the workers to make it a real strike — by walking down from the shops and coming to the Left wing halls. The workers did not understand this "brilliant" maneuver, this "novel" way of uniting the workers to struggle against the bosses in a strike. The result was, despite all the self-deception and exaggeration of the official Party press, that the bulk of the workers went to the Right wing halls and not to the Left.

What the Left wing should have done was to "organize concerted actions of all workers' organizations" and "take into consideration that in countries in which there are several trade union headquarters, every action of the workers, particularly in the event of the general strike, is threatened with great danger, if the trade unions will not fight jointly;" that "the revolutionary trade union officials should taken upon themselves the initiative to create the united front," as is correctly stated by the second Congress of the R. I. L. U.

The Left wing, as soon as there was a prospect of a strike by the Right wing, should have made proposals for joint action to guarantee the solidarity of the workers' front against the bosses, guarding at the same time its own independence and its right of criticism and agitation. Proposals for unity could have been made even to the Right wing leaders, yes,

War in the Indep't Workmen's Circle

In the last days of May was held the convention of the Independent Workmen's Circle at Chicago.

The Independent Workmen's Circle is a radical and fraternal organization which has been in existence for the last 23 years. It has always been in opposition to the Workmen's Circle because the Forward clique always had the control over the latter and would force it to adopt its methods. The best part of the I. W. C. was that members of any political party could join it and preach openly their ideas. The left wing had a free field for propaganda there.

The Workmen's Circle suppressed the left wing movement because that was the order of the Forward and the S. P. With the impractical work of the Communists in the Workmen's Circle they were absolutely defeated. Now the same impractical methods are used in the I. W. C. Before the convention the W. P. tried to organize a few small branches of left wingers with the aim to "capture" the convention of the I. W. C. With a majority of nine votes they adopted resolutions that would be good only for a party convention and not for a non-partisan fraternal organization whose membership is composed of left wingers, nationalists, small business men and workers who don't belong or sympathize with any political party.

As soon as these resolutions were accepted at the Convention a revolt began in the I. W. C. The first revolt started in Beson and a meeting of more than three hundred people was held Wednesday, June 26, in the American House with Mr. Oripow as chairman. The chairman began his speech with the following words: "Last Monday's Freiheit editorial and today's editorial of the Freiheit attacked me as a right winger and an enemy of the working class. I shall state since I was 16 years old I became a worker and I am working in a shoe factory today. I gave away my activity for the working class and I am doing so at the present. I was never a right winger. I always was a sympathizer with the left wing movement. When the Freiheit made the first appeal since its publication to the I. W. C. I made a motion to the National Executive to support the Freiheit with \$300. That will show that the slander of the Freiheit is not true."

A few telegrams and letters were read to the mass meeting declaring their support. Especially it should be mentioned that a telegram of the second largest branch in the organization, Number 15, which is also considered to be a left wing branch, pledged its support to the new revolt for a free platform and non-partisan organization.

"We were never afraid to fight against the trio: the Forward the W. C. and the trade union bureaucracy left wingers in the Jewish movement. We have donated \$300 to

even to the Schlesingers and Dubinskys provided that the Left wing would simultaneously carry on a persistent agitation for such unity below, in the ranks of the workers themselves. The Left wing had a splendid opportunity to agitate for and form joint strike or action committees in the shops, composed of workers belonging to both unions and those standing outside of either. There were numerous other weapons at the command of the Left for the organization of the unity of the workers, but they chose none of them.

Instead of placing the stigma of division where it belongs, on the Right wing leaders, instead of showing the workers clearly where the responsibility lies for the split in the workers' ranks, the course followed by the Left wing enabled the Right wing to escape from under and to burden the Left with the responsibility for divided action. The test of the correctness of the policy lies with the results: the Right is today stronger and the Left weaker than either of them has been for the last 3 or 4 years.

PREPARE FOR THE FUTURE

This ominous fact, the result of the irresponsible ultra-Left course of our American Stalinists, is common knowledge among the workers in "the market." Unless it is taken into serious consideration by the Party and Left wing union leaders, and their tactics changed accordingly, the Left wing will be in a still worse position. The starting point for such a change is a recognition of the unpleasant truth that so far as the cloakmakers are concerned, the Right wing now has the upper hand. The Left wing must proceed to win back those workers who now follow the Right either because of conviction or job compulsion. Despite every effort of the Right to isolate the Left wing, the latter must find ways of establishing the closest contact with the workers in the shops. It must be recognized that in many cases Left wing workers will have to submit to the necessity of joining the Right wing union in order to be able to work side by side with the less advanced workers and mobilize them in the shop and in the Right wing union for a renewed struggle for unity and against the class collaborationist Right wing and their policy of betrayal.

The cloak strike movement was only a hesitant beginning, a sign and a promise of deeper struggles to come for the actual realization of the aims which the workers failed to accomplish under the Right wing. The growth of the militancy of the workers and the strengthening of their spirit can be safely relied upon. The question of tactics and leadership will have a decisive bearing on the results of these coming struggles. The present failure is not a permanent one. With the help of correct tactics and resolute leadership on the part of the Left wing the advance of the Rights can be pushed back and the present situation turned into a mere episode. Only by becoming an undetachable segment of the needle trades masses will the Left wing make progress and finally defeat the Right. The militant tradition of the workers and the unsavory record of the Right are a guarantee of the victory. The word lies with the Left wing workers. — M. S.

attacked Soviet Russia and the American Communists as spies and provocators — L. S.) For the last few years we have done everything for the left wing movement. Now the Communist Party came to Chicago after the wonderful work we have done for the left wing movement, after we have accepted the left wing workers, where they were expelled from the W. C. as individual members and as branches in our organization. Now the Communist Party came to Chicago and made a pogrom and tried to discredit our active members as counter revolutionists, enemies of Soviet Russia. We were helping to build the new needle trade union. We are organizing an I. W. C. "Village" in Russia."

When the chairman tried to introduce the next speaker, Mr. Wilson (the first chairman of the I. W. C.), "comrade" Marx, manager of the Freiheit, who is a member a few months in the I. W. C. and was one of the steering committee, stood and with a few of his sympathizers made so much noise that it was brought to a fist fight. Thus the meeting was broken up and adjourned.

The steering committee had prepared in advance a hall downstairs. The Freiheit manager shouted, "all the left wingers should go downstairs in the hall." But only a few followed him. The left wingers who were in the hall did not agree with the hooligan methods of the steering committee. By these methods the Party is being discredited among the sincere sympathizers in the left wing and the right wing reactionaries gain ground in the Jewish labor movement.

L. Schlossberg,
Ex-National Executive Committee,
Independent Workmen's Circle.

THE MILITANT

Published twice a month by the Communist League of America (Opposition)

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

Publisher address at 332 East 18th Street, New York, N. Y.

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

Associate Editors:
Editor
James P. Cannon
Martin Abern
Max Shachtman
Maurice Spector

VOL. II AUGUST 1st, 1929. No. 12

Entered as second-class mail matter November 28, 1928, at the Post Office at N. Y. N. Y. under

The Crisis in the Communist Party

By James P. Cannon

The crisis in the American Communist movement is a part of the crisis in the International which has been maturing over a period of years. The Communist movement throughout the world is paying, in disintegration and defeat, for the false leadership of Stalin Centrism and the mechanical extermination of the Leninist wing.

The American Party was slow to manifest open reactions to the International crisis, and particularly slow to develop a conscious participation in the world struggle over the basic questions which lie at the bottom of the crisis, but it is catching up now with devastating speed. And what we see now is only a beginning. Greater storms are ahead. The life of the movement is at stake. Only those who rouse themselves to think and act can play the part of Communist soldiers now and in the days ahead. Theological worshippers of formulae handed down from above, automatic hand raisers, are worse than useless. The cult of "corpse obedience" serves only the bureaucratic destroyers and holds back the awakening of the movement and its regeneration.

It is necessary first of all to tear aside the curtain of falsehood, deception and trickery behind which the pitiful subsidized agents of American Stalinism try to conceal the real state of affairs from the party. The spurious "enlightenment campaign" is such a curtain. It talks of discussion of the issues—and prohibits it by organization measures and threats. It crusades against factionalism—under the direction of the most unprincipled and corrupted faction mongers. It cries about the unity of the party—and plunges the party headlong into a new split, the second in less than a year. The "enlightenment campaign" is a bare-faced fraud, an insult to the party and a target for the ridicule of its enemies.

Contempt for the Communist rank and file is a characteristic of Stalinism which rules by apparatus compulsion and corrupts by subsidy. Take the case of Lovestone. For years the Stalin E. C. C. I. supported him in his criminal factionalism; time and time again it interfered to strengthen his control of the party. Foster was his comrade-in-arms in the expulsion of the Opposition Communists. Stachel, Bedacht & Co. were his partners in every perfidious faction manoeuvre, assuring the Party that he represented the line of the Communist International. With the help of the E. C. C. I. and with the help of Stachel, Bedacht and Weinstein he gained the support of 90 per cent of the delegates at the Party Convention a few months ago. Now, out of a clear sky, without Lovestone having changed his character or his actions in the slightest detail, he is expelled from the Party as an opportunist and renegade. And Stachel, Bedacht and Weinstein conduct a campaign to "enlighten" the party about the matter; explaining, however, that they, like Saul of Tarsus, suddenly saw the light and can now be trusted safely.

THE STALINISTS AND THE RIGHT WING

Why should anyone be surprised if the enemies of Communism laugh and if the party members and sympathetic workers fall away in bewilderment and disgust? When we spoke at the December Plenum of the Central Executive Committee about the growth of the right wing in the Russian Party and the crisis in the Right-Center Bloc, we were accused of scandal mongering and "speculation". Pepper, who made the report against us, denied the existence of any differences between Stalin and Bucharin, and Foster nodded approval of the statement. Now the Party, which was left in ignorance of all the developments, is blandly informed that Lovestone is aligned with the Russian and International right wing and therefore must be expelled.

The Party member who takes official pronouncements on faith does not understand this rigamarole—and for a good reason. The Right-Center Bloc (Stalin-Rykov-Bucharin) which has ruled the International through the six-year war against "Trotzkyism" has conspired all the time to prevent the Communist workers from knowing the truth about the conflict within it. Up to the present moment the identity of the leaders of the right wing (Rykov-Bucharin-Tomsky) has not been disclosed in the official Party press, although everyone knows it except the "loyal" Party member who is supposed to know everything. The question of the right wing in the Russian Party is indeed a burning question of the International movement; the fate of the Russian Revolution, of the Comintern and, consequently, of our Party is bound up with it. But the "enlightenment campaign" only obscures and muddles the great issue, keeps the membership from understanding it and thus strengthens the right wing and Lovestone, its outstanding American representative.

