

MILITANT

VOL. 1. NO. 3.

NEW YORK, N. Y., DECEMBER 15, 1928.

PRICE 5 CENTS

The July Plenum and the Right Danger

A short few weeks ago, the official Party press carried the first stories from Moscow about the "opening" of a new struggle within the C. P. S. U. These stories revealed that the struggle between the Right wing (Rykov-Tomsky) and the Center (Stalin), with Bucharin playing the customary buffer role, could no longer be concealed behind the curtains of the Political Bureau of C. P. S. U. and had broken out in the Moscow and other organizations of the Party, where advance "scouts" for the Right wing had been presenting in the lower units of the Party the policies already proposed by Rykov-Tomsky-Kalinin in the Political Bureau. The dispatches in the Party press, however, throw no light on the actual situation and the real issue at stake.

The entire course of the present developments in the C. P. S. U. was predicted with amazing precision by comrade Trotsky in his platform as far back as the 15th Party Congress (1927) and in the following suppressed arti-

cle written in July of this year. Just as Stalin fruitlessly attempted to deny the existence of a Right danger, as analyzed by Trotsky then, so he is now trying to deny the existence of this danger in the Political Bureau (Rykov, etc.), and continues to lull the membership of the C. P. S. U. and the Comintern into a false security. The article of Trotsky printed below was absolutely correct when it was written, and is even more correct now. It throws a penetrating searchlight upon the present situation within the Soviet Union Party, exposes the inexorable class forces represented by the contending groups, and proves again the irrefutable accuracy of the predictions and program of the Leninist Opposition. This article was sent to the Sixth Congress of the Communist International but was not distributed to the delegates. It is printed here for the first time in English. Other suppressed documents of equal importance will be printed in subsequent issues of *The Militant*.

THE report read by Rykov on July 13 at the meeting of the Moscow Party workers on the outcome of the July Plenum of the Central Committee was an event of capital political importance. Here was expounded the program of the most authoritative representative of the right wing, carrying his banner to the tribune if not entirely unfurled, at least half-way. In his report Rykov did not pause an instant upon the program of the Communist International; he did not even mention it. He devoted his speech exclusively to the question of the grain collections. Moreover it is not without good reason that his report was delivered in the tone of a victor. The Right has issued entirely victorious from its first skirmish with the Center, after four or five months of "left" politics. The July Plenum of the Central Committee marks the first victory of Rykov over Stalin, gained to be sure with the consent of the latter. The essential idea of Rykov's report is that the swerve towards the left which occurred in February was only an episode due to extraordinary circumstances, that this episode ought to be buried and forgotten, that we must also lay on the shelf not only Article 107,¹ but also what appeared in *Pravda* in February, that we must abandon the former course and turn not to the left but to the right—and that the more brusquely this is done the better. To clear the road Rykov acknowledged (he would not do otherwise before the accusing facts) three of his small errors: "First, at the moment when the crisis arose I judged it to be less profound than it really was; but, second, I thought that thanks to extraordinary measures we would succeed in overcoming completely this crisis of grain supply. We did not succeed. Third, I hoped that the whole campaign of grain collection would be carried on in reliance on the poor peasant, and maintaining in perfect stability our union with the masses of middle peasants. Upon this point also I was mistaken."

Now this whole crisis of grain supply, with all the political phenomena which accompanied it, was foreseen by the opposition in its counter-theses,² which showed Rykov accurately all that he did not comprehend and did not foresee. It was just in order to avoid tardy and exaggerated administrative measures, adopted in haste and without coordination, that the Opposition proposed in good season a forced loan of grain from the rich elements of the villages.³ To be sure this measure also was an exceptional one. The entire preceding policy had made exceptional measures inevitable. If the loan had been made methodically and soon enough, that would have reduced to a minimum these administrative excesses, which are too high a payment for

1) The Plenum of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. which was held in July 1928, was devoted to economic difficulties and to the Congress of the International, which was to convene immediately after. A bitter struggle arose at this Plenum, or more exactly behind the scenes of the Plenum, between the Stalin and Rykov factions. As appears later, it was in fact the Right which carried the day, with Rykov and Bucharin at its head.

2) Article 107 of the Penal Code deals with the struggle against speculation and the fraudulent concealment of surplus merchandize. This article was widely applied last Spring as an extraordinary measure for requisitioning grain from the peasants.

3) This refers to the Counter-theses, which the Opposition opposed to the official theses presented by the Central Committee at the 15th Congress of the Party. These Counter-theses, which appeared at the time in the discussion supplement of *Pravda*, were devoted to questions of Party policy in the country and the five-year plan for the development of industry.

4) Foreseeing the imminent crisis of grain hoarding, the Opposition proposed in its platform a forced loan of grain from the rich elements of the villages which should yield 150,000,000 to 200,000,000 puds.

By L. D. TROTSKY

very slight material results. Measures of administrative violence do not belong to a correct course. They are the price we pay for an incorrect one. The attempt of Rykov to attribute to the Opposition a tendency to eternalize these procedures *à la* Rykov, derived from the period of Military Communism, is purely and simply ridiculous. From the very first the Opposition considered these perquisitions in the country, the re-establishment of flying squadrons, etc., not as the beginning of a new course but as the failure of the old. Article 107 on hoarding is not an instrument of a Leninist policy, it is one of the crutches of the Rykov policy. In trying to present as a program of the Opposition administrative measures of economic disorganization for which he is himself entirely responsible, Rykov is behaving as all petty-bourgeois politicians do, for they always in such a situation stir up the peasant against the Communist by depicting the latter as a bandit and an expropriator.

What is the significance of the change of course in February? It was an acknowledgement of the lagging of industry, of the threatening class-differentiation in the country, and of the extreme Kulak

danger. What should we deduce from it in order to establish the new line of conduct? A change in the distribution of the national income which should divert to the industries a part of what had gone to the Kulak, thereby diverting it from capitalism towards socialism, and accelerating the development of both light and heavy industry. Contrary to the article which appeared in February in *Pravda* (which merely repeated in this question the arguments of the Opposition) Rykov discovered the cause of the collection crisis, not in the lagging of the development of industry but in that of agriculture. To offer such an explanation is to make fun of the Party and of the working class. It is to deceive the Party in order to accomplish a swerve to the right. It is the old way of posing this question in the manner of the Ustrialov professors. It is perfectly obvious that our agriculture is incoherent, scattered, backward, that it has a barbarous character, and that this backwardness is the fundamental cause of all the difficulties. But to demand on this basis, as Rykov does, a diversion of the financial resources due to industry towards the individual peasant estate, is to choose not only the bourgeois road but the road of the agrarian bourgeoisie, of the reactionary bourgeoisie. It is to become a Soviet

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

GANGSTERISM!

On Monday evening, December 10th, two women comrades, Maria Reinl and Pauline Gutringer, who were selling *The Militant* on the sidewalk in front of the Workers Center on Union Square, New York City, were set upon by an organized squad which had been detailed to execute the slogan given out by Party officials to "prevent the sale of *The Militant* at all costs and beat up the Oppositionists."

"Get out of here, you counter-revolutionary prostitutes!" This and similar commands, mixed with unprintable obscenities, were hurled at the two working class women before a crowd of several hundred which quickly gathered.

Screaming epithets and calling the women comrades every name in the vocabulary of the underworld, they seized the two comrades by the arms and began to push them away. The Communist women resisted and stood their ground. The papers were torn from their hands. Comrade Reinl attempted to recover some of the papers and received a fist blow in the face.

The police appeared and immediately seized the two women leaving their attackers unmolested. The two Communist women who had attempted to sell *The Militant* on the sidewalk were then forcibly driven away by the police.

These events are the direct result of a planned campaign of incitement by Party officials who themselves never yet took part in a fight and who lacked even the courage to participate in the attack on the women comrades. Wolfe, who ran away from the Party like a craven during the Palmer raids and also after the Bridgeman raid, directly incited to physical violence against the Opposition in his speech at the Workers Forum on November 25. Dr. Markoff in his speech to the Italian Party membership meeting on November 28 said, "The Oppositionists

are worse than Mussolini and his Fascists. We must beat them politically and physically." Party comrades have been directly instructed by such functionaries as Miller and Benjamin that they must not speak to the members of the Opposition but should spit upon them. More than that, physical assaults against comrades attempting to sell *The Militant* on the streets, have been directly discussed and planned in committee meetings of the Party in the New York district, where every kind of bourgeois and anti-Communist literature is freely sold in the Party's book-store.

The methods of violence which the bureaucrats are copying from the labor fakery are necessary only for a false policy. Their methods condemn their policy and will defeat it, for Communist ideas are stronger than the gangster's fist.

None of the Foster comrades participated in the shameful gangster attack. It is primarily the proletarian revolutionists in the Party ranks who must defeat this course. They must burn the incipient Fascist tactics out of the Party with a white hot iron. They must compel a free discussion of the disputed questions in a normal Communist way.

For our part we will take up the challenge of gangsterism incited and organized by poltroons who never yet took a blow on the picket line or in a raid. Our task and duty is to reach the Communist workers with our views. Since we are deprived of our Party rights by expulsion and suppression we must do this through *The Militant*. We will sell the *Militant* before every workers' institution and meeting. The rights of the revolutionary workers are higher than the rights of landlordism. We will maintain these rights by struggle. In this struggle our strength will be multiplied by steadfast belief in our views and by our courage to defend them.

The July Plenum and the Right Danger

CONTINUED FROM PRECEDING PAGE

caricature of the "Friends of the People," of the *Zemstvos* of 1880. Agriculture cannot be elevated except with the aid of industry. There exist no other levers. Nevertheless our industry is frightfully backward in relation to the peasant economy, incoherent, scattered and barbarous as that is. The lagging of industry is observable not only by comparison with the general historic aspirations of peasant economy, but also by comparison with the buying capacity of the peasant. To confound these two questions, one having to do with the general historical backwardness of country as against town, the other having to do with the backwardness of the cities in face of the present need of merchandize in the villages, is to capitulate and abandon the hegemony of the cities over the country.

Our agriculture in its present form is infinitely backward open in comparison to industry, which is backward enough. But to conclude that this consequence of the operation throughout centuries of a law of unequal development of the different parts of an economy, can be overcome or even attenuated by reducing the already insufficient funds allocated to industrialization, would be like combatting illiteracy by shutting down the institutions of higher learning. That would be to tear out the very roots of historic progress. Although our industry has a type of production and technique infinitely superior to that of agriculture, not only is it not big enough to play a directive and transforming role—a truly socialist role towards the country, but it is not even capable of satisfying the current needs of the village market, and it thereby holds up the development of this market.

It is exactly upon this basis that the collection crisis became so sharp. It was not caused either by the general backward historic character of the country, or by an alleged too rapid advance of industry. On February 15, *Pravda* informed us that three years "had not passed without leaving their mark," that the country was enriched, that is to say especially the Kulaks, that in the face of the delay in the development of industry this must inevitably bring a hoarding crisis. Directly contradicting this interpretation, Rykov judges that the mistake committed during the last year by the Party heads was on the contrary to have excessively speeded up industrialization and that it is necessary to slacken the pace, diminish its share of the national revenue, and utilize the funds thus made available as subsidies for the rural economy, especially in its predominant private property form. It is by means of such procedures that Rykov hopes in a very short time to double the yield per acre. But he says nothing as to the means of disposing of this doubled yield on the market, that is to say, of exchanging it for the products of an industry whose rate of development will have grown still slower. It is impossible that Rykov does not raise this question in his own mind. A doubled harvest would entail a five or ten times multiplied demand of merchandize by the rural economy; the dearth of industrial products would thus also be multiplied several times. It is inconceivable that Rykov does not understand this very simple correlation. Why then does he not divulge the secret which is to enable him to triumph in the future over this disproportion, destined to grow monstrously? Because the hour has not yet come. For politicians of the Right, words are silver but silence is gold. Rykov moreover had already spent too much silver in his report. But it is not difficult to estimate the value of his gold. An increase in the rural economy of the capacity to buy merchandize, faced by a backward movement in industry, would mean quite simply an increase in the importation of manufactured products from abroad, destined both for the towns and the country. There does not, and there cannot exist any other alternative. As a result, the necessity of entering upon this course will be so imperious, the pressure of the growing disproportion will be so menacing, that Rykov will decide to coin his gold reserve and will demand out loud the abolition—or a reduction that is equivalent to abolition—of the monopoly of foreign trade.

