

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

# The MILITANT

VOL. II, No. 7.

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

PRICE 5 CENTS

## TROTSKY'S REPLY TO STALIN

To the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union!

To the Executive Committee of the Communist International!

Today, December 16th, the representative of the Council of the G.P.U. Volinsky, transmitted the following ultimatum to me orally:

"The work of your own colleagues in the country"—he declared almost literally—"has lately assumed an open counter-revolutionary character. The conditions under which you live in Alma Alta give you full possibilities to direct this work. On this ground the Council of the G. P. U. has decided to demand of you the categorical promise to discontinue this work, or else the Council will be obliged to change your conditions of existence in the sense of a complete isolation from political life. In connection with this the question of changing your place of residence is also raised."

I declared to the representative of the G. P. U., that I would only give him a written answer to a written formulation. My refusal to give an oral reply to the G. P. U. was called forth by experiences of previous times; my words would be maliciously distorted in order to mislead the working masses of the U. S. R. and the whole world.

Nevertheless, irrespective of the further steps to be undertaken by the G. P. U., which after all carries no independent role in this matter but only carries out technically the old decision of the narrow Stalin faction which I have known for some time, I consider it necessary to submit the following to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Executive Committee of the Comintern:

To demand that I renounce my political activity is to demand that I abjure the struggle for the interests of the international proletariat, a struggle I have been conducting without interruption for thirty-two years, that is, during my whole conscious life. The attempt to represent this activity of mine as "counter-revolutionary" emanates from those whom I accuse before the international proletariat of trampling under foot the basic teachings of Marx and Lenin, of injuring the historical interests of the world revolution, of breaking with the traditions and the heritage of the October, of the unconscious—and therefore the more dangerous—preparation for the Thermidor.

To renounce political activity would mean to give up the struggle against the blindness of the present leadership which heaps upon the objective difficulties of socialist construction ever greater political difficulties that arise out of the opportunist incapacity to conduct a proletarian policy on a large historical scale.

It would mean the renunciation of the struggle against the stifling regime in the Party which reflects the growing pressure of the enemy classes upon the proletarian vanguard.

It would mean to be passively reconciled to the economic policy of opportunism, a policy which undermines and destroys the foundations of the proletarian dictatorship, which hampers the material and cultural growth of this dictatorship and at the same time deals heavy blows at the alliance of the workers and the working peasants, the basis of the Soviet power.

The renunciation of political activity would mean to cover with silence the disastrous policy of the International leadership which, in Germany, 1923, led to the surrender of great revolutionary positions without a struggle; a policy which attempted to cover up its opportunistic mistakes with the adventures in Estonia and Bulgaria; which falsely estimated the international situation at the Fifth Congress and gave the Parties directives which only weakened and split them, a policy which, through the Anglo-Russian Committee, supported the British General Council, the bulwark of imperialist reaction, in the most difficult months for the traitorous reformists; which in Poland, at the sharp internal turning point, trans-

formed the vanguard of the proletariat into a rear-guard of Pilsudski; which in China carried out to the end the historical line of Menshevism and thereby helped the bourgeoisie to demolish, to bleed and to behead the revolutionary proletariat; which weakened the Comintern everywhere and squandered its ideological capital.

To cease political activity would mean to submit passively to the blunting and the direct falsification of our most important weapon: the Marxist method, and the strategical lessons we acquired

awarded the "historical right" to Stalin.

If this blind, cowardly, incompetent policy of adaptation to the bureaucracy and the petty bourgeoisie had not been followed, the situation of the working masses in the twelfth year of the dictatorship would be far more favorable; the military defense far firmer and more trustworthy; the Comintern would be in quite a different position and would not have to retreat step by step before the traitorous and bribed social democracy.

The incurable weakness of this apparatus reaction in the Party, despite all its apparent power, lies in the fact that it does not know what it is doing. It is carrying out the command of the enemy classes. There can be no greater historical curse for a faction that arose out of the Revolution and is now undermining it.

The great historical strength of the Opposition, despite its momentary weakness, lies in the fact that it feels the pulse of world historical processes, that it clearly perceives the dynamics of class forces, that it foresees the future and prepares for it consciously. To renounce political activity would be to renounce the preparations for the coming day.

\* \* \*

The threat to change my conditions of existence and to isolate me from political activity sounds as though I am not separated by 2500 miles from Moscow and by 150 miles from the nearest railroad and by approximately the same distance from the border of the desolate Western provinces of China, where the fiercest malaria shares its dominion with leprosy and pestilence. As though the Stalin faction, whose direct organ is the G. P. U., had not done everything in its power to isolate me not only from political life, but from any other form of life as well. The Moscow newspapers arrive here only after a delay of ten days to a month, sometimes more. Letters get to me only in exceptional cases, after they have lain around for two or three months in the drawers of the G. P. U. and the Secretariat of the Central Committee.

Two of my closest co-workers since the civil war, comrades Sermouks and Posnansky, who accompanied me voluntarily to my place of exile, were arrested immediately upon their arrival, thrown into a cellar with common criminals, and then sent away to the remotest corners of the North. A letter from my hopelessly sick daughter, whom you expelled from the Party and kept from all work, took seventy-three days to get to me from the hospital, so that my answer found her no longer alive. Another letter on the serious illness of my second daughter, whom you also expelled from the Party and drove from all work, I received a month ago from Moscow, forty-three days after it was mailed. Telegraphic inquiries about health hardly ever reach their destination. In a similar or far worse position are thousands of the best Bolshevik-Leninists, whose services to the October revolution and to the international proletariat are infinitely greater than the services of those who exiled or imprisoned them.

In preparing still more cruel repressions against the Opposition, the narrow faction of Stalin, whom Lenin characterized in his "Testament" as rude and disloyal, (at a time when these characteristics had not yet reached a one-hundredth part of their present development), is attempting with the help of the G. P. U. to lay at the door of the Opposition some kind of "connection" with the enemies of the dictatorship. Among themselves the present leaders say: "We have to do this for the masses." And very often even more cynically: "That is for the simpletons." My close co-worker, Georgi Vassilievitch Butov, secretary of the Revolutionary War Council during all the years of the civil war, was arrested and detained under unheard of conditions. From this upright and

CONTINUED ON PAGE 3

### Comrade Trotsky to the American Opposition

We are able to announce that the Communist Opposition in the United States has finally succeeded in getting into direct connection with comrade L. D. Trotsky, who is now living in exile in Pera, the foreign quarter of Constantinople! We have just received a letter written by comrade Trotsky to the United States stating that he has largely overcome his malarial affliction, is in fairly good health and has not the slightest intention of dying despite the ardent wishes of the enemies of Bolshevism. In a very early issue we expect to present to our readers a message from comrade Trotsky to the American Communists. We are further assured of regular contributions from comrade Trotsky to the Militant and we intend to publish a new article by him in every issue of our paper.

Long life to comrade Trotsky, the living leader of world Bolshevism!

in struggle under the leadership of Lenin and with the aid of this method.