The new manoeuvre of Stalin Centrism which brands Lovestone as an opportunist and expels him from the Party—seven months after he expelled us—cannot change the position of the Communist Opposition on any of the principle questions, above all on the question of the right wing. It was the Bolshevik-Leninists in the Russian Party—the "Trotskysts"—who analyzed its social basis and exposed its Thermidorian character. The Opposition alone wages a real struggle against it in defense of the Proletarian Dictatorship. The present sham battle of the Centrists against the right wing is carried out only under the whip of the Opposition.

The newly appointed leadership of the Party, in order to create confusion, spreads rumors of a combination between the Opposition Communists and the Lovestone faction. Weinstein "predicts" such an eventuality in his article in the Daily Worker. These people who themselves change with every wind and every cablegram from Moscow do not understand a struggle on principle lines. The Weinsteins and Foster

Lovestone in every infamous practice against loyal Communists, who were his accomplices in gangsterism, in burglary and slander, make this accusation with ill grace.

THE OPPOSITION AND THE RIGHT WING

There can be no combination of the Communist Opposition with the Lovestone faction. A serious discussion in which the political issues are elucidated will make this absolutely clear. When we speak of the Lovestone faction in this sense it goes without saying that we refer to the leaders only and not to the honest Communist workers who have been deceived by them with the help of the E. C. C. I. Many of these are already finding their way to our platform and will be among its staunchest defenders.

The right wing of the Russian Party, with which Lovestone is unquestionably connected, is the representative of the class forces in the Soviet Union which are driving the restoration of capitalism. This fact, now openly proclaimed by the Stalinists, was also the case when it was in one bloc with Stalin to exterminate the Leninist wing of the Party, and its bloodthirsty campaign against the "Trotskysts" was the clearest expression of its Thermidorian character. The dissolution of the Communist International would be an inevitable corollary of its victory. For those who want to fight for the preservation of our communist movement, any kind of support for the right faction—to say nothing of a bloc with its American agents—cannot be spoken of lightly; it cannot be spoken of at all. An absolutely irreconcilable war against the right wing is the first and foremost duty of the American Opposition Communists.

The idea that the right wing Thermidorian elements in the Russian Party can really espouse "party democracy"—an idea suggested in an editorial in the New York Volkszeitung—is the greatest and most dangerous illusion. The right wing, by its very nature, by the class forces of capitalist restoration it represents, had to demand the fiercest and most criminal repression of the Bolshevik-Leninists and to drive the Stalin Centrists who were allied with them onto this path. The condition for the existence and growth of the right wing is the annihilation of the Leninists who are fighting for the October revolution and the regeneration of the Comintern on the line of Lenin. "Democracy" for the right wing is only an expedient in the faction struggle with the Centrist Apparatus, not a principle of party organization which they would or could apply.

This is true also in America. The Lovestone who demands party democracy expelled the Opposition Communists from the Party for their views alone. They went further—the Lovestones and Fosters together—and expelled Communist proletarians for merely protesting against the expulsion of the others. Party democracy is an absolute prerequisite for the Party. It will be the mightiest weapon in the hands of the proletarian elements for the salvation and regeneration of the movement and for its normal development on the revolutionary path. But Lovestone is not and cannot be the champion of this slogan.

FAILURE OF NEW LEADERSHIP

The re-unification of the Party and the elimination of factionalism are categorical tasks for the accomplishment of which the conscious revolutionaries must band together and fight. The "Open Address" and the measures which followed it have not and cannot solve this problem. Crisis, splits, paralysis and disintegration are the results so far. And the coming period will only intensify the crisis, widen the splits and increase the demoralization until the course is changed. To bring this change about a discussion and an education of the Party, a correct line of tactics in the class struggle and a bona-fide leadership, freely chosen by the Party and standing on its own feet, are necessary. They are lacking now.

The present make-shift leadership, a conglomeration of yes-men and parasitical place-hunters who confess their sins for self-advancement, patched together from the tag ends of the old factions and appointed by cablegram from above, cannot overcome the crisis and unite the Party. The stop-gap leadership of today only makes matters worse. It has all the faults of the Lovestone regime without any of its strength or independence. It confuses the Party by giving the outward appearance of a change from petty bourgeois politicianism and factional corruption which does not exist in reality.

Lovestone is out but Stachel remains. And Stachel is in charge of the campaign against factionalism. Is this not a spectacle for gods and men? Stachel, the organizer and right-hand man of Lovestone in every evil enterprise of disruption, the most dubious character that ever floated to the top in the foul waters of party factionalism, an individual with no tradition, experience, ability or integrity, the faction-monger who lived by factionalism—Stachel has made the sign of the cross and become the apostle of unity.

Wolfe is removed from the Political Committee and Wicks, equally characterless and with far less ability, takes his place. Gitlow is slated to go but Bedacht, who by his own confession was steeped in moral and political corruption, is promoted. Add a few Amters and Tallentires—the numer makes no difference because they weigh nothing—and Foster. This is the "new leadership".

The new leadership has no real authority. Its temporary existence signifies the abolition of a genuine leading body and the establishment of a receivership over the Party by the Stalin E. C. C. I. This so-called leadership enjoys no confidence in the Party ranks and the "loyal" Party members who want salvation by faith alone are falling back on the

itly this is literally the case. The C. E. C. is only the rubber stamp for the Representative of the E. C. C. I. who in turn relies on cabled instructions at every change in the situation. The C. E. C. does not even venture to write its own statements; this is obvious from their language. Such expressions as "defeat" all efforts of drawing the Party away from the political path of the 6th Congress" and "sending the direction to the devil" show that the C. E. C. does not even do a decent job of translating the statements it signs.

STRENGTHENING THE RIGHT WING

Their method of "fighting" the right wing only strengthens it as an ideology in the Party. There is no education of the party on the political issues. The victories over the right are mechanical and temporary. The Lovestone right wing was nurtured too long to be suddenly uprooted by decree.

The political line of the leadership is heading toward catastrophic defeats for the Party which will weaken its position in the class struggle and sharpen the crisis in the party. The false tactics of counterfeit leftism in the preparations for the T. U. E. L. Conference, in the Gastonia defense, in the Needle Trades and in other questions will bring swift and devastating reactions.

The leadership which promises to unite the Party will itself fall apart into factions, in fact it is already doing so. The groupings which are taking place around Foster on the one side and Bedacht on the other are common knowledge in the circles of informed functionaries. These are not purely arbitrary and personal groupings, as may appear. They have a political base in the impulse of Foster, whose real trend is toward labor progressivism, to find a way out of the blind alley of fake leftism on the trade union field and the wish of Bedacht to "make good" for his confessed sins of opportunism. This base will widen as the harmful results of the present tactics accumulate. Under the impact of the class struggle, and of the blows of the right wing on the one side and the Communist Opposition on the other, the present Central Executive Committee lacking independence of thought and action and any real principle foundation, is doomed to defeat and collapse.

Stalinism is breaking up the ranks of International Communism, and the American section is now beginning to feel the full force of the International crisis. This is the meaning of the crisis in the Party. The Communist forces must reform themselves and build anew. Help will not come from above; the source of the disruption lies there. The struggle against disintegration must be organized from below. The revolutionary workers must awaken. They must give up blind obedience and begin to think and to act independently. The struggle must cease to be an affair of the bureaucratic upper crust and become the concern of the Communist workers in the mass. The development of the initiative of the Party ranks and their conscious intervention in the struggle is the hope for the future of the movement. This means, as a beginning, a fight for definite aims along the following lines:

THE WAY OUT OF THE CRISIS

1. In place of the fraudulent "enlightenment campaign", a real discussion of the three political tendencies which are now taking definite shape in the American Party. Such a discussion calls for the publication of all important documents and a free opportunity to explain and clarify the conflicting views. Only in this way can the Party be educated politically and enabled to act consciously, solving its problems without inner convulsions. We stand for such a discussion because we know that in it the Leninist line will prevail and the right wing, which thrives on bureaucratic measures, will be politically annihilated.

2. Genuine party democracy in place of the regime of administrative terror and suppression. A situation must be created where nothing is taken for granted and where incompetent bureaucrats can no longer hide behind official authority. The members must assert and take the right to speak out what they think without fearing organization measures and threats. The reinstatement of the expelled Oppositionists with full rights to defend their views is the first prerequisite. Without this party democracy is a sham.

3. A genuine proletarianization of the leadership in which bona-fide workers, leaders in class struggle activities who have independent opinions and the ability to defend them, play an active part in all the leading bodies. This must replace the present system of electing harmless proletarian elements for show purposes only.

4. A reorganization and reduction of the Party apparatus which, including the functionaries and employees of auxiliaries, now exceeds ten per cent of the Party membership. These paid officials, remote from the actualities of the class struggle, are a crust over the party, stifling its normal life and monopolizing party discussion and direction. The drastic reduction of this staff and the election of fresh worker elements will strengthen and invigorate party life.

5. Subsidies of all kinds must be absolutely abolished and the Party adjusted to operate by its own means derived from membership dues and contributions. Opposition to subsidy is no principle. Mutual assistance of revolutionary parties has played a positive role in the past and no doubt will do so in the future. But in the present situation subsidy has become an instrument for corruption, for bureaucratization and crushing out independent life. Opposition to subsidy under these conditions is a fight for the integrity of the Party.