This is exactly the plan of the Right which our platform predicted. From now on it will be carried openly to the tribune, if not as a whole, at least in one of its very considerable parts. As it appears from the whole speech of Rykov the raising of the price of grain is hypothecated upon that plan. It is above all a bounty to the Kulak. It permits him to lead along with still more assurance the middle peasants explaining to him: You see, I have made them pay me well for the damage caused by Article 107. It is in struggle that we will win our rights, as say our masters, the Social Revolutionaries. One

cannot doubt that functionaries who really know their business, are consoling the politicians by assuring them that it will be possible to recoup upon other raw materials produced by the peasants, what is to be paid in excess for grain. But such talk is pure charlatanism. In the first place, the worker consumes bread and not the raw materials utilized by the machine; the raising of the price of grain will thus strike directly at the budget of the worker. In the second place, we will not succeed any better in indemnifying ourselves through the other peasant products if it is first decided to cover the losses of the Left zig-zag course with the ruble. In general maneuvers of retreat are carried out with more loss than gain. This is still more true of a retreat as disordered as that marked by the decisions of July as against the resolutions adopted in February. The raising of the price of grain, even conceived as an exceptional and extraordinary measure, as a kind of article 107 read backwards, conceals in itself an enormous danger: it only accentuates the contradictions which gave birth to the hoarding crisis.

This rise in prices strikes only the consumers, that is, the worker and the poor peasant whose harvest is not sufficient for his personal consumption. It is not only a bounty to the Kulak and the well-off peasant, but a still further increase of class differentiation. If industrial products are lacking already under the old price of grain, the lack will be still greater after the rise in prices and the increase in the quantity of grain harvested. This will amount to a new extension of the shortage of industrial merchandize, and to a continuation of the growth of social differentiation in the country. To combat the hoarding crisis by increasing the price of grain, is to enter decisively upon the road of the depreciation of the chervonetz—in other words, it is to quench your thirst with salty water. This would be so, even if it were an isolated and exceptional measure. But in the mind of Rykov this rise in prices is in no wise an extraordinary proceeding. It is one of the essential parts of the Rykov policy of sliding towards capitalism. Upon this road currency inflation is only a technical detail.

On the subject of the danger of inflation, Rykov says with a meaningful air: "In the meantime the buying capacity of the ruble continues firm." What does this mean: "in the meantime"? It means: Until the sale of the new harvest at increased prices, in the face of a shortage of industrial products. But when the inflation arrives, Rykov will say to the workers, whose wages will fall inevitably in such a situation: "You remember I said to you 'in the meantime!'" And then he will begin to develop

T. J. O'Flaherty for the Opposition

Tom O'Flaherty, the most popular Communist propagandist in America and the writer of the famous *Daily Worker* column "As We See It" and a revolutionist of many years' standing, has issued a statement setting forth his unconditional support of the Platform of the Russian Opposition and his solidarity with all comrades expelled for these views.

"After studying new material on the question of the Trotsky line in the C.P.S.U. and the Comintern," said comrade O'Flaherty in his statement, "I have come to the conclusion that the line of the Russian Opposition led by comrade Trotsky is the correct Leninist line and therefore I associate myself with the position taken by comrade Cannon and his associates in the Workers (Communist) Party of America. They were unjustly expelled from the Party for attempting to explain to the membership of the Party the political line really advocated by Trotsky in the C.P.S.U. and the Comintern."

Comrade O'Flaherty's statement sets forth his agreement with the position of the Russian Opposition on such specific questions as Socialism in one country, the Anglo-Russian Committee and the problems of the Chinese Revolution, and brands the accusation of "counter-revolutionary" hurled as its supporters as ridiculous phrase-mongering having no basis in actual fact and carrying no conviction.

Comrade O'Flaherty, who has been removed from his position on the *Daily Worker*, has promised to contribute regularly to *The Militant*.

the part of his program on which he now remains silent. It is impossible to solve the crisis by entering the road of the NEO-NEP without impairing the monopoly of foreign trade.

At the same time that Rykov was celebrating this triumph, Stalin, the vanquished, made a speech at Leningrad. In his really impotent speech (it actually makes one sick to read it), Stalin presents the bounty now accorded to the rich elements of the villages and extorted from the workers and the poor peasants, as a new consolidation of the bridge uniting town and country. (How many of these consolidations have we had already!) Stalin doesn't even attempt to show how he intends to avoid the contradictions which are closing in on him. He has just got out of the difficulties produced by Article 107, and proceeds to tangle himself up in those of the rise in prices. Stalin is merely falling back on the same general phrases about the "bridge" which have already been repeated *ad nauseam*. As if the problem of the "bridge" could be solved by a phrase, a formula, a promise, as if one could believe (anyone, that is, except Stalin's docile functionaries) that if the next harvest is good, it will be able by a miracle to overcome the disproportion which has only been aggravated by the three previous harvests. Stalin is afraid of the Rykovist solution from the Right, but he is still more afraid of the Leninist solution. He is waiting. He is turning his back and occupying himself with manipulating the apparatus. Stalin is losing time under the impression that he is gaining it. After the convulsive shock of February we are now again in the presence of "Khvostism" in all its pitiable impotence. The speech of Rykov has a totally different tone. When Stalin dodges the issue by keeping still, it is because he has nothing to say. Rykov, on the contrary, leaves certain things unmentioned because he doesn't want to say too much. The policy of raising the price of grain (especially accompanied as it was by an exposé of the Rykov motives in explaining the abrogation of the Left zig-zag in the Spring) constitutes, and cannot but constitute, the beginning of a change of orientation towards the Right, a deep and perhaps decisive change. Legal barriers erected upon this road, such as the limitation of leases, and of the employ of wage labor, will be abolished with a stroke of the bureaucratic pen, along with the monopoly of foreign trade—at least unless these people break their heads against the iron wall of the proletariat vanguard. The logic of the Right course can very quickly become irrevocable. All the false hopes in the false policy of the Right, all these reckless calculations in general, the loss of time, the minimizing of contradictions, the mental reservations, and the diplomacy, are nothing but an effort to put the workers to sleep, to support the enemy, to promote, whether consciously or unconsciously, the Thermidor. In the speech of Rykov commenting on the resolutions of the July Plenum, the Right wing has thrown down the gage to the October Revolution. We must understand that. We must take up the gage. We must immediately and with all our might give the first blow to the Right. The Right, in issuing its defiance, has fixed its strategy in advance. For this it did not need any great ingenuity. Rykov asserts that at the basis of the Centrist tendencies of the Left there is "a Trotskyist distrust of the possibility of building Socialism on the basis of the Nep, and a desperate panic before the Moujik." The struggle against "Trotskyism" is the favorite hobby of those who are beginning to slide. But if this sort of arguments were fairly stupid on the lips of Stalin, they become a pitiful caricature on the lips of Rykov. It is just here that he ought to have remembered that silence is gold. It is those who distrust the conquest of power by the proletariat in peasant Russia who are really panic-stricken before the Moujik. These heroes of panic were seen on the other side of the barricades of October. Rykov was one of them. As for us, we were with Lenin and the proletariat, for we never doubted one instant that the proletariat was capable of leading the peasantry. The Rykov policy of 1917 was only an abridged anticipation of the present economic tactic. At present he proposes to surrender one after another the dominant economic positions already conquered by the proletariat to the elements of primitive capitalist accumulation. It is only thanks to the privileges which have been conferred upon him these last years by the falsification of history, that Rykov dares to describe as a panic the uncompromising

5) Rykov was in 1917 among the most resolute opponents of the seizure of power. Appointed a Commissar in the Government after the Revolution of October, he deserted several days after with Zinoviev and Kamenev.

At the moment when the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries began their open struggle against the newly-formed Soviet Government, Rykov, Kamenev and Zinoviev demanded a capitulation to them and the formation of a coalition government.

When the Central Committee refused to agree to the formation of such a government, they announced their resignation from the Central Committee, and Rykov and some others deserted the positions in the Government which had been confided to them by the Party.

struggle carried on by the Opposition in defense of the Socialist dictatorship. He attempts at the same time to pass off as political courage his disposition to capitulate to capitalism with his eyes wide open.

At present Rykov is directing his reactionary demagoguery, perfectly adapted to the psychology of the small owner on the way to wealth, less against the Opposition than against Stalin and the Center who incline toward the Left. Just as in his time Stalin directed against Zinoviev all the attacks which Zinoviev had directed against "Trotskyism," so Rykov is now learning to repeat the same operation against Stalin. Who sows the wind reaps the whirlwind. You can't play with political ideas. They are more dangerous than fire. The myths, legends, slogans of an imaginary "Trotskyism," have not become an attribute of the Opposition, but certain classes have seized upon them, and thus these conceptions lead their own life. To drive them more broadly and deeply, the agitation of Stalin had to be a hundred times more brutal than that of Zinoviev. Now it is Rykov's turn. One can imagine what persecutions the Right is going to turn loose when relying openly upon the property instinct of the Kulak. We must not forget that if the Rykovists form the tail of the Centrists, they have in their turn another, still heavier, tail.

Immediately behind Rykov, come those who, as *Pravda* has already recognized, want to live in peace with all classes—that is to say, want once more to force the worker, the hired man and the poor peasant to submit peacefully to the master. Behind them looms already the small employer, greedy, impatient, vindictive, his arms raised and the knife within reach. And behind the small employer, beyond the frontier, the real boss stands ready with dreadnoughts, airplanes and asphyxiating gases. "We must not let ourselves become panic-stricken. Let us go on building as we have in the past." That is what the little Judases of the Right are preaching, putting the workers to sleep, mobilizing the property holders, preparing the Thermidor.

Such is the present position of the men on the chess board. Such is the veritable mechanism motivating the classes. Rykov, as we have already said, deceives the Party in stating that the Opposition would like to perpetuate the exceptional measures to which we are reduced, to our shame, after eleven years of dictatorship by the policy pursued since the death of Lenin. The Opposition has said clearly what it had to say in its documents sent to the 6th Congress. But Rykov was perfectly right when he said: The principle task of the "Trotskyists" is to prevent this Right wing from triumphing. That at least is true. The victory of the Right wing would be the first step leading to Thermidor. After a victory of the Right wing it would no longer be possible to rise again to the dictatorship by the sole method of inner-Party reform. The Right wing is the handle on which the enemy classes are pulling. The success of this wing will be but a temporarily disguised victory of the bourgeoisie over the proletariat. Rykov is right. At present our principal task is to prevent the triumph of the Right. In order to achieve this, it is necessary not to put the Party to sleep as the Zinovievs, Piatakovs and others are doing, but to sound the alarm ten times as loud all along the line. We say to our Party and to the Communist International: Rykov is beginning openly to surrender the Revolution of October to the enemy classes. Stalin is standing now on one foot, now on the other. He is beating a retreat before Rykov and firing to the Left. Bucharin is lulling the mind of the Party with his reactionary scholasticism.

The Party must lift its voice. The proletarian vanguard must take its destiny in its own hands. The Party must discuss broadly the three courses: Right, Center and Leninist. The Party needs the reinstatement of the Opposition into its ranks. The Party has need of a Congress honestly prepared for and honestly chosen.

Alma-Ata, July 23, 1928.

THE MILITANT

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

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

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

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

Editor

James P. Cannon

Associate Editors

Martin Abern
Max Shachtman
Maurice Spector

VOL. I.

DECEMBER 15, 1928.

No. 3.

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

Whither Foster?

AN impression prevails which, for the sake of absolute and impartial truth, should be corrected. The opinion that the E.C.C.I., under Bucharin's leadership, always and under all circumstances is supporting Lovestone and Pepper in all things is not quite so. It is true that Lovestone and Pepper, not to mention Wolfe, receive the necessary political support to maintain their artificial hold on the party apparatus. But along with this whole-hearted backing to the opportunist adventurers go occasional "concessions" to the Foster group and these "concessions" are the bread they live by. After all, half a loaf is better than a crust and a crust is better than a crumb.

The arrival of one of these crusts of concession was made known through the columns of the *Daily Worker* on Dec. 3rd. It was a cable urging the Polcom to allow the Foster group to "express its dissociation from Trotskyism." This cable resulted in the publication on the same day of the Bittelman statement of the Foster group. Up till then the document had been suppressed by the Lovestone majority which had been unfairly hogging the credit for the fight against the "Trotskyist", right or left—take your choice—"danger". This illuminating document of Bittelmanism had been living a furtive life, so to speak, being smuggled around as an illegal work, surreptitiously shoved under back doors, etc. The cable of the E.C.C.I. legalized the statement and made its publication possible.

