

# MILITANT

VOL. II, No. 5.

NEW YORK, N. Y., MARCH 1, 1929.

PRICE 5 CENTS

## War, Kellogg Pact and the Soviet Union

By Max Shachtman

THE foreign policy of a revolutionary Workers' State that is surrounded by imperialist powers was outlined a decade and more ago by the leaders Bolshevism, Lenin and Trotsky. Its course is directed to warding off all interventionist and counter-revolutionary movements no matter what their form may be, so that the Workers' State may be able to lengthen the period in which it strengthens the socialist forces in the country as against the forces of capitalism while the revolutionary proletariat in the imperialist countries gathers sufficient strength to overthrow their own bourgeoisie. The Soviet power must therefore aim to aid in every possible way the revolutionary movement in other countries, to help free the masses everywhere from the "democratic" and "pacifist" illusions cultivated by the bourgeoisie, to expose the imperialist machinations of the foreign bourgeoisie, to arouse the workers against them, and thereby become a rallying center for the workers and oppressed peoples of the world. Such a course, followed in the Brest-Litovsk period resulted in the overthrow of the German Kaiser. Some time later, this same policy resulted in the victorious overthrow of Menshevism and imperialism from Georgia and the establishment of a Soviet Republic. In the struggle against the Black International of the League of Nations the Communist International was built.

The signing of the Kellogg Pact by the Soviet Union—the whole course of Soviet foreign policy in the recent period, in fact—marks a departure from this revolutionary path. Instead of destroying bourgeois illusions it strengthens them. Instead of strengthening the revolutionary movement in other countries, it weakens it. Instead of exposing the inherently reactionary and war-making character of imperialism it conceals it. To be sure, this is not the intention of the authors of this course, but it is its inevitable result. And the latter is the important question.

In the official reply of the Soviet Government, signing the Kellogg Pact, given out by Litvinov on August 31, 1928, is contained a series of the most astounding statements. Says the Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs on the reservations made by Great Britain:

"This reservation the Soviet Government cannot but consider as an attempt to use the compact itself as an instrument of imperialist policy." (Current History, October 1928, page 6.)

An "attempt"! We must take it, therefore, that the "compact itself" is not an instrument of imperialist policy, but that the rascally British are making an "attempt" to use it for this purpose. If this analysis is advanced before the working class with all the authority of the Soviet Union behind it, what becomes of the daily agitation in the press which continues to repeat—and correctly so—that "Versailles, Locarno, the Anglo-French agreement, the Kellogg 'Peace' Pact are all steps toward a war of all imperialist powers against Soviet Russia"? (See Daily Worker, March 6, 1929). Millions read the proclamations of the Soviet Union, where only a handful read the Communist press. Even if this were not so, the theory that the Workers' State can talk one way and the workers another way, is fundamentally false.

But this is not the worst. The Soviet note says further:

"Nevertheless, inasmuch as the Pact of Paris objectively imposes certain obligations on the powers before public opinion and gives the Soviet Government a new chance to put before all the participants of the compact a question of disarmament, the solution of which is the only guarantee of prevention of war—the Soviet Government expresses its willingness to sign the Pact of Paris." (Current History, October 1928, page 6.)

This amazing nonsense is repeated by Litvinov the Soviet note to the Polish government of October 29, 1928:

In so far, however, as the Soviet Government has declared that the Paris Agreement (Kellogg Pact) im-

poses upon its participants certain obligations of a peaceful character, it has without delay adhered to it." (Soviet Union Review, Feb. 1929, page 31.)

And this is not meant as polite diplomatic rigmarole, for Litvinov repeats it in worse form to the Central Executive Committee of the Soviet Union on December 10, 1928:

"Our government took into consideration the fact that the states signing the Kellogg Pact thereby placed themselves under a certain moral (sol) obligation to public opinion with respect to non-aggression." (Inprecor, December 20, 1928, page 1703.)

If this is not enough to make a cat laugh, as Stalin would say, it is at least enough to throw Messrs. Briand, Chamberlain, Stresemann, Mussolini and Hoover into convulsive fits. The Kellogg Pact is supposed to "impose upon its participants certain obligations of a peaceful character", yes, "moral obligations"! Why doesn't the Soviet Union sign the Locarno Pact, or join the World Court, or the League of Nations? Don't they all "impose moral obligations of a peaceful character on their participants"? Or perhaps Litvinov (read: Stalin-Rykov) would have us believe that the Kellogg Pact is less the instrument of the imperialist bandits and war mongers than the Versailles Treaty and the League of Nations?

Does not this babble fly in the face of all Bolshevik teachings, of the whole tradition of Soviet policy? Lenin said this the Soviet power, on the question of peace,

"Would declare that it expects nothing good from the bourgeois governments and proposes to the workers of all countries to overthrow them and transfer all political power to Soviets of workers' deputies." (Lenin, How to Attain Peace, March 25, 1917.)

It is true that the Soviet Union has a reservation on the Pact. Its note says further:

"Summarizing what has been said above, one must state the absence in the compact of obligations concerning disarmaments, which is the only (!) essential element of peace guarantee." (Current History, October 1928, page 6.)

We suppose that this unbelievable clap-trap (we will not use a harsher term) is accepted as very "clever" Soviet diplomacy in some quarter, a type of Machiavellian stroke that outwits everybody—except the bourgeoisie for whom it is apparently intended.

The Communists have persistently striven to permeate the proletariat with the idea that disarmament talk under capitalism is the worst crime of the bourgeois pacifists. That capitalism, armaments, war and militarism are synonymous and in-

separable. That the demand for disarmament always results in actually disarming the working class before its class enemy, because capitalism will not and cannot disarm. That those who create the impression that capitalism can disarm "as the only essential element of peace guarantee," are drugging the working class. That the only real road to peace is the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the victory of socialism. That the appeal for disarmament is reactionary utopianism. Lenin said a thousand times:

"The Kautskyan preaching of 'disarmament', which is addressed chiefly to the present governments of the imperialistic great powers, is a vulgar piece of opportunism, of bourgeois pacifism, actually calculated—in spite of the good intentions of the gentle Kautskys—to divert the workers from the class struggle. For such a propaganda is calculated to inspire the workers with the thought that the present bourgeois governments of the imperialistic powers are NOT bound by thousands of threads of finance capital and tens or hundreds of corresponding (i. e., predatory, greedy, preparatory to imperialistic aggression) SECRET TREATIES between themselves." (Lenin, The Disarmament Cry, Sbornik Sozial-Demokrata, December 1916.)

If the Workers' State does not constantly expose the inherent counter-revolutionary nature of the imperialist powers, but, on the contrary, creates the impression that these powers can be made to disarm and establish peace, who is deceived? Certainly not the Hoovers, the Briands, the Chamberlains and the Stresemanns. They laugh in their sleeves at the very idea of disarmament or peace and at all the pitiful talk of Litvinov. They are secretly or openly preparing for the next imperialist war as they must by their very nature, as well as for a war to crush the workers' republic. All their pacts, conferences and treaties are window-dressing to hypnotize the workers while they themselves work feverishly for the proper moment. But the workers, to whom the authority of the Soviet Union is great, are deceived by the disarmament palaver. Their illusions about peace under capitalism, about the possibilities of disarmament, are deepened when the Soviet Union signs the Kellogg Pact. And the Communist Parties are disarmed. It becomes almost impossible for them to denounce effectively the Kellogg Pact as an imperialist, war-mongering document, when the bourgeoisie can easily reply: "Dear friends, your own Soviet Union has signed it and hailed it as a step towards peace".

For when the Soviet Union praises the imperialists as "our friendly neighbors" how can the Communists in other countries expose their bourgeoisie as enemies of the Soviet Union who are preparing to crush it? When the Communist member of Reichstag, Stoecker, denounces German imperialism's war preparations against the Soviet Union, the social-democratic Chancellor, Mueller, triumphantly replies with

"The words of M. I. Kalinin, president of the Soviet Union, who on his recent reception to the new German Ambassador to Moscow, Dr. Herbert von Dirksen, asserted that the relations between the Soviet Union and the German Republic were thoroughly peaceful and friendly." (New York Herald-Tribune, February 27, 1929.)

The Communist deputy was unable to reply to this. Mueller could also have quoted Litvinov's speech (Inprecor, December 20, 1928, page 1706) in which the German bourgeoisie is praised as the friend of Russia. Mussolini, in reply to the Italian Communists, can also quote Litvinov's speech:

"An example of the possibility of maintaining normal and perfectly correct (!) relations to another state, in spite of different social political systems, is offered by our relations to Italy, which give rise to practically no mutual complaints." (Inprecor, ibid., page 1706.)

And Herbert Hoover, who is denounced very properly in the Communist press here as an arch enemy of the Soviet Union and the working class can also reply to these attacks by quoting Litvinov:

"We must openly admit that up to the present we have

CONTINUED ON PAGE FOUR

## Protest TROTSKY'S Deportation

Come and hear the truth about the present situation in Russia and the reasons for the exile of Trotsky, the defender of the Workers' Rule.

SPEAKERS:

JAMES P. CANNON  
MARTIN ABERN  
MAX SHACHTMAN

at

LABOR TEMPLE, 242 E. 14th St.

Tuesday, March 19th, 7:30 P. M.

ADMISSION 25 CENTS

Auspices New York Group of the Communist Opposition.

# Who Supports Trotsky?

THE liars who got their training in the five years campaign of falsifying and misrepresenting the viewpoint of the Russian Opposition are now excelling themselves. The paid scribblers of the Stalinist press are seeking to cover up the shame of the regime that illegally exiled (in cahoots with Kemal Pasha, the Turkish Mussolini) the Sword of October, L. D. Trotsky, with a barrage of the most revolting lies that ever disgraced a working class press. In the United States, the leadership in the campaign is being taken by the **Daily Worker** and the **Daily Freiheit**. The editors of both of these papers, Miner and Olgin, are old hands at slandering and defaming Bolsheviks. They did it for years after the Russian Revolution of 1917 before they found a comfortable place in the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

The **Daily Worker** of February 27, 1929, writes these shameless words:

"Trotsky has openly espoused the same slogans of struggle and the same methods of counter-revolutionary struggle against the Soviet power that are characteristic of the entire school of agents of capitalist reaction—the mensheviks."

Minor, like Olgin, is very careful not to quote a single sentence of Trotsky's writings or the authoritative viewpoint of the bourgeois and social democratic press on Trotsky. To do either would be to shatter the whole edifice of lies of the Stalinists. Since Minor will not quote, we will, and it will very easily be demonstrated that every genuinely reactionary element in the world is imbued with an ineradicable hatred of Trotsky and all he stands for.