6. The Party must have a real Convention, preceded by an honest discussion and the honest selection of

Karl Radek and the Opposition

During the last few weeks there has been considerable talk in the world press about the "disintegration" of the Russian Opposition and comrade Radek has often been called the leader of the group that is joining Stalin. The uninformed — and they are the majority in the West — may conclude from this that Radek has only lately turned from the Opposition to the apparatus Centrists. In reality, comrade Radek's hesitation has been going on for about a year and a half. It would be still more correct to say that comrade Radek's path, beginning with 1923, has crossed with the line of the Opposition only to turn from it to the Right or to the Left — mostly to the Right — and then again to meet with it. Up till 1926 Radek held that it would be impossible to carry through any economic policy other than that of Stalin-Bucharin. Up till 1927 Radek was under the illusion that it would be possible to work together with Bandler and his group. Radek was against the Chinese Communist Party leaving the Kuo Ming Tang. After the general strike in England, Radek was against the dissolution of the Anglo-Russian Committee. After the Right and Left Kuo Min Tang had betrayed the revolution, Radek was against the slogan of the proletarian dictatorship and for that of the "democratic" dictatorship, interpreting that the same way Stalin, Bucharin and Martinov did. In 1923-4 Radek argued that the theory of the permanent revolution was basically one with the strategic line of Lenin. In 1928 he attempted to build up a complete contradiction in this question between Lenin and Trotsky. He had to repeat, with minor reservations, Zinoviev's hackneyed arguments. On the other hand, on the question of the Thermidor and two Parties, Radek went ultra-Left in 1927. He attempted several times to proclaim that the Thermidor was already "accomplished." For a time he refused to sign the Platform only because it spoke too categorically for a single Party. There is nothing unnatural in this combination of ultra-Left conclusions and Right premises. On the contrary, the history of the Comintern is replete with such combinations. Nor is there anything unnatural in Radek's going over so easily from ultra-Left deductions on the question of the Thermidor and two Parties to the road of unprincipled conciliation with regard to the Left-Centrist zig-zag. We have seen also in other countries, particularly in Germany, how easily people who have accused the Russian Opposition of "not going far enough," and who have proclaimed dozens of times that the Thermidor was already "accomplished," went over with their light baggage to the camp of the social democrats.

RADEK'S IMPULSIVENESS

To be sure, none of us means to put Radek on the same plane as these weathercocks. Radek has to his credit a quarter of a century of revolutionary Marxist work. Not only is he incapable of going over to the social democrats, but he can hardly become one with the Stalinites. At any rate, he will not be able to live together with them. He is too much of a Marxist for that, and, above all, too international. Radek's misfortune lies where his strength is: his excessive impulsiveness.

Radek is undoubtedly one of the best Marxist journalists in the world. It is not only the precision and strength of his style. No, it is first of all his ability to react with amazing quickness to new phenomena and tendencies and even to their first symptoms. Here lies Radek's strong point. But the strength of a journalist becomes a source of weakness to a statesman. Radek exaggerates and anticipates too much. He measures with a yardstick where it is only a matter of inches. Therefore he almost always finds himself to the Right or to the Left — much more often to the Right — of the correct line.

As long as we lived in Moscow, Radek's impulsiveness was often of service to the Opposition. At almost every session he would bring up suggestions for decisive changes in the policy of the Opposition — in the whole of it or in this or that question. He usually met with friendly resistance and was soon reconciled to it. But under his exaggerated and dangerous innovations one could often find some valuable observation or new impression. That is why Radek's participation was always beneficial to the collective work. And none of us would have made a list of the numerous zig-zags of Radek — to the Right as well as to the Left; more often to the Right, though, than to the Left. The trouble is, however, that since 1928 the leading group of the Opposition has been dispersed. All of us were separated from one another by enormous distances, and each was left to himself. It is clear that under such circumstances Radek's extreme impulsiveness would serve him badly.

RADEK'S RIGHT-ABOUT-FACE

Since February 1928 comrade Radek has made a very abrupt turn in the question of the Thermidor and "two Parties." He did not foresee the possibility of resistance on the part of the Centrists to the Right, as did all those who first heard about the Thermidor from us and immediately began to vow that it was already "accomplished." Only, since Radek does not merely repeat general, empty phrases, but tries to observe facts and understand them, he went to the opposite extreme. The Stalinites began to seem to him, after February 1928, to be Marxist, and the Thermidor almost a myth. Had we all been in Moscow, Radek would probably have quieted down after his first exaggerations — until a new flare-up. But Radek was in Siberia. He sent letters and theses to a number of comrades. Everyone jumped on him. The correspondence was intercepted by organs of the G. P. U. and turned over to the Central Committee. Yaroslavsky reported Radek's views at meetings, making a mess of it for lack of understanding and telling lies out of malice. Thus Radek became the

ced more and more to color Stalin's zig-zag in order to justify his own.

This story, as already stated, has been going on for about a year and a half. In July of last year Radek wrote his draft of an appeal to the 6-th Congress. At that time the exiles were still permitted to correspond somewhat freely; the Stalinites hoped that the split would manifest itself more quickly that way. Through an exchange of telegrams between the colonies of the exiles a sort of vote took place on the two texts of the appeal to the Sixth Congress. Radek gathered half a dozen votes. My draft was signed by several hundred. In the end Radek also attached his name to the collective declaration.

On July 17, 1928, I subjected the draft of Radek's theses to an analysis in a letter which I sent to the exiles and to Moscow. I consider it timely to publish this analysis now. The reader will become convinced through that, I hope, that in 1929 Radek has added little to his mistakes of 1928. At any rate, these individual or group zig-zags, even when made with the best intentions, cannot turn the Opposition from its path.

L. D. TROTSKY.

Constantinople,
May 26, 1929.

The Theses of Comrade Radek

Three days ago I received the draft of comrade Radek's theses, sent to the eight comrades. These theses have probably already been sent to the Congress so that the immediate practical purpose of my remarks is lost. But since we need clarity for the future as well, I consider it necessary to express an opinion on these theses.

THE ANTI-KULAK AGITATION

1. First of all, the theses say: "Several months of anti-Kulak agitation — that is a fact of the greatest political significance which it would be complete political blindness not to recognize." In these words the polemical spear is pointed in the wrong direction. In my opinion, the following should have been said: "Several months of anti-Kulak agitation, if they are not followed by a radical change in the line, will inevitably throw the Party back considerably and will undermine the last vestiges of confidence of the ranks in all slogans and in all campaigns."

2. With regard to the capital outlay, Radek says: "Instead of investing the basic capital in a series of undertakings in the same branch of production which would only show results several years later, concentration of funds is necessary in order to obtain goods with the least possible delay." This obscure expression is apparently intended to convey the idea that funds should be transferred from heavy industry to light. This is part of the Right wing's program. I see no reason why we should enter on that road. If it is a purely practical proposal, then it should be supported by figures; that is, it should be proved that in allocating the funds, the necessary proportion between heavy and light industry is not being preserved. If such a reallocation of funds were to be made only on considerations of the moment, it would mean to prepare a still greater crisis in two or three years. Improvisation in such a question cannot be allowed at all and, as has been said, is only grist to the mill of the Right. It is sufficient for us to demand the allocation of funds for light as well as for heavy industry.

3. With regard to the Stalinist argument that it is impossible to combat the Kulak as long as the middle peasant has not been won over, Radek's theses say: "We still haven't won over the middle peasant sufficiently." This is to embellish the reality. With our policies we have lost the middle peasant whom the Kulak has led away, something that is acknowledged by the February article in *Pravda*.

4. Coming out against the view that the left move is a mere maneuver, the theses say: "Whether or not this struggle will be carried to the end depends on the strength and the determination with which the working masses will insist on the extension of this struggle." This, of course, is true, but it is too general. It would mean: The Central Committee did what it could, but now it is the turn of the masses. In reality it should be said: "The measures undertaken above will result in an inevitable fiasco if the Opposition — in spite of the dreadnoughts of bureaucratic Centrism — will not educate the masses and help them carry this struggle to the end."

5. "The Center in the Party," say Radek's theses, "by concealing the existence of this group — the Right — only weakens the chances of the struggle for a correction of the Party line." This is to put it very tenderly. The struggle against the Kulak means in the Party a struggle against the Rights. Carrying on a "campaign" against the Kulak, the Center in the Party covers up the Right wing and stays in a bloc with it. The theses remark reproachfully that this "only weakens the chances of the struggle." No, it dooms the struggle to inevitable defeat, if the Opposition will not open the Party's eyes to this whole mechanism.

6. The characterization of Schwartz* as a "comrade keenly attuned and tied up with the proletarian masses" sounds strange. Did he protest anywhere against the infamous banishments under Article 58? It seemed to me that he "keenly voted for these banishments."

*Schwartz is the chairman of the All-Russian Miners of the Central Committee of the

FRAUDULENT SELF-CRITICISM

7. With regard to self-criticism, the theses vow: "It is not a fraud and not a maneuver, because the intervention of a number of Party leaders implies the greatest concern for the fate of the Party and the revolution." Is not here meant the latest appearance of the master's (Stalin) understudy (Molotov) with a shower of abuse addressed to the Opposition and with an explanation that criticism of the administrative organs is useful, while criticism of the leadership — harmful? I should say: "If in the question of the Kulak the purely combinatory maneuver amounts to 10-20 per cent and the positive measures forced by the bread shortage amount to 80-90 per cent of the given zig-zag, then in the question of self-criticism the apparatus-manuevered tricks amount even at the present moment to not less than 51 per cent, and 49 per cent are general expenses of the maneuver: redeeming victims, scapegoats, etc., etc." There is hardly any reason for swearing with such assurance that there is neither maneuver nor fraud here.

8. Radek's theses refer to Stalin's speech before the students, without mentioning that with regard to the question of the Kulak, the speech is also a complete withdrawal of the February article in *Pravda*, and may mean the obliteration of the Left zig-zag also in this important and specific question. Incidentally, this speech is astounding for its illiteracy in economic questions.

9. Further on comes the explanation why the Center, as distinct from the Right, was against inner-Party democracy. Because, you see, our Party is not one hundred percent democratic — (Stalin). Radek's theses accept this explanation at its face value, repeat it and develop it. It is as if the Centrists were afraid that the insufficiently proletarian Party would not comprehend their truly proletarian policies. This is inadmissible apologetics. The Centrists felt that their Chiang-Kai-Shek, Purcell and Kulak policy would not be accepted by the proletarian kernel of the Party. That is why they have been and are strangling democracy.

10. "The question of inner-Party democracy lies alone in the awakening of the Party masses. If they do not take into their hands the matter of self-criticism" . . . etc. Again too general. In order that the masses may actually participate in this matter, it is necessary that they do not allow the Centrists to lull them to sleep. The Centrists have considerable means for that even now. They lack only the blissful confidence on our part. "Piatakoviade," "Safaroviade" are at present the most effective "opium" for the people. All the more frequent should be the antidote from us.