The Foster group leaders, who appreciate all small favors, were very happy about this "victory". But we believe the jubilation was ill-placed. Sober reflection on the part of anyone able to read the thesis of Bittelman through will lead to the conclusion that the decision which authorized its publication was in reality a defeat for the Foster group. It would have been more merciful to suppress the document altogether and to order the confiscation of the extant copies.

The statement begins with a plaintive wail about being deprived of the "credit" for promptly reporting our Right deviations on Left Trotskyism to the Right Wing Polcom. Being ourselves fair and impartial and wanting to see everyone get his due, we wish to say a word in favor of this claim. It is an absolute and indisputable fact that the Foster group dutifully furnished this evidence to Lovestone and Pepper, and they are fully entitled to all the honor and glory which services of this kind usually bring to those who perform them. If the "leadership" of Foster and Bittelman in the heroic battle against "Trotskyism" lasted only for a day, or, more precisely for an hour, and was strictly limited to the role of information-givers, it is not because of lack of ambition on their part. The greater energy and initiative of the Polcom majority and their control of the apparatus, on the one hand, and the determined opposition of the proletarian supporters of the Foster group to such a course on the other, combined to frustrate their aspirations in this case, as their plans are so frequently frustrated by the inability to see where the second step leads when the first step is taken.

"The Right Danger in the American Party" which the Foster group signed yesterday was a straight-from-the-shoulder document. It said in plain terms (and correctly) that "the main danger comes from the Right" and said (also correctly) that the present leadership of the Party is the consciously organized Right Wing. The Foster statement of today crawls away from this straight-out declaration and cannot find room in a document of six or seven thousand words to directly characterize the opportunist charlatans who control the party. The plain words of yesterday which called these adventurers the Right Wing and the greatest menace to the Party are emasculated into vague talk about "opportunist tendencies" in the statement of today. Nowhere is there a direct and straight-forward characterization of the present leaders without which there can be no question of a serious struggle against them. And furthermore—let the proletarian Communists of the Foster group take note and remember—this "diplomatic retreat" from the basic position taken at the Sixth Congress is only a transition step to a further retreat and an abandonment of the struggle after the Convention. A part of the leadership of the Foster group is moving directly to this. The pressure of the rank and file of the Foster group who really want to struggle against the Opportunist leadership make such an immediate capitulation impossible. This explains the fact that the leaders of the Foster group, lacking firmness and definiteness of principle, are moving in zig-zags backward.

Right and Left deviations, arising out of specific

objective conditions, represent obstacles to the class development and victory of the proletariat. In the struggle against them, as Lenin said, "Bolshevism grew, gained strength and became hardened." Lenin precisely defined the nature of these deviations, explained their source and origin and gave invaluable instruction for combatting them, enriching this instruction with illustrations from the history of the Bolshevik Party. All this is lost insofar as the statement of the Foster group is concerned. The whole business is reduced to a Chinese puzzle of contradictions, inconsistencies and light-hearted jugglery of words and formulae which have nothing at all to do with serious politics.

According to the Bittelman evangel "deviations to the Left in the American Party grow out of the same objective situation as right deviations." Moreover, right deviations are the same as Left deviations, the Right being "a fatalistic attitude toward American capitalism, toward the possibilities of struggle against it and the opportunities of building up a mass Communist Party in the United States", while the Left is "pessimism in the possibility of building up a Communist Party in the United States."

Thus Right is Left and Left is Right. The main danger comes from the Right, and "Trotskyism" which Foster and Bittelman called a social-democratic and counter-revolutionary tendency on October 16, is now re-baptized (after Stalin's latest right-about-face speech on October 19) as a Left deviation. The fight against it "as an organic part of the general struggle against the Right Danger," which they prescribed on October 16, is now replaced by a "merciless struggle on two fronts—against the open Right Danger and against the Trotsky Opposition led by Cannon." Then to make everything absolutely clear, so that even a Gomez can understand it, it is pointed out that the Right Danger is the greatest, therefore the Left must be expelled "to protect the Party from the demoralizing effects of Trotskyism."

It would be a great error to identify this nonsense with the actual standpoint of the great majority of the Foster group supporters. These are proletarian and revolutionary, animated by a relentless opposition to the opportunist adventurers and the will to fight them—an attitude firmly crystallized and maintained over a period of years, and soundly based on experiences in the class struggle. It is their misfortune, and the Party's misfortune too, that their revolutionary antagonism to the Lovestone faction is capitalized by such "leaders" as the authors of this document and thus deprived of real effectiveness in the struggle. These leaders act as lightning rods, catching the opposition sentiments of many worker-Communists, diverting them from their real objects and running them into the ground.

A serious fight on their part to change the present leadership of the Party is, of course, impossible with such a policy. The task of the proletarian supporters of the Foster group is to break through this contradiction and find a clear and consistent line. That all their tendencies are in this direction has already been clearly shown in recent weeks. It was their pressure which has compelled Foster and Bittelman to come forward with proposals to moderate the criminal expulsion policy of the Lovestone majority. But the worker-Communists must not be fooled or pacified by this temporizing half-measure. It is impossible to fight the opportunist leadership and at the same time support in any way the expulsion of its real opponents. The workers in the Foster group—the great majority—who understand the disruptive consequences of this expulsion policy and stand opposed to it, must come out in the open against it. The same holds true for the many who secretly sympathize with our whole position. Mere caucus agitation only plays the game of small-scale caucus politicians and serves the interest of the Right Wing splitters.

Benefit Performance for
THE MILITANT

of

"SINGING JAILBIRDS"

by Upton Sinclair

A New Playwrights Theatre Production

at

PROVINCETOWN PLAYHOUSE

133 Macdougall St.

TUESDAY EVENING, DEC. 18.

Curtain at 8:40 Sharp.

THE DRAFT PROGRAM OF THE COMINTERN

CONTINUED FROM LAST ISSUE

Here is what Bucharin wrote on the subject in 1917

"Revolutions are the locomotives of history. The irreplaceable engineer of that locomotive can even in backward Russia be only the proletariat, but the proletariat cannot stay within the limits of the property relations of bourgeois society. It marches to power and towards Socialism. However, this mission which is being put on the order of the day in Russia cannot be fulfilled within national boundaries. Here the working class meets with an insurmountable wall."—(L. T.)—"which can be broken through only by the battering ram of the INTERNATIONAL WORKERS' REVOLUTION."—(Bucharin, "Class Struggle and Revolution in Russia," page 34, Russian edition).

One could not express himself more clearly. Such were the views held by Bucharin in 1917, two years after Lenin's alleged "change" in 1915. Perhaps the October Revolution taught Bucharin differently? We shall see.

In 1919, Bucharin wrote on the subject of the "Proletarian Dictatorship in Russia and the World Revolution" in the theoretical organ of the Comintern, saying:

"Under existing WORLD economy and the connections between its parts, with the simultaneous inter-dependence of the various national bourgeois groups, IT STANDS TO REASON" (our emphasis) "that the struggle in one country cannot end without a decisive victory of one or the other side in SEVERAL civilized countries."

At that time this was even "self-evident." Further:

"In the Marxian and quasi-Marxian pre-war literature, the question was many times raised as to whether the victory of Socialism is possible in one country. Most of the writers replied to this question in the negative" (And what about Lenin in 1915?—L. T.) "from which one does not at all conclude that it is impossible or inadmissible to start the revolution and to capture power in one country."

Exactly! In the same article we read:

"The period of great development of the productive forces can begin only with the victory of the proletariat in several large countries. From here it follows that an all-round development of the world revolution and the formation of a strong economic alliance of the industrial countries with Soviet Russia is necessary." (N. Bucharin, "Proletarian Dictatorship in Russia and the World Revolution," The Communist International, No. 5, 1919).

Bucharin's statement that a rise in the productive forces, that is, real Socialist development, will begin only after the victory of the proletariat of the advanced countries of Europe—why, that is exactly the phrase which was used as a basis of all acts of indictment against "Trotskyism," including also the indictment read at the Seventh Plenum of the E.C.C.I. It is only strange that Bucharin, whose only salvation lies in his short memory, read the indictment. Side by side with this comical circumstance, there is also a tragic one—among those indicted was also Lenin, who expressed, tens of times, the very same elementary idea.

Finally, in 1921, six years after Lenin's alleged change of 1915, and four years after the October Revolution, the program of the Young Communist League, approved by the Central Committee headed by Lenin and drawn up by a Commission under Bucharin's leadership, says in paragraph 4:

"In the U.S.S.R. political power is already in the hands of the working class. In the course of three years of heroic struggle against world capitalism it maintained and strengthened its Soviet Government. Russia, although it possesses enormous natural resources, is, nevertheless, from an industrial point of view, a backward country, in which a petty-bourgeois population predominates. It can arrive at Socialism only through the world proletarian revolution, which epoch of development we have now entered."

This paragraph of the program of the Young Communist League—not of an accidental article, but of a program—renders the attempts of the authors of the draft to prove that the Party "always" held the construction of a Socialist society possible in one country and precisely in Russia, ridiculous and inadequate. If "always," why is it that Bucharin wrote such a paragraph in the program of the Young Communist League and why was Stalin looking on? How could Lenin and the whole Central Committee voice such a heresy? How was it that no one in the Party noticed this "trifle" or raised a voice against it? Does this not look like a vicious joke which is a direct mockery of the Party, its history and the Comintern? Is it not high time to put a stop to this? Is it not high time to tell the revisionists: Dare not hide behind Lenin and the theoretical traditions of Marxism?

5. WHERE IS THE "SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC DEVIATION"

What I have said is more than sufficient to characterize Bucharin's theoretical position of yesterday and today. To characterize his political methods one must recall that having selected in the statements written by the Opposition those which are absolutely analogous with those which he himself (IN THIS CASE in full agreement with Lenin) wrote up to 1925, Bucharin erected on their basis the theory of our "Social Democratic Deviation." It appears that in the central question concerning the relations between the October Revolution and the international revolution, the opposition thinks . . . the same as Otto Bauer, who does not admit the possibility of Socialist construction in Russia. One would think that printing has been discovered only in 1924 and that everything that happened before that has been forgotten. It is all trusted to short memory.

However, on the question of the nature of the October Revolution, the Comintern settled its accounts with Otto Bauer and other philistines of the Second International at the Fourth Congress. In my speech (on the question of the New Economic Policy and the prospects of world revolution) authorized by the Central Committee, Otto Bauer's position was outlined in a manner which expressed the views of our Central Committee of the time; it did not give rise to any objections at the Congress and, I think, it fully holds good today. So far as Bucharin is concerned, he declined to deal with the political side of the problem since "many comrades, including Lenin and Trotsky, had already spoken on the subject"; in other words, Bucharin agreed with my speech. Here is what I said at the Fourth Congress about Otto Bauer:

"The Social Democratic theoreticians, who, on the one hand recognize in their holiday articles that capitalism, particularly in Europe, has outlived its usefulness and has become a brake on historical development, and who on the other hand express the conviction that the evolution of Soviet Russia inevitably leads to the triumph of bourgeois democracy, fall into the most pitiful and flat contradiction of which these stupid and conceited confusionists are worthy. THE NEW ECONOMIC POLICY IS CALCULATED ON CERTAIN DEFINITE CONDITIONS OF TIME AND SPACE. IT IS A MANOEUVRE OF THE WORKERS' STATE WHICH EXISTS IN CAPITALIST SURROUNDINGS AND DEFINITELY CALCULATES ON THE REVOLUTIONARY DEVELOPMENT OF EUROPE. . . Such a factor as time cannot be left out of consideration in political calculations. If we admit that capitalism will really be able to exist in Europe for another hundred or fifty years and that Soviet Russia will have to adapt itself to it in its economic policy, then the question solves itself automatically because, by recognizing this, we presuppose the crushing of the proletarian revolution in Europe and the rise of a new epoch of capitalist revival. On what basis? If Otto Bauer has discovered in the life of present-day Austria any miraculous signs of capitalist revival then all that can be said is that the fate of Russia is pre-determined. But so far we do not see any miracles, and we do not believe in such. From our viewpoint, if the European bourgeoisie will hold power in the course of several decades, it will under the present world conditions signify not a new capitalist bloom, but economic stagnation and the cultural decline of Europe. That such a process might be able to draw Soviet Russia into the abyss can, generally speaking, not be denied. Whether she would have to go through a state democracy, or adopt some other forms, is a question of secondary importance. But we see no reason whatever, for the adoption of Spengler's philosophy. We definitely look forward to a revolutionary development in Europe. THE NEW ECONOMIC POLICY IS MERELY AN ADAPTATION TO THE RATE OF THAT DEVELOPMENT." (L. Trotsky, Five Years of the Comintern, Social Democratic Criticism).