Says Duranty, the Stalinized Moscow correspondent of the big bourgeois **New York Times**:

"Before going further it must be understood that the Right Opposition differs greatly from the opposition of the Trotskyists in being conducted upon 'legal' party lines; that is, it represents criticism of current policies of the Kremlin by a majority group which remains willing to accept the majority ruling even should that be adverse. Trotsky, who was never a real Bolshevik, made the fatal error of continuing his opposition, despite majority decisions, by 'underground' and 'illegal' methods." (February 27, 1929.)

Duranty-Stalin-Minor-Olgin sing in chorus that Trotsky was never a real Bolshevik." The **Times** writes editorially on the series of articles by Trotsky which it printed:

"He makes no attack upon the Soviet system, which he believes will endure in some form or another, but he is bitter enough and explicit enough in condemning the men now at the head of affairs in Russia, who are, to his mind, betrayers of the pure doctrine preached by Lenin, and really at heart enemies of the true cause of the Soviets." (February 24, 1929.)

Says the organ of Al Smith "liberalism," the **New York World**:

"Trotsky belongs at the farthest extremity of the left wing; he stands for the most radical interpretation of Marxian principles. . . . At any rate, there is no 'Thermidor' now in sight. All Russian reports agree upon the strength of Stalin and his policy." (February 27, 1929.)

And Brisbane, the arch-jingo, writes in **Hearst's New York American**:

"Trotsky's statement that Stalin and other Russian leaders that exiled him and his friends are leaning to the right, that is toward conservatism and capitalism, will interest America's conservative government. Stalin, intelligent Russian, knows that power without money is a shadow, so he leans in the direction of money." (February 27, 1929.)

The yellow socialist **Jewish Daily Forward** writes in the same manner as Olgin does in the **Freiheit**:

"We are the last ones to regret Trotsky's fate. We know very well that he is, perhaps more than anyone else except Lenin, responsible for Russia's calamities and for the seas of innocent blood that were shed there. We also know that if Trotsky should get the opportunity to carry out his present program it would be a new calamity for Russia as well as for the entire world." (February 15, 1929.)

## 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 370 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. II MARCH 1, 1929 No. 3

Entered as second-class mail matter November 23, 1928, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1979.

And here is what the **Forward** reports on the lecture Chernov, the counter-revolutionary Social Revolutionary, gave in New York on Trotsky:

"So far as Trotsky is concerned the lecturer believes that he also has finished his role. He has no chance of again becoming a part of the Russian power." (February 10, 1929.)

Here is what Alexander Berkman, the petty-bourgeois anarchist, writes in the paper, **The Road to Freedom**:

"In reality the Trotsky element is more reactionary than the present regime and therefore less dangerous to Stalin than the Rights." (February 1929.)

Let the **Daily Worker** and the **Freiheit**, and all the other little Stalinists explain why it is that the "counter-revolutionary Trotsky" has been refused admission into the centers of reaction and counter-revolution throughout the world. Why he has been rejected in Berlin, in Rome, in Vienna, in Paris, in London, in Washington or New York. Why have not the counter-revolutionary statesmen of the world, Chamberlain, Briand, Mussolini and Hoover extended an urgent invitation to Trotsky to stay and work with them? Why does Stresemann threaten to resign if Trotsky is invited to Germany? The bourgeoisie fear and hate Trotsky who is the symbol of the proletarian revolution.

The **Berliner Boerszenzeitung**, which is the German **Wall Street Journal**, writes as follows:

"Germany has enough to do in these difficult times with the maintenance of its own internal equilibrium, and we consider it superfluous to create new burdens artificially by a hospitality that will give the strongest propagandist of Bolshevism (Trotsky) the opportunity of exercising his propaganda powers in a country which in his opinion can be most swiftly ripened for a Bolshevik harvest." (February 1, 1929.)

Its colleagues in the reactionary **Preussische Zeitung** write:

"We need hardly emphasize that we would consider a lengthy stay of Trotsky, alias Bronstein, on German soil as highly undesirable and disagreeable."

The **Neukoellner Tageblatt** writes:

"In political circles in Berlin the opinion prevails that the presence of Trotsky would create a highly unpleasant incident. The possibility must be reckoned with that Trotsky might undertake something against the government in Russia while in Germany. Such a fact would bring extremely bad consequences for German-Russian relations. Germany would finally be forced into the unpleasant position of exiling Trotsky again!"

The **Hamburger Nachrichten**, an arch-reactionary sheet with Bismarckian tendencies, demands that Stalin assassinate Trotsky, even as Minor urges that the Opposition be executed by the government:

"It is possible that this element still sticking to the Trotsky cause is not numerically powerful when compared with others. Nevertheless the venom it steadily ejects against Stalin and his crowd has its stinging effect. Stalin is getting the consequence of his blunder in not having sent Trotsky and the Trotsky crowd into the Great Beyond by methods as usual as they are familiar. The crowd now in power did not feel strong enough to venture so far." (January 25, 1929.)

But if Stalin was not sure enough of himself to do away with Trotsky entirely, perhaps the fascists will help him out. **Illustrierte Beobachter**, the organ of Adolph Hitler, the German anti-semitic and fascist, prints a picture of Trotsky with the following comment:

"Trotsky, the Soviet-Jewish bloodhound, wants to reside in Berlin during his exile. We will have to keep a vigilant eye on this Jewish assassin and criminal." (February 9, 1929.)

Hitler is not entirely alone. If you pick up a copy of the official "comic" paper of the Finnish section of the Workers Party, **Punikki**, you will find its cover decorated with an anti Trotsky cartoon drawn by A. K. Suvanto, one of the leaders of the Finnish Stalinists here, which is permeated with vicious anti-semitism. Anything goes in the "ideological struggle" against the Opposition.

Indeed, everything goes. Lies, distortion, inventions. The official Party press tries to whip up a hysteria over the appearance of Trotsky's articles in the **New York Times**. Trotsky has very correctly taken advantage of the extraordinary "news value" of his exile—the greatest political sensation of millions of workers who read the bourgeois press, just as Lenin and Trotsky made use of the bourgeois press to broadcast the secret treaties, which were first published in the reactionary **New York Evening Post** and the yellow **New York Call**. Scores of Bolshevik documents first saw light of day outside of Soviet Russia in the bourgeois press. Lenin even made use of the German monarchist government in 1917 to travel in a sealed train through Germany in order to participate actively in the Russian revolution. In those days, Olgin, writing in the **Forward** hailed the forged Sisson documents that "proved" that Lenin and Trotsky were agents

of the Kaiser's imperialism; in the **New York World**. Minor called Lenin and Trotsky "counter-revolutionaries" because they put a few petty-bourgeois anarchists in jail. Today Minor and Olgin combine to call Trotsky a "counter-revolutionary" once more. They know that Stalin is writing against Trotsky for the bourgeois press in Europe (in London **Daily News**, for instance). They know that their own Party constantly employs publicity agents in important campaigns whose sole duty is to get the Party's viewpoint into the bourgeois press. But they remain silent about this. They are earning the right to the Brass Check.

Many years have passed, and there has been a change, but not in Trotsky, not in Minor, not in Olgin. In 1917, Trotsky was writing and fighting for Bolshevism. Minor and Olgin were writing and fighting against the Bolsheviks in the bourgeois and yellow socialist press. In 1929, Trotsky is still writing and fighting for Bolshevism. Minor and Olgin are still fighting against Bolsheviks. The difference is that they speak in the name of Stalin now, and write in the Stalinist press. "It is the march of events . . ."

## Hail to the New Chief?

Great travail marks the Party convention now in session. The mountain is groaning in labor, and may give forth a mouse at any moment.

As we predicted months ago, the minority is seeking a convenient formula for capitulation and Stalin has offered them one by which they may gracefully retire from the fight with feeble shouts of victory. The caucuses are now feverishly discussing the demand of Stalin that Wm. Z. Foster, the leader without followers, be made secretary of the Party. Picture to yourself the touching scene that may ensue: The "Right danger" which each faction claimed the other personified will be completely liquidated and the hitherto estranged factions will fall on each other's neck in a blubber of unity as they look upon the new born, while its fond parents, Lovestone and Bittelman, make preparations for the Long Journey to Moscow or the Caucasus to rest for a year from their labors.

The fact that only yesterday during the Party discussion the Lovestoneites have strongly implied that Foster is a social democrat, labor faker and was a social patriot during the war, and that the Bittelmanites have formally read him out of the barren "vineyard" because "he liquidates everything connected with Communism," surely makes him the logical compromise candidate for these apostles of Stalinism.

The meaning of this ten cent maneuver is obvious. The shuffling of offices is the Stalinist method of "solving" political difficulties. The appointment from above of Foster as secretary of the Party, although ninety-nine percent of the Party membership has repudiated him, is entirely devoid of principle and settles NOT ONE of the principle questions raised by the Opposition or any one else in the Party. This maneuver is designed to kill two birds with one stone: to "establish" unity in the Party and to head off the Opposition's steady growth. It will accomplish neither. Foster is to be surrounded by the old gang of opportunists and bureaucrats, and be ab crbed by them, while the minority is made to subordinate itself. Anyone who wants such "unity" is welcome to it. As to the Opposition we are told that a "big drive" is to be made after the convention to "win back" the Oppositionists. Foster is to be the decoy for the Communist workers who have revolted. The Lovestoneites will crusade up and down the land, with the image of St. William pasted on their foremost banner, flanked by the few remaining Bittelmanites hoarsely echoing their shibboleth and urging the errant to follow the new "leader."

The crusaders will fail. The workers who have rallied to the banner of the Opposition on the basis of a principle fight that involves the entire course and fate of the revolutionary movement will not be deceived by this cheap stratagem so characteristic of the Stalin regime. Fake unity, unprincipled combinations arrived at behind the backs of the membership and a corrupt Lovestone regime covered with a new plaster will not be accepted as a substitute for the settlement of principle disputes on a Leninist basis. This maneuver will fizzle like a penny firecracker; the fight for principle will go on.

It is a matter of little concern whether Foster or Lovestone is the new secretary of the Party. The regime and its line remain the same, and we won't buy any bonds from either of them.

# The Communists and the "Progressives"

By James P. Cannon

ON the heels of the recent convention of the American Federation of Labor which outdid all others in reaction there have appeared a number of manifestations of a new "progressive" movement which call for the most serious consideration of the Communist and Left Wing workers.