11. The deductions of Radek's theses with regard to self-criticism are the following: a) further extension of self-criticism; b) curtailment of the Party apparatus; c) proletarianization of the apparatus; d) prosecution of those who strangle democracy in the factory; e) ridding the Party of bourgeois and bureaucratic elements. All this is too general and is repeated on every possible occasion, without furnishing any guarantees. As an afterthought, it is said: "Finally, the readmission of the Opposition into the Party is necessary." That is correct. And in place of the other points, which are too general, it should be said more concretely: "a) to fix the date for the 16th Congress during 1928 and to bind the preparations for the Congress with every guarantee of real self-criticism; b) to publish immediately all the articles, speeches, and letters of Lenin that have been hidden from the Party — I have named seven groups of such documents in my letter to the Congress; c) to curtail at once the Party's budget twenty-fold, that is, to five or six millions, because the present budget is the financial basis of the apparatus of autocratic and bureaucratic corruption. These demands do not, of course, exhaust the questions of the regime, but they are perfectly concrete and mark a step forward."

PROBLEM OF THE COMINTERN

12. It is still worse when it comes to the question of the Comintern. Radek's estimation of the February Plenum as a great, in a way decisive, turn about face to the road of Marxist policy, is basically incorrect. The symptomatic significance of the February Plenum is very great; it shows that the Right-Centrist policy has landed completely in a blind alley, and that the leadership is trying to find a way out not to the Right, but to the Left, and that is all. There is no unifying idea in the Leftism of the February Plenum. This Leftism reminds one a great deal of the Leftism of the Fifth Congress. No real conclusion have been drawn from the greatest defeat of the Chinese revolution; instead there is the fanfare of boasting about the approach of the so-called new wave, with regard to the peasant movement — and this after the proletariat has been decimated. This whole perspective is false and the whole manner of approaching the question gives its blessing to adventurism. The little reservations on putches are for self-justification in the future. If there is a new wave, then the revolts in the provinces are not putches. In reality, it is the destruction of the remnants of the proletarian vanguard that is going on. Theoretically the Menshevik resolution on the Chinese question, though it was written in pseudo-Bolshevik terminology, should, from the strategical point of view, destroy the Chinese Communist Party. The English and French resolutions cover up the traces of yesterday, combining with them elements of ultra-Leftism and Right premises. Here, too, there is much resemblance to the Fifth Congress which tried to eliminate the question of the German defeat of 1923 by means of ultra-Left violence.

13. Finally, Radek's theses say that those should be returned to the Comintern "who sincerely

mintern with the methods proclaimed by the last Plenum of the E. C. C. I." You can hardly believe your eyes when you read it.

The „methods” of the February Plenum of the E. C. C. I. consist first of all of the approval of Article 58 and of the assertion that the Bolshevik-Leninists „are banking on the fall of the Soviet power.” Can it be that the resolution on the Opposition is of less historical significance than the resolution on the second ballot in France, or the dubious hodge-podge on whether or not the British Communist Party should take part in the Labor Party? How can that be forgotten? Can I be admitted to the Comintern if I am deeply convinced that in voting for the Chinese resolution the February Plenum dealt another mortal blow to the Chinese proletariat, and that in voting for the resolution on the Opposition gives the worst, most reactionary and self-debasing expression of the treacherous, bureaucratic methods of “leading” the Party?

14. The theses of the February Plenum put the question of “temporary agreements with liberals in colonial countries” word for word just as the draft of the program puts it; but the draft of the program, under a radical form, sanctifies the Kuo Min Tangiade.

15. On the theory of stages, on the theory of dually composed Parties, on the theory of socialism in a single country, Radek's theses say that these are “tails” that should be removed. It is as if the Marxist man has already emerged full grown out of the Centrist monkey, but with one superfluous organ: “the tail.” The good teacher and preceptor hints: Please hide your tail and all will be well. But that is to embellish the reality in a flagrant manner.

THE “VALUE” OF THE C. I. PROGRAM

16. The general appraisal of the draft of the program by the theses is incorrect, that is, it is exceedingly good - natured. Contradictory, eclectic scholastic, full of patches, the draft of the program is no good at all.

17. The general principle indications of Radek's theses on the question of partial or transitional demands are quite correct. It is high time that these general considerations were translated into a more concrete language, that is, for us to attempt to outline a plan for transitional demands which would apply to countries of different types.

18. On the question of the Thermidor, Radek's theses quite unexpectedly say: “I shall not discuss here the question of knowing to what extent analogies of the French and Russian revolutions can be made.” What does that mean? The question of the Thermidor we formulated together with the author of the theses and with his participation. Analogies should be made within the strict limits of those aims

for which they are visualized. Lenin compared the Brest-Litovsk peace with the peace of Tilsit. Maretski could have explained to Lenin that the class conditions of the Tilsit peace were entirely different, as he explained to us the difference between the class nature of the French and our own Revolution. We then called Maretski by the name he deserved. We took the Thermidor as a classic example of a partial counter-revolutionary *coup d'Etat* accomplished as yet completely under the revolutionary banner, but already having at bottom a decisive character. No one has ever named or offered a clearer, more striking and more richly instructive historical analogy for explaining the dangers of degeneration. A tremendous international polemic has developed and continues around the question of the Thermidor. What political sense, then, has the above-mentioned unexpected doubt about knowing to what point analogies between the French and Russian revolutions can be established? Are we sitting in a society of Marxist historians and discussing historical analogies in general? No, we are carrying on a political fight in which we have made use of the analogy with the Thermidor a hundred times, within definite limits indicated by us.

19. “If history will prove,” Radek's theses say, “that a number of Party leaders with whom we crossed swords yesterday are better than the theories which they defended, then no one will be more pleased than we.” That sounds awfully chivalrous: Noble leaders first cross swords and then they weep tears of reconciliation on each other's bosom. But here is the rub: How can leaders of the proletariat be better than their theories? We Marxists have been accustomed to appraise leaders by their theory, through their theory, by the ability of leaders to understand and apply it. Now it would seem that there may be excellent leaders who are accidentally armed with reactionary theories on almost all the basic questions.

20. “The support we give to the move that has begun,” Radek's theses declared, “should consist of fighting ruthlessly... against all the evils against which the Party is now mobilized.” Not that alone. The pitiless unmasking in each practical matter or theoretical question of the half-measures and confusion of Centrism — there is the most important part of support of any progressive steps of Centrism.

THE CHINESE REVOLUTION

21. I do not stop to consider a whole number of less weighty and specific observations. I confine myself only to pointing out the supplement to the theses which is devoted to the Chinese revolution. This supplement is written in such a way as if we were approaching the question privately for the

first time, as if we had not carried on a correspondence with Preobrazhensky: the theses have not a word to say in reply to a single one of my considerations. But that is not yet the worst. What is worse is that Radek's theses are written as if here had never been a Chinese revolution in 1925-27. All of comrade Radek's considerations might have been successfully formulated at the beginning of 1924; the bourgeois-democratic revolution is not completed, it still has democratic stages before it, and then there will be a change by growth again. But the Right and Left Kuo Min Tang, the Canton period, the northern expedition, the Shanghai *coup d'Etat*, the Wuhan period — what are all those if not democratic stages? Or, since Martinov has made a mess of it, can we simply leave it out of consideration? The theses see in the future what has in reality already been left behind. Or, perhaps the theses hope to get “real” democracy? Let them give us her address. The essence of the matter is that all those conditions which with us united the agrarian revolution with the proletarian revolution are expressed still more clearly and imperiously in China. The theses demand that we “wait” until the democratic revolution has grown into a socialist revolution. Two questions are combined here. In a certain sense our democratic revolution grew into a socialist revolution only towards the middle of 1918. Yet power had been in the hands of the proletariat since November 1917. The argument sounds particularly bizarre coming from comrade Radek who so resolutely tried to prove that there is no feudalism in China, no class of landowners and that therefore the agrarian revolution would not be directed against the landlord but against the bourgeoisie. Survivals of feudalism are very strong in China, but they are indissolubly bound up with bourgeois property. How then can comrade Radek now pass over this difficulty by saying that the bourgeois-democratic revolution „is not completed,” repeating here the mistake of Bucharin, who in turn repeats Kamenev's mistake in 1917? I cannot do better than to quote here again Lenin's word against Kamenev to which Beloborodov recently called my attention:

“He who is guided in his activity by the simple formula ‘the bourgeois-democratic revolution is not finished’ takes it on himself to guarantee in some way that the petty bourgeoisie is really capable of being independent of the bourgeoisie. He thereby capitulates weakly at the moment, hoping for the grace of the petty bourgeoisie.” (Lenin. Vol. 14, Part 1, page 35).

That is all I can say on comrade Radek's theses. I think it is necessary to say it for the sake of clarity, without fearing the attempts of our “monolithic” opponents to exploit our differences of opinion.

LEO D. TROTSKY;

Alma-Ata, July 17, 1928.

The Draft Program of the Comintern

8. THE BENEFITS OBTAINED FROM THE FARMERS' AND PEASANTS' INTERNATIONAL MUST BE PROBED.

One of the main, if not the main accusations hurled against the Opposition, was that of its “under-estimation” of the peasantry. Also on this point life has given the test proof both along the internal and the international lines. The official leaders proved guilty of UNDER-ESTIMATING the role and significance of the proletariat in relation to the peasantry all along the line. Here can be mentioned the greatest blunders and errors along the economic, political and international lines.

At the bottom of the internal errors, since 1923 there lies an under-estimation of the significance of State industry under the management of the proletariat for the whole of national economy and for the alliance with the peasantry. In China the revolution was lost by the failure to understand the leading and decisive role of the proletariat in relation to the agrarian revolution.

From the same viewpoint it is necessary to examine and estimate the role of the work of the Krestintern* which from the beginning was not more than an experiment—an experiment which required the utmost vigilance, and integrity of principle, to boot. It is not difficult to understand the reason why.

The peasantry, by the history and conditions of its life, is the least international of all classes. What is called national traits has its chief source precisely in the peasantry. The peasantry and only its semi-proletarian sections at that can be interested in the international cause, only under the guidance of the proletariat. All roundabout ways are a mere play with classes, and such playing is always detrimental to the interests of the proletariat. Only to the extent that the national peasantry is severed by the national proletariat from the influence of the national bourgeoisie and is trained to see in the proletariat not only its ally, but also its leader, can it be attracted to the path of international politics. Attempts, however, to organize the peasants of the various countries into an independent international organization over the head of the proletariat and regardless of the national Communist Parties, are doomed beforehand to failure and, in the final analysis, can only hamper the struggle of the national proletariat for influence on the agricultural laborers and poor peasants.