This formulation of the questions brings us back to the point from which we started in dealing with the draft program, namely, that in the epoch of imperialism one cannot regard the fate of one country in any other way but by taking as a background the tendencies of world development, in which the individual country with all its national peculiarities is included and to which it is subordinated, as a whole. Theoreticians of the Second International exclude the U.S.S.R. from the world unit and from the imperialist epoch: they apply to the U.S.S.R., as an isolated country, the vague criterion of economic "maturity"; they declare that the U.S.S.R. is not ready for independent social construction, and draw the conclusion of the inevitability of a capitalist degeneration of the Workers' State.

The authors of the draft program adopt the same theoretical ground and accept the metaphysical methodology of the Social Democratic theoreticians as a whole. They too "abstract" from the world entity and from the imperialist epoch. They start out from the fiction of isolated development. They apply to the national phase of the world revolution a vague economic criterion. But their "sentence" is different. The "leftism" of the authors of the draft lies in the fact that they turn the Social Democratic evaluation inside out. However, the position of the theoreticians of the Second International, no matter how much one would remodel it, is equally bad. One must take Lenin's position which simply REMOVES Bauer's position and Bauer's prognosis as the exercises of an elementary class.

That is how matters stand with the "Social Democratic deviation." Not we but the authors of the draft should consider themselves related to Bauer.

6. THE DEPENDENCE OF THE U.S.S.R. ON WORLD ECONOMY

The precursor of the present prophets of the national socialist society was no other than Herr Vollmar.* Describing in his article entitled "An Isolated Socialist State" the prospect of independent socialist construction in Germany, the proletariat of which country advanced much further than that of progressive Britain, Vollmar, in 1878, refers clearly and quite correctly in several places to the law of uneven development which, according to Stalin, Marx and Engels did not know. On the basis of that law Vollmar arrives in 1878 at the irrefutable conclusion that:

"Under the existing conditions, which will retain their forces also in the future, it can be foreseen that a simultaneous victory of socialism in all cultural countries, is absolutely out of the question."

Developing this idea still further, Vollmar says:

"Thus we have come to the ISOLATED socialist State which is, I hope I have proven, although not the only possible, the MOST PROBABLE WAY."

Inasmuch as by the term of isolated State one must understand one State under a proletarian dictatorship, Vollmar expressed an irrefutable idea which was well-known to Marx and Engels and which Lenin expressed in the quoted article of 1915.

But then comes already something which is purely Vollmar's idea which, by the way, is by far not as one-sided and wrongly formulated as the formulation of our sponsors of the theory of socialism in one country. In his construction, Vollmar took as a starting point the supposition that socialist Germany will have live economic relations with world capitalist economy, having at the same time the advantage of possessing a highly-developed technique and a low cost of production. This construction is based on the prospect of a PEACEFUL co-habitation of the socialist and capitalist systems. But inasmuch as socialism must, as it progresses, constantly reveal its colossal productive advantages the necessity for a world revolution will fall away in itself, as socialism will be able to settle accounts with capitalism by the sale of goods more cheaply on the market.

The authors of the first draft program and one of the authors of the second draft, Bucharin, in their construction of socialism in one country, proceed entirely from the idea of an isolated self-sufficing economy. In Bucharin's article entitled "As to the Nature of our Revolution and the Possibility of Successful Socialist Construction in the U.S.S.R." (The Bolshevik, No. 192, 1926), which is the last word in scholastics multiplied by sophistry, all arguments are kept within the limits of isolated economy. The chief and only argument is the following:

"Once we have all that is necessary and sufficient for the building up of socialism, it follows that in the process of building of socialism there can be no such a point at which its further construction would become impossible. If we have in our country such a combination of forces that in relation to each past year, we are marching ahead with a greater relative strength of the socialist sector of economy and the socialized sectors of economy grow faster than the private capitalist sectors, then we are entering every subsequent new year with a greater balance of power."

This argumentation is comprehensible "ONCE we have all that is necessary and sufficient," SO . . . we have it. Starting out from a point which needs to be proven, Bucharin builds up a complete sys-

* George von Vollmar, son of an aristocratic Bavarian family, was one of the leaders of the German Social Democracy in the days of Bebel and the elder Liebknecht. He opposed the Marxian contentions on the questions of the concentration of capital, on the agrarian problem, and the like. He was one of the fathers of the "evolutionary" reformist movement in the German Party. During the days of the Bismarck anti-Socialist law, he served a term in the Zwickau prison, where he wrote a work on the question of an isolated Socialist State.—Ed.

FOREWORD

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

A rigid control on the document was established forthwith and the copies of the document which were distributed were called by the Secretariat. Copy which we have just received. It deals chiefly with the role of American imperialism and the prospect of new revolutionary situation in the revisionist theory of "socialism in one country," with the Chinese revolution and its lessons, and with the formation of workers' and peasants parties which Trotsky is in line with Lenin's condemnation in principle. Trotsky's comment on the "Third Party Alliance" with Follet's fight against which was led by him, will be especially interesting to American communists. The entire document will be printed in full consecutively in this and forthcoming issues of The Militant without any change. Its basic importance for the international revolutionary movement and the unanswerable correctness of its position on the burning problem of the Communist International make its invaluable contribution to the literature of our period.

—Editor

PROGRAM OF THE COMINTERN A CRITICISM OF FUNDAMENTALS By

“SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC DEVIATION”

is more than sufficient to recall that having selected in ten by the Opposition those 7 analogous with those which HIS CASE in full agreement up to 1925, Bucharin erected a copy of our “Social Democratic” in the central question between the October Revolutionary revolution, the opposite as Otto Bauer, who does ability of Socialist construction could think that printing has y in 1924 and that everything e that has been forgotten. It ort memory.

question of the nature of the , the Comintern settled its ac- Bauer and other philistines of ional at the Fourth Congress. he question of the New Econ- prospects of world revolution) entral Committee, Otto Bauer's d in a manner which expressed entral Committee of the time; to any objections at the Con- it fully holds good today. So concerned, he declined to deal de of the problem since “many Lenin and Trotsky, had al the subject”; in other words, th my speech. Here is what Congress about Otto Bauer:

democratic theoreticians, who, on the e in their holiday articles that capy in Europe, has outlived its use- come a brake on historical devel- on the other hand express the e evolution of Soviet Russia nee triumph of bourgeois democracy, it pitiful and flat contradiction of id and conceited confusionists are **NEW ECONOMIC POLICY IS ON CERTAIN DEFINITE CON- TIME AND SPACE. IT IS A OF THE WORKERS' STATE IN CAPITALIST SURROUND- FINITELY CALCULATES ON TIONARY DEVELOPMENT OF** ch a factor as time cannot be left in political calculations. If ealism will really be able to exist ither hundred or fifty years and a will have to adapt itself to it in cy, then the question solves itself ause, by recognizing this, we pre- h of the proletarian revolution e rise of a new epoch of capitalist at basis? If Otto Bauer has dis- life of present-day Austria any of capitalist revival then all that at the fate of Russia is pre-deter- ar we do not see any miracles, and e in such. From our viewpoint, if bourgeoisie will hold power in the decades, it will under the present signify not a new capitalist bloom, gnation and the cultural decline of such a process might be able to ssia into the abyss can, generally denied. Whether she would have a state democracy, or adopt some question of secondary importance. reason whatever, for the adoption. ilosophy. We definitely look for- lutionary development in Europe. **ONOMIC POLICY IS MERELY ION TO THE RATE OF THAT T.”** (L. Trotsky, Five Years of Social Democratic Criticism).

of the questions brings us from which we started in deal- ft program, namely, that in rialism one cannot regard the in any other way but by taking e tendencies of world develop- individual country with all its es is included and to which it a whole. Theoreticians of the al exclude the U.S.S.R. from d from the imperialist epoch: U.S.S.R., as an isolated country, of economic “maturity”; they U.S.S.R. is not ready for inde- struction, and draw the conclu- sibility of a capitalist degeneration tate.

the draft program adopt the ound and accept the metaphys- f the Social Democratic theoret-

icians as a whole. They too “abstract” from the world entity and from the imperialist epoch. They start out from the fiction of isolated development. They apply to the national phase of the world revolution a vague economic criterion. But their “sentence” is different. The “leftism” of the authors of the draft lies in the fact that they turn the Social Democratic evaluation inside out. However, the position of the theoreticians of the Second International, no matter how much one would remodel it, is equally bad. One must take Lenin's position which simply REMOVES Bauer's position and Bauer's prognosis as the exercises of an elementary class.

That is how matters stand with the “Social Democratic deviation.” Not we but the authors of the draft should consider themselves related to Bauer.

6. THE DEPENDENCE OF THE U.S.S.R. ON WORLD ECONOMY

The precursor of the present prophets of the national socialist society was no other than Herr Vollmar.* Describing in his article entitled “An Isolated Socialist State” the prospect of independent socialist construction in Germany, the proletariat of which country advanced much further than that of progressive Britain, Vollmar, in 1878, refers clearly and quite correctly in several places to the law of uneven development which, according to Stalin, Marx and Engels did not know. On the basis of that law Vollmar arrives in 1878 at the irrefutable conclusion that:

“Under the existing conditions, which will retain their forces also in the future, it can be foreseen that a simultaneous victory of socialism in all cultural countries, is absolutely out of the question.”

Developing this idea still further, Vollmar says:

“Thus we have come to the ISOLATED socialist State which is, I hope I have proven, although not the only possible, the MOST PROBABLE WAY.”

Inasmuch as by the term of isolated State one must understand one State under a proletarian dictatorship, Vollmar expressed an irrefutable idea which was well-known to Marx and Engels and which Lenin expressed in the quoted article of 1915.

But then comes already something which is purely Vollmar's idea which, by the way, is by far not as one-sided and wrongly formulated as the formulation of our sponsors of the theory of socialism in one country. In his construction, Vollmar took as a starting point the supposition that socialist Germany will have live economic relations with world capitalist economy, having at the same time the advantage of possessing a highly-developed technique and a low cost of production. This construction is based on the prospect of a PEACEFUL co-habitation of the socialist and capitalist systems. But inasmuch as socialism must, as it progresses, constantly reveal its colossal productive advantages the necessity for a world revolution will fall away in itself, as socialism will be able to settle accounts with capitalism by the sale of goods more cheaply on the market.

The authors of the first draft program and one of the authors of the second draft, Bucharin, in their construction of socialism in one country, proceed entirely from the idea of an isolated self-sufficing economy. In Bucharin's article entitled “As to the Nature of our Revolution and the Possibility of Successful Socialist Construction in the U.S.S.R.” (*The Bolshevik*, No. 192, 1926), which is the last word in scholastics multiplied by sophistry, all arguments are kept within the limits of isolated economy. The chief and only argument is the following:

“Once we have ‘all that is necessary and sufficient’ for the building up of socialism, it follows that in the process of building of socialism there can be no such a point at which its further construction would become impossible. If we have in our country such a combination of forces that in relation to each past year, we are marching ahead with a greater relative strength of the socialist sector of economy and the socialized sectors of economy grow faster than the private capitalist sectors, then we are entering every subsequent new year with a greater balance of power.”

This argumentation is comprehensible “ONCE we have all that is necessary and sufficient,” SO... we have it. Starting out from a point which needs to be proven, Bucharin builds up a complete sys-

* George von Vollmar, son of an aristocratic Bavarian family, was one of the leaders of the German Social Democracy in the days of Bebel and the elder Liebknecht. He opposed the Marxian contentions on the questions of the concentration of capital, on the agrarian problem, and the like. He was one of the fathers of the “evolutary” reformist movement in the German Party. During the days of the Bismarck anti-Socialist law, he served a term in the Zwickau prison, where he wrote a work on the question of an isolated Socialist State.—Ed.