The most important of these manifestations is the Manifesto printed in the February number of the *Labor Age*. This manifesto outlines a platform of 16 points which is only a slightly modified re-statement of the practical platform of the Left Wing militants in the labor movement. It includes the organization of the workers in the basic industries into industrial unions, trade union democracy, the 5-day week, independent political action, social insurance and most of the other standard demands of the Left wing. Action of a certain sort has accompanied this attempt to formulate the platform of the new "progressives." The conflict between the Brookwood Labor College and the A. F. of L. Executive Council, which has opened fire on it, is one phase. On March 2nd, these apostles of trade union reform unfurled their banner at a polite luncheon in New York City under the auspices of the League for Industrial Democracy, an auxiliary of the Socialist Party headed by Norman Thomas. Also should be mentioned the "crusade" which the Socialist *New Leader* has been conducting against the Civic Federation policies of Matthew Woll. In all these developments the trend toward a crystallization of a respectable body of "progressive opinion" within the labor movement can be plainly seen.

The sponsors of this movement are the group around the *Labor Age* and the Brookwood Labor College—Muste, Budenz, and others, including quite a few such as Brophy and Hapgood who have had relations with the Communists in United Front movements in the past; a considerable number of trade union officials around the country; and the Socialists who have fought side by side with the A. F. of L. bureaucrats against us. Hillquit, Thomas, O Neal and Co. are devoting much attention to the movement and are aiming for the hegemony of it. It would be erroneous, however, to regard the movement as simply the creation of the Socialist Party. Its basis appears to be much broader and, if it continues to develop, will very probably include a much wider circle.

These events are not accidental. They reflect in the first place the unmistakable growth of discontent of wide sections of the workers and their impulse to struggle against the present state of affairs. They are a reaction to the position of the ruling officialdom which grows ever more brazenly reactionary, smothering these sentiments of the workers and giving them no expression. The virtual abandonment of the old unions by the Communists, who have stood at the head of most of the opposition movements in the past five years, facilitates the emergence of the reformist group and affords the Socialists an opportunity to regain some of their lost positions. The new movement is a challenge to the Communists for the leadership of the coming fights.

These "progressives" are weather-cocks who reflect certain winds blowing in the labor movement. Their emergence now with demands which connote militancy is an indicator of the radicalization of the workers growing within the old unions as well as in the ranks of the unorganized masses. Their role, objectively speaking, is to express this radicalization in words, to harness it in action and to head it off from any real collision with the capitalists and the A. F. of L. machine. And their field for this function is by no means confined to the old unions. A strongly organized block of these elements in the A. F. of L. can also exercise a great influence on the struggles of the unorganized.

The question whether they will succeed in stultifying the promising movements of the proximate future or whether the very movements of the workers they express and, to a certain extent, help to create are developed in the direction of real class battles, depends very much upon the activities and tactics of the Communists. Communist tactics will have a tremendous bearing on the outcome of the impending struggles of the workers. And one of the most decisive aspects of these tactics is the question of our attitude toward the progressives and the movement which they indubitably express.

International experience will be useful to us in this question but it cannot provide us with a ready-made formula. Nothing approximating an analogy to the situation and stage of development

of the American labor movement exists in any of the European countries. The fight there is between the Communists and the Social Democrats for the leadership of the masses. This is so in America only in the needle trades, a small sector not representative of the whole labor movement. The struggle here is for the creation of a class movement of the workers and the expansion of Communist influence within it. And this, of course, is also a struggle against reformism of all kinds. The events of the past few years have not altered this basic perspective. Our fundamental tactical line, modified in the light of experience, with the errors and distortions corrected, still holds good. Contrary opinions only substitute wishes for realities. We are not done with the progressives. On the contrary the question of our attitude towards them and relations with them will take on a ten-fold greater significance in the coming period of mass struggles than in the period behind us.

Let us look back at our established tactics on this question. Numerous resolutions, unanimously adopted by the Party, as well as resolutions of the C.I. on the American question, could be quoted. All of these resolutions emphasized the tactic of the united front with progressive elements and in practice we followed this line.

Such tactics, fundamentally correct, were the key to much of our progress in the trade unions. There were attempts to liquidate them, but these attempts were defeated by a sharp Party struggle in 1925 and by the intervention of the Comintern.

In applying this tactic of the united front the Party made many errors. The block with Brennan in the anthracite, for example, was formed under conditions which actually rehabilitated this discredited faker and failed to build the Communist influence. The non-critical attitude toward Brophy, Hapgood, etc., worked against the militancy of the fight in the miners' union and the firmness and cohesion of the Left wing. Some of the maneuvers in the needle trades were more disgraceful back-room bargains with fakers than Communist actions to mobilize the masses. But to react against such distortions, with the abandonment of the united front tactic is like cutting of one's head to cure a toothache. This, it seems, is what is now being proposed, if we are to judge by the Party comment on the new "progressive" manifestations.

The old tactic of united front with criticism and an independent policy is to be replaced by the tactic of straight-out denunciation and completely independent struggle, according to the comment on the "new progressives" which has appeared in the *Labor Unity* and the *Daily Worker*. This looks simpler and easier, but how will it work out? It is not without significance that the same comrades who wanted to pull the Party onto this track in 1925, come forward now as the spokesmen of the new revelation. Now, as then, they see the "progressive" leaders only as individuals and roundly denounce them as fakers. They fail now, as before, to see the movement of workers they express and, to a certain extent, represent. And that is the most important and decisive thing for the Communists.

Earl Browder, back from the Far East in a very revolutionary mood, makes short shrift of these new "progressives" in the *Daily Worker* of February 25, 26 and 27, 1929. He recites their past treacheries, vacillations and cowardice with such indignation as to make one wonder what he expected of them. Such conduct is the inevitable result of reformist policy. That is why the revolutionary Marxists formed the Communist Party. The question is not what the reformists will do when the fight grows hot—that should be known in advance—but how can the Communists best develop the struggles of the workers and expand their influence? It is from this standpoint that we must evaluate our past experience with the "progressives" and draw conclusions for the future.

Proceeding in this way we have to take issue with Browder's deductions. He says:

"We will no longer waste our energies and time in disastrous attempts to work with these fake progressives. We will never again put forward such a 'progressive' as Brophy as leader for the tens of thousands of revolutionary miners who have nothing but contempt for such spineless quitters." (Our emphasis.)

What pompous nonsense! What disregard of the facts of the protracted struggle to build the Left wing among the miners! What a ridiculous attempt to punish the Party for his own illusions and disappointments about the "progressives."

Did we get our influence among the miners and eventually gain the leadership of a great mass movement in 1928 by having nothing to do with "progressives"? Quite the contrary. At the beginning of 1926 the Left wing in the Miners' Union was demoralized and the Party was isolated. It was the block with Brophy and other "progressives" which gave us access to the masses of miners who at that time were not "revolutionary miners who have nothing but contempt for such spineless quitters," but admirers of these same Brophys. It was the prestige of Brophy and others, and the confidence the miners had in them primarily, that gave the movement its wide basis at the start. It was only later, as the struggle grew sharper, that our direct influence grew and the true character of the Brophys was revealed to the miners and they became alienated from them. Our mistakes, particularly our failure to criticize Brophy and others, hampered this process, but in spite of that, the united front yielded rich results and proved its validity by them. And that is precisely the value of the united front tactic: it mobilizes the workers for struggle and strengthens the Communists as against the reformists. However, to say that the "tens of thousands of miners" even now are "revolutionary" is somewhat of an exaggeration.

The Communists must learn from the experiences in the miners' struggle and draw the conclusions, not to reject the tactic of the united front, but to correct the errors in its application and employ it widely in the future in all fields.

Another stronghold of the new sectarianism remains. It is the theory that the shifting of the center of gravity in our trade union work to the formation of new unions—an absolutely necessary shift—does away with the troublesome problems of the "progressives."

"We are entering upon a new course . . ." says Browder, "the course of independent struggle, independent leadership, independent organization, inside and outside the existing trade unions." But are all the influential leaders we encounter in this new field to be pure Communists and Left wingers who will not "disappoint" us? Anybody who thinks so is working to build another Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance and not a mass labor movement reflecting the stage of radicalization and class development of the progressive sections of the workers. And it is just this theory that is beginning to confront the new union movement as a real menace. The current practise of monopolizing the control of the new unions in a mechanical way, of regarding every worker who is not a Party member as a faker, of arbitrarily excluding relations and compromises with influential leaders who reflect the hazy development of masses of workers—this practise will be fatal for the movement. It disregards the stage of development, the relation of forces, and all the realities of the situation.

## Where to Buy THE MILITANT

The following is a partial list of newstands, bookstores, and Agents from whom *The Militant* can be purchased. The *Militant* is also obtainable from our Opposition Group Secretaries:

Boston, Mass.: Shapiro's Bookstore, 8 Leverett St.

Malden, Mass.: Comrade Dublin, 15 Semmett St.

Roxbury, Mass.: Charles Goldberg's Store, 536 Warren St.

Chelsea, Mass.: Charles Kleinfeld, at Labor Lyceum.

New York City and Brooklyn:

At various newstands around Union Square & 14th St. & Broadway; Second & Third Aves. on 14th St.; newsstands in the Bronx, and other stands in New York City, and various stands in Brooklyn. Also, at *The Militant*, 340 East 19th St., New York City.

Troy, N. Y., Allen's Bookstore, Hendrick Hudson Hotel.

New Haven, Conn., S. Gendelman, 393 Sherman Ave.

Philadelphia, Pa., Leon Goodman, 327 So. 11th St.

Cleveland, Ohio., Joseph Keller, 304 Vega Ave.; L. Bryant, 2211 East 55th St.

Youngstown, Ohio, Denis Plarinos, 387 East Federal St.

Detroit, Mich., Barney Mass., 8720-12th St., Apt. 24.

"Aidas" Book Shop, 1713-24th St.

Chicago, Ill., Cheshinsky's Community Store, 2720

W. Division St.; Bornstein's Bookstore, 1326 So. Kedzie

Ave., Albert Glotzer, 2610 Thomas Ave.

Springfield, Ill., Joe Angelo, 431 No. Wesley St.

San Francisco, Calif., McDonald's Bookstore, 76 Sixth

Street.

Richmond, Calif., Rosa Powell, McDonald Ave.

Kansas City, Mo., Buehler's Book Store, 220 W. 12th

St. Louis, Mo., Foster's Book Store, 410 Washington

Avenue.

Toronto, Ont., Maurice Spector, 231 Palmerston St.

Goodman, News Vendor, Queen St. W.