In bourgeois revolutions as well as counter-revolutions, beginning with the peasant wars of the

sixteenth century, the various strata of the peasantry played an enormous and, at times, even decisive role. But this role was never an independent role. Directly or indirectly the peasantry always supported one political force against another. By itself it never constituted an independent force, having its own common national political tasks. In the epoch of finance capital the polarization of capitalist society has constantly progressed as compared with the phase of capitalist development. This means that the relative strength of the peasantry has diminished and not increased. At any rate, in the imperialist epoch the peasants of the capitalist countries are less capable of INDEPENDENT political action on a national scale than in the epoch of industrial capitalism. The farmers of the United States today are incomparably less capable of playing an independent political role than forty or fifty years ago when, as the experience of the Populist movement shows, they could not organize an independent national party.

The temporary but sharp agrarianization of Europe as a result of the economic decline caused by the war has given rise to illusions concerning the possible role of “peasant”, that is, bourgeois pseudo-peasant Parties. If in the period of grave peasant unrest after the war one could still risk the experiment of organizing a farmers' and peasants' international so as to test by experience the new relations between the proletariat and the peasantry, the peasantry and the bourgeoisie, the time has at last come when the five years experience of the Farmers' and Peasants' International must be theoretically and politically summarized, its great shortcomings revealed and an effort made to show what are its advantages. One conclusion at any rate cannot be denied. The experience of the “peasant” parties of Bulgaria, Poland, Roumania and Jugo-Slavia, that is, of the backward countries, the old experience of our Social Revolutionaries, and the fresh (the blood is not yet dried) experience with the Kuomintang, the sporadic experience in the advanced capitalist countries, particularly that of La Follette and Pepper in the United States, have invariably shown that in the epoch of capitalist decline there is even less reason to look for INDEPENDENT revolutionary anti-bourgeois peasant parties than in the epoch of rising capitalism.

“The town cannot be equalled to the village; the village cannot be equalled to the town in the historical conditions of that epoch. The town inevitably LEADS THE VILLAGE, the village inevitably follows the town.”

still play a decisive role but this role, again, will be neither leading nor independent. The poor peasants of Hupeh, Kwantung, or Bengal can play a role not only on a national but also on an international scale. However, only on condition that they will support the workers of Shanghai, Hankow, Canton and Calcutta. This is the only way out for the revolutionary peasant ON AN INTERNATIONAL road. The effort immediately to unite the peasants of Hupeh with the peasants of Galicia or Dobrudja, the Egyptian fellah with the American farmer, is hopeless.

But the nature of politics is such that everything which does not directly serve its object inevitably becomes an instrument for other objects, frequently for the very opposite ones. Have we not seen examples when a bourgeois party, which relied on the peasantry or sought to rely on it, became interested in the Farmers' and Peasants' International for a longer or shorter period if it could not do so in the Comintern, only in order to find protection from the blows of its own Communist Party, as Purcell, in the trade union domain, protected himself through the Anglo-Russian Committee? If La Follette did not try to register in the Farmers' and Peasants' International that was due to the extreme weakness of the American Communist Party, the more so considering that at that time its leader Pepper, without an invitation, embraced La Follette, even without that. But Raditch, the bankers' leader of the Croatian rich peasants, found it necessary to leave his visiting card in the Farmers' and Peasants' International on his road to the Cabinet. The Kuomintang went much further than that and secured protection for itself, not only in the Farmers' International and the Anti-Imperialist League, but even knocked at the doors of the Politbureau of the C.P.S.U., against only one vote.

It is very significant for the leading political tendencies of recent years that whereas tendencies in favor of the liquidation of the PROFINTERN (the Red International of Labor Unions) were very strong (its very name was deleted from the statutes of Soviet trade unions), we find that, so far as we remember, the question has never been raised in the official press as to what exactly are the conquests of the FARMERS' AND PEASANTS' INTERNATIONAL.

The Sixth Congress must seriously probe the work of the Farmers' and Peasants' International from the viewpoint of p...

The Secret Resolution Against Bucharin

ADOPTED BY THE LAST PLENUM OF THE C. C. OF C. P. S. U.

FOREWORD

The Joint Plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union approves the resolution of the joint session of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee and the Presidium of the Central Control Commission on inner-Party affairs of February 9, 1929.

In view of the fact that the joint session of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee and the Presidium of the Central Control Commission did not have the opportunity of estimating the declaration of Bucharin, Tomsy and Rykov of February 9, 1929, which presents a factional platform; that comrades Bucharin, Rykov, Tomsy continue in their speeches at the joint Plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of the C. P. S. U. to develop and defend their views in contradiction to the Party line; that Comrades Bucharin and Tomsy have refused to submit to the decisions of the joint session of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee and the Presidium of the Central Control Commission on withdrawing their resignations, the joint Plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of the C. P. S. U. considers it necessary to make the following decision:

1. The growth and development of the Right deviation in the C. P. S. U. are most closely bound together with the peculiarities of the present stage in the development of the proletarian world revolution. The 15th Congress of the C. P. S. U. and the 6th World Congress of the Comintern already established the symptoms of a serious change in the position of world capital as well as in the international revolutionary movement. The characteristic essential features of this change are a sharpening of the inner contradictions in the camp of capitalism which confuse and undermine ever more its temporary and wavering stabilization, and the growth of the elements of a new revolutionary rise (the strike wave in a series of European countries, the leftward march of the working class and the successes of the Communists at the parliamentary elections, the serious victories in the factory councils elections in Germany, the spread of the revolutionary crisis in India and the uninterrupted ferment in the other colonies, the accumulation of contradictions and the war danger in the camp of the imperialists as well as between the capitalist world and the U. S. S. R.).

Under these circumstances, the most important tasks of the Communist Parties are the following: the further bolshevization of the Communist Parties, their purging from social democratic traditions, the assurance of the leading role of the Party in the growing revolutionary movement and the preparation of the broad masses for the coming decisive class struggles.

STABILIZATION AND THE RIGHT WING

In the questions of international policy, the Right deviation glides down toward the side of the social democratic estimation of the stabilization of capitalism (the theory of the "recovery" of capitalism) which finds expression in an obliteration of the ever more sharpening crisis of capitalism, in the denial of the fact of the wavering of capitalist stabilization and in the veiling of the essential revolutionary features of the "third period." In this manner the Rights, and the Conciliators they have taken in tow, arrive directly at a revision of the Leninist estimation of the present epoch as the period of the crisis of capitalism, as the epoch of wars and proletarian world revolution. They underestimate, in connection with that, the mobilization of working masses (especially the unorganized) to independent struggle against the reformist trade union bureaucracy.

The connection between the Right deviation in the C. P. S. U. with this opportunist tendency in the ranks of the Comintern is absolutely obvious. Comrade Bucharin has really solidarized himself in this question with the opportunist stand of the Conciliators, Humbert-Droz, Eweht, Gerhardt and others.

Comrades Bucharin, Rykov and Tomsy are restraining the struggle of the Comintern against the Right deviation and Conciliationism in the Comintern. The declaration of these three comrades that the policy of our Party is "disintegrating" the C. I., weakening its ranks and is leading to division as well as to splits in the foreign Communist Parties signifies not only ignorant-opportunist lack of understanding of the tasks of the purging of the Communist Parties from the elements of social democracy but also a real support of the Right renegades. That is why comrades Bucharin, Rykov and Tomsy are objectively more and more the center of attraction for all the opportunist and conciliatory groups in the sections of the C. I. . . .

The slanderous statement of the group of comrade Bucharin that the Party is spreading bureaucracy signifies a discrediting of that tremendous work which the Party has developed in the struggle against bureaucracy. The philistine slander of self-criticism by this group can have no other meaning than that of direct struggle against the slogan of self-criticism. In the question of the trade unions, comrades Bucharin, Rykov and Tomsy are proceeding on the highly dangerous road of playing the trade unions against the Party, of really adopting a course that leads to the weakening of the trade union movement by the Party, glossing over the shortcomings of the trade union work and cloaking the trade unionist tendencies as well as the appearance of a bureaucratic hardening of a part of the trade union which picture the struggle of the

Below we reprint the secret resolution adopted by the Stalin faction against the Bucharin-Rykov-Tomsky group at the recent Plenum of the Russian Party Central Committee. The excerpts published below compose the most important parts of the resolution and were translated from Gegen den Strom, central organ of the Brandlerite Right wing in Germany, where it was made public for the first time. The resolution is characteristic of Stalin's method of fighting the Thermidorian Right wing in the Russian Party. It is the method of the Centrist apparatus, of the bureaucrat whose faith lies entirely in the all-powerfulness of the Party machine, who is mortally afraid of arousing the masses of the workers and the Communists against the Thermidorian Right wing. To arouse the masses for a genuine — and not a pitiful apparatus struggle against the Right would involve the setting in motion of such a force as would sweep over the restorationist Right, and over the Centrist swamp as well, and clear the ground for the reinstitution of the Bolshevik principles fought for by the Opposition. Stalinist Centrism fears action of the masses far more than it does the Right wing. It is ready to unite with the latter against the revolutionary currents in the working class. Stalin did this for more than five years in the struggle to decimate the Leninist Opposition led by Trotsky. He thereby only played the miserable role history assigns to Centrism.

Stalin can not lead a real fight against the Thermidorian Right. To conduct such a struggle would lead to the annihilation of Centrism itself, since the Right wing can be eliminated only if it is attacked from a principle viewpoint. But the basic principle of the Right wing — the theory of socialism in one country, the Menshevik betrayal of the Chinese revolution the theory of two-class parties, the capitulation to Purcellism in the British General strike, the false internal line in the Soviet Union, etc. etc., — were worked out jointly by the Bucharin-Rykov Right and Stalinist Centrism in the five years of struggle against the Opposition! Only by such an approach to the present crisis in the Right-Center bloc can a Marxist result be attained.

Stalin's present left zig-zag is the forerunner of a new swing to the Right. It is a zig-zag for which the Center will pay dearly and the working class most heavily of all.

It is worth mentioning, in conclusion, the unconcealed contempt with which the Stalinist bureaucracy regards the foreign Communist Parties. Bucharin who was unanimously chosen chairman of the Comintern at the 6th Congress is removed by Stalin without even the formality of an ordinary or special meeting of the Comintern or its executive. Stalin knows that the Thaelmanns, Semards, Bells and Fosters will vote with both hands for any decision of the Stalin faction. He also knows that these international puppets of the Centrist apparatus will see to it that the membership of the Internation does not ask questions but does as it is told, whether it knows why or not. Stalin does not even bother to inform the Russian Party of his decisions against the Right; the resolution is given only to the functionaries, the apparatus men. As for the foreign Communist press, they have long ago been transformed into language bulletins for Stalin's paid scribblers. We have arrived in the Communist movement today to the shameful stage where the yellow socialist rags, like the Forward in New York, give its readers more detailed information on the events in the Communist movement than the Daily Worker and the Freiheit combined. The readers of the latter two papers don't know yet that Bucharin is out!