FOREWORD

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

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

—Editor.



tem of self-sufficing socialist economics without any entrances or exits to it. As to the external environment, that is, the rest of the world, Bucharin as well as Stalin, think of them only from the viewpoint of intervention. When Bucharin speaks in his article about the necessity to “abstract” from the international factor, he has in mind not the world market but military intervention. Bucharin does not have to abstract from the world market because he simply forgets about it in his structure. In harmony with this scheme Bucharin championed at the Fourteenth Congress the idea that if we will not be interfered with by intervention we will build up socialism “although with the speed of a tortoise.” The uninterrupted struggle between the two systems, the fact that socialism can be based only on the highest productive forces, in a word, Marxian dynamics in displacing one social form by another on the basis of the growing productive forces—all this has been blotted out. Revolutionary historical dialectics has been displaced by a skinflint reactionary Utopia of encircled socialism, built on a low technique developing with the “speed of a tortoise” within national boundaries, connected with the external world only by its fear of intervention. The refusal to accept this miserable caricature on Marx's and Lenin's doctrine has been declared a “Social Democratic deviation.” In the quoted article, this characterization of our views, has, in general, for the first time been advanced and “substantiated.” History will mark that we have fallen into a “Social Democratic deviation” for failing to recognize as inferior version of Vollmar's theory of socialism in one country. The proletariat of Czarist Russia could not have taken power in October if Russia had not been a link, the weakest, but yet a link, of the chain of WORLD economy. The capture of power by the proletariat has not in the least excluded the Soviet Republic from the international “division of labor” set up by capitalism.

Like the wise owl which comes out only in the dusk, the theory of socialism in one country has appeared at the moment when our industry, which exhausts ever greater parts of the old fixed capital, two-thirds of which is a crystallization of the dependence of our industry on world economics, has manifested an acute demand for a renewing and extension of relations with the world market and when the questions of foreign trade have arisen in their full scope before our economic directors.

At the Eleventh Congress, that is, at the last Congress at which Lenin had the opportunity to speak to the Party, he issued the warning that the Party will have to face another examination:

“An examination which the Russian and INTERNATIONAL MARKET TO WHICH WE ARE SUBORDINATED, WITH WHICH WE ARE CONNECTED AND FROM WHICH WE CANNOT ESCAPE, WILL MAKE US GO THROUGH.”

Nothing strikes the theory of an isolated “complete” socialism such a death blow as the simple fact that the figures of our foreign trade have in recent years become the corner stone of the figures of our economic plans. The most “stringent place” of our economy, including our industry, is our import which depends entirely on the export. And inasmuch as the power of resistance is always measured by the weakest link, the extent of our economic plans is measured by the extent of our import.

In the journal *Planned Economy* (a theoretical organ of the State Planning Commission) we read in an article devoted to the system of planning, that

“in drawing up our estimates for this year we had to take our export and import balance as a starting point; we had to orientate ourselves on that in our plans for the various industries and consequently for industry in general and particularly for the construction of new industrial enterprises, etc., etc.”—(January 1927, page 27).

The methodological approach of the State Planning Commission says without any doubt, for all who have ears to hear, that the estimate figures determine the tendency and tempo of our economic development but that these estimate figures are already controlled by world economy; not because we have become weaker, but because having becoming stronger we have outgrown the narrow enclosed circle.

The capitalist world shows us by its export and import figures that it has other means of persuasion than those of military intervention. Inasmuch as productivity of labor and the productivity of a social system as a whole is measured on the

market by the correlation of production, to the extent it is not so much military the intervention of cheaper capital that constitute the greatest danger. This alone shows that it is merely a question of an isolated over one's “own” bourgeoisie:

“The Socialist revolution will win the whole world will by no means mean the victory of the proletariat of each own bourgeoisie.” (Lenin, 1919, p. 100)

It is a question of competition between two social systems, a death struggle between two social systems which only commenced to build productive forces and the other which only commenced to build productive forces of immeasurably greater magnitude.

Anyone who sees in the admission of dependence on the world market (Lenin's “SUBORDINATION to the world market”) “pessimism,” reveals thereby a petty-bourgeois feebleness in the world market and the pitiful country-bred optimism, hoping to develop an economy behind a bush and to grow with his own means.

The question of honor for the proletariat to become the curious idea that it will perish from a military intervention means form its own economic basis inasmuch as in socialist society the toiling masses to defend their interests much greater than the readiness of capitalism to attack that country with destruction? Is it because of TECHNICALY immeasurably greater forces only in the military technique does not want to understand that just as dangerous as the Creusot gun difference that whereas the gun of time to time, the tractor brings its constant. Besides, the tractor stands behind it, as a last resort.

We are the first Workers' State, world proletariat together with us, PEND upon world capital. The central and bureaucratically castrated “nationalism” is set in motion only with the cealing the extremely difficult nature of these “connections.” I deduce according to the price of the our dependence on the latter, would be a dependence, would be of a character than it is now. But it is not so. The very monopoly betrays the severity and the danger of our dependence. The decisive factor in monopoly in our socialist construction is precisely of the existing correlation is unfavorable to us. But one moment that the foreign trade dependence upon the world market eliminate it.

“So long as our Soviet Republic will remain the only border land of the whole capitalist world, so long will the ridiculous fantasy and Utopia of complete economic independence and the absence of any of our dangers.”—(Lenin, 1919, p. 100)

The chief dangers arise consequently from the objective position of the U.S.S.R. in capitalist economy to us. These dangers may, however, increase. This depends on the factors—socialist construction on the one hand and the development of capitalist construction on the other. The second factor of our dependence of world economy as a whole is the FINAL ANALYSIS, of DECISION.

Can it happen—and in what circumstances—that the productivity of our socialist economy constantly lag behind that of the capitalist countries—which, IN THE END would result in the downfall of the Socialist Republic? Can we manage properly our economy in a world economy it becomes necessary to create a new industrial basis with its incomparable demands to the management, then the productivity of labor will grow. Is it, however, that the productivity of labor in the capitalist countries, or, more correctly, in the capitalist countries, will grow faster than in the socialist country? Without a clear answer to this meaningless and wordy statement, the tempo “is in itself” sufficient (the factitious philosophy about the “speed of a tortoise”) are insolvent. But the ve-

COMINTERN A CRITICISM OF FUNDAMENTALS By L. D. TROTSKY

FOREWORD

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

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

—Editor.

tem of self-sufficing socialist economics without any entrances or exits to it. As to the external environment, that is, the rest of the world, Bucharin as well as Stalin, think of them only from the viewpoint of intervention. When Bucharin speaks in his article about the necessity to "abstract" from the international factor, he has in mind not the world market but military intervention. Bucharin does not have to abstract from the world market because he simply forgets about it in his structure. In harmony with this scheme Bucharin championed at the Fourteenth Congress the idea that if we will not be interfered with by intervention we will build up socialism "although with the speed of a tortoise." The uninterrupted struggle between the two systems, the fact that socialism can be based only on the highest productive forces, in a word, Marxian dynamics in displacing one social form by another on the basis of the growing productive forces—all this has been blotted out. Revolutionary historical dialectics has been displaced by a skinflint reactionary Utopia of encircled socialism, built on a low technique developing with the "speed of a tortoise" within national boundaries, connected with the external world only by its fear of intervention. The refusal to accept this miserable caricature on Marx's and Lenin's doctrine has been declared a "Social Democratic deviation." In the quoted article, this characterization of our views, has, in general, for the first time been advanced and "substantiated." History will mark that we have fallen into a "Social Democratic deviation" for failing to recognize as inferior version of Vollmar's theory of socialism in one country. The proletariat of Czarist Russia could not have taken power in October if Russia had not been a link, the weakest, but yet a link, of the chain of WORLD economy. The capture of power by the proletariat has not in the least excluded the Soviet Republic from the international "division of labor" set up by capitalism.

Like the wise owl which comes out only in the dusk, the theory of socialism in one country has appeared at the moment when our industry, which exhausts ever greater parts of the old fixed capital, two-thirds of which is a crystallization of the dependence of our industry on world economics, has manifested an acute demand for a renewing and extension of relations with the world market and when the questions of foreign trade have arisen in their full scope before our economic directors.

At the Eleventh Congress, that is, at the last Congress at which Lenin had the opportunity to speak to the Party, he issued the warning that the Party will have to face another examination:

"An examination which the Russian and INTERNATIONAL MARKET TO WHICH WE ARE SUBORDINATED, WITH WHICH WE ARE CONNECTED AND FROM WHICH WE CANNOT ESCAPE, WILL MAKE US GO THROUGH."

Nothing strikes the theory of an isolated "complete" socialism such a death blow as the simple fact that the figures of our foreign trade have in recent years become the corner stone of the figures of our economic plans. The most "stringent place" of our economy, including our industry, is our import which depends entirely on the export. And inasmuch as the power of resistance is always measured by the weakest link, the extent of our economic plans is measured by the extent of our import.

In the journal *Planned Economy* (a theoretical organ of the State Planning Commission) we read in an article devoted to the system of planning, that

"in drawing up our estimates for this year we had to take our export and import balance as a starting point; we had to orientate ourselves on that in our plans for the various industries and consequently for industry in general and particularly for the construction of new industrial enterprises, etc., etc."—(January 1927, page 27).

The methodological approach of the State Planning Commission says without any doubt, for all who have ears to hear, that the estimate figures determine the tendency and tempo of our economic development but that these estimate figures are already controlled by world economy; not because we have become weaker, but because having becoming stronger we have outgrown the narrow enclosed circle.

The capitalist world shows us by its export and import figures that it has other means of persuasion than those of military intervention. Inasmuch as productivity of labor and the productivity of a social system as a whole is measured on the

market by the correlation of prices, to the same extent it is not so much military intervention as the intervention of cheaper capitalist commodities that constitute the greatest danger to Soviet economy. This alone shows that it is by no means merely a question of an isolated economic victory over one's "own" bourgeoisie:

"The Socialist revolution which is meant for the whole world will by no means consist merely in a victory of the proletariat of each country over its own bourgeoisie." (Lenin, 1919, Vol. 16, page 388).

It is a question of competition and of a life and death struggle between two social systems one of which only commenced to build on backward productive forces and the other which still rests on productive forces of immeasurably greater strength.

Anyone who sees in the admission of our dependence on the world market (Lenin spoke directly of our SUBORDINATION to the world market) "pessimism," reveals thereby his own provincial petty-bourgeois feebleness in the face of the world market and the pitiful character of his country-bred optimism, hoping to hide from world economy behind a bush and to get along somehow with his own means.

The question of honor for the new theory has become the curious idea that the U.S.S.R. can perish from a military intervention, but by no means form its own economic backwardness. But inasmuch as in socialist society the readiness of the toiling masses to defend their country must be much greater than the readiness of the slaves of capitalism to attack that country, the question is why should a military intervention menace us with destruction? Is it because the enemy is TECHNICALLY immeasurably stronger? Bucharin admits the preponderance of the productive forces only in the military technical aspect. He does not want to understand that Ford's tractor is just as dangerous as the Creusot gun, with the only difference that whereas the gun can act only from time to time, the tractor brings its pressure to bear constantly. Besides, the tractor knows that a gun stands behind it, as a last resort.

We are the first Workers' State—a part of the world proletariat together with which we DEPEND upon world capital. The indifferent, neutral and bureaucratically castrated word, "connection" is set in motion only with the object of concealing the extremely difficult and dangerous nature of these "connections." If we would produce according to the price of the world market, our dependence on the latter, without ceasing to be a dependence, would be of a much less severe character than it is now. But unfortunately this is not so. The very monopoly of foreign trade betrays the severity and the dangerous character of our dependence. The decisive importance of the monopoly in our socialist construction is a result precisely of the existing correlation of forces which is unfavorable to us. But one must not forget for a moment that the foreign trade only regulates our dependence upon the world market, but does not eliminate it.

"So long as our Soviet Republic," says Lenin, "will remain the only border land surrounded by the whole capitalist world, so long will it be an absolutely ridiculous fantasy and Utopia to think of our complete economic independence and of the disappearance of any of our dangers."—(Vol. 17, page 409).

The chief dangers arise consequently from the objective position of the U.S.S.R. as the "only borderland" in capitalist economy which is hostile to us. These dangers may, however, diminish or increase. This depends on the action of two factors—socialist construction on the one hand, and the development of capitalist economy on the other. The second factor of course, that is, the fate of world economy as a whole, is, IN THE FINAL ANALYSIS, of DECISIVE significance.

Can it happen—and in what particular case—that the productivity of our socialist system will constantly lag behind that of the capitalist system—which, IN THE END would inevitably lead to the downfall of the Socialist Republic? If we will manage properly our economy in the phase when it becomes necessary to create independently an industrial basis with its incomparably higher demands to the management, then our productivity of labor will grow. Is it, however, inconceivable that the productivity of labor in the capitalist countries, or, more correctly, in the predominant capitalist countries, will grow faster than in our country? Without a clear answer to this question the meaningless and wordy statements that our tempo "is in itself" sufficient (let us forget the factitious philosophy about the "speed of the tortoise") are insolvent. But the very mentioning of

the rivalry of two systems leads us to the arena of world economy and world politics, that is, to the arena of action and decision of the revolutionary International which includes also the Soviet Republic, but not by any means the self-sufficing Soviet Republic, which secures from time to time the support of the International. Before, however, taking up this question we will try to reveal its main contradiction, basing ourselves on the draft program.