Edmonton, Alta., Labor News Stand, 9796 Jasper Ave.

Hamilton, Ont., A. Altman, 109 So. Catharine St.

Winnipeg, Man., National Book Store, Selkirk Ave.

# On the Legend of "Trotskyism"

Dear Comrades!

After a long pause, Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev and their closest friends are again beginning with the legend of "Trotskyism". For the last two years they went with us, together with us they worked out the most important documents of the Opposition, among them also the Platform. At that time there was no "Trotskyism". But when difficulties arose in the struggle to carry out the line of the Opposition under the assault of world reaction and attacks at home, comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev turned back to the bugbear of "Trotskyism". For this reason I would like to establish a few facts:

1. When the so-called "literary discussion" (in 1924) was kindled, a number of comrades close to our group declared that the publication of *The Lessons of October* was a tactical error because it gave the then majority of the Political Bureau the possibility to open up the "literary discussion". On my part, I maintained that the "literary discussion" would have come in any case, on one ground or another. The essence of the "literary discussion" consisted in hunting up as many facts and quotations as possible against me and—by outraging the perspectives and historical truth—to spread them among the uninformed Party masses. The "literary discussion" had no connection at all with *The Lessons of October*. Any one of my books and any of my speeches could have served as the occasion to begin the hunt against "Trotskyism" in the Party. That was my reply to those comrades who were inclined to view the publication of *The Lessons of October* as a tactical error.

After our bloc with the Leningrad Group had taken place, I put approximately the following question in a discussion with comrade Zinoviev: "Tell me, please, if I had not published *The Lessons of October* would the so-called 'literary discussion' against 'Trotskyism' have taken place in spite of that or not?"

Without hesitation, Zinoviev answered: "Naturally *The Lessons of October* was only a pretext, otherwise something else would have been the motive, the forms of the discussion would have become somewhat different, nothing more."

2. In the July declaration signed by Zinoviev and Kamenev, it says: "There can no longer be any doubt that, as the development of the present leading faction has shown, the Opposition of 1923 correctly warned against the dangers of the departure from the proletarian line and the menacing growth of the apparatus regime. Yet dozens and hundreds of leaders of the 1923 Opposition, among them many workers, old Bolsheviks, steered in the struggle and alien to careerism and servility, are kept away from all Party work despite their submission to all discipline."

3. At the joint plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of July 14 to July 23, 1926, Zinoviev said:

"I have made many mistakes. But I consider two mistakes as my most important ones. My first mistake of 1917 is known to all. . . . The second mistake I consider more dangerous, since the first one was made under Lenin, and was made good by us after a few days even if it was done with the help of Lenin, but my mistake of 1923 consisted in . . ."

Ordjonikidze: "That you wanted to make the Party believe something?"

Zinoviev: "We say, there can no longer be any doubts now that the kernel of the 1923 Opposition, as the development of the leading faction has shown, correctly warned against the departure from the proletarian line and against the menacing growth of the apparatus regime. . . . In the question of deterioration and in the question of bureaucracy 'Trotskyism' was right in the end against you." (Stenogram, Volume IV, Page 33.)

In this manner Zinoviev admitted his mistake of 1923 in the struggle against Trotsky, and even characterized it as more dangerous than that of 1917.

4. This acknowledgment of comrade Zinoviev called forth astonishment among many Leningrad Oppositionists who had sincerely believed in the legend of "Trotskyism". Comrade Zinoviev told me repeatedly:

"In Leningrad we hammered it into the consciousness of the comrades more deeply than anywhere else and it is therefore more difficult to learn anew there."

Shortly before the departure of comrade Lashevitch to the Chinese Eastern Railway (I cannot re-

member the exact date) two members of the Opposition came from Leningrad to Moscow to exercise pressure on the 1923 Group in the question of "Trotskyism." They repeated all the stock phrases about the "permanent revolution", about the insufficient estimation of the peasantry and so forth.

Comrade Zinoviev asked me, together with the other leading comrades of the 1923 Group, to participate in a discussion that was to take place at comrade Kamenev's home. The discussion assumed a rather violent character, mainly between Zinoviev and Lashevitch on the one side and the comrades who had come from Leningrad on the other.

I recall quite accurately the words that Lashevitch shouted out to the Leningraders:

"Don't stand the matter on its head. We invented 'Trotskyism' together with you in the struggle against Trotsky. Why won't you understand this? You are only helping Stalin!" And so forth.

Comrade Zinoviev said:

"We must acknowledge what happened. It was a struggle for power. The trick was to combine the old differences of opinion with new questions. For this 'Trotskyism' was invented. . ."

This conversation made a deep impression upon us, the members of the 1923 Group, even though we had already perceived the mechanics of the struggle against "Trotskyism" before. On the way back we exchanged impressions and repeated the crassest expressions of Lashevitch and Zinoviev. Besides that, I reported the discussion the same day to a few close comrades who had not participated in the conference. That is why many formulations of Zinoviev and Lashevitch have remained so well fixed in my memory.

Now that comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev are again trying to make use of the same "trick", that is, to combine old differences of opinion with entirely new questions of capitulation, I ask that you remember, what I or an other participant in these proceedings reported to you on the expressions of Lashevitch and Zinoviev. The exact establishment of these facts now has a great political significance and can be useful in summing up the results of "Lessons of December" (1927).

With Communist greetings,

L. Trotsky.

## Letter from Preobrazhensky

I confirm everything brought out in this document. Only Lashevitch said: "We invented 'Trotskyism' without the words 'together with you.'" The two Leningrad comrades who are mentioned here were quite sincerely worried about "Trotskyism". The meeting took place at Comrade Kamenev's about the 16th of October 1926, perhaps a few days before or after—I cannot recall exactly. December 29, 1927.

E. A. Preobrazhensky.

## Letter from Piatakov

You ask me to inform you what I know about the speeches of Lashevitch and Zinoviev on the occasion of a discussion with Leningrad comrades on "Trotskyism" which took place in Kamenev's home. I no longer remember all that was said. But since I have always followed the question of so-called "Trotskyism" with the greatest attention, and since the position of the Opposition of 1925-26 was of the greatest political interest for me, I remember quite clearly what comrades Zinoviev and Lashevitch said. The sense of their words was the following: "Trotskyism" had been invented so as to replace the real differences of opinion with alleged differences, that is, to utilize historical differences of opinion that had no relation to the present, for definite purposes mentioned above. This was told the comrades from Leningrad who hesitated on the question of "Trotskyism" and they wanted to explain to them who had invented "Trotskyism" and to what end. Moscow, January 2, 1928.

G. Piatakov.

## Letter from Elzin

Dear Leo Davidovitch!

I remember very exactly an episode that occurred in Kamenev's home on the eve of the declaration of October 16th, during a debate on the "literary discussion" and *The Lessons of October*. On your question, as to whether the discussion on "Trotskyism" would have taken place even if *The*

*Lessons of October* had not appeared, Zinoviev then answered: "Certainly it would have taken place, for the plan to open up this discussion was already in existence and we only lay in wait for a pretext." None of the supporters of the 1925 Group who were present expressed any disagreement with this; everyone received this information of Zinoviev as a generally well known fact. January 2, 1928.

E. Elzin.

## Letter from Radek

I was not present at the first conversation but I heard about it after it took place from L. D. [Trotsky].

I was present at the conversation with comrade Kamenev when L. B. [Kamenev] said he would openly declare at the Plenum of the Central Committee how they, that is, Kamenev and Zinoviev, together with Stalin decided to utilize old differences of opinion between Trotsky and Lenin so as to keep Trotsky from the leadership of the Party after Lenin's death. Besides this I heard repeatedly from the mouth of Zinoviev and Kamenev how they invented "Trotskyism" as an actual slogan. December 25, 1927.

Karl Radek

Radek here recalls a striking incident that is not mentioned in my letter. During the July Plenum in 1927, Zinoviev and Kamenev were driven into a hail of quotations out of their own writings against "Trotskyism". Since Kamenev hoped to get the floor again on the question of the Opposition, he wanted to take the bull by the horns and declare openly before the Plenum how and why the Trotskyist danger was invented. But the speakers list was closed and Kamenev did not get the floor again.

L. Trotsky.

## War, Kellogg Pact and the Soviet Union

CONTINUED FROM PAGE ONE

not found the government of the United States among those governments who are carrying on intrigues against our Union. We do not forget that during our most difficult years, the famine years, the American people came to our aid with the generous efforts of the 'Ara' organization, headed at that time by the future president of the United States, Hoover." (*Impecor*, ibid., page 1706.)

Is Hoover deceived by these suave words? Not for a moment! He remembers very well the American intervention in Siberia. He knows that it was through his "generous" American Relief Administration that the Hungarian Soviet republic was drowned in blood. He knows that the United States is financing the anti-Soviet activities of Poland and Rumania. But the workers who read the official pronouncements of Litvinov in the name of the Soviet Union will be deceived as to Hoover's counter-revolutionary role, and the Communist Party will be deprived of its weapons in fighting Hoover and American imperialism.

That is the practical result to the working class movement of the signing of the Kellogg Pact by the Soviet Union and the "diplomatic" speeches of the spokesmen of the Stalin regime. The reason for this anti-Leninist course is the pernicious theory of "socialism in one country". The theory that socialism can be completed in Russia alone if only military intervention is prevented, inevitably leads to opportunism before the world bourgeoisie. It entails an accommodating attitude to the world bourgeoisie, for if an isolated national socialist economy is to be built, then, according to Stalinism, military intervention must be kept off at any price. One of these prices is the Kellogg Pact and all that it involves. But even this payment does not "buy off" intervention because it undermines the revolutionary capacities of the proletariat in the imperialist countries, the strongest deterrent to war against Russia. Another price that revolutionary Russia must pay is the drive to exterminate the Leninist Opposition.

Trotsky, the living leader of world Bolshevism, is deported to Turkey. Stalin, together with Kellogg, Chamberlain, Briand and Stresemann, sign the "great" Kellogg "peace" pact. The one act supplements the other. Both are blows struck at the foundation of Lenin's work.

# Epitaph for a Scoundrel

Pages from the Record of John Pepper

By Ladislaus Rudas, President of the International Lenin School of Moscow

NOTE: In our Platform, published in the last issue of The Militant, we referred to the malodorous records of the present leaders of the Party who are expelling proletarian Communists wholesale. Many comrades have been astounded at the statements we made and wonder if it can be really true that such people control the Party.