Stalin drags the Communist movement to the swamp of Centrism, to splits; he covers it with discredit and shame. — Ed.

THE RIGHT AND THE PARTY REGIME.

In the question of the role of the Party apparatus and of the inner-Party regime, however, the attitude of the group of comrade Bucharin completely represents a repetition of the most malicious accusations raised by the Trotskyist Opposition against our Party. . . .

4. The Right deviation is rooted in the petty bourgeois mass elements that surround the working class. Inside the Party, the bases of the Right deviation are the least steadfast elements in the non-proletarian sector of the Party who are most exposed to petty bourgeois influences and the danger of degeneration, as well as the backward sections of the workers who have not gone long enough through the school of shop and factory and are connected with the village as well as the city petty bourgeoisie. The platform of the group of comrade Bucharin of February 9 as well as the viewpoint represented by the members of this group at the Plenum of the C. C. and the C. C. C. form an appeal to these unstable elements and contribute objectively to the creation of the Right deviation in the Party. . . .

5. The joint Plenum of the C. C. and the C. C. C. declares that the Bucharin group has already begun the factional struggle against the Party leadership. It has recourse to quite impermissible violation of Party discipline (resistance of comrades Bucharin and Tomsy to the repeated decisions of the Political Bureau on their method of resignation). It inspired the factional work against the Central Committee in the Moscow organization, endeavored to play the faction at the 6th Trade Union Congress against the Central Committee, made the attempt to form an unprincipled bloc of leaders against the Central Committee (proposal of comrade Bucharin

The unheard of gossip about the Party sliding down to the Trotskyist position, the slanderous reproach against the Party on the policy of the "military-feudal exploitation" of the peasantry which is taken from the arsenal of Miliukov's Party, the accusation of the Party that it is spreading bureaucracy and disintegrating the Comintern — all this is without doubt indicative of the factional character of the Bucharin group and the departure of this group from the general line of the Party. Thereby the Bucharin group violates in the grossest manner the Leninist unity of the Party, shatters Bolshevik discipline and undermines the collective leadership in the Central Committee.

Fortified by the will of all the Party organizations, which unanimously support the line of the Central Committee and have energetically condemned the attitude as well as the viewpoints of comrade Bucharin, Rykov and Tomsy, the viewpoints which, considered basically, reflect a Right deviation; in view of the fact that comrades Bucharin, Rykov and Tomsy have not admitted their mistakes; finally, proceeding from the interests of the unity of the Party which is especially necessary under present circumstances, the Plenum of the C. C. and the C. C. C. of the C. P. S. U. decides:

THE ORGANIZATION REMOVALS

a) to condemn the views presented in the declaration of comrade Bucharin of January 30, in the declaration of comrades Bucharin, Rykov and Tomsy of February 9 and in the speeches of these comrades at the Plenum of the C. C. and the C. C. C., as views that are incompatible with the general line of the Party and which, basically considered, conform with the position with the Right deviation, and to obligate these comrades to carry out unconditionally the decisions of the Party and the committees;

b) to condemn the negotiations behind the scenes by comrade Bucharin with comrade Kamenev as the crassest expression of the factional character of the group of comrade Bucharin;

c) to condemn the policy of resignations of comrades Bucharin and Tomsy as a gross violation of Party discipline;

d) to remove comrades Bucharin and Tomsy from the posts occupied by them (Pravda, Comintern and Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union), and to warn them that in the event of the slightest attempt to violate the decisions of the Central Committee and its organs they will be immediately removed from the Political Bureau as destroyers of Party discipline;

e) that the Political Bureau shall adopt measures to prevent the occurrence of any deviations from the line of the Party and the decisions of the leading Party committees in the speeches of individual members and candidates of the Political Bureau;

f) to adopt all the necessary measures for a thorough execution of the line of the Party and the decisions of the Central Committee in the press of the Party as well as the Soviet press, and in all papers and journals;

g) to establish special measures — up to expulsion from the Central Committee and the Party — for guaranteeing the preservation of privacy of the decisions of the Central Committee and its Political Bureau and to exclude the possibility of informing the Trotskyists on the affairs in the Central Committee and the Political Bureau;

h) to send the present resolution to all the local organizations of the Party and members of the 16th Party Conference and not to publish it in the press.

Remember Comrade Malkin

One of the surest tests of the vitality and integrity of any section of the workers' movement is its attitude toward the vanguard fighters who have fallen into the hands of the enemy and languish in their prison. A special regard for the class war prisoners, a constant remembrance of their heroic sacrifices and an unrelenting struggle for their liberation is the mark of every revolutionary body worthy of the name. Support of class war prisoners cannot have any sectarian or partisan limits. Every worker in prison for his class is entitled to loyal support and help regardless of his political views and without any conditions. This will always be our principle.

There is a special need for the readers of the Militant and for members and supporters of the Communist Opposition, to remember comrade Maurice L. Malkin who is serving time at Comstock Prison, New York. This special remembrance should be given to him because he was one of the first American Communists to fight under our banner and was one of the most active and militant workers up to the moment of his imprisonment. We should remember him also because the faction mongers of the Party, of the International Labor Defense and of the Needle Trades Industrial Union (for which he went to prison) have mistreated and neglected him, suppressed his name and publicity about his case, withheld the material support that is his due and failed to send him the books he asked for out of funds generously provided by workers for this purpose.

Time drags heavily in prison and doubly so for class conscious and intelligent men such as comrade Malkin whose thoughts are concerned with the worldwide workers' struggle. Letters from "the outside" do much to make life endurable for the class war prisoners and sustain them with the knowledge that they are not forgotten by their comrades in the struggle. We therefore remind all comrades of the importance of writing to comrade Malkin. Address: Malkin, No. 10061, Box 51,

FIRST OF AUGUST!

CONTINUED FROM PAGE ONE

most favorable to it, the Communist Party gained in all only fifty thousand votes. This terrible debacle is a direct and immediate payment for the ruinous policy of the Comintern upon the question of the Anglo-Russian Committee — the central question of the policy of the Comintern in England for the past few years.

The recent elections in England revealed an unquestionable leftward movement of the mass of the workers. But this leftward movement, i. e., a breaking away of millions of workers from the bourgeoisie, has at the given stage a clearly reformist-pacifist character — and that sharply emphasized, moreover, by the defeat of the British Communist Party. It is hard to imagine a more cruel joke than that perpetrated by the Comintern upon British Communism. For several years they have compelled the British Communist Party to ride on Purcell's running board, and hold a revolutionary wreath on the head of Cook. The Moscow leadership remained for a whole year in union with the unqualified strike breakers of the General Council. Politically the Communist Party in these circumstances did not exist. The revolutionary minority of the trade unions remained intellectually helpless, and the Comintern with its entire policy helped Thomas and Purcell shatter, discourage and absorb this minority. After all this, the British Party received an order to accomplish an immediate turn about of 1802 degrees. As a result it could only find out that the working class simply does not know it as an independent revolutionary party.

GERMANY AND CHINA

The German Communist Party, incomparably stronger than the other parties, has also a more serious tradition and more militant cadres. But in 1928 the German working class had only begun to emerge from the paralysis with which its vast majority was afflicted after the catastrophe of 1923. Giving nine million votes to the social democracy, the German workers explicitly declared that they wish again to try their luck on the peaceful road of reform.

In China the Communist Party now numbers three or four thousand members, and not that hundred thousand which was so light-mindedly claimed at the Sixth Congress by the bureaucrats of the Comintern. But this little Party is in a state of still further disintegration. The leadership of Stalin, combining Opportunism with adventurism, has wrecked the Chinese revolution for years, and with it the young Chinese Communist Party. When the Central Committee of the French Party promises that on the First of August the proletarian battalions will march in Shanghai as in Paris, this prophesy can only be classed as cheap rhetoric. Alas, everything goes to show that battalions will not march either in Shanghai or in Paris. The French Communist Party, like its pale shadow the Unity Confederation of Labor, has by no means increased its influence of late years. There is not the slightest hope that the First of August will prove any more revolutionary in France than the First of May. Semard and Monmousseau undertake everything and promise everything in order to do nothing.

Or perhaps the outcome of the Belgian elections give grounds to hope for a demonstration of the workers of Brussels and Antwerp at the summons of the Jacuemotte?

We will not stop to mention the other parties of the Comintern. They all reveal exactly the same features: decline of influence, weakening of organization, ideological splitting up, a decrease of confidence of the masses in the appeals of the Party.

The Czecho-Slovak Party was considered one of the most powerful sections of the Comintern. But its first attempt last year to designate a "Red Day" uncovered an alarming stagnant reformism in the Party, poisoned with the spirit of Smeral and those like him. As a result of the sheer command from the top to become revolutionary in 24 hours, the Czecho-Slovak Party simply began to crumble away.

FALSE ESTIMATE OF THE SITUATION

They told us during the period of the Sixth Congress that the situation in Germany is placing revolution on the order of the day. Thalmann clearly announced: "The situation is becoming more revolutionary every day." But that judgment was false to the roots. In a letter sent by comrade Trotsky to the Sixth Congress in the name of the Opposition ("And What next?") the official estimate of the situation was analyzed in complete detail, and an accurate warning was issued a year ago against the ruinous adventurist conclusions which that estimate would entail. The Opposition does not deny the symptoms of a leftward movement of the German working masses. On the contrary for us also this "leftward movement" found an unqualified expression at the time of the recent elections to the Reichstag. But the whole question is as to the present stage of this leftward movement. We have had in Germany a simultaneous growth of the Social Democracy and the Communist Party. That has undoubtedly meant an ebbing of broad circles of the workers away from the bourgeois parties. But the principle current still flows in the channel of the Social Democracy. In these circumstances it is intolerably light-minded to say that "the situation is becoming more revolutionary." The social democracy is not a part of revolution. Hermann Mueller and Zoergiebel reminded the whole world of that on the First of May.

We have to understand correctly what a growth of the social democracy means in the present circumstances. After the experience of the war and the defeat of German militarism, after the revolutionary uprising and defeats of the proletariat, a new generation of

all processes are rapidly carried through, this schooling will not last for decades like the pre-war school of the social democracy, but most likely only a few years. But it is just this period that the German, yes, and the whole European working class is going through. The appearance of an independent Brandler faction is a small incidental symptom of this same process. The passing of the workers from the bourgeoisie to the social democracy testifies to a leftward movement of the masses. But this leftward movement has still a purely pacifist, reformist and nationalist character. The further fate of this process depends upon a whole series of domestic and international causes, and to a considerable degree upon our own policy, upon our ability to understand the essence of the process, upon our skill in distinguishing its successive stages.