7. THE ANTAGONISM BETWEEN THE PRODUCTIVE FORCES AND THE NATIONAL BOUNDARIES AS THE CAUSE OF THE REACTIONARY UTOPIAN THEORY OF SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTRY.

The theory of socialism in one country is confirmed as we have seen by means of several sophist interpretations of Lenin's expressions on the one hand and by a scholastic interpretation of the "law of uneven development" on the other. By giving a correct interpretation of the historical law as well as of the respective quotations we arrived at a directly opposite conclusion, that is, a conclusion at which Marx, Engels, Lenin and all of us including Stalin and Bucharin up to 1925, have arrived at.

From the uneven sporadic development of capitalism follow the unsimultaneous, uneven and sporadic nature of the socialist revolution; from the extreme tensivity of the inter-dependence of the various countries upon each other, follows not only the political but also the economic impossibility of the building up of socialism in one country.

From this angle we will examine once again the text of the program a little closer. We have already read in the introduction that:

"Imperialism... intensifies the contradiction between the growth of the productive forces of world economy and national State barriers to an exceptional degree."

We have already stated that this utterance was meant to be the corner-stone of the international program. But it is precisely this enunciation which excludes, rejects and sweeps away beforehand the theory of socialism in one country as a reactionary theory because it is irreconcilably opposed not only to the main TENDENCY of development of the productive forces but also to the MATERIAL RESULTS which have already been attained. The productive forces are incompatible with national boundaries. From here follow not only foreign trade, the export of people and capital, the conquest of land, the colonial policy, and the last imperialist war, but also the economic impossibility of a self-sufficing socialist society. The productive forces of CAPITALIST countries have already for a long time broken through the national boundaries. Socialist society however, can be built only on the most advanced productive forces, on electricity and chemistry in the processes of production including also agriculture, in the combination, generalization and culmination of the highest elements of modern technique. We have been repeating since Marx that capitalism is unable to cope with the spirit of new technique to which it has given rise and which breaks asunder not only the private property rights of bourgeois property but, as the war of 1914 has shown, also the national limits of the bourgeois State. Socialism, however, must not only take over from capitalism the most highly developed productive forces but must immediately carry them onward, raise them to a higher level and lend them such a state of development which has been unknown under capitalism. The question arises, how can socialism drive the productive forces back into the boundaries of a national state which they have broken through under capitalism? Or perhaps we ought to abandon the idea of "unbridled" productive forces for which the national boundaries AND CONSEQUENTLY ALSO THE BOUNDARIES OF THE THEORY OF SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTRY are too narrow, and limit ourselves to, let us say, the home productive forces, that is, to our technical backwardness? If this is the case, then we should in many branches of industry stop making progress right now, and decline to a position even lower than our present pitiful technical level which managed to link up bourgeois Russia with world economy in an inseparable bond and to bring it into the vortex of the imperialist war for an EXPANSION OF ITS TERRITORY FOR THE PRODUCTIVE FORCES which had outgrown the State boundaries.

TO BE CONTINUED

The Struggle in the Y. W. L.

THE letter sent to the Young Workers (Communist) League of America after the Fifth Congress of the Young Communist International was not made available to the League ranks until an appreciable period after it was received. The agents of Lovestone who are in control of the League's national executive committee, in whose eyes the Y. C. I. document found disfavor, resorted to the simple expedient of withholding its publication and suppressing its circulation. Despite the protests of the minority, the right wing Polcom of the Party supported its League adherents, and it was not until the minority had appealed to the Executive Committee of the Y. C. I. and the latter had responded, demanding the immediate publication of the letter, that it was finally published.

The minority in the League is as jubilant over this letter and its "victory" as a condemned prisoner who has received three days of grace.

They seem to have forgotten entirely the lessons, as plain as a pikestaff, to be learned from the relations of the Y. C. I. to the struggle in the American League and Party in the past few years. It is necessary therefore to repeat them.

The Y. C. I. must follow, and has followed, the general political line of the C. I. on the American question which has been, unfortunately, "on the whole for the political support of the Ruthenberg group". Every decision of the Y. C. I., which appeared to be favorable towards the present minority (even at a time when it was the majority of the N. E. C.) invariably ended its brief career by being transformed into support of the Lovestone (Zam) group in the League. This occurred even though the present minority in the League had, at every decisive point, a majority of the membership behind its policies and leadership. Each time this majority was mechanically routed either by a thunderbolt decision of the Y. C. I., by its representatives to the League here, or by factional gerrymandering by the Lovestone Central Committee of the Party. When the latter method was used, the Y. C. I. did not find a word of criticism to make.

We recall, for instance, the scandalous action of the Lovestone G.E.C. in the League convention at Chicago in 1925, where an established majority delegation for the present minority group was squeezed into a minority against the will of the membership and with the acquiescence of the Y. C. I. We recall the post-convention period when the policy of the Y. C. I. representative was the fraudulent "unity" line which consisted in driving the weak and spineless elements of the minority group into the Zam group and thus... liquidating the factional fight! (Later on, it is true, a somewhat different song was sung after considerable damage had been caused.) We recall the fourth convention of the League, (New York, 1927). Despite a favorable previous decision of the Y. C. I. to the then majority of the N.E.C., the genuine unity group, both the representatives of the C. I. and the Y. C. I. over to the hands of the Zam group, on the basis of the fact that the Comintern had given its political support in the Party to the Lovestone group.

What is the political line followed in the present decision of the Y. C. I. that would lead anyone to believe that a new era has dawned? Absolutely nothing! Objectively analyzed, the political content of the letter of the Y. C. I.—once we discount the little bonbons it gives to the minority—is precisely that of the decision on the American question of the Sixth Congress of the Comintern, i. e., a denial of the main political contention of the minority that the Party leadership is a right wing which must be removed.

"Not one of the groups can claim the title 'real Left' or accuse the other of being 'Right'. So

called Right errors were committed by all groups." "One must CONDEMN THE REVIVAL OF GROUP STRUGGLE IN THE AMERICAN YOUNG COMMUNIST LEAGUE. The Y.C.L. as well as the Communist Party of the United States have been guilty of a series of Right opportunist errors but both contending groups are responsible for them."

Not even Lovestone himself—although he may and does make a few grimaces at some of the formulations—could phrase it more satisfactorily. Is he not ready to say in the middle of the night that he has made some right errors also, that factional struggle is evil, that "the League be united on the line of the C.I. and Y.C.I. and that the League or any part of it shall endeavor not to be connected with either fractional group in the Party"?

The League Lovestone group is preparing to maintain control of the organization by all means. The process of cutting the minority to pieces is proceeding right merrily. The functionaries of the minority have been either removed or wangled out of position throughout the country, (attempted removal of Mates in Pittsburgh; removal of Frankfeld as D. O. in New York; the squeezing down of the minority in Chicago and the mechanical usurpation of control by Plott and Lurye; the foisting of the two eastern statesmen, Shohan and Schaap, on two western districts; the removal of Don and Rijak from the New York D. E. C. etc., etc., etc.) The minority has further given shame-faced support to the expulsion for their views in support of the Russian Opposition of the two leaders of the Chicago league, Glotzer and Zalisko, of Carl Cowl in Minneapolis, of Morganstern, Lankin and Goodman in Philadelphia, of others in New York and elsewhere. Indeed the entire question of the issues raised by the Russian Opposition led by Trotsky now confronts the League minority with its full force and demands of them a clear-cut position which they have thus far not given. They are showing a vacillation which they never learned in any school of Bolshevism. They flutter about piteously between calling "Trotskyism" a "left danger" or a "right danger". They participate in the self-debasing campaign of heaping attacks upon Trotsky and the Opposition, and pour the official, newly warmed-over pap down the already raw throats of the young membership which tries to digest it between gasps and well-organized and well-timed cheers for the new revelations.

The League minority comrades continue to rely on, and be led by, elements whose most malicious enemies could never accuse of consistency. Their entire record has demonstrated that for them "dialectics" is construed as a license for "changing their minds" every forty-eight hours. For them mediocrity is placed at a premium. The minority must wake up every morning in a cold sweat and reach trembling for the latest paper to see whether or not the night has passed successfully without a new reversal of position by these shifting elements.

Neither the Lovestoneites in the League, nor the bulk of the minority comrades themselves, take the latter's protestations of anti-Trotskyism seriously. They cannot speak with conviction of Trotsky's "errors" on the questions of socialism in one country, the Chinese revolution, the Anglo-Russian Committee, and so forth, for the simple reason that they do not believe them to be errors. Some of them realize already that tomorrow they will themselves be confronted with their record of today's feeble huzzahs for expulsion of the supporters of the Opposition, since they must soon choose between the position of the right wing (Lovestone) and the viewpoint of the Russian Opposition, and the choice of that tomorrow is already on the agenda. They cannot continue with the poppycock of "educating" the Communist youth against the Russian Opposition's Platform which many of them hesitate to study and understand for fear of the consequences which inevitable conviction would bring. They should remember the admonition of Lenin, particularly to the Communist youth (in his speech at the 3rd Congress of the Russian Y. C. L.):

"A Communist who would dream of boasting of his Communism on the basis of the ready-made conclusions taught to him, without performing the most serious, the most difficult and persistent work without understanding the facts of which he should be extremely critical, would be a miserable Communist indeed."

The genuine Oppositionists in the League who have taken a principle stand on the basic questions of the International movement and suffered expulsion for their views are showing the way. Morganstern, Lankin and Goodman in Philadelphia,

Glotzer and Zalisko in Chicago, Cowl and others in Minneapolis, Gerry Allard in the mine fields, the League group in Akron—these are names of honor. They are showing the hesitant "leaders" how to adopt a principle position and stand up and fight for it as befits a Communist. They are setting an example for those who really want to lead. Around them and their example will be crystallized the Bolshevik nucleus of the League which not only in words but in deeds will struggle for the reorganization of its leadership on a proletarian-Communist basis and for the establishment of the League in its rightful place in the vanguard of the historic struggle now developing in the Party.—S

Lovestone Smashes the Right Danger

The huge imposture which the Lovestone C.E.C. is carrying on in the name of a "fight" against the right danger in the Party is on in full swing. The bewildered observer who cannot understand how this faction can properly conduct a fight against opportunism without exterminating itself has apparently not yet even begun to fathom the resourcefulness and "ability" of our Party leaders. For them even such a superhuman effort is quite possible, and that by the simple method of discovering a right wing danger in quarters other than their own. What could be more convenient?

In the *Daily Worker* of November 23, 1928, John L. Sherman, one of the reporters, wrote a story on the Hoover three billion dollar "stabilization fund" proposal. It was neither brilliant nor correct, that is to say it was neither better nor worse than many stories, articles and editorials that appeared before and since, written by far more responsible spokesmen for the Party and but little improved by the "corrections" which usually follow them the very next day in a special column on the editorial page reserved for this purpose.

It was Sherman's misfortune to concoct his article at a time when a blood-sacrifice was necessary. No sooner had it appeared than the eagle eye of the sentinel on the beleaguered watch tower of the Polcom espied it. Immediately the agit-prop and organizational departments of the Party were mobilized for action. A special meeting of the Polcom was called to consider the menace of Sherman.

Who, it was asked, is John L. Sherman? All we know of him is that he came to the Party a short while ago from City College of New York, that alma mater from which so many of his inquisitors have leaped directly into leadership of the Party without any intermediary stops in the turmoil of the class struggle. But whom does he represent? Who follows him in the Party? Who, outside of a handful of comrades in the *Daily Worker* office, had even ever seen or heard the name of this terrible ogre before he broke into unwilling notoriety?

These doubters and conciliators who asked these questions, these objective supporters of the right wing, were quickly and mercilessly suppressed. All the 12-inch guns of the Lovestone group, Lovestone, Bedacht, Minor, Pepper and Wolfe, were wheeled into action. The breach was loaded, the range found, the muzzles trained, a barrage laid down, and when the smoke of the terrific detonation had cleared, the target was riddled to bits. On the battlefield, twittering and fluttering with pain, lay a tiny sparrow.

The next day, the somewhat stupefied Sherman, blinking his amazed eyes in the white glare of the unaccustomed and pitiless publicity, delivered his unconditional capitulation. He repented his shameless opportunist boldness, denounced himself for being (or having been) a menacing right winger, welcomed the sock in the jaw given him by the Polcom, and in turn delivered a sock at "this danger and Trotskyism which is its crassest form."