Can it be possible, they ask, that people branded by their own past as Social Patriots jailors of Communists, witnesses for the Government against Communists, craven-hearted cowards, Renegade "Anti-Red" crusaders, former enemies of the Russian Revolution, former agents of Hillquit and Berger in the fight against the Communists, etc., are parading as the "leaders" of Communism and expelling and defaming revolutionaries with honorable records behind them?

Yes, all the statements are true. Nobody dares to challenge a single one of them; for they can all be proven by documentary evidence.

John Pepper, (now in Moscow) whose record is set forth below, is one of the main leaders and is the Moscow wire-puller of the present Party regime. He is one of those scoundrels (there are many of them) who have taken the places in the Communist International of its founders—the Trotskys, the Radeks, the Rakowskys—and whose principal occupation is the fight against "Trotskyism," the term which is being used nowadays to define Leninism.

Pepper is the author of many of the slanderous denunciations of the expelled Communists and one of those who incited to violence against us. He was selected by the C.E.C. at the last Plenum to deliver the report against us and to demand our expulsion as "counter-revolutionaries," "renegades," etc. The document printed below shows that he is well qualified, by experience for this kind of a job.

We quote here a number of extracts from a book written by Ladislaus Rudas, one of the leaders of the Hungarian Revolution, who knows Pepper well. The book, entitled "Adventurers and Liquidationism" ("Abenteuer und Liquidationismus") was published in Vienna in 1922 for party circulation by the Voros Ujsag Verlag. Ladislaus Rudas is now the head of the International Lenin School at Moscow.

## Pepper before the War

TO conduct this sham battle against a sham danger Pepper sought out in the sweat of his brow three passages out of a hundred articles. He tore these passages out of their context where, alone, they might be condemned. He tore these passages out of little notices where they were never intended as "slogans" but as agitation, and took the field against them with all the commonplaces of his Marxism. His Marxism however consists of patterns which he applies everywhere, whether they fit or not. He gave long discourses on Communism standing for the expropriation of the means of production, for large factories, etc., as though these were not ruins already well known to us when Pepper was still editor-in-chief of the petty-bourgeois boulevard sheet Friss Ujsag, while I had for some time been editor of the central organ of the social democracy in Budapest (1905). It is a piece of knavery when such as he would teach me about anarchism and syndicalism, where it was I who left the social democracy for its corruption when Pepper—to make a career—joined it! (page 191-2).

## Pepper During the War

Without investigation Bela Kun ordered the expulsion from the Party of this comrade (in charge of the Party's illegal work Ed.) who had been active in the working class movement for twenty years, who suffered a heavy prison sentence for many months during the war for the anti-militarist propaganda conducted while an officer, who led peasants' revolts during the Karolyi revolution and during the entire period of the dictatorship fought courageously and honestly with the Communists despite the fact that he was a social democrat. He ordered this punishment—the severest that a Communist can suffer—carried out by the same Pepper who, as Royal and Imperial war correspondent drank toasts to Austrian Generals while this comrade risked his life in anti-militarist agitation! (Page 116).

## Pepper the Social Democrat

On February 20, 1919, great masses moved demonstratively before the building of the social democratic organ Nepszava. Clashes took place with the police in which a number of them were killed. The day after the demonstration the Communist leaders were arrested and brutally beaten in prison.

To characterize the conceptions of the social democracy another article by John Pepper, which appeared in Nepszava of February 21, 1919, should

be indicated here. Pepper, the most ambitious and conscienceless demagogue ever to be found in the social democracy; whose "Marxism" always consisted in covering with a theory the basest instincts of the dominant men in power in the Party to which he belonged; who in his writings always found a formula precisely for the commonest and most vulgar arguments—this Pepper strutted about as the leader of the soldiers' councils in the first days of the bourgeois revolution. . . . Even as the workers' councils were nothing but a pseudo-institution named by the party and trade union bureaucracy to hinder the creation of a real revolutionary institution of the proletariat, a pseudo-institution with no power at its command and with no will to exert influence,—just so was the soldiers' council seized by the social democratic party and served only to divert the proletarian revolution. The instrument of the social democracy was John Pepper, whom the soldiers' council served to satisfy his personal lust for power. He worked with full steam to become the war minister of the bourgeois republic. To show that he would maintain this post, not to the detriment, but to the benefit of the bourgeoisie, he stormed against the Communists whom he was the first to designate as "left counter-revolutionaries". His expressions best characterize therefore the counter-revolutionary nature of the social democracy, since he was always merely the empty-headed mouthpiece of the prevailing demagoguery. (Page 29-30).

## Pepper and the Bolsheviks

While participating, at the beginning of December 1918, in a meeting of the Ministry for Military Affairs at which martial law against the Communists was considered, he (Pepper) declared:

"I consider the whole Bolshevik movement, whose leaders I know very well, to be harmless. It is led by a few immature persons who have returned from Russia." (Voros Ujsag, December 11, 1918).

But when this movement led by "immature persons" began to bear ripe fruit, Pepper coined the phrase "left-counter-revolutionaries" and was ready to use the most shameless methods against them. He ordered out machine guns and armored cars against the soldiers who demanded in a demonstration the dismissal of the at that time openly counter-revolutionary Minister of War Festetich (Voros Ujsag, January 11, 1919); he ordered the arrest of comrades Tibor and Ladislaus Szamuely (Voros Ujsag, January 15, 1919); in numerous speeches he summoned the soldiers to pogroms against the Communists. At the same time, naturally, he sailed in the filthiest nationalist waters when he enjoined the soldiers: "Social democrat and Magyar mean the same thing." (Voros Ujsag, March 6, 1919. This remark was made by Pepper to incite the soldiers to the new imperialist war against the Czechs in the interests of the Hungarian bourgeoisie!) He had translated this passage directly from the Communist Manifesto into Hungarian (Page 31).

## Pepper Imprisons Bela Kun

On January 2, 1919, the Communist soldiers in one of the barracks demanded the resignation of the then reactionary War Minister. Pepper thereupon ordered the arrest of Bela Kun. *Az Est* of January 2, 1919, wrote as follows on the matter:

John Pepper, government commissar of the soldiers' council expressed himself to us about the demonstration of the Communist soldiers:

"The entire Communist soldiers' demonstration only shows that the Communists cannot really influence the soldiers, that the soldier masses as a whole are supporters of the social democratic party and are soldiers of the People's republic. Contrary to the artificial blatherskiting, the truth is that it is just the soldier masses who were the ones that arrested Bela Kun and his colleagues, and refused to give them the floor." (Page 31).

## Pepper Turns Commissar!

Yesterday still "democrats" they (the social democrats) today became supporters of the proletarian dictatorship; yesterday still ministers of the bourgeois government, they today became without any transition "People's Commissars" of the Soviet government. On March 19, Siegmund Kunfi still made a long speech at election meetings "where I," he writes, "took a position everywhere against the dictatorship and for democratic socialism." John Pepper, however, still said the same thing, as Kunfi on March 19, 1919. And when a Com-

munist proposed at an election meeting to set free the imprisoned Communists, Pepper answered him as follows:

"I speak in the name of the Hungarian working class movement (He always talked tall—L. R.); in the name of the social democratic party, and these will use mass terror against everyone who seeks to terrorize in any way the representatives of the Hungarian working class (namely: himself, John Pepper—L. R.)" Pester Lloyd, March 20, 1919.

Two days later they became—Pepper even with "stormy enthusiasm"—"people's commissars"! (Page 41-2).

## The Communists Force Pepper's Resignation

The Communists were naturally embittered that the fate of the Party should be decided over their heads. . . . Mainly, however, did the Communists feel bitter over the naming of John Pepper as People's Commissar for Military Affairs, the same Pepper who, of all the social democrats, had acted most shamelessly and despicably towards the Communists, who coined the phrase of "left counter-revolutionaries" against them, who was prepared to assume the role of Noske and to order out machine guns against the revolutionary soldiers. The Communists did not allow even the threats of Kun to restrain them and moved en masse before the building of the People's Commissariat of Military Affairs and forced Pepper to resign. On April 4, Nepszava published the report of his resignation. (Page 58).

## Pepper Wants a Second Party

There were many who blamed Bela Kun entirely for the failure of the revolution.

Thus, for example, John Pepper openly proclaimed that Bela Kun was a traitor, that he must be eliminated from the movement, that a new party must be founded. We all wanted a new party, but Pepper immediately became a liquidator. He wanted to found a party on new principles; and that the new Communist Party should be a peasants' party. An open, legal peasants' party—since Hungary was an agrarian country! In this spirit he drew up a memorandum and sent it—to Michael Karolyi, the former president of the People's Republic, since he had chosen this gentleman as the leader of his "new" party! At any rate, it was rejected by Karolyi, for Karolyi, personally one of the most honest bourgeois politicians, would not for a single moment have anything to do with a Pepper. Then, said he, the proletariat needs no party, since every proletarian in Hungary is a Communist, it is only necessary to put arms in his hands and the revolution is here again! At one and the same time he was—a right and a left liquidator! (Page 96-7).

## Chicago Comrades Protest

"To the District Convention  
Workers Communist Party  
District No. 8.

Dear Comrades:

We request that you read the following to the District Convention:

1. We have witnessed recently a series of expulsions of leading and proletarian comrades, most of whom participated in the formation of our Party, and actively engaged in Party work. These expulsions took place because of their political views or protesting the expulsion policy.

2. The expulsion policy carries all the dangers of destroying our Party and is the path to split our Party.

3. In our opinion the expulsions are only an effort on the part of the CEC majority to conceal their right wing errors. It is an effort to hide the real danger facing our Party, the right danger exemplified by the Lovestone group. This has only the effect of perpetuating the right wing danger in our Party and the continuance of their bureaucratic control.

4. The expulsion took place on the basis that these comrades adopted the position of "Trotskyism" or protested the expulsion of Comrades Cannon, Abern and Shachtman. It must be stated that the discussion on Trotskyism was inadequate, and it is necessary to hold a free and open discussion of the Russian Opposition with the documents present.

5. We wish to emphatically protest against the expulsions and demand the reinstatement of these comrades to their former duties and Party posts.

Fraternally yours,

Jack Cohen, Dan Pollin, Fannie Mirak,  
Rebecca Sacherow, H. P. Glaser, A.  
Bornstein, Elsie Meyers, H. Kretick, Os-  
heroff, Leon Mussel, Lillian Bergeron.