It would mean to be reconciled passively—to bearing the responsibility for them—to the theory of the Kulak's growing into Socialism, to the myth about the revolutionary mission of the colonial bourgeoisie, to the slogan of the "combined workers' and peasants' parties" for the East, a slogan which breaks with the foundations of class theory, and finally to that which is the crowning point of all these reactionary fables and many others, the theory of socialism in a single country, the greatest crime against revolutionary internationalism.

The Leninist wing of the Party has endured blows since 1923, that is, since the unprecedented defeat of the German revolution. The force of these blows has increased with every successive defeat of the international and the Russian proletariat as a result of the opportunist leadership.

Theoretical understanding and political experience teach us that a period of retreat, of retrogression, that is, of reaction, can take place not only after bourgeois revolutions, but also after proletarian revolutions. For six years we have lived in the U.S.S.R. under conditions of growing reaction against the October, and with it the clearing of the road for the Thermidor. The most open and consummate expression of this reaction within the Party is the wild persecution and the organized smashing of the Left wing.

In its last attempts to resist the open Thermidorians, the Stalin faction had to borrow the "rubbish" and the "remnants" of the ideas of the Opposition. Creatively, it is impotent. The struggle against the Left deprives it of all firmness. Its practical policy is unbalanced, false, contradictory and unworthy of confidence.

The campaign against the Right Danger, undertaken with such clamor, remains three-quarters only a sham campaign and serves above all to cover up the real war of annihilation against the Bolshevik-Leninists before the masses. The world bourgeoisie and international menshevism have both blessed this war: these judges have long ago

# Next Steps in the Struggle

## Material for the National Conference Discussion

IT is now more than 5 months since our declaration in support of the Russian Opposition, made on the occasion of our return from the Sixth Congress of the Communist International, was answered by expulsion from the Party. The period which has intervened since that time has seen a steady development of the work of popularizing the main ideas of the Opposition, a task which has been carried on in the face of a campaign of falsification and incitement reminiscent of Palmer's days and having not a little of the same essential content.

By James P. Cannon

There could be no better testimony to the revolutionary impulses in the Party ranks than the fact that the revolutionary platform of the Opposition was able in so short a time to make its way through the "cordon sanitaire" of corrupted bureaucracy and to find supporters in every section of the Party, in all parts of the country, who stood up in defense of that platform even to the point of expulsion from the Party. These are the vanguard fighters for the Communist ideal and the living proof of its vitality. Their firmer union on a national scale and their collective preparation for the next stages of the struggle now stand on the order of the day. The National Conference of the Opposition, which will convene in Chicago on May 17th, will be devoted to these tasks. The thoughts of the most reliable and tested militants of American Communism are turning to the forthcoming Conference which is fraught with such a great significance for the future.

The Conference will sharpen the line of our struggle and work out the organization forms for the next stage of its development. The action of the Convention in rejecting our appeal and denying us the right to be heard, will naturally have no influence in halting this determination. The Convention, which was packed and prearranged by the mechanical exclusion of the Opposition, accomplished nothing whatever except to demonstrate again the bankruptcy of the regime. Formal decisions arrived at in this way cannot be taken as a substitution for conclusions based on free collective work of revolutionaries.

The question has been asked by timid people in the Party ranks whether the action of the Convention, which was inspired and is fully supported by the Stalin leadership in the Comintern, will prompt the Opposition to give up the struggle and return to the Party on the terms implied in the present policy toward the Opposition on an International scale. It is a significant feature of the Opposition movement that not a single voice in favor of this has been heard in its ranks. Despite the difficult circumstances under which we conduct our work, or perhaps because of them, the determination to carry on the fight to a victorious conclusion, no matter how long it takes nor how hard the road, has been voiced on every side. We are confident that the National Conference will confirm this attitude unanimously.

There has been much speculation in the circles of the party bureaucracy on the appearance of a "Zinoviev" tendency, that is, a tendency toward capitulation, toward treason to principle, in the ranks of the Opposition. Such things are, of course, possible on the part of individuals, but we do not believe they will be seen. The nature of the campaign against us was not without its positive side in our favor. The fact that expulsion and unprecedented calumny had to be faced by every Party member coming out for our platform

restrained those afflicted with weak knees and faint hearts from joining our struggle. Those who passed to our side through this selective process only grew firmer in their convictions and stronger in their confidence under the pressure on us.

The experience of the International Opposition has not been in vain. The nature of the struggle is so clear now that Zinovievs, Fishers and Maslows can no longer be attracted to it. It will be the duty of the Conference to sum up this International experience and to say that capitulationist tendencies are a foreign substance in the movement of the Communist Opposition which must be cast aside in the most ruthless fashion at their first appearance.

Capitulation on the terms of the bureaucratic destroyers of the Communist International means to give up participation in intellectual and political life at a time when the movement stands most in need of this participation by all the creative forces. It means to become a silent partner in the criminal destruction of the Russian Revolution and the Communist International. It means treason to Communism and to the cause of the working class.

We have no doubt that the Conference will estimate the question in this way and give a revolutionary answer to it. In doing so it will have to go beneath the surface and attack the germs of this disease which present themselves in the form of "ultra-legalism" in the struggle for our views. This is the "advice" frequently given to us by "sympathizers" of our cause who think it sufficient to hold views in secret and do nothing to advance them because it is prohibited by the bureaucrats. This "advice" must be specifically and categorically rejected by the Conference as it has been in all of our activities since the expulsions began. The movement of the International Communist Opposition is a fighting movement and it will triumph by struggle. We can agree to give up extraordinary methods and organization in this struggle only when our Party rights and the Party rights of all our comrades throughout the International are restored.

While confirming the fighting methods we have employed in the Communist struggle for our views and working out the organization forms for their intensification and further development, the Conference will also have to answer the question of a new Party. This tendency, the antipode of capitulationism, has a superficial attractiveness. It could be seriously entertained by the Opposition, however, only if it had become clear that the Communist International, of which our Party is a part, had definitely left the proletarian path. This is by no means the case. The bureaucratization and opportunist politics of its upper stratum are the objects of our attack.

The Comintern possesses enormous revolutionary resources in its proletarian ranks which are beginning to assemble and take shape. The Opposition must continue to base itself on them. Our policy will become the policy of the proletarian forces of the Comintern if the correct tactics in furtherance of it are employed. A split in the Comintern is the aim of the Stalinist bureaucrats. The unification of the Comintern on the basis of Leninism, against the bureaucrats and opportunists, is the slogan of the Opposition. With this slogan we will defeat all attempts to isolate us from the Party membership. The tactics proceeding from this slogan will be the means of helping the proletarian tendency in the Party to find the right line and march on the same path with us.

Alongside the task of penetrating ever deeper into the Party ranks with our agitation, we have the task of recruiting and organizing the revolutionary workers outside the Party who are becoming attracted to our banner in large numbers. This is a revolutionary duty of the greatest importance which the Opposition must perform. The present leadership has failed miserably in this. Among these non-Party Communists are thousands and tens of thousands who have been alienated and estranged from the Party but who remain true to the cause of communism. The problem of organizing them is not separate from the work within the Party ranks but is bound up with it. The National Conference of the Opposition must work out the organization form for this double task.