The reformist leftward movement will begin to be replaced by a revolutionary one from that moment when the masses begin in a continually increasing flood to pass from the social democracy to the Communist Parties. But that has not yet happened. Individual, episodic manifestations do not matter. It is necessary to take the process as a whole. When Thaelmann, following Stalin and other leaders of the Comintern, said in July 1928 that "the situation is becoming more revolutionary every day," he only revealed a complete incapacity to understand the dialectic of the process which is taking place in the working class.

The German Communist Party received at last year's elections 3,200,000 votes. After the defeat of 1923, that is, after the collapse of Brandlerism, and after the monstrous mistakes of the ultra-lefts of 1924 and 1925, such a result was in the highest degree significant and promising. But it was not by any means a symptom of a revolutionary situation. Nine million are weighing upon these 3,200,000. This was made clear at the time of the Armored Cruiser Campaign, which completely refuted Thaelmann's selling-talk about the situation becoming "more revolutionary every day."

A NEW GROWTH OF REFORMISM

The working masses, and above all the new generation, are now passing through an accelerated repetition of the course of reformism. That is the fundamental fact. From this it by no means follows, of course, that we must soften our attitude toward the social democracy, or the right opposition, (Bucharin, Brandler and Co.). But our own tactical tasks ought to flow first of all from a correct understanding of what is taking place. The May Day celebration of 1929 could not jump out of its political setting. It could not help the Communist Party become stronger in the course of 24 hours than it actually was. May Day could be only an episode in the process of an as yet pacifist and reformist "leftward movement" of the masses. The attempt to jump over the sky in 24 hours strictly according to the calendar, flowed from a false estimate of the processes taking place in the mass, and inevitably led to a defeat, in which there was an indubitable element of adventurism. The opportunists always make gains on the miscalculations of revolutionary adventurism. In this case the social democrats made these gains and in part also the Brandlerites who represent the tidiest, most honest and freshest edition of "revolutionary" social democracy. They are using the debacle of revolutionary adventurism in order to discredit revolutionary methods in general.

There cannot be any doubt that the May Day celebration set back the German Communist Party. This does not mean of course that it set the Party back forever, or even for a long time. The unexampled crime perpetrated by the Social Democracy will be gradually assimilated into the consciousness of the working mass and will help them make the transition to Communism. There can be no doubt of that — upon one single condition: a fairly correct policy of the Communist Party itself.

If you approach the situation from this point of view it is necessary first of all to ask the question: What is now needed by the Berlin workers and the German workers and all other workers? A repetition of May Day or a learning of the lesson of May Day? The answer is already contained in the question. A repetition is unthinkable and not to be permitted. A repetition would be a bare, senseless adventure. What we want is a learning of the lessons, a correct estimation of what happened. What we want is a correct political line.

"RED DAY" CONDEMNED TO FAILURE

We have said that May Day cannot artificially raise itself above the political level of the movement. Still less can an artificial piling up of "red days" bureaucratically designated in advance according to the calendar, do this. Moreover the Comintern is making an attempt to take a First of August revenge for the First of May. It is possible to say even now, and it is necessary to say it in the hearing of all: The First of August "Red Day" is condemned in advance to failure. In addition to that: What was valuable in the First of May (the self-sacrifice of a part of the proletarian vanguard) will be reduced to a minimum on the First of August. And what was bad on the First of May (the elements of adventurism) will be raised to a higher power.

In the Autumn of 1923, when mental life in the Comintern was not yet entirely choked, there was an international polemic in the leading Communist organs as to whether or not it is possible to set the date for an insurrection in advance. Basing themselves upon the whole experience of revolutions the Marxists demonstrated that it is not only possible but necessary. Following Stalin and Zinoviev, Brandler and Maslov laughed at the idea of setting the date for an insurrection, thereby showing that upon

a situation is, the more necessary it is for the proletarian vanguard to have a clear and definite plan of action. The leadership of the Party ought to stand firmly at the helm with its eyes forward. One of the fundamental moments of leadership in such circumstances is the practical preparation, of an insurrection. And since an insurrection, like all human affairs, develops in time, the leadership must designate in good season the date of an insurrection. It stands to reason that with a change in the circumstances the date may be changed — as it was changed in Petrograd in 1917. But that leadership which cannot understand the significance of the time factor, which merely swims with the current, gurgling and blowing bubbles is condemned to ruin. A revolutionary situation demands a revolutionary calendar.

But this certainly does not mean that it is sufficient for Thaelmann, Stalin, Manuisky or Semard to pick up the calendar and put a red blot on the First of August in order to turn that day into a revolutionary event. Such an approach combines the most ruinous features of bureaucratism and adventurism. In those countries and those parties, where pure bureaucratism is uppermost — and these are the majority — the First of August will in all probability end in a comical fiasco like the Vincennes demonstration of Semard-Monmousseau. In those countries where the elements of adventurism are uppermost, the First of August may end in a tragedy which this time — in contrast to May Day — will be wholly, absolutely and irremediably to the advantage of the enemy.

IRRESPONSIBLE SLOGANS

The summons of the Western European Bureau of the Comintern issued in Berlin on the 8th of May, although we are accustomed to much, shock us with its light-mindedness, garrulousness, braggadocio and disgusting irresponsibility. "Into the streets, proletarians!" "Down with Imperialist war!" "Appropriate the political and military-technical experience of the struggle of the Berlin proletariat!" "Learn the fighting methods of the police!" "Make secure your ability to manoeuvre!" "Unite your support of the Berlin proletariat with the daily demand of the broadest proletarian masses!" "Down with imperialistic war!" "Into the streets, proletarians!"

In other words the European Communist Parties are given a strictly dated task: In the course of three months (May to August) to unite themselves with the broadest masses of the workers (no more and no less), learn the art of manoeuvring, acquire the fighting methods of the police, appropriate the political and military-technical experience of a struggle and go into the streets against... the imperialist war. It is really difficult to imagine a more pitiful document, testifying to the fact that the consecutive blows of the governmental apparatus of the skull of the Comintern have succeeded in producing an ominous stupidity. And now this headless leadership, armed with the above cited ideas and slogans, warns the bourgeoisie of all Europe that it intends on the First of August to lead the workers into the streets "fully armed with military-technical methods!" Could it be possible to play more shamelessly with the lives of the proletarian vanguard and the honor of the Comintern than these contemptible epigones are playing with Stalin at their head.

The tasks and duties of the Bolshevik-Leninist flow very clearly from the whole situation. We represent at present in the workers' movement a small minority — and this for the same reasons that the bourgeoisie are strong, the social democracy has grown, the right wing of the Comintern is consolidating, and Centrism holds the apparatus in its hand. The task of the Marxian minority is to analyze, estimate, foresee, warn against dangers and indicate the road.

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

What is to be done immediately? The first thing is to correct what is already done. It is necessary to call off the August First Demonstration.

But this will do injury to the prestige of the Comintern and its national sections? Indubitably. A crude political mistake cannot pass without affecting the authority of the Comintern. But the injury will be less if you call off the demonstration in time, than if you stubbornly persist in the mistake, converting the demonstration in the one case into an unworthy comedy, and in the other into a guerilla battle between small revolutionary troops and the police.

The recent Congress of the German Communist Party seems to attempt to dissent from the summons of the Western European Bureau in the direction of common sense. But instead of clearly and firmly rejecting it, the manifesto of the Congress is content to smear over and dissolve in water the military technical slogans of the Comintern. That is the worst course to take, for it combines all the disadvantage of a retreat with all the dangers of adventurism.

It is necessary to call off the demonstration. The Opposition ought to use all its strength to accomplish that. We should be able to knock on the doors of all the organizations of the party, behind whose back the demonstration was announced. We must appeal to the advanced elements of the trade unions. We must spare no effort to explain the error and the danger of this new invention. We must explain to Communist and revolutionary workers in general that the first requisite for a militant mass demonstration at the summons of the Party is an influence of the Party on the masses, gained from day to day by a clear, farsighted and correct policy. The present policy of the Comintern is undermining and destroying the influence won by the October Revolution, and in the period of the first four Congresses of the Comintern. We must change the policy at bottom. We must begin by calling off the August First Demonstration.

The Opposition will under no conditions permit itself to be cut off from the masses and above all

The New Progressive Movement

By Arne Swabeck

The Conference for Progressive Labor Action (Muste Group) has emerged as a definite trade union opposition with an elaborate program and a proposed membership basis of groups and individuals.

The program of the C. P. L. A. contains points worth noting, as for instance:

- Demands for social insurance.
- To assist in organization of industrial unions in basic industries with aggressive fight on the picket line and against the power of the courts to issue injunctions and their attempts to cripple unionism.
- To encourage working class education.
- To help establish farmer and labor co-operatives.
- To urge independent labor party action.
- Support of the struggle for the six hour day.
- Opposition to expulsions from trade unions for political beliefs.

To urge the workers to demand the wealth they create and to strike for their right as of old.

Unquestionably this program and its militant terminology to a large extent reflects the pressure of genuine left wing policies and activities of the past. It is a progressive program, most of its points being identical with those sponsored by the T. U. E. L. This new movement is a direct outgrowth of the increasing class pressure upon the workers in trustified industry and is one expression of working class radicalization. The almost complete disappearance of an organized left wing has facilitated the emergence of the C. P. L. A. at this time. These are facts of the greatest significance. They demand attention and a correct attitude from the Communists.

In industry everywhere the pressure upon the workers is increasing. More speed-up, more machinery, more uncertainty of employment. The present faint gropings of the workers for a way out will, in the course of its natural process, turn into more definite channels. The unorganized, unskilled and semi-skilled workers in the basic industries, who here and there begin to stir, are becoming ready material for organization. Those in the unions will be compelled to seek new policies, new methods, which will go beyond the obsolete craft barriers and challenge reaction.

NEW SPIRIT IN OLD UNIONS

Simultaneously the reactionary trade union leadership is marching ever more into the open as the agents of capitalism. In union administration and strategy the policy of the employers is becoming more dominant. Actually to prevent organization of the unorganized is now the main concern of these flunkies. Yet to conclude that the A. F. of L. and kindred unions are passing out of existence would be entirely wrong; or even to deny the possibility of a certain growth. The lower functionaries who are closer to the rank and file and more subject to its pressure will feel themselves compelled to move for expansion. The Chicago Federation of Labor is a case in point.