# The Draft Program of the Comintern

CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS ISSUE

The Chinese bourgeoisie is sufficiently realistic and knows closely enough the nature of world imperialism to understand that a real serious struggle against it requires such an upheaval of the revolutionary masses which would first of all become a menace for the bourgeoisie itself. It the struggle against the Manchu Dynasty was a task of smaller historical importance than the overthrow of czarism, the struggle against world imperialism is a task on a much larger scale. And if we taught the workers of Russia from the very beginning not to believe in the readiness of liberalism and the ability of petty bourgeoisie democracy to overthrow czarism and to destroy feudalism, we should in a no less degree, have imbued the Chinese workers with the same spirit of distrust. The new, absolutely false, theory promulgated by Stalin and Bucharin about the "imminent" revolutionary character of the colonial bourgeoisie is, in substance, a translation of Menshevism into the language of Chinese politics; it serves only to make, on the basis of the oppressed position of China an internal political allowance for the Chinese bourgeoisie and to throw on its scale another weight against the weights of the trebly oppressed Chinese proletariat.

But, say the authors of the draft program, Stalin and Bucharin, Chiang Kai-shek's northern campaign roused a powerful movement among the workers and peasants. Of this there is no doubt. But did not the fact that Gutchkov and Shulgin brought to Petrograd Nicholas II's abdication play a revolutionary role? Did it not arouse the most downtrodden and scared section of people? Did not the fact that Kerensky, who but yesterday was a Laborite, became the President of the Ministers Council and the Commander-in-Chief, rouse the masses of soldiers? Did it not bring them to meetings, did it not rouse to its feet the village against the landlord? The question could be raised even more widely. Did not all workings of capitalism rouse the masses, did it not snatch them, to use the expression of the Communist Manifesto, out of the idiocy of rural life? Did it not move the proletarian battalions to the struggle? Does our historical evaluation of the role of capitalism as a whole or the various actions of the bourgeoisie stop our active class revolutionary attitude to capitalism or to the actions of the bourgeoisie? Opportunism was always based on this kind of non-dialectical conservative Khvostist "objectivism." Marxism on the contrary invariably taught that the revolutionary results of one or another act of the bourgeoisie to which it is forced by its position will be fuller, more decisive, less doubtful and firmer, the more independent the proletarian vanguard will be in relation to the bourgeoisie, the less it will trust the bourgeoisie, the less it will be inclined to play into the hands of the bourgeoisie, to see it in bright colors, to overestimate its revolutionary nature or its readiness for a united front or for a struggle against imperialism.

Neither theoretically nor historically nor politically can Bucharin's appraisal of the colonial bourgeoisie stand criticism. However, this is exactly the appraisal, as we have seen, the draft resolution is seeking to lay down.

\* \* \*

One uncondemned error always leads to another or prepares the ground for it.

\* \* \*

If yesterday the Chinese bourgeoisie was included in the one revolutionary front, today it is declared to have "definitely gone over to the counter-revolutionary camp." It is not difficult to find how unfounded are these transpositions and inclusions which have been effected in a purely administrative way, without a more or less serious Marxian analysis.

It is absolutely clear that the bourgeoisie in joining the revolution does so not accidentally, not owing to light mindedness, but under the pressure of its class interests. For fear of the masses the bourgeoisie later deserts the revolution or openly displays its secret hatred for the revolution. But to go over "definitely" to the counter-revolutionary camp, that is, to free itself from the necessity to "support" again the revolution or at least to flirt with it, this the bourgeoisie can do only in the event that, whether in a revolutionary or in any other way (for instance the Bismarkian way), its main class requirements are satisfied. We will recall the history of the period of 1848-1871. We will recall that the Russian bourgeoisie received an opportunity to turn its back so openly to the

## A CRITICISM OF FUNDAMENTALS

By L. D. TROTSKY

revolution of 1905 only because it received from the revolution the State Duma, that it, it received an opportunity to bring direct pressure to bear on the bureaucracy and to compromise with it. But when the war of 1914-1917 revealed the inability of the "new" regime to secure the basic interest of the bourgeoisie, the latter again turned towards the revolution and became more radical even than in 1905.

Can it be considered that the revolution of 1925-27 in China has at least partly satisfied the basic interests of Chinese capitalism? No. China is now just as far from national unity and from customs independence as it was prior to 1925. But as a matter of fact the creation of one home market and its protection from cheaper foreign goods is for the Chinese bourgeoisie a question of life and death. It is a question only second in importance to that of maintaining the basis of its class domination over the proletariat and the rural poor. But also, for the Japanese and for the British bourgeoisie the maintenance of China in its colonial state is a question of no less importance than the question of economic independence is for the Chinese bourgeoisie. That is why the Chinese bourgeoisie will still display many zig-zag moves towards the left in its future policy. For those who like united fronts there will still be many chances in the future. To tell the Chinese Communists today that their alliance with the bourgeoisie during the period of 1924-1927 was correct but that now it is no good because the bourgeoisie has definitely gone over to the counter-revolutionary camp, means to disarm the Chinese Communists once again in face of the coming objective changes in the situation and the inevitable zig-zags of the Chinese bourgeoisie towards the left. The war now conducted by Chiang Kai-shek fully disproves the mechanical scheme of the authors of the draft program.

\* \* \*

But, if you please, the fundamental error of the official formulation of the question will appear more glaringly, more convincingly, and more definitely if we will remember the fact which is still fresh in our minds, and is of no little importance, namely, that czarist Russia was a combination of oppressed and oppressor nations, that is, it consisted of Great Russians and other nationalities, many of whom lived entirely in a colonial or semi-colonial state. Lenin did not only insist on the greatest attention to the national problem of the nationalities of czarist Russia, but even proclaimed—against Bucharin and others—the elementary duty of the proletariat of the dominant nation to be the support of the struggle of the oppressed nations for their self-determination, even to the extent of separation. But did the Party conclude from this that the bourgeoisie of the nationalities oppressed by czarism—the Poles, Ukrainians, Tartars, Jews, Armenians and others—were more pro-

gressive, more revolutionary than the Russian bourgeoisie? Historical experience bears out the fact that the Polish bourgeoisie,—notwithstanding the fact that it suffered from the yoke of the autocracy and national oppression, was more reactionary than the Russian bourgeoisie and, in the State Dumas, was always inclined, not towards the Cadets (liberals) but towards the Octobrists (reactionaries). The same is true concerning the Tartar bourgeoisie. The fact that the Jews had absolutely no rights whatever did not prevent the Jewish bourgeoisie from being more cowardly, more reactionary, and more vile than the Russian bourgeoisie. Or perhaps the Estonian bourgeoisie, the Lettish, the Georgian, or the Armenian bourgeoisie were more revolutionary than the Great Russian bourgeoisie? How can one forget such historical lessons?

Or perhaps now, post factum, we should declare that Bolshevism was wrong when—in contradistinction to the Bund, the Dashnaks, the P.P.S., the Georgian and other Mensheviks—it called upon the workers of ALL oppressed nationalities, of all colonial peoples of czarist Russia, at the very dawn of the bourgeois democratic revolution, to dissociate themselves from the other classes and form their independent class organizations, to break ruthlessly all organizational ties not only with the liberal bourgeoisie, but also with the revolutionary petty-bourgeois parties, to win over the working class in the struggle against those parties, and to fight against them with the help of the workers, for influence over the peasantry? Was it not a "Trotskyist" mistake, did we not skip over, in relation to the oppressed, including the extremely backward nations, the Kuomintang phase of development? How easy it is after all to say that the P.P.S., the Dashnaks, the Tsutun, the Bund and others were "peculiar" forms of necessary collaboration of the various classes in the struggle against the autocracy and against national oppression. Can such historical lessons be forgotten?

For a Marxian it was clear even prior to the Chinese events of the last three years—now it should become clear even to the blind—that foreign imperialism as a direct factor in the internal life of China, renders the Chinese Miliukovs and Chinese Kerenskys in the final analysis even more vile than their Prussian prototypes. It is not in vain that the very first manifesto of our Party proclaimed that the further east we go the lower and more vile become the bourgeoisie, the greater become the tasks of the proletariat. This historical law fully applies also to China.

"Our revolution is a bourgeois revolution, THEREFORE the workers must support the bourgeoisie—this is what the bankrupt politicians of the liquidator camp say. Our revolution is a bourgeois revolution is what we Marxians say. THEREFORE the workers must open the eyes of the people to the treachery of the bourgeois politicians, teach them not to believe them and to rely on their OWN forces, on their OWN organizations, on their OWN unification, and on their OWN arms alone." (Lenin, Vol. 14, part 1, Page 11).

This Lenin thesis is obligatory for the whole of the East and must by all means find a place in the program of the Comintern.

TO BE CONTINUED

### JOIN the CAMPAIGN for a WEEKLY MILITANT

The fight for a Weekly Militant is now beginning in earnest.

The goal of the campaign is the raising of a \$2,000 fund to insure its existence over the first period.

The Chicago group of the Communist Opposition has started the ball rolling with a donation of \$100. All the local groups are now taking the responsibility for definite quotas of the \$2,000 total.

All the militants of the Communist Opposition must concentrate on this task. Our future work and effectiveness depends on it.

The progress of the campaign will be reported in each issue of The Militant until the goal is reached.

The Weekly Militant will be a mighty weapon in the fight for the preservation of the Communist movement in America. It will be a powerful fighter on the side of the heroic Russian Bolsheviks who defend the basic principles of the Russian Revolution in the face of expulsion, imprisonment, calumny and exile.

In addition, the Weekly Militant will be able to present to its readers serious articles and comment on the situation in the United States, the latest developments in the labor movement, and on the situation within the Workers Party which is not properly discussed in the official Party press, because a real discussion is forbidden.

All together for the Weekly Militant!

Answer the expulsions with a contribution to the \$2,000 fund!

Send Contributions to

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

# Platform of the Communist Opposition

CONCLUDED FROM LAST ISSUE

## The Party Organization

The organization of the Party, in the Party units and in the trade union and language fractions, represents today a state of chaos and demoralization. The execution of the reorganization and the functioning of the Party from top to bottom since that period have brought confusion, inaction and indifference into the Party ranks.

The basis of Party organization today is the shop nucleus and the street nucleus. (international branch). This is correct. The organization of street nuclei (international branches), where shop nuclei cannot be organized, had as its purpose an accelerated political development and general activity on the part of all members. The former language branches formally were liquidated in order that the foreign-speaking member might be brought into the sphere of general American labor and political activity and Party life and get away from the narrow existence of his national grouping.