## Boston Works for a Weekly Militant Fund

The Boston group of the Communist Opposition opened its campaign for the Weekly Militant with the holding of a Vetcherinka on Sunday night, March 24th which was attended by a good crowd. A profit of \$50. was realized by the affair and contributed to the fund for the Weekly. Comrade Schlosberg, who presided, reminded the comrades of a similar gathering held during the war which many of those present had attended which had marked the launching of the Boston section of the Left Wing movement and said the same spirit which had animated the pioneers of Communism in those days was in our Opposition movement today.

The Boston group held a special meeting on Saturday, March 23rd, on the occasion of Comrade Cannon's visit to the city and decided to accept a quota of \$250. for the fund for the Weekly. The amount raised at the Vetcherinka is the first installment on this pledge.

In our last issue we remarked that reports from Kansas City and other places were "still awaited." Since then K. C. has been heard from in the form of a letter from "Shorty" Buehler, the veteran of the Communist movement there who is famous for doing things which others consider impossible.

"K. C. comrades pledge \$100." says the letter. "Enclosed find check for \$20. as a starter on the pledge. Keep up the good fight."

Al Glotzer, for the Chicago group, sends along another \$56. to apply on their pledged quota of \$500. This makes a total of \$176.50 from Chicago so far which puts it ahead of all points East, but still behind Minneapolis.

Individual responses to our circulation of collection lists are beginning to come in. L. S. Quong, a Chinese comrade who has already contributed more than five dollars through the Chicago group, sends another dollar on his own list. Charlie Byrne sends a five spot on his own account from Youngstown. Joseph Keller, of Cleveland, sends five dollars and says, "I am very glad to hear the news of the campaign for a Weekly Militant and will do my best in securing subs and money toward its maintenance. The beginning may appear slow, but there surely will be good results later."

Alex Schreiber, treasurer of the Detroit group, sends \$5.75 as the first installment and Rosa Powell sends another contribution of three dollars from Richmond California.

A collection of \$60.50 for the Weekly fund was taken at the Trotsky protest meeting held in New York on March 9th. In addition to this a number of individual contributions have been received, the largest of which is \$10. from comrade Louis Stone.

The struggle to maintain our Militant even as a semi-monthly has been a hard one which required sacrifices all around of a kind which only pioneers animated by real convictions and Communist determination are able to make. The establishment and maintenance of the Weekly will be a still harder struggle for a time, but the Opposition Militants will go through with it just the same.

The Weekly Militant must and will be realized.

Amount necessary to start Weekly \$2,000.00  
Previously acknowledged \$382.00  
Received since last issue 180.70

Total contributions to date \$ 562.70

Balance needed \$1437.30

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

## THE MILITANT

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

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

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

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

Editor

James P. Cannon

Associate Editors

Martin Abern

Max Shachtman

Maurice Spector

VOL. II. APRIL 1, 1929 No. 7.

Entered as second-class mail matter November 28, 1928, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1929.

# A New Dawes Plan for the Old

By Max Shachtman

THE so-called Experts Conference now meeting in Paris, in an attempt to "settle" for the nth time the question of German reparations and debt payments, has projected the most ambitious plan for American imperialist domination of Europe that has yet been presented. The plan calls for the establishment of an international debt bank for the ostensible purpose of regulating the movement of the funds created by reparations and war debts. Translated into the language of the current world financial relation of forces, the establishment of such a bank would result in the establishment of a hitherto unequalled domination of the countries of Europe especially such as the United States has never before enjoyed.

The plan becomes even clearer when it is understood that the only country at present in a position to organize and insure the maintenance of such an institution is the United States, whose enormous and dominating financial power would be immediately reflected in its control of the policies of the bank. It is not for nothing that the head of the American "unofficial" delegation to the conference is J. P. Morgan who sits in the center of the immense American financial spider web that extends over the entire capitalist world.

The proposal has left the European press breathless. American finance capital is playing its cards with a sure, firm hand, and the plan it offers is another way of informing the bourgeoisie of Europe that the U. S. has every intention of pressing the knife more sharply to their throats in an attempt to put an end to the uncertainty with which the question of reparations and debt payments has hitherto been surrounded.

American domination of such a bank—and no other domination is at present conceivable—would leave the disputed questions entirely in the hands of Wall Street. The primary function of the institution, according to the announcements, would be to "act as trustee in receiving from Germany such annuities as may be arranged and disbursing these among the creditor nations . . . It also could cooperate with and act as an essential intermediary between all the interested governments and the issuing bankers in marketing such bonds as might be issued for the commercialization of the German annuities." In other words, Wall Street, sitting at the cashier's window of the new bank would decide on the payments to be made to the creditor nations (England, France, Belgium, Italy, etc., etc.), the percentages, the frequency of payment, and so forth, and would further be the controlling factor in any attempt to commercialize the reparations payments. Should the plan be adopted on this basis, the entire financial structure of the nations involved would be in the grip of the huge octopus whose head is in New York and its tentacles everywhere else.

This is all the more so since the question of debt and reparations payments is far from being a secondary question. On the contrary, it is the focal point today of the sharpening conflicts between the imperialist powers who are vainly seeking a permanently satisfactory way out of the quagmire of contradictions into which world capitalism sinks more deeply every year. On the question of reparations and debts, and all that flows from it, hinges the question of the so-called European bloc against the United States, the increasingly strained relations between the various imperialist powers in Europe itself, and, mainly, the question of the growing antagonism between England and the United States. On the consequences of the solution of the debt problem hinges to a large extent the question of the increasing Leftward tendency of the German working class and the perspectives of the German proletarian revolution.

But precisely because of all that is involved, a settlement of the question by imperialism—we mean a settlement that will actually solve these burning problems—is impossible of achievement. The establishment of the international debt clear-

ing bank will not settle the question. At best it will succeed only in delaying for a brief period the final revolutionary solution.

Such a bank cannot settle the question to the satisfaction of France and England on one side, and Germany or the United States on the other. The German bourgeoisie demands a sharp downward revision of the reparations payments. That is, the German industrialists and bankers, with the renewed strength accumulated in the past years of rehabilitation, demand a greater share of the profits extorted from the sorely pressed German proletariat which up to now have been turned over in part to the Allied bourgeoisie in reparations payments.

On the other hand, England, whose financial condition is far from a desirable one, demands from Germany the payment of such reparations as will cover at least the British debt to the United States, which has been estimated at some five billion dollars.

The French Shylocks demand from Germany payments that will run up to about four billion dollars, that is, the French debt to the United States, plus its debt to England, plus the indemnity it claims for the devastated war areas. Unfortunately for Germany, incidentally, France still holds over its head the question of evacuating the 2nd and 3rd Rhine zones, to which Briand will not pledge himself definitely unless there is a satisfactory financial settlement.