Thus ended the first big engagement in the war to make the Party safe for Opportunism. Fiercer battles are feared, however, in the near future.

NOTICE

Comrade Maurice Spector, former editor of the *Canadian Worker* and the *Canadian Labor Monthly*, who has been expelled from the Communist Party of Canada for his support of the Russian Opposition, has joined the staff of "The Militant" as Associate Editor and will contribute articles regularly.

Comrades wishing to communicate with comrade Spector should address him at 231 Palmerston Avenue, Toronto, Ont., Canada.

Our First Pamphlet!

THE DRAFT PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL A Criticism of Fundamentals

By

L. D. TROTSKY

With an Introduction by James P. Cannon

READY SOON

25 cents per Copy

In lots of 5 or more 18 cents per Copy

Order now from

THE MILITANT

Box 120, Madison Square Station
New York City.

The Right Danger in the American Party

CONTINUED FROM LAST ISSUE

VI. Insufficient Appreciation of Leading Role of Party and Failure to Build It.

The political Secretariat of the ECCI found it necessary to state in its letter of April 13th to our Party that it "deems it necessary to call attention to . . . the tasks of the Party in the sphere of leadership of the growing workers' mass movement;" the Secretariat further stated that our Party "has now as its major task to mobilize and to organize the workers under its banner against the capitalist offensive... it is immediately necessary to intensify the ideological and organizational preparation of the Party, especially the local Party organization, to enable it quickly to mobilize its forces and means and thus to make it ready for a leading role in the developing class struggle."

The insufficient appreciation of the leading role of the Party and the failure to build the Party to which this letter called attention is one of the main characteristics of the Lovestone group. This is shown by the following facts:

1. Overemphasis on labor party. Slowness and delay in deciding upon and announcing our own election campaign. (Lovestone article April "Communist." Delay in acting on minority motion of February 29th for mobilization of Party for our own election campaign.) Allowing SP to enter field first.
2. The Palken, Bearak and Milwaukee cases (support of Socialist Party candidates).
3. The tendency to make our Party into a mere instrument for organizing a Labor Party. (Minnesota), describing our election campaign as an "organic part of the Labor Party campaign." (Lovestone)
4. The tendency to look upon our own election campaign as of less importance than the labor party campaign.
5. The tendency to look upon our Party merely as the left wing in farmer-labor organizations (running party candidates in primary elections without statement that they are Communists). (Minnesota).
6. Resistance to Party leadership in trade union work (needle trades).
7. Absolute denial of Party leading role (Furriers' Union, and Workers' Delegation to the USSR).
8. Failure to carry on genuine Communist education and training—opportunist confusing of mass workers education and the education of the Party membership and training of Communist cadres (Workers' School).
9. Failure to build Party in campaigns.
10. Failure to create Party apparatus for Women's work and permitting foreign language organizations, consisting of housewives, to take the leading role despite repeated demands of the International Women's Secretariat.
11. Sectarian approach to Party building (Bedacht—separation of Party building work from mass work.)
12. Refusal to print Swabek's pamphlet on internal Party organization and Party building.
13. Non-recognition of Party role in Women's work. "The working women will march to power through trade unions, through clubs, housewives' organizations, through cooperative leagues, and through a labor party." (First issue New York Working Women, 1928.)
14. The official organ of the Party, the Daily Worker, affords a devastating example of the underestimation of the role of the Communist press as "the collective organizer of the Party and the masses" as described by Lenin. As an organ of a Communist Party, the Daily Worker is seriously deficient. There has been a systematic liquidation of Communist political writing in the Daily Worker to the point where its Communist character has been weakened. Comrade Minor, the editor, made a motion in the Political Committee on April 19th, 1928, to permit the publication of the establishment of anti-war department in the paper April 1st. Instructed to publish articles against Shipstead, Comrade Minor was obliged to make a motion to turn the work over to the Agit-Prop. On the ground "of the almost total deprivation of the Daily Worker of all political writers at the present time. . . ." One of the chief political writers of the Daily Worker for the last five months has been Comrade Nearing, whose articles almost without exception, contain gross reformist and petty bourgeois errors. There has been a systematic liquidation of tried Communist journalists on the staff and their replacement by elements whose training has been acquired on the capitalist press. The line has been to try to make Communists out of journalists rather than to train Communists as journalists.
15. Failure to utilize the mass campaigns to strengthen the nuclei and build the Party, allowing a gradual and growing disintegration of the nuclei in many centers, New York, etc. to take place, are characteristics of the present leadership

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

The statement in the Daily Worker of December 11, 1928, that "immediately upon request of the Opposition, the Central Executive Committee instructed the Daily Worker to print this document" is false. Even before the delegates returned from the Sixth World Congress of the Comintern, the Lovestone Polcom had defeated motions made by the minority to publish in the Party press the speeches and platform of the minority delegates to the Congress.

The document printed here had to be circulated surreptitiously by the minority, and when it was discovered by the Polcom majority, it, together with other documents was officially denounced as anti-Party, and its circulation strictly prohibited. This document was written in July. Only after five months had elapsed, and after its publication had commenced in The Militant, did the Lovestone C. E. C. make the "generous" gesture of printing it in the Daily Worker. — Ed.

16. Extravagant financial programs which place unduly heavy burdens upon the membership and make it difficult for the lower paid workers to join and remain in the Party and fulfill the demands made upon them.

VII. OPPORTUNIST APPLICATION OF UNITED FRONT POLICY

The C.I. line against the United Front from the top with reactionary trade union, liberal and Socialist Party leaders, and for united front with the workers against them applies with special emphasis in America. The new objective factors making for the discontent of the masses and strengthening their impulse and will to struggle create increasingly favorable conditions for the application of the united front tactics directly with the workers and leading them in the fight against the reactionary leaders and the capitalists. The firm adherence to this basic conception is a prerequisite for the full utilization of the possibilities to broaden and intensify the fight of the workers and build the Party.

The complete degeneration of the Socialist Party and its incorporation into the capitalist—A. F. of L.—police machine puts before the Party as one of its essential tasks the smashing frontal attack against it and its entire leadership all along the line in order to destroy its influence over the workers.

The Lovestone majority has not understood the C.I. policy on the united front and has applied it in an opportunistic manner. This is demonstrated by a whole series of gross errors, many of which remain unacknowledged and uncorrected.

Examples which illustrate the opportunist line in this respect may be cited as follows:

1. False estimation of the Socialist Party and calculation on a "left wing" within it which would work with us for a labor party. This is indicated by the motion of Lovestone to send a number of comrades into the Socialist Party "for the purpose of working for our labor party policy in the Socialist Party", and the rejection of the motion by the minority declaring such tactics to be false and calling for a policy of frontal attack against the Socialist Party all along the line. (Polcom Minutes, December 14, 1927).

The same policy was executed in the support in the elections of the Socialist Judge Panken, an agent of the black gang in the needle trades who was likewise supported by the Republican Party and the New York World and New York Times. The majority stubbornly defended this decision in spite of the most energetic protest of the minority; the support of the Socialist Bearak in Boston; and the proposal to support Berger, the National Chairman of the Socialist Party in Milwaukee; (criticized in the letter of the E.C.C.I.).

The policy in the Panken case was not an incidental error; it proceeded from a false conception of the Lovestone group. It was proposed as a national policy in a program submitted to the Polcom by Comrade Lovestone, which contained the provision that our Party should run candidates on its own ticket only in those cases where it can be done "without endangering the election of candidates running locally on the tickets of other working class parties." (Point 22 of Lovestone's proposals on the Labor Party Campaign, Polcom Minutes, Oct. 7, 1927.)

2. The Open Letter to the Socialist Party, an error of the Polcom as a whole, which was pointed out in the letter of the E.C.C.I.
3. The united front made by the Party leaders

of the Furrier's Union, members of the Lovestone group in the Party, with the so-called middle group in the Union, under conditions which surrender the leadership to the latter and on the basis of a written agreement containing the unheard of provision that "there shall be no Party or clique control of the Union".

4. Building united front in Anti-Imperialist work too much on top and with liberals and not from below among the workers. Concealing the role and face of the Party in Anti-Imperialist work. Removal of Comrade Gomez as Secretary of the Anti-Imperialist League in order to secure a "non Communist or someone not known as a Communist". (Polcom Minutes, December 21, 1927—reconsidered at a subsequent meeting under pressure of minority). Failure to do serious anti-imperialist work as shown by refusal to send workers into the American forces in China and Nicaragua on the ground that it was necessary to proceed slowly and concentrate on work at home.

5. Failure to publicly criticize Brophy and other progressives in the Mine Workers' Union united front despite numerous record motions to that effect passed under pressure of the minority.

6. Wrong form of united front with so-called "Tolerance Group" and Shelly group in the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union; failure to criticize them, failure in the united front with them to build our own strength and forces in the I. L. G. W. U.

7. United front with Brennan in the Miners Union under conditions which rehabilitated the prestige of this faker and brought discredit on the Party and weakened its forces in the Anthracite.

8. Liberal, legislative, constitutional and vulgarly "American" line in the "Council for the Protection of the Foreign Born".

9. Opposition to leading role of Negro proletariat in united front Negro race movement by Comrade Moore, Party leader of Negro work, corrected by Polcom on the initiative of the minority.

10. Persistence in organizing workers and farmers in one Party (Farmer Labor Party) contrary to C. I. decision.

11. Wrong orientation in Women's work, basing it on housewives instead of devoting main attention to women in industry despite repeated letters from the International Women's Secretariat on this point. Failure to draw women industrial workers into leading activities; the entire leading committee for women's work in New York is composed of school teachers, with the exception of Comrade Wortis, a leading right winger in the needle trades.

CONTINUED IN NEXT ISSUE

It Can and Will Be Done

Our opponents circulate two contradictory stories about us. They say one day that we are financed by the wealthy enemies of the Party and the working class. The next day they say we will never be able to publish another issue of THE MILITANT. Both these stories are like all their stories.

Complacent officials who stand aloof from the revolutionary workers and know nothing of their spirit and capacity for sacrifice cannot believe that a small group of them could dare to take such a burden as the publication of a paper on their shoulders. But we have been identified with many such proletarian enterprises in the past and know that we are only doing over again what has often been done before by convinced revolutionaries.

The generous contributions of a small group of Communist workers who have stood with us from the first, plus loans made on personal responsibility, plus voluntary work, has made possible the first two issues of THE MILITANT. The same resources, plus the help of a wider circle of supporters, will make possible the continued publication of THE MILITANT and its development into a weekly, the publication of the pamphlets and other necessary expenses of our principle struggle.

We say this because we are convinced that the Communist workers will increasingly support us as the issues are made clear to them. The comparative few who are beginning this historic struggle are unavoidably required to make heavy sacrifices in this respect and are doing so. It is now absolutely necessary to organize the financial support on a wider basis. Your help is also needed in this revolutionary work. The most dependable financial foundation for our great enterprise is the regular weekly or monthly contributions of sympathetic workers to the sustaining fund. The organization of this fund has already taken place. If you agree with the object it is your duty to help.

Join the Pledge Fund and send your contribution to THE MILITANT, Box, 120, Madison Square Station, New York City.

Letters from the Militants

KANSAS CITY

Kansas City, Missouri, Nov. 9, 1928.

Dear Comrade:

Your letter of the 7th reached me about 10 hours after I had been expelled from the Party.

November 8th, 10 P. M. the District Polcom met with most of the D. E. C. members present. Comrade Kassen was not present but had sent in a signed statement as follows:

"I consider the action of the National Polcom in removing Cannon, Aberg and Shachtman from the positions and their expulsion from the Party as unjustified. Therefore I disapprove of the action of the National Polcom. Signed,—Sam Kassen."

He was expelled from the Party for being a Trotskyite. Kassen was a member of the D. E. C.

I was also a member of the D. E. C. of the Party. Both of us, as you know, have belonged to the Party since it was first organized and to the Left Wing before that.

Well, Jim, I hold no hard feelings against my comrades who expelled Kassen and myself. I am sure they were sincere, but they had become fanatical from the poisonous propaganda the regime had spread in the last four years. I shall avoid all personalities in our differences at this time. The night I was expelled an amusing but tragical incident occurred. The meeting was adjourned, we got our hats and coats and all the comrades left in a body and went one way and I went another way. No time wasted in even bidding each other good by.