But what do we find actually? The street nuclei or international branches, are for the most part non-functioning bodies in a political sense. Organizationally, there is the anomaly that three, four or five street nuclei, with 20 or more members each on the record book, will meet in the same room or hall at the same hour, often mixing or combining their work. (New York district). Presumably the street nucleus is organized on the territorial (living area) basis of the members. Generally throughout the Party the street nuclei are formally organized in that manner. Actually the street nucleus (international branch) loosens this practice and membership becomes general regardless of residence. This, however, is not the main defect. The defects are so outstanding, and known to any member who wants to see, that it is but necessary to mention them in general outline form. The functions conducted by the street nuclei are mockeries of working class activity and political life. It is common practice that the Party members at their unit meetings find themselves confronted with an orgy of ticket-selling, money-collecting and similar technical activities, till they feel that they are petty salesmen and agents instead of active Communists concerning themselves with the vital issues of the working class. Bureaucratism is rampant, the functions of political activity, discussion and decision are usurped by the committees and officials.

It is necessary that the Party organization be overhauled. Shop nuclei must be formed in such places where there are sufficient members working to make it possible for the nucleus to function actively (issuance of a shop paper; organization of the unorganized, etc.).

The street nuclei (international branches) must be constituted on a genuine territorial basis and have a membership of not less than 25 or more than 50. The Party shall emphasize the character of work of the nucleus. Namely, that the units shall concern themselves with political and labor problems (discussion and action on shop problems, trade union questions, parliamentary activity, strikes, etc.) All technical work, such as payment of dues, other financial collections, etc. shall be placed as a subsidiary part of the agenda and conducted at specific periods only, and in such a manner as in no way to interfere with the main tasks.

The general vitalization of Party life for each member is essential. Each member must feel himself as a factor and contributor to the life and needs of the Party. The practice of thinking and administering from above, without real consultation and participation by the membership, must give way to the opportunity for each member to contribute his ideas. Mere orders are not sufficient to produce healthy Party life and participation in the class struggle. Thought from the membership is a prerequisite. The membership must have the opportunity through more frequent membership meetings (on a city or section scale, depending upon the size of the membership) to take up the major issues and campaigns of the Party in order that they may thoroughly understand the Party's objective and better be able to carry out its aims. The practice which has made the meetings of functionaries (officials) almost the main and the only medium of discussion must be liquidated. Such practices are breeding grounds for

bureaucracy, for separation of the rank and file members from the officialdom, both high and low. More frequent membership meetings will make it possible for the rank and file worker to contribute his views and to check the functionary; at the same time the officials thereby can obtain a clearer picture of the actual views of the membership, the resources and capacities of the Party, and the Party work can thus be better carried out. All organizations, and the Party organization too, tend to develop always a certain inertness and tradition that conservatize. These tendencies must be guarded against by a continuous re-invigoration from below.

### TRADE UNION FRACTIONS

The trade union fractions of the Party, where they are not utterly liquidated, are lifeless, functioning usually only in time of union elections. In a large measure this is due to the virtual liquidation of the work in the existing trade unions and the wrong line being developed in the Party in this respect. Functioning trade union fractions in every trade and industry, in each local union, district council, etc., are absolutely essential for the extension of Party influence in the trade unions. Lifeless or non-functioning trade union fractions foster the development of a non-critical attitude toward so-called progressives and Left wingers in the labor movement, of an easy-going opportunism and adaptability on the one hand and completely "Leftist" or sectarian attitude on the other. The latter tends to confine activity in the trade unions and among the unorganized to the Communists alone.

The trade union fractions must be organized and brought to life in the unions. The T.U.E.L. must become a genuine organization and not remain just a Communist body. The Party center must put this work in the foreground, and work out also for each industry a concrete program around which and through which the fractions may be vitalized and become the real instruments of the trade union work.

## Agrarian Work

The severe crisis in agriculture, with all its sharp consequences for the masses of poor farmers and farm wage workers, has not been entirely overcome by American capitalism. It has remained one of the chief sources of weakness in the armor of the American bourgeoisie, and a broad field for agitation and organization for the Communist movement which has not been taken advantage of except to an insignificant extent.

The Party has indeed, followed a consistently opportunist line in this field of work, having gone so far as to give virtual endorsement to the hypocritical McNary-Haugen Bill and other bourgeois "remedies." It has further failed to separate the various strata of the agricultural population from each other, and has therefore not succeeded in approaching any of them properly. The farmers have been looked on "as a mass" solely as objects for maneuvering in Farmer-Labor Party movements. It is necessary to change the course of the Party in this respect.

The first step the Party must take is to obtain contact with the agricultural wage workers, the proletarians on the farm. It is the primary duty of the Party to carry on this work, and especially to have a correct approach to the syndicalist workers (the I.W.W.) who have been the only organizing force in this field up till now.

The ranks of the Party must be open to only those farmers who accept the proletarian viewpoint on property. It must concentrate its chief efforts among the farmers upon organizing the tenant and heavily-mortgaged farmers who feel the heavy oppression of the bankers, railroads, mill-owners, and big farmers. A guarantee for the proper functioning of the movement of the poor farmers, that they will remain on the correct path of struggle instead of succumbing to the pressure of the big farmers, is that the proletarians and semi-proletarians on the land shall have the preponderance of leadership in the movement.

The Negro tenant farmers, share croppers, and those who are slaving under a system of virtual peonage in the South, must receive the special attention of the Party. It is possible to organize them: this has been demonstrated in the past by the fact that organizations of the Negro poor farmers have arisen spontaneously in the South.

It is possible to unite them with the poor white farmers: this has also been demonstrated by past experiences even in the reactionary South, where, in Texas for example, strong organizations of Negro and white poor and tenant farmers existed and functioned effectively for some time.

## Young Workers League

The situation in the Young Workers (Communist) League merits the deepest attention of the entire movement. The leadership and line of the League have merely been a miniature replica of the factional and corrupt Party regime. The evils of the Lovestone-Pepper leadership in the Party have appeared in an even more grotesque form in the Zam-Herberg (Lovestone) leadership in the League. Rampant factionalism, petty-bourgeois cynicism and super-sophistication, occupation with "high" politics, are corrupting the League like so many diseases. The League has become nothing more nor less than a faction agency for the Lovestone regime. Instead of the League being in the forefront of the struggle against opportunism in the Party, it is always ready to endorse it unconditionally.

In every struggle where splendid opportunities for growth were presented, the League failed signally to take advantage of them. In the face of the growing exploitation of the working youth and the possibilities for the development of struggle, the League has either lost membership or stood still. There is an increase in the mood of passivity among the League members, and the inner life of the League becomes constantly more barren and withered. The leadership of the League has been a dead hand on the organization.

A symbol of the situation is the fact that the founders of the Communist youth movement in this country, and its leadership at the period of its swiftest and healthiest development (Abern, Carlson, Edwards, Shachtman, etc.) have now been expelled. In their stead have been placed a leadership which cannot have the confidence of the mass of the membership or the young workers, which has brought only disintegration, factionalism and degeneration into the League. Instead of helping to turn out this leadership, and replacing it with a sound proletarian core which alone is able to solve the difficulties with which the League is pressingly confronted, the Executive Committee of the Young Communist International has followed a course which has in actuality resulted in the entrenchment of the Zam Lovestone leadership in the League. The same course has been followed by the Party leadership in its relationship to the Youth.

The League (and even the Pioneers!) is at present being mobilized against so-called "Trotskyism," that is, against the fundamental tenets of Leninism. Instead of the Communist Youth being permitted to develop freely their natural inclinations against opportunism and revisionism, they are herded into blind support for the liquidation of the basic teachings of Bolshevism. The main task of the League members is to fight relentlessly for the line of revolutionary principles now being defended by the Leninist Opposition. An additional prerequisite is the eradication of all corrupt petty-bourgeois tendencies in the League, of opportunism following in the path of the Party faction regime, of "smart-Aleckism," cynicism and playing with the working class movement.

### PHILADELPHIA MEETING

James P. Cannon will speak in Philadelphia on Sunday, March 17 at 7:30 P. M. at the Friendship Liberal League Forum, Clayton Hall, 9th St. and Girard Ave. The subject of the lecture will be "The Truth about Trotsky and the Platform of the Russian Opposition."

### CANNON MEETINGS IN BOSTON

Friday, March 22, Chelsea, Mass., Chelsea Labor Lyceum.  
Saturday, March 23, Boston, Mass., at Militant "Vetcherinka".

## Ready Now

THE DRAFT PROGRAM OF THE  
COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

By L. D. TROTSKY

With an Introduction by James P. Cannon

THIRTY-FIVE CENTS PER COPY

In lots of 5 or more - 25 cents per copy

Order now from

THE MILITANT

Box 120, Madison Square Station  
New York, N. Y.

# Letters from the Militants

## A VOICE FROM PRISON

Sing Sing Prison,  
Ossining, New York,  
February 12, 1929.

Dear Comrades:

I have received your letter and also the editions of the Militant and you don't know how happy I was when I read about the wonderful work our Group is doing. Dear Jim, when I read about the deportation of L. D. and about the way the Thermidorians and the Caesars of the present regime in the C.P.S.U. are doing with the Lieutenants of Lenin and the leaders of the October, it made my blood boil, but as L. D. has foreseen this very tactic of theirs before it is not surprising to us. Lenin said in 1923 to remove Stalin from his present position and that he will in time split our Party. Lenin was the first one to predict and foresee that. Lenin said that this cook will feed us a peppery soup and he will yet break the Party. Later, after Lenin's death, this same Stalin collected all those that were against Lenin in October (in those days when deeds counted and not words) like Zinoviev, Kamenev, Rykov, etc., and to his collection he added the "theoretician" and phraseologist, Bukharin, who was out of the Party in 1918 at Brest Litovsk, propagating against Lenin by saying that Lenin is misleading Russia and will bring it to ruin. Together they started the attack against those that stood with Lenin side by side at all times in all emergencies from 1917 until his death.

In this country Pepper's boys started the pot boiling first with the miners, then with the endorsement of Panken and the Socialist Party then with the sending of Communist Party members into the S. P., then with the textile union and most of all the main important task is now to obey the Master's voice in the liquidation of the Trotskyites. They are so eager in doing it that they will end up with the expulsion of all the proletarian members of the Party and remain with the City College of New York boys like Weinstone, Miller, Wolfe, Benjamin, Weisbord, Lovestone, Ragozin, Trachtenberg and a few more teachers, lawyers and petty-bourgeois. When Pepper gets through with those he will be able to repeat those words that he wrote in 1918 against all Bolsheviks.

Now I will conclude with the words of Lenin plus a little of my own. Watch these cooks for they will feed us with peppery soups. They will ruin the Party. We must remain pure for the victory of the Opposition and the health of L. D.