Similar demands are presented by the other former Allies; the Little Entente even goes so far (under French and Italian coaching, to be sure,) as to demand that Germany pay the entire debt of the former Entente of the Central Empires.

American imperialism, further, has no inclination to see the Allies receiving sufficient funds from Germany to maintain and strengthen their military and naval machinery for probable future use against the U. S.! Especially so, since such funds will necessarily derive from Germany, at the expense of its industrial and financial development, from which the United States expects to receive the payments on the tens of millions of dollars in-

vested in Germany since the inauguration of the Dawes Plan.

There is no doubt that a temporary "solution"—by the typical method of capitalist anarchy—can be found to this problem. But the solution can "work" only at the expense of the German proletariat, already doubly-exploited, already subjected to a most intense rationalization, already driven into a constantly lower condition of life. All signs point to the increased rapidity of the tempo of this development.

American imperialism, already deeply involved in the maelstrom of world economics and drawn inexorably deeper into the vortex, is seeking to fight its way out at the expense of the European bourgeoisie, chiefly of the German bourgeoisie, who in turn unload their burdens on the German proletariat. The German bourgeoisie, for its part, is preparing the grounds for a more violent pressure upon the working class.

These preparations are reflected on the political field by the movement for a "bloodless putsch" in Germany, for the establishment of a naked dictatorship. The reactionary press in Germany demands ever greater power for the President, Hindenburg, who has, significantly enough, refused to withdraw from the position of honorary chief of the fascist Stahlhelm. The same press is filled with sharp criticisms of "the outworn, fruitless parliamentary system." It is further significant that Hjalmar Schacht, head of the German State Bank, and chief German negotiator at the Experts' Conference, is mentioned prominently for the post of German Mussolini. Incidentally, the German social-democracy, nominally at the head of the government, is in reality clearing the road for the reactionary coup, and the repetition of a collaboration with naked reaction to suppress the rebellious proletariat—as was done years ago by Ebert and Severing—is entirely likely.

The bourgeoisie may feel elated at the thought that they are solving this delicate question satisfactorily by uprooting the old Dawes plan in order to plant a new one. But they are blindly sowing dragon's teeth. Whether the harvest is to be a reactionary dictatorship or a proletarian revolution in Germany will depend chiefly on the strength, preparedness and resolution of the German Bolsheviks.

## Trotsky's Reply to Stalin

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

modest man and irreproachable Party comrade they tried to extort confirmation of their consciously concocted and false accusations in the Thermidorian spirit. Butov answered with his heroic hunger strike which lasted fifty days and brought on his death in prison in September of this year. Violence, blows, torture—physical and moral—are applied to the best worker-Bolsheviks for their loyalty to the October.

These are the general conditions which according to the Council of the G. P. U. "offer no obstacle at all" to the political activity of the Opposition in general and of myself in particular.

The miserable threat to change these conditions in the sense of a stricter isolation simply signifies that the Stalin faction has decided to replace exile by imprisonment. This decision, as is mentioned above, is nothing new to me. Already adopted as a perspective in 1924, this decision has been gradually converted into deed over a series of stages. In order to accustom the crushed and deceived Party in a round-about manner to the methods of Stalin, whose rule disloyalty has today matured to the most venomous bureaucratic dishonesty.

In the Declaration to the Sixth Congress of the Comintern, where we refuted the slanders which besmirch only their authors, we made known our unshakable readiness to fight within the framework of the Party with all the methods of Party democracy for the ideas of Marx and Lenin without which the Party suffocates, petrifies and crumbles. Once more we made known our unflinching readiness to help the proletarian kernel of the Party with word and deed to change the political course, to restore the health of the Party and the Soviet power with united forces—without convulsions or catastrophes. We will stand firm by these words. To the accusation of factional work we answered that it can be liquidated immediately only when Article 58<sup>1</sup>, perfidiously applies to us, is recalled and we are taken back into the Party again, not as repentant sinners but as revolutionary fighters who are not betraying their banner. As though we

had foreseen the ultimatum presented to us today, we wrote literally in the Declaration:

"Only a bureaucracy corrupted to its roots can demand this renunciation (from political activity, that is, from service to the Party and the international proletariat). Only contemptible renegades can give such a promise."

I can change nothing in these words. I submit them again to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Executive Committee of the Comintern which bear the full responsibility for the work of the G. P. U.

Each to his own part! You want to continue to carry out the promptings of the class forces hostile to the proletariat. We know our duty. We will carry it out to the end.

L. D. TROTSKY.

December 16, 1928, Alma Alta.

<sup>1</sup>Article 58 of the Penal Code of the Soviet Union deals with the counter-revolutionary activities. It was employed by Stalin to imprison and exile the Opposition.

## An Opposition in England

We are glad to announce the formation of an Opposition Group in the Communist Party of Great Britain for the first time since the beginning of the struggle between the Russian Opposition and the Centrist regime. The Opposition in the British Party consists of a number of tested Bolshevik fighters who stand completely on the Platform of the Opposition led by Comrade Trotsky. They have begun a struggle to present their viewpoint to the Party and win the British revolutionary workers to the revival of the Communist movement on the basis of Marx's and Lenin's teachings.

We send our warm fraternal greetings to our British comrades. The Opposition, in the face of persecution, suppression and misrepresentation of its views, continues to grow and march forward to its inevitable victory.

### 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.

# Industrialization and the Peasantry

By Martin Abern

In the unscrupulous falsification of the history of the Russian Revolution by the Stalin clique, the distortions and total misrepresentation of the views of comrade Trotsky and the Russian Opposition on the peasant question stand out in bold relief. On this question, the position of Trotsky coincided with that of Lenin.

Lenin, replying to rumors of differences between him and Trotsky, wrote:

"The rumors of disagreements between him and me are a monstrous lie, propagated by the landlords and capitalists or their conscious or unconscious servitors. I, upon my part, fully confirm this statement of comrade Trotsky. There are no disagreements between him and me, and in regard to the middle peasants there are no disagreements not only between Trotsky and me, but in general in the Communist Party of which we are both members.

"...I subscribe with both hands to everything Trotsky wrote." (Lenin, Pravda No. 35, February, 1919.)

The falsification of the views of Trotsky is attempted both for the period when Trotsky was Lenin's closest co-worker, and also for the general historical position of Trotsky. Trotsky "underestimates the peasantry"; he "does not accord them the proper attention"; he "pays no attention to the peasant at all"—every conceivable idea is attributed to Trotsky on the peasant question. All the distorters of Trotsky's ideas have one thing in common. They never quote or state his actual views which differ in nowise from Lenin and the Bolshevik position. The procedure of Trotsky is completely Marxist, as even casual investigation would show.

From a revolutionary standpoint, in any relations with other social groups, the Marxist puts forward the unquestioned domination of the proletariat. To see the peasant in any other light fundamentally than as an ally of the proletariat under the leadership of the latter is to undermine the foundations of proletarian revolutionary rule; for example, such "defenders of the U.S.S.R." as Arthur Rhys Williams who extolls the peasant above all other groups. The peasant cannot be the leader, and driving force comes from the city. Hence, the theory of the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution is accepted naturally by the Communist from historical, political and social reasons.