I look back now and ponder over the hard task I had to convince myself that Trotsky and the Russian Comrades of the Opposition were traitors to the Revolution. It reminds me of being a good Catholic and believing all and not asking any questions.

The rank and file of the Communists are honest and when they once get the facts they will soon act. Persecution will only make us better Communists.

With greetings to all the comrades in New York from Kassen and myself, I remain,

A. A. BUEHLER

VINCENT DUNNE

Minneapolis, Minn., Nov. 8, 1928.

Dear Comrades:

We were taken completely by surprise as we had no information before your statement came to the different comrades in the mail last week. This was quickly followed by a letter from the "cleansed" minority boasting of their part in the shameful expose.

Almost all of OUR comrades feel that here at last is the key to the riddle that we have been trying to understand for so many years. That is, we too have come to realize during the time of the Congress that international politics were being played with us while we were still attempting to out-smart these bureaucrats within the confines of our own little Party.

We have EVERY important comrade of the old opposition with us. They have accepted the slogan, "Against the Bureaucrats", as a slogan of action.

The comrades realize that this is not the ordinary Party fight and that all comrades who take a position now of Opposition will in all probability find themselves confronted with a campaign of the most unjust slander and vilification. Most of us understand that there will be those who cannot understand the pressure and who will desert. We also know that with the correct line we will be able to strengthen our forces by bringing over to us those elements that are honest and politically alert, those with that old fighting heart.

VINCENT R. DUNNE.

FROM A YOUNG COAL MINER

Frederick, Colorado, Nov. 4, 1928.

Dear Comrades:

I got a copy of the document that you sent to a comrade here in Frederick and at the beginning I was tremendously surprised.

The entire matter hits me so hard that I don't know whether I have come back to earth or not. It is very difficult to form at an instant an opinion on matters that you briefly touch upon. I mean the Trotsky question. I totally agree with your charges against the Lovestone groups "incapability, unscrupulousness, bureaucracy, etc." As a vivid example we have your expulsion as a verification of the functions of this outfit. It is a tragedy to a revolutionary organization to tolerate such hideous actions as this "Lewis machine" of our Party has perpetrated and they will again endeavor to force your expulsion down our throats. But as I look over the whole matter now, I see that the Lovestone group has bitten off more than they can chew, when they begin to expel the best leaders of our Party merely for their views on political questions.

It is the membership of our Party, the masses of workers throughout the country that will suffer because of this despicable act of the bureaucracy in our Party. It shows once more the necessity of rank and file rule instead of a few leaders who can utilize their position for personal advantages and machine rule.

The slogans must be:

"Save the Party!"

"Lovestoneism Must Go!"

"For a Communist Party of the Workers!"

GERRY ALLARD

FROM THE FIRST COMMUNIST LEGISLATOR

Williston, N. Dakota, Nov. 24, 1928.

Dear Comrades:

I had just started to write a letter to the Daily Worker when the Militant was laid on the table before me. In this letter to the Daily Worker I intended to ask the editors of that paper why they did not publish the program of the Opposition (Trotsky, Zinoviev) since they had devoted two pages to the Cannon-Lovestone Party differences?

To accuse each other of being "right wing" with-

out showing the program that is in contention, leaves the Party members, likewise the rank and file masses in the dark. As to the writer, he has seen nothing in the Party press, other than that the Oppositionists were working with the counter-revolutionary forces, and that they were rejected by the whole Party membership, not only this, but were expelled from the Party by a vote of more than 99 percent of the membership. Never a peep in our Party press about the Opposition leaders being exiled and put behind the bars. What little has leaked out from our Party press about the Opposition and their program was so twisted that many of the Party members here thought the platform of Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev and others was that which was adopted by the Russian Party headed by Stalin.

I wish to state that the Militant gave me the first inkling of what had taken place in the C. P. of Russia and the American Party. Likewise the Opposition program, yet I have read everything I could get since the

THE EXPELLED

The following is a partial list of the comrades expelled in the present campaign of the Lovestone leaders to split the Party by the expulsion of all who fight them on principle grounds. The expelled comrades have taken an open stand for the platform of the Russian Opposition and opposed the expulsion of Cannon, Aberg and Shachtman. Most of the comrades expelled in Cleveland were expelled on trumped-up charges, but the real reason was their unyielding opposition to the opportunist bureaucrats of the Party, and particularly for their refusal to give up their fight against the corrupt misleaders of the Party in the South Slavic Section and in the Cleveland district.

While the opportunists expel the revolutionary Communist workers and the active fighters who have founded the Party and helped to build it up, they continue to draw into the ranks of the Party—and into its leading circles and responsible positions—petty-bourgeois dilettants, careerists and second-hand intellectuals. The fight against this disruptive campaign is the foremost duty of the proletarian Communists.

In the forthcoming issues of The Militant we shall print the Party and revolutionary records of the expelled Communists, which, for lack of space, we are compelled to omit in this number. They bear proud records of service to the cause of the revolution which are in themselves a crushing reply to those dubious individuals who so expertly slander them with the infamous terms of "renegades", "counter-revolutionaries", and the like.

CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

JAMES P. CANNON, member Polcom of the C.E.C.

ARNE SWABECK, member of the C.E.C.

MARTIN ABERN, member of the C.E.C.

MAX SHACHTMAN, alternate to the C.E.C.

CANADA

MAURICE SPECTOR, member of Polcom, and E.C.C.I.

NEW YORK

MAURICE L. MALKIN, member of Furriers Union.

JOSEPH FRIEDMAN, member of Y. W. L.

PHILADELPHIA

M. MORGENSTERN, member of Y.W.L. Dist. Bureau.

LEON GOODMAN, member of Y.W.L. Dist. Bureau.

SOL LANKIN, member Y.W.L. District Committee.

CLEVELAND

JAMES ANTOLOVICH, member of Machinists Union.

PETER MARGETICH, Ohio District Organizer of South Slavs.

MATT GRZINCICH, nucleus financial secretary.

D. GURMAN, stockyard worker.

G. MALJEVAC, member of Section Exec. Committee.

P. MATAKANOVICH, secretary South Slavic Workers Club.

V. UJCICH, cement worker.

P. SVETINA, factory worker.

G. MILLER, member of Section Executive Committee.

ELMER BOICH, member of District Bureau and Secretariat.

JOHN FOLEY, member of agit-prop depart of D.E.C.

DETROIT

BARNEY MASS, member Auto Workers Union.

RUTH REYNOLDS, editor of Dodge Worker (Nucleus No. 5).

CHICAGO

ALBERT M. GLOTZER, member of League N.E.C.

HELEN JUDD, member of District Control Commission.

MIKE ZALISKO, League and Party organizer in coal fields.

ROGER COMPTON, agit-prop director of nucleus.

TWIN CITIES (Minneapolis and St. Paul)

VINCENT R. DUNNE, member of D.E.C. and District Bureau.

KARL SKOGLUND, member of D.E.C. and District Bureau.

OSCAR COOVER, member of D.E.C. and District Bureau.

O. R. VOTAW, member of D.E.C. and Dist. Bureau.

C. R. HEDLUND. P. G. HEDLUND.

MARTIN SODERBERG. SAM LESSIN.

LOUIS ROSELAND. A. T. HEDLUND.

SAM ZALMANOFF. ALVA HEDLUND.

MAX KAUFMAN. JOE ROSS.

MRS. SCHWARTZ. A. SHROGOWITZ.

HELEN HEDLUND.

CARL COWL, member of the Y.W.L.

SARA AVRIN, member of the Y.W.L.

FANNIE BARACH, member of the Y.W.L.

SIMON BARACH, member of the Y.W.L.

KANSAS CITY

A. A. BUEHLER, member of D.E.C.

SAM KASSEN, member of D.E.C.

NEW HAVEN

S. GENDELMAN, member of D.E.C.

October revolution.

In conclusion, I for one, unequivocally denounce any act of giving concessions to the Kulaks and Nepmen, when the withholding of concessions cannot cause any violent eruption to the Party in power. Any Party member acting otherwise is not a true Bolshevik.

A. C. MILLER

P. S. You are at liberty to publish this letter or any part of it. They say that I was the first Communist that climbed into legislature in the U. S.—1925 North Dakota Session.

A. C.—M.

THE CLEVELAND EXPULSIONS

Cleveland, Ohio, Nov. 29, 1928.

Dear Comrade:

I am in receipt of your statement relative to your expulsion from the Party. It may interest you to know that I was expelled several weeks ago because I dared to prefer charges against the District Polcom majority. I charged them with corruption, material and political, embezzlement of Party funds, and a dozen other charges which they knew were true. I demanded a thorough investigation or I would expose them before the membership meeting. This they feared and without the formality of charges they railroaded me out of the Party by a 5 to 4 vote. Beside myself the following comrades were expelled: Margetich, South Slavic District Organizer and alternate to the D.E.C., Matakanovich, Maljevac, Jucich, Grzincich, Gasparac, Svetina, Miller, Slabak. Comrade Lesko was expelled a couple of months ago. He was a member of the D.E.C. and the Polcom charge against him was never proved. He was expelled for no other reason but his sympathy with Trotsky.

All above mentioned comrades are proletarians, factory workers. I was a member of the District Polcom and the secretariat prior to my expulsion. Appeal was sent to Lovestone, two weeks ago against the Polcom decision, but no reply was received. The attempt to tyrannize over the Opposition in the Party has no limit. Bureaucracy is increasing daily in the Party. Self-criticism is only an empty gesture on the part of our bureaucrats. To fight for democracy in the Party today requires courage and determination. This can be supplied by the development of the revolutionary spirit within oneself. These are times when we must oppose the crowd of fanatics even in the face of ridicule and intimidation. We would like to have you come here and speak at a meeting which we will arrange for you. Please inform me if you could come and when.

ELMER BOICH.

"YOU ARE WORSE THAN FASCISTS"

Under the supervision of the Lovestone commissar, Dr. Markoff, the membership meeting of the Italian fraction in New York took place on Wednesday, November 28, with about 50 comrades present. The secretary of the Bureau, Candela, was given unlimited time for his report against "Trotskyism". The meeting had decided that each member be given 10 minutes, twice. But after the first series of speakers, Markoff arbitrarily cut off the discussion and demanded that the vote be taken. A motion was introduced to endorse the position of the C.E.C. and the Foster comrades introduced their resolution; but when our comrade attempted to read our resolution in support of the Russian Opposition, Markoff said that it could neither be introduced nor read at the meeting.

"All those who support the Opposition," said Markoff, "are not only counter-revolutionaries, but Fascists and worse than Mussolini." To our comrade who demanded the right to speak in answer to the stupidities of Candela and the vileness of Markoff, the latter said, "As a member of the C.E.C., I remove Refugee from the Italian Bureau, with no right to speak any more, even at the meeting." Markoff made the most slanderous attacks upon our comrades, shouting that we had been in the Party for only a few months, denying that we had ever fought in the movement or struggle in Italy. But the comrades who supported us have long records of membership in the Socialist Party, then the Communist Party of Italy; of persecution by and bitter struggle against Fascism in Italy; of being the heart and muscle of the anti-Fascist struggle in this country; of service on the strike picket line, arrests, police sluggings, imprisonment. Only one that has completely lost his honor and integrity, and lacks all contact with the ranks, can flaunt his shameless slanders against revolutionary workers with such brazenness as did Markoff.

A good number of the comrades, sickened by the proceedings, left before the vote was taken. Eight voted for our position; 3 abstained, saying that not all that was necessary had been said at the meeting; 3 abstained, saying that they did not know enough of the situation; 10 voted for the resolution of the Foster comrades; 1 voted against everything, including Trotsky; 1 voted for the C.E.C. (Zucca), saying that he believed Trotsky was correct on some questions. The rest, a minority of the membership, voted with the C.E.C. majority resolution.

Markoff then declared to the eight who had voted for the Opposition: "Consider yourselves expelled, and get out of the hall." We did not, of course, leave at the command of this cheap bureaucrat. Our comrades are not new fighters. Under Bordiga and Maffi and other heroes of the Italian revolution they have fought against Fascism and for our cause. Under the banner of Trotsky and the Opposition we continue our fight for the victory of Bolshevism.—JOHN MENELLA.

"SINGING JAILBIRDS"

"Singing Jailbirds" is by far the best production yet offered by the New Playwrights and marks a significant step forward to the development of a Worker's Theatre. We regret that unusual urgencies of space prevent The Militant from printing the extended review which it deserves. Friends of The Militant should make it a point to attend the performance on Tuesday, Dec. 18 which is for the benefit of our paper.