Recently by resolution a committee was established to carry on organization to further increase the union ranks. While this committee is composed of paid officials from the affiliated local unions bringing with them all the conservative craft prejudices, the action itself is nevertheless a response to pressure of conditions. Lately also on several occasions almost unanimous sentiment for the building of a labor party and discarding the A. F. of L. time worn political policy has been voiced at meetings in quite militant terms.

Our limited experiences have already quite clearly established the fact that the building of new unions in basic industries is conditioned upon the waging of the most militant struggle and facing the most ferocious persecutions. This is vividly brought out in the Southern textile mills. Would it then be reasonable to expect that the workers who become ready for organization will in mass numbers entirely discard the existing unions which have a tradition behind them? Hardly. On the Pennsylvania railroad, for instance, the unions are now — in agreement with the bosses — organizing the shop crafts.

Surely in the present objective conditions there are many favorable possibilities for the growth and development of a broad progressive movement. To deny this is tantamount to denying the present beginning of radicalization of the workers, which, although not yet of large ramifications, will ever more express itself both among the unorganized workers in basic industry and among those in the trade unions. On the whole, the ideology of the American workers is yet the one inculcated by capitalism. To expect that they should at once tear themselves loose from all capitalist influences and completely accept communist leadership will be a mere expectation having no foundation in facts. To pursue a policy based on the supposition that these working masses are waiting for the Communists to assume the direct lead — which the Party endeavors to establish by mechanical measures — without traveling the road of intermediary steps, can only lead to disaster and isolation.

BEGINNING OF REVOLT

The signs indicating the present trend of the workers, even including the formation of the C. P. L. A., show the beginning of revolt against the growing reaction of the officialdom. A definite class ideology by no means exists as yet. Our task is still the one of struggling for a class movement of the American workers. This of course presupposes the compact organization of a left wing capable of developing and broadening its influence in the course of struggle, exposing the reformists aspiring to leadership and new

methods of the left wing.

The C. P. L. A. in its organizing conference, made an attack upon the Communists. This was done partly to preserve their own appearance of respectability, but mainly to solidify the influence of their own reformist position. To the workers, however, the one thing must remain decisive that any group proposing to organize a progressive movement to the exclusion of the Communists will neither be able nor have the slightest intention of actually leading the workers in revolt against the reactionary policies of the A. F. of L. bureaucracy, much less against American imperialism. Their aim is, rather, to keep all such developing movements within "safe, legal" channels and prevent the actual and necessary revolt.

LEFT WING TACTICS

Yet it would be entirely too narrow and un-Marxian a view to identify the progressive movement which this period will develop merely by these aspiring leaders, even though they may be the very ones instrumental in unloosing the forces of great potentialities. Such is the destiny of the new progressive movement: it must either turn into more definite, more left, more revolutionary channels and discard its reformist leaders or become merely a shield for reaction and disappear in a merger with it.

The official attitude so far taken by the "new trade union line" of the Party in refusing to recognize the forces these elements represent and the coming movement they express in its first stage, in simply lumping them all with the A. F. of L. bureaucrats in one hodge podge, has nothing to do with Communist tactics. The present moment calls for the united front tactic with an independent policy and merciless exposure of the reformists, fakers and betrayers; a constant pressure to make the present grandly proclaimed program a program of realities, carried into life in the movement; constant pressure for more definite left wing and revolutionary policies. In this process the reformist leaders will be discarded and the left wing will prove its worth as the only force able to bring these policies to their correct conclusion.

VINCENT ST. JOHN

The death of Vincent St. John at San Francisco marks the passing of another of the great figures of the American revolutionary movement whose deeds helped to make its tradition and whose names will not be forgotten. "The Saint", as he was known, by those who knew and loved him, died at the age of 56 after a long illness complicated by high blood pressure. He will be sincerely mourned by thousands whose lives were influenced by him, particularly by those who belonged to the old guard of the I. W. W. in its bravest days when he was its moving spirit and guiding intelligence.

Vincent St. John, like Haywood and Frank Little, was trained in the hard school of the Western Federation of Miners, that model labor union whose mighty struggles threw their shadow across the world in the latter years of the Nineteenth Century and the first years of the Twentieth. A metal miner by trade, he joined the Western Federation in 1894, and became one of the most militant fighters in its ranks and an influential voice in its councils. Despite his modesty of disposition, his freedom from personal ambition and his lack of the arts of self-aggrandizement, his work spoke loudly and brought him widespread fame. His stirring deeds as a pioneer organizer became legends of the movement and remain such today. Until 1907 he was a member of the executive board of the W. F. M. and in that strategic position became the leader of the left wing in the looming struggle between conservative and revolutionary unionism which centered around the question of affiliation to the I. W. W. which the Western Federation had played a major part in founding in 1905.

At the second convention of the I. W. W. in 1906 St. John headed the revolutionary syndicalist group which combined with the S. L. P. elements to oust Sherman, a conservative, as President and establish a new administration in the organization with a revolutionary policy. He became the general organizer under the new administration, breaking with the W. F. M. on the withdrawal of the latter body, and giving his whole allegiance to the I. W. W. He presided at the 1908 convention which saw the split with the S. L. P. and the elimination of the "political clause" from the preamble. St. John was the leader of the proletarian "Direct Action" forces which defeated the "political" wing of De Leon. Thereafter he served as General Secretary of the I. W. W. until 1914, and undoubtedly did more than anyone to shape its course and prepare the ground for its later development under the active leadership of Haywood.

He withdrew from activity on leaving the office of General Secretary and engaged in a mining enterprise, doubtless with the illusory hope of acquiring a fortune to help finance the organization of the workers. Despite his retirement at the period, fear of his abilities and the prospect of his return to the office vacated by the imprisonment of Haywood dictated his own arrest and subsequent conviction with the Chicago group of I. W. W. wartime prisoners. He served two and a half years at Leavenworth before commutation brought his release.

From his earlier concepts of revolutionary socialism St. John, in revolt against the parliamentary reformism of the Socialist Party and the sectarian, ultra-legal concepts of the Socialist Labor Party, developed along the line of revolutionary syndicalism, the path taken by many of the best proletarian fighters of the period. In many respects this represented a

or industrialist position were storing up disasters for the future. The philosophy of the I. W. W., which St. John did so much to shape, was too simple for the complex situation brought about by the entry of the United States into the World War. The great sacrifices and heroic deeds of its members were unavailing against this handicap and were greatly discounted by it. The spirit of the I. W. W. died in the war, and not the least of the signs of this tragedy was the loss of faith of practically the entire body of the old guard which had made its history and its glory. St. John was among them. Spiritual death is the real death of revolutionaries.

To the great loss of the workers' cause, St. John, and with him the great majority of the leading militants of the I. W. W., failed to make the theoretical and tactical adjustments necessitated by the experience of the World War and the Russian Revolution. Their limited industrialist concepts remained unchanged. Communism, especially its American representative, impressed them unfavorably and they could not swim with the current of the new movement. The enormous errors, presumptuousness and tactlessness of the Party leadership are partly responsible for this calamitous state of affairs. American Communism should have been a natural growth out of the soil of the pre-war movement represented in part by the I. W. W. The early years of the Party were weakened and hampered by this failure and the I. W. W. movement, alienated from Communism, lost its old-time vigor and passed into an inevitable degeneration and decline.

But despite the tragedy of the after-war years the earlier work of the I. W. W. militants — and St. John in the front rank — retains all its validity. They wrote much of the tradition of the American revolutionary movement in letters of fire that will never be extinguished. The modern movement of Communism, which is the heir to their achievements, should value this tradition highly and honor the memory of the men who made it. The memory of Vincent St. John will always be a treasure to the revolutionary workers of America in their aspiring struggle for the workers' world.

For those who knew "The Saint" as a man and friend his untimely death brings a deep and poignant grief. He was a most admirable personality — brave and resolute, loyal and honest. He was a gifted and inspiring leader and organizer who gave himself, throughout the years of youth and manhood prime, untiringly and unsparingly to the workers' cause. And with the highest executive qualities he combined the rare gift of friendship, of warmly human consideration and concern for others, of loyalty in personal relations, which bound men to him in lifelong affection. Those who were so bound to him, who knew the warmth of his handclasp, enshrine his memory in their hearts along with the best memories of the great cause for which we live and strive.

Hail and farewell, Soldier, Man and Friend!

Gastonia in Danger

CONTINUED FROM PAGE ONE

movement of defense to the exclusion of all other working class forces. Instead of solidarity they showed dissension; instead of uniting the movement, they divided it. The mass movement arose in spite of them. The momentum of the movement swept over these triflers and succeeded in becoming a power despite these reactionary leaders. The policy of International Labor Defense in those days brought it the support of hundreds of thousands of workers, increased its prestige, and called into existence the largest mass movement the country has ever seen since the strongest days of the Mooney fight.

Grave consequences will be reaped by the defense unless this policy is adopted by the Communists and the I. L. D. in the Gastonia fight. Up to now, the defense work and agitation has been conducted on a most narrow and irresponsible scale. The united front has been sunk without a trace. Instead of welcoming outside support, the Party has repulsed it. Instead of inviting united aid, the Party has preferred to proceed alone in its "pure" ultra-"Left" madness. The Gastonia "unity" conferences of the I. L. D. have been organized on the most limited basis conceivable. In Chicago, the frivolous Stalinist dabblers refused to seat the delegates of the Communist League (Opposition at the defense conference because — they are "counter-revolutionaries"). We denounce this as a criminal attempt to carry on the factionally corrupt splitting game of the Stalinists at the expense of the Gastonia defendants.

There is not the slightest reason why the Left wing cannot arouse a broad inclusive movement for the defense of Gastonia on the same scale as the movement we set into motion in defense of Sacco and Vanzetti. There is not the slightest reason why the unity for support and defense of the Passaic strike cannot be repeated in the case of Gastonia.

Gastonia is in danger! The labor movement in the South has the knife to its throat. Every worker must answer. The banner of unity, not the flag of sectarian isolation and partisan primacy, can become the standard that will rally every honest element in the working class to the stirring appeal of Gastonia.

Tempus Fugit

"The leader of the Canadian Communist Party, unfortunately, used to be an ex-comrade by the name of Spector." — Jay Lovestone, The Communist, January-February, 1929.

Tempus fugit! The lea

American Com-