Trotsky wrote, "Once in power, the proletariat will appear before the peasantry as its liberator." From "Our Revolution", Henry Holt & Co., p. 98. (written in 1906).

While the proletariat maintains hegemony once it achieves political supremacy, nevertheless, "The proletariat will be able to hold this position under one condition; if it broadens the base of the revolution." (Ibid, p. 96, our emphasis.)

But in what manner shall this base be broadened and for what groups and classes? Are the class differentiations, for instance, among the peasantry to be ignored? Is only volume of commodity production in agriculture to be the main guide in the attitude of the proletarian dictatorship and the U. S. S. R. toward the various peasant groupings: the hired worker, poor and middle peasants and the rich Kulak? The Right Wing, as an instance, led by Rykov, as Trotsky pointed out long ago and which the Stalin regime today repeats without understanding, bases its policies primarily upon increased productivity by the Kulak with his use of hired labor, perhaps some horses and other means of production which the poor peasants do not have. But the encouragement of Kulak production as against development of Soviet and collective farms hinders the socialist development of agriculture, as well as the productivity of the rest of the peasantry.

"The Kulaks and their ideological defenders, hide all their ambitions under a pretense of worrying about the development of their productive forces, about increasing the volume of commodity production 'in general', etc. As a matter of fact, Kulak development of the productive forces, a Kulak increase of commodity production, represses and checks the development of the productive forces of the entire remaining mass of the peasant industry." (From the Platform of the Opposition.)

This means, further, the development along capitalist roads, as the Russian Opposition declared, along the direction of Thermidor, for saying which the Opposition are imprisoned, persecuted and exiled. But now, at a time when the Right Wing, nurturing for so long the Kulak, Nepmen and bourgeois ideologies, has grown rapidly and strong, the shocked and distressed Stalin regime, shouts the words of Trotsky but finds itself actually only

puttering around with a program it does not understand and feel sure about,

But in words, Molotov, Stalin henchman, can say, among other things, at the March 1929 Moscow Party Conference:

"The Right deviation, in the question of the mode of development of agriculture, takes a different, openly anti-Party position, . . . the essence of the Right deviation culminates in the following: Less expenditure of money on collective economics and state economics, caution in the development of advance payment for harvests, in the organization of tractor colonies, in the development of an agricultural economy based on agricultural machinery and tractors. Hence, the Right deviation means, in the first place, a loosening of the fetters binding the Kulak economy, which would lead in the last analysis to a victory of the bourgeois elements and to the restoration of capitalism."

To develop agriculture along the line of soviet and collectivist farms, there must be an industrial development along socialist lines. Without a policy and plan which works toward electrification and the development of big scale production in industry, and a use of the resources of the country with this aim in view, agriculture will remain on the low basis of independent production by tens of millions of small peasants, producing virtually in a barbaric manner. Industry must produce the machinery which can transform agriculture into socialist agriculture production. "The sole material basis for socialism is a vast machine industry, capable of reorganizing agriculture," said Lenin. Today, this strikes root more strongly than ever. Only a high development of the means of production and electrification is able to overcome the technical backwardness of millions of small industries. However, this process of industrialization must be along socialist roads if the working masses in the city and country are to be the gainers thereby.

It would be incorrect to say that the Stalin regime has no policy on industrialization. It is in particular contrast with the policy of the Bukharin-Rykov group. The latter has no faith in the possibility of a swift industrialization development in the U.S.S.R., and hence bases its major policy on agricultural production, especially in the development of the productive forces of the Kulak. This situation, in their view, will continue for years, while the U. S. S. R. slowly, at a "snail's pace" develops industry. This policy dooms socialist construction in the U. S. S. R. and inevitably draws upon capitalist elements for sustenance. Bukharin's writings, "Notes of An Economist" contain the arguments for this line.

The Stalin regime now has, on the contrary, an industrialization policy. Unfortunately, it leads also to capitalist domination by another road. The Stalin regime says: Industrialize! and it calls upon foreign capitalists to enter and build industries along modern lines. True, the U.S.S.R. will become industrialized thereby, indeed, along Ford methods, if you please. But it will be capitalist industrialization and not socialist industrialization. The Stalin plan of industrialization may yet lead to a Dawes plan of development and "cure" for the U. S. S. R. These are the signs to be noted in the agreement with the International General Electrical Company of the United States, the plans of Colonel Cooper for electrification, etc., and the "freer" foreign relations that are being indicated in the present foreign policy of the U. S. S. R. (Kellogg pact, etc.) Both Stalin's and Bukharin's way lead away from the Revolution and the proletarian dictatorship.

The program of the Opposition is the way of industrial and agrarian socialization with an absolute assurance of the retention of the foundation of proletarian rule: the dictatorship of the proletariat. That policy has as its basis the absolute maintenance of the foreign trade monopoly, a redistribution of the national income by means of a correct use of the budget, credit and prices, and a correct use of the bonds with the world economy. There are sufficient resources for a socialist policy for agriculture and industry in the U. S. S. R., as against the Stalin "capitalist industrialization" policy on the one hand and the "Kulak" hope of Bukharin on the other. What is needed is the correct policy.

The Stalin-Bukharin regime jointly for these past years is responsible for the loosening of the control of the village by the Party and the proletariat. When Kulaks are told, as Bukharin told them, to "enrich themselves" and Stalin says, "Create non-party peasant active centers by revivifying

the soviets" without mentioning the matter of which "class" is to dominate in the soviets thus set up, the Kulaks enrich themselves not only in an economic sense but also take the opportunity to establish political rights, i.e., privilege of voting, etc.

"If the dominant party should be guilty of one mistake after another, in politics as well as in economics, if it should retard the growth of industry, . . . if it should relinquish its grasp of the control over the political and economic processes in the village, of course, the cause of socialism would be lost in the country." (Leon Trotsky, "Whither Russia", International Publishers, p. 13-14.)

The persistent crisis and confusion of policy these past years in the C.P.S.U. under the Stalin-Bukharin regime attests eloquently to the warnings of Trotsky uttered already in 1925.

The Stalin-Bukharin regime, contrary protestations notwithstanding, saw the "Peasant problem" true enough, but they did not see it correctly, as Trotsky saw it, namely, that:

"In the class struggle now going on in the country, the party must stand, not in words but in deeds, at the head of the farm-hands, the poor peasants, and the basic mass of the middle peasants, and organize them against the exploitative aspirations of the Kulak." (From the Platform of the Opposition. Our emphasis.)

For those who wish to know the detailed program of the Russian Opposition on this and other questions, there should be read the Platform of the Opposition published in "The Real Situation in Russia", the article on the July Plenum and the Right Danger by L. D. Trotsky printed in The Militant, etc.