Maurice L. Malkin.

(NOTE: Comrade Malkin has been transferred from Sing Sing prison to the prison at Comstock, New York. Together with him went the two other needle trades workers: Leo Franklin and Sam Kurland. All comrades are urged to write to him regularly at his new address: Maurice L. Malkin, No. 10061, Box 51, Comstock, New York.)

## A LEAGUE MEMBER ON THE NEW YORK MEETING

To the Editor of the "Daily Worker"

Dear Comrade:

The occurrences at last Tuesday's Trotskyite meeting held at the Labor Temple will repay the scrutiny of Party and League members. The disgusting spectacle enacted as a consequence of Party tactics was surpassed only by the putrid report of the affair which appeared in the next day's issue of the Daily Worker. If nothing else was accomplished, it gave conclusive proof that certain Party elements have nothing more to learn from capitalist teachers; as far as gangster methods and maliciously false newspaper reporting are concerned.

All the allegations in the Daily Worker article give quite the opposite of the truth. In all cases the disturbances were provoked by Party or League members. The first blow of the evening was struck at the ticket-taker by one who alleged himself to be unemployed and tried to force his way into the hall. Most ridiculous of all is the accusation that the presence of police was due to a telephone call from Cannon asking for police protection. In adjourning the meeting, the chairman explained that the reason for adjourning at that time was due to the presence of police. The Daily Worker article omits to mention this but declared that the adjournment was forced by the departure of the audience. I have been present at many a Party mass meeting, however, which was considered a success, and which did not have more of an audience than was present at the adjournment of the Cannon meeting.

The success of a Communist movement is not based on a policy of distorting facts or obscuring issues. The movement thrives only to the extent that workers are presented with the facts and given a sound ideological basis. There are enough capitalist agencies thru which the minds of workers are doped with falsehoods.

The Labor Temple meeting is not important in itself, but there is something seriously wrong with the sort of tactics that were employed. These same tactics are having their deplorable effects in all Party and League units. A comrade is not even permitted to present an opposing stand on vital questions, and if he votes according to his conviction, he is conveniently expelled.

I protest against such tactics and in doing so I know that I am expressing the attitude of many members who are not yet prepared to speak openly.

Paul Green, member Y.W.L.

## FROM A DETROIT COMMUNIST

Detroit, Mich., Feb. 9, 1929.

Dear Comrade Cannon:

I wish to inform you that I was expelled from the Workers Party for holding certain views regarding Trotsky. Two years I have been fighting to express my views and I was suppressed. The Party removed me from all activities and on February 3, 1929, I was expelled.

After a thorough study of both sides, i.e., Stalin and the Opposition, I came to the conclusion that the Opposition is more capable of applying Marx's and Lenin's

teachings to the world situation and Russia in particular. To my understanding the Opposition is the real Bolshevik group. I am organizing an Opposition group; there is a large field to work on and I need information regarding its organization. For that reason I would like to keep in touch with you. I regretted very much that I missed the opportunity to arrange a meeting for you when you were in Cleveland a short time ago. If you intend to come to Detroit, please let me know so that I will arrange a well-attended meeting of workers who sympathize with Trotsky's views. I am sure you will find them very promising supporters.

They have requested for all kinds of literature that will enlighten them about the present situation in the movement. There is a big demand for the book "The Real Situation in Russia" by Leon Trotsky. A lot of these books can be sold here. I read that book, and I think it will clarify some comrades who are misled by Stalin.

Comradely yours,

Alex Schriber.

## COPIES OF FIRST ISSUE OF MILITANT WANTED

All readers of the Militant who have on hand copies of the first issue dated November 15, 1928 are urgently requested to send them to us. Even single copies will be greatly appreciated as our file copies were stolen in the burglary conducted by the professionals hired to do this job by the Central Executive Committee of the Party.

## NEW EXPULSIONS

On the eve of the Party Convention, which is to mark the fake "internal consolidation" of the Party, we have to record numerous other expulsions of active workers from the Party for their support of the Platform of the Russian Opposition. Behind all the hypocritical buncombe about "Party unity" the campaign of expulsions and Party-splitting is continuing in full blast. New expulsions about which the Militant has recently been informed are as follows:

### BOSTON

I. COOPERSTEIN.

### NEW YORK

HAROLD ROBBINS, Young Workers League.  
JOHN JUSTIN, Young Workers League.  
SAM WATTS, Young Workers League.  
GEORGE CLARK, Young Workers League.  
MAX WALDMAN, of the Furriers' Union.

### ST. LOUIS

ELMER McMILLAN, Communist candidate for Mayor  
MARTIN PAYER, Acting sub-district organizer  
Y. W. L.

H. L. GOLDBERG.

CHARLES MAHLER, Young Workers League.  
E. CARLSON, Young Workers League.

### DETROIT

ALEX SCHRIBER.  
JULIUS ROSEN, Section Agit-Prop Director.

### RICHMOND, CALIF.

ROSA POWELL.

### WILLISTON, N. DAKOTA

A. C. MILLER, first Communist legislator in U. S.  
BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA  
SARAH F. J. LINN.

### TORONTO, CANADA

S. QUAELEK.

## WHO ARE THE EXPELLED COMMUNISTS

VINCENT R. DUNNE—Member Western Federation of Miners, 1905; joined I.W.W. at foundation; in I.W.W. actions in Missoula, Spokane, Seattle, Fresno and San Francisco. Participated in I. W. W. strikes and free speech fights, 1906-8. Served sentences in Seattle and Los Angeles for street speaking. Worked in lumber camps, mines and construction camps in Idaho, Washington, Montana, California, Texas and Arizona. Member of strike committee of Saw Mill Workers at Bogaloo, La., 1908. Express wagon driver and messenger for Northern Pacific, Wells Fargo, Adams Express, discharged several times for organizing workers, finally blacklisted and forced out of industry. Active in Mooney Defense fight and in Friends of Soviet Russia. Charter member Minneapolis Office Workers Union, financial secretary and delegate to Central Labor Union, 1922-24. Removed from office and expelled from C.L.U. for Communist activity by order of Executive Council of A.F. of L. in 1924. Secretary of 12th Ward Farmer-Labor Club (Minneapolis) 1924-8. Removed from office for fighting F.L.P. bureaucrats and labor fakers Shipstead, Cramer, Weir, Starkey, Lundeen, etc. Expelled from union November 11, 1928 for opposing Shipstead as Senatorial candidate, just three days before expulsion from Party. Joined Workers Party, held minor offices, secretary Minneapolis C.C.C. for three years. Member District Executive Committee, 1923-8; of District Polcom, 1926-28; member District secretariat, 1927-8. Delegate National Convention, 1927. Delegate to every convention of Farmer-Labor Federation and Association. Member of National Party Election Campaign Committee, 1928. Communist candidate for Congressman in 1928. Expelled from Party, November 14, 1928.

HELEN JUDD—Secretary of North Side English branch of Socialist Party in 1919 and helped to swing it into Communist Party when William F. Kruse, J. Louis Engdahl, Victory Berger, Adolph Germer, Seymour, Stedman and others were trying to hold it in line for the Socialists. Indicted in the Palmer Raids, held under \$10,000 bonds. Secretary of Local Chicago, National Defense Committee, for two years, while Party was underground. Afterward active for several years in forming pioneer groups. At the time of second expulsion by William F. Kruse, was secretary of Nucleus 31, one of the largest and most active in Chicago, and also a member of Control Commission of District Eight of the Party.

## A MINNEAPOLIS MILITANT

Minneapolis, Minn.

Dear Comrade:

Our Communist work is going on in Minneapolis despite the expulsion, slander and finally the fascist methods to which our Party has degenerated in District Nine. Bureaucratic, gangster and suppressive methods workers have to be fought whether in our Party or in other workers' organizations.

A short time ago, in fact on the evening of the same day on which I was notified by the little bureaucratic Devine, District Organizer here, that I was expelled from the Party, the pamphlet entitled "Emotion Hides Communist Trickery" issued by Green and Morrison of the A. F. of L., was read before my union. I took the floor



OSCAR COOVER

Slugged by Lovestone-Foster gangsters at Minneapolis meeting.

and in an 18 or 20 minutes talk exposed the lies, innuendo and cheap trickery contained in the pamphlet and also explained what we Communists stood for in the unions, as well as our final aim, the necessity for our democratic-centralized form of organization, the dictatorship of the proletariat, etc., etc.

Probably our Party bureaucrats will claim this is counter-revolutionary work but just the same it helps to clear the minds of the workers. Their saying we are not Communists doesn't make it so, and I am satisfied that by the time this fight is over we will have made it so hot for the little bureaucrats of the Communist movement that they will never again dare try the suppression of real Communists or their platform honestly put forth.

With Comradely greetings,

OSCAR COOVER.

## Proletarian Youth Against Gangsterism

### A STATEMENT TO DOWN-TOWN UNIT NO. 2, YOUNG WORKERS LEAGUE OF N. Y.

At the Tuesday night (February 26) meeting of the Opposition to protest the deportation of Trotsky, we saw the kind of activity that the officials of the Party and League carry on against the Opposition. A big squad was sent down to the meeting by Bert Miller, the organization secretary of the Party in New York. They did not come in order to argue or discuss the issues intelligently or in a manner that would convince workers of the correctness of the Party position. On the contrary, they came there only for the purpose of breaking up the meeting by violence and physical attacks on the supporters of the opposition. We are absolutely convinced that such activity can only bring the greatest harm to the movement and help to discredit it before the eyes of the workers. It will bring about a situation where the cops and dicks will become the judges and final settlers of all disputes in the ranks of the movement and the working class. We are absolutely opposed to such tactics.

We believe further that a real discussion of the important issues, should be conducted, especially for the young comrades in the League. Such a discussion can be worth while only if both sides of the issues are clearly presented to us, and all the material made available for study and discussion. All we have had so far is the pamphlet by Bertram D. Wolfe on the "Trotsky Opposition" which didn't teach us anything. Otherwise we simply become automatic hand-raisers who endorse everything that the Party and League Officials instruct us to do. We propose the immediate opening of such a real discussion and the end of the kind of work that the Party carried on at the Tuesday meeting.

JOE BURTON, member of Executive Board, American Association of Plumbers Helpers.

MAC KUDLER, member of Executive Board American Association of Plumbers Helpers.

IRVING SPREIREGEN, vice-president, American Association of Plumbers Helpers.

JOSEPH FOX, League unit Industrial Committee.

HAROLD ROBBINS.

JEAN TISHMAN.