Meanwhile, the grain crisis in the C. P. S. U. is not solved, and the Stalinites, now "cleansing" the Party of the Bukharin wing, still zig-zags in all directions. The fight against the Right Wing is three-fourths a sham battle. The Russian Opposition is cut off in the Stalinist way, the way of ruin, division and disintegration of the Communist forces. But still the Opposition remains and points out the correct line of action for the C. P. S. U., the U. S. S. R. and the International Communist movement. Stalin falsifies history today. But history will correct Stalin. And that will yet bring the victory of the Opposition under the leadership of Leon D. Trotsky.

## Two Meetings in Chicago

Sunday evening, March 24, comrade Swaback spoke before the Plebian Forum on Madison Street to about 125 workers—Party members, ex-Party members, I. W. W., etc. It was an excellent meeting with a spirit of interest throughout, until the organized Party hooligans, led by the Fosterites who have assumed a new responsibility in fighting the "Trotskyist danger", marched into the hall. Swaback had finished speaking, questions were answered and discussion had finished. The speaker was summing up when a group of Y. W. L. members, acting as scouts for the Party "bruisers" began to howl. They did not want to listen to any counter-revolutionary discussion, and when asked to take the floor, they wouldn't, because a Stalinite must not discuss with renegades.

The workers at the meeting became impatient with the hoodlums and began to eject them from the hall for their disturbance and their refusal to pay admission. George Maurer yelled: "Why don't you speak on Leninism?" But when he was asked to speak on it, he was in a pretty bad way since he hardly knows how the word is spelled. The Stalinites then began their customary stunts until the workers would stand for it no longer. The heroes suddenly became advocates of non-violence and set up a demand for peace! The meeting having been concluded, it was adjourned properly. The whole audience was thoroughly disgusted with the actions of the Party.

Plans are under way to hold another meeting in the near future.

The first attempt to hold a meeting under the auspices of the Scandinavian Workers Club of Chicago to be addressed by Arne Swaback, of the Communist Opposition, on the subject of the controversy in the Communist movement, did not succeed. What was responsible for the failure was the threat of the Party bureaucrats to smash the meeting violently. Letters were sent out by the District Office calling upon the membership to meet in front of the hall to break up the meeting. This was done despite the fact that the Club had invited comrade Swaback to come and address the workers. Swaback had offered to debate a representative of the Stalinites but the latter had refused.

About a hundred Party members were present, mostly of the top layer of paid functionaries and faction leaders. Holm, the caretaker of the hall was informed prior to the meeting by Nels Kjar that if the meeting would take place the Party would break it up. The Party then used the feeble pretense that Swaback had advertised the meeting with leaflets, in order to force through a motion in the Club calling off the meeting. The votes stood 12 to 12, with the chairman Hans Peterson, a Party member, voting with the Stalinites. Needless to say, this act of political cowardice did not strengthen the prestige of the Party among the workers in the Club. Naive workers that they are! They could not understand how the Party could assume the responsibility for breaking up their Club meeting.

# After the Dress Strike

THE results and lessons of the dressmakers' strike begun in New York on February 6, 1929 under the leadership of the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union have not yet been adequately analyzed in the Communist press. The central English organ of the Party has entirely neglected this task and has, instead, fed its readers with typical philistine optimism about the great victory for the strikers. An article in the current number of *Labor Unity* ("Some Progress and a Few Mistakes," by Philip Aronberg), however, while not complete, comes closest to a clear and honest review of the outcome of the struggle.

The importance of such an appraisal is especially necessary because the strike was the first big struggle led directly by the new left wing industrial union. Without a critical examination of its results, the mistakes made will form a millstone around the neck of the new unions now being formed and seriously hamper their future work and development.

Instead of the official bally-hoo of the *Daily Worker*, Aronberg bluntly indicates the following errors of the union's leadership:

"The first point was in the inadequate preparations for the strike of 50,000 and more workers involved in this industry. This can best be illustrated by the failure to develop and put forward any demand which would deal with the generally prevailing piece-work system in the industry (a method of speed-up generally used by the bosses to intensify their exploitation). The demand for week-work is part of the economic program of the new union established only a few weeks previously, yet it was not put forth before or during the strike.

"But the crassest example of the inadequate preparations for the strike was the failure to bring forward the most basic demand (which was also incorporated in the program of the new union) that the jobbers assume the responsibility for conditions and wages of the workers that employ through contractors and for the limitation of the contractors employed by them. This failure is beyond comprehension if we consider the needs of the workers in the industry and that this demand was developed in the course of long struggles against the social reformism and the employers. . . . The demands put forward in the strike—forty-four hour five-day week; increase in the piece rates; minimum scales; and guarantee of the job without the right of the boss to discharge—cannot be very effectively enforced if the jobber can discharge at will any number of workers and hire any other number he wishes by discharging and hiring his contractors. . . .

"This conception that the strike must be of short duration led to further errors in strategy. Instead of mobilizing the 8,000 workers who answered the strike call to spread the strike to the other 50,000 workers employed in the dress industry, the leadership of the new union proceeded against the advice of the T. U. E. L., to make settlements with the contractors. This made impossible the development of the strike so that the mass of the workers in the industry did not participate and were not drawn into the struggle, and the new union has still the task of organizing the mass of the workers in the industry.

"But the agreements arrived at between the contractors and the union and the settlements proposed by the union should be the most glaring signal of the extent to which the policies and practices of the social reformist officials of the old union are taken over bag and baggage by the new union leadership. Agreements which call for 'impartial arbitration' are proposed and signed by the leadership of this union which was built in the struggle against class-collaboration schemes of the Schlesiingers and the Sigmans." (Our emphasis).

What Aronberg writes is entirely correct, but he is naturally backward in establishing the forces behind these crude opportunist craft union blunders. He is not so naive as to think that the "failure is beyond comprehension". On the contrary, it is but too clear.

Back of these reformist conceptions and actions are the long years of craft union opportunism brought into the new union—not by the rank and file fighters who developed in the struggle against it—but by the group of leaders that dominate the union today, Zimmerman, Wortis, Gold and their colleagues. Aronberg knows this to be at the root of the trouble, just as everyone else in the Party knows it. But he dare not say so. Were Aronberg a "free agent" he would point out that Zimmerman, Wortis and Co., all of whom are Party members, as are the majority of the leaders of the new union, can flaunt the formal decisions of the Party and the T. U. E. L., as they have done repeatedly, because they are guaranteed factional protection from the ruling Lovestone group whose trade union "specialists" they are. Any other explanation of the cynical refusal by these opportunists to accept the proper proposals of the T. U. E. L. are entirely invalid.

On our part, we have nothing in common with the dilletante factional division of labor in which

the *Daily Worker* signs paeans of uncritical praise for Zimmerman, Wortis and Co.—because they are all members of one faction in the Party, while *Labor Unity* cautiously makes a critical analysis of the same group—because they are on different sides of the factional fence. This method is repulsively alien to the Communist movement. It reflects the transference of "the corrupt practices of the bourgeois parties" into our movement. It accomplishes anything but the clarification of the movement and the training of the masses in the class struggle.

At the outset of the strike we said in the *Militant* (February 15, 1929) that one of the causes of the setbacks for the left wing in the needle trades was a stratum of its leadership,

"Gold, Zimmerman, Wortis, etc., whose practices have been a constant obstacle to the development and execution of a fighting Communist policy which alone is able to mobilize the full resources of the masses for their struggle. Almost every opportunist prejudice from craft union conceptions to the theory that a struggle cannot be carried on against the bosses and the right wing leaders at the

## How Will Hoover Recognize Russia?

WE are reliably informed that the Hoover government is on the eve of understaking negotiations leading to the recognition by the United States of the Soviet Government. Our information is as follows:

A. L. Scheinman, chairman of the board of directors of the State Bank of the U.S.S.R., who has been in the United States for the last few months at the head of a special mission, has been spending a great deal of his time in Washington conducting unofficial negotiations with American government representatives. A basis of agreement has been tentatively reached for the coming recognition of the Soviet Union. The process of accomplishing this is to be somewhat as follows: The Soviets are to ask formally for the opening of negotiations which is to be followed by the appointment of a commission by Hoover. Formal recognition is to follow on the basis that the Soviet government will recognize the debt incurred by Bakhmetieff, former ambassador of the Kerensky government to the United States! The debt, amounting to the tidy sum of \$180,000,000, was always repudiated — in the old days at least — by the Soviet government, since the money was used to furnish munitions to the counter-revolution to shoot down the Russian workers and peasants.

Scheinman has been assuring the American bourgeoisie that they have nothing to fear from the Soviet Government, that Communism and capitalism can live blissfully side by side. In his speech before the American-Russian Chamber of Commerce, on February 7, 1929, he said: "The United States and the U.S.S.R. are two countries which, through fortunate historical circumstances, have no political or economic antagonisms at this present stage of development, nor can such antagonisms be foreseen in the future. On the contrary, it would seem that their interests are naturally complementary." (*Economic Review of the Soviet Union*, February 15, 1929, page 68. Our emphasis.)

This reactionary drivel is "naturally complementary" to the Stalinite theory of socialism in one country. The touching picture of revolutionary Russia and counter-revolutionary capitalist America, "which have no political or economic antagonisms at this present stage of development," working side by side to build a "national socialism" in the Soviet Union is enough to make Lenin turn in his grave.

\* \* \*

Those who imagine that Scheinman speaks this way because of some special dispensation granted to revolutionary "diplomatic representatives" should read the leading editorial in the *Daily Worker* of March 28, 1929:

"The interests of 'American nationals' in the Soviet Union are continually growing. This is easily seen in the contracts reached, for instance, by the Standard Oil Company of New York and the International Electric Company with the Soviet government. The United States government claims to be jealous of the rights of its 'nationals.' It has declared a war in permanency against Latin America to protect their interests, maintains a hard-boiled machine gun diplomacy ready for duty at a moment's notice, and sends thousands of marines and fleets of battleship to danger sectors in the

same time, from a complete misapprehension of the class role of the police to illusions regarding deals with this or that group of fakers, has found expression in the course of this faction of leaders. To this can be added the survivals of odious trade union bureaucratic and 'business agent' relations with the rank and file. The struggle for a true Communist policy—the only fighting policy—was and is a struggle against the tactics and policies of this group."

This estimate is still fully correct. The revolutionary needle trades workers, whose courageous battle against reformism and corruption in their unions led to the defeat of the Sigmans, Schlesiingers and Kaufmans and the founding of the industrial union, have a proud record that insures their triumphant future. The struggle against the socialist fakers and A. F. of L. lieutenants of capitalism who repeatedly betray the workers' interests, against the machinery of the government which works hand in hand with the bosses, must be carried on with even greater vigor than before. The fight for a revolutionary, class course in the new union itself must, at the same time, still be won. It can be won only in a struggle of clarification against the opportunists who have been factionally protected in the leadership of the union by the corrupt clique of Lovestone and Co.

orient, especially against China." (Our emphasis).

In effect, the *Daily Worker* is saying to the Hoover government: Why don't you protect the interests of American nationals in Russia? You claim to be jealous of the rights of American business everywhere. You protect them in Latin America and China even to the point of armed intervention. Why don't you make good your claim? The least you can do to protect the interests of American business men in Russia is to recognize the country.

That such revolting anti-revolutionary writing can appear in the official organ of the Communist Party is a bitter comment on the situation in the movement. Three or four years ago, Bombacci, one of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party, spoke in the Chamber of Deputies and urged the government to trade with Russia because of the economic advantages it would bring to the Italian bourgeoisie. In those days Stalinism had not yet corrupted the Communist movement, and Bombacci was expelled. Today, when the *Daily Worker* outstrips Bombacci, it is in perfect accord with the official theory of the Comintern, with Stalinism, and no action is taken against it.

Recognition of Kerensky's debt and rejection of revolutionary principle by the *Daily Worker*! Are these the price that will be paid for American recognition?

## Il Duce Speaks up for Stalin

The New York Times of March 28, 1929, carries a copyrighted Associated Press dispatch from Rome in which the maniac of the Palazzo Chigi, Mussolini, airs his views on the world situation. He expresses himself on the present situation in the Communist movement as follows:

"The Premier then indicated that he thought communism was in full retreat while the danger was quite past in Germany. In some other parts of Europe he thought there might be a good deal of vitality left in the Communist movement. Returning to the question of Russia, the Premier said that the struggle between Joseph Stalin and Leon Trotsky was most important because M. Trotsky represented the Left."

Mussolini is keen enough to detect the characteristics of the struggle between the Leninist Opposition and the dominant opportunists. The struggle is important for him because "M. Trotsky represented the Left" and Trotsky has now been "put out of the way" by Stalin, for which Mussolini, like the reaction everywhere in the world, is duly thankful. But then, it is only fair exchange when Litvinov finishes praising Mussolini for the latter to return the compliment by praising Stalin for persecuting the Left. One good turn deserves another.

### NOTICE TO BUNDLE AGENTS

Bundle Agents failing to receive their bundles within two or three days after the date of issue should notify us at once. Hereafter each number will go to press before the date of issue.

# The Draft Program of the Comintern

CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS ISSUE

## 3. DEMOCRATIC DICTATORSHIP OR A DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT?

What was the decision of the last Plenum of the E.C.C.I. on the experiences of China, including the experiences of the Canton insurrection? What further prospects has it outlined? The resolution of the February (1928) Plenum, being the key to the corresponding parts of the draft program, says concerning the Chinese Revolution:

"It is wrong to characterize it as a 'permanent revolution'" (the position of the representative of the E. C. C. I.). "The tendency of skipping (?) through the bourgeois democratic phase of the revolution with a simultaneous (?) appraisal of the revolution as a 'permanent revolution' is a mistake similar to that which Trotsky made in 1905 (?)."

The ideological life of the Comintern since Lenin's departure from its leadership that is, since 1923, consisted primarily in a struggle against so-called "Trotskyism" and particularly against "permanent revolution". How could it happen that in the main question of the Chinese revolution not only the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, but even the official representative of the Comintern, that is, the leader who was especially instructed for the job, should have fallen into the same "error" for which hundreds of people are now being exiled in Siberia and put in prison? The struggle around the Chinese problem has been raging already about two and a half years. When the Opposition declared that the old Central Committee of the Communist Party of China (Chen Du-siu) under the influence of wrong instructions from the Comintern, conducted an opportunist policy, this was declared to be "slander". The leadership of the Communist Party of China was declared flawless. The well-known Tang Pin-san clamored with the general approval of the Seventh Plenum of the E.C.C.I. that:

"As soon as the first manifestations of Trotskyism made their appearance the Communist Party of China and the Young Communist League immediately adopted a unanimous resolution against Trotskyism." (Stenographic Report, Page 205).

When however, notwithstanding these "achievements" events have unfolded their tragical logic which at first led to the first and then to the second, even more terrific, ruin of the revolution, the leaders of the Communist Party of China were rechristened in twenty-four hours from being model leaders to Mensheviks. At the same time it was declared that the new leaders fully represented the line of the Comintern. But as soon as another serious phase came it was found that the new Central Committee of the Communist Party of China is guilty, as we have already seen, not in words, but in action, of having adopted the position of the so-called "permanent revolution". This is the path chosen also by the representative of the Comintern. This surprising and unbelievable fact can be explained only by the glaring "scissors" between the instructions of the E.C.C.I. and the real dynamics of the revolution.

We will not dwell here upon the myth of the "permanent revolution" of 1905 which was cast out in 1924, in order to sow confusion. We will limit ourselves to an analysis of how this myth broke down on the question of the Chinese revolution.

The first paragraph of the February resolution, from which we have taken the above passage, motivizes its negative attitude to the so-called "permanent revolution" as follows:

"The present period of the Chinese Revolution is a period of democratic revolution which has not been completed either from the economic viewpoint (the agrarian revolution and the abolition of the feudal relations) or from the viewpoint of the national struggle against imperialism (the unification of China and the establishment of national independence), or from the viewpoint of the class nature of the government (the dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry)."

This motivization is full of blunders and contradictions.

The E.C.C.I. taught that the Chinese revolution must guarantee an opportunity for China to develop along socialist lines. This could be done only if the revolution would not stop at the solution merely of the bourgeois democratic task but by growing over from one stage into another, that is, by constantly or permanently developing, would lead China towards socialist development. This is precisely what Marx understood by the term "permanent revolution". How then can one, on the

## A CRITICISM OF FUNDAMENTALS

By L. D. Trotsky

one hand, speak of a non-capitalist path of development of China and on the other deny the permanent character of the revolution?

But—objects the resolution of the E.C.C.I.—the revolution has not been completed, either from the viewpoint of the agrarian revolution or from the viewpoint of the national struggle against imperialism. Hence the conclusion about the bourgeois democratic nature of the "present period of the Chinese revolution". In reality the "present period" is a period of counter-revolution. The E.C.C.I. apparently wants to say that the new rise of the Chinese revolution, or more correctly, THE THIRD CHINESE REVOLUTION, will be of a bourgeois democratic character, in view of the fact that the second Chinese revolution of 1925-1927 has not solved the agrarian problem nor the national problem. However, even with this correction, this argumentation is built on a complete failure to understand the experiences and lessons both of the Chinese as well as of the Russian revolution.

The February revolution of 1917 in Russia left unsolved all internal and international problems which led to the revolution—serfdom in the villages, the bureaucracy, the war and the economic ruin. Based on this, not only the S. R.s and the Mensheviks, but also a considerable section of the leaders of our own Party tried to show Lenin that the "present period of the revolution is a period of the bourgeois democratic revolution." In its general aspect the resolution of the E.C.C.I. merely copies the objections raised against the struggle for the proletarian dictatorship waged by the opportunists against Lenin in 1917. Furthermore, the bourgeois democratic revolution proves to be unaccomplished not only from the economic and national viewpoint, but also from the "viewpoint" of the class nature of the government (the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry). This can only mean that it has been forbidden that the Chinese proletariat fight for power so long as there is no real democratic government in China. Unfortunately it is not pointed out where that is to come from.

The confusion is further increased by the fact that the Soviet slogan was rejected for China in the course of two years on the sole ground that Soviets can be organized only during the transition towards the proletarian revolution (Stalin's "theory"). But when the Soviet Revolution broke out in Canton and its participants arrived at the conclusion that this is the transition to the proletarian revolution, they were accused of "Trotskyism". Can a Party be trained in such a way and can it be helped in this manner to solve the greatest tasks?

To save a hopeless position the resolution of the E.C.C.I. without any contact with the entire trend of its thought, gives its last argument—from imperialism. We find that the tendency to skip through the bourgeois democratic phase:

"is the more harmful because such a formulation of the question excludes (?) the greatest national peculiarity of the Chinese revolution being a semi-colonial revolution."

The only meaning that these words have is that the imperialist yoke will be overthrown by some other and not the proletarian dictatorship. But this means that the "greatest national peculiarity" has been dragged in at the last moment only in order to present in bright colors the Chinese national bourgeoisie or Chinese "petty-bourgeois democracy." They can have no other meaning. But this only "meaning" we have sufficiently examined in our chapter concerning the "nature of the colonial bourgeoisie" and there is no need to return to this subject.

China is still confronted with an enormous, terrific, bloody and prolonged struggle for such elementary objects as the liquidation of the most "Asiatic" forms of slavery, such as national emancipation and unification of the country. But it is from here, as the march of events has shown that further petty-bourgeois leadership or even half leadership in the revolution is impossible. The unification of China is now an international task. It is no less international than the existence of the

U. S. S. R. This task can be solved only by means of a desperate struggle of the suppressed, hungry and downtrodden masses under the direct leadership of the proletarian vanguard, not only against world imperialism, but also against its economic and political agency in China — the bourgeoisie, including also the "national" and democratic bourgeois flunkies. And that is the road leading towards the proletarian dictatorship.

Beginning with April 1917 Lenin explained to his opponents who accused him of having adopted the position of the "permanent revolution", that the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry was partly realized in the epoch of dual government. He explained later that it was further realized during the first period of Soviet power since November 1917 until July 1918, when the peasants, together with the workers, effected the agrarian revolution while the working class had not yet proceeded with the confiscation of the factories and plants, but experimented on workers' control. As to the "class nature of the government", the democratic S. R. Menshevik "dictatorship" gave all that it could give—the dual government miscarriage. As to the agrarian revolution, it gave birth to a healthy and strong child, only the proletarian dictatorship acted as the midwife. In other words, that which in the theoretical formula of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry was united, was disunited in the course of the actual class struggle.

The empty shell of the half government was provisionally entrusted to Kerensky and Tseretelli; the real kernel of the agrarian democratic revolution was in the hands of the victorious working class. This dialectical disappointment of the democratic dictatorship, the leaders of the E.C.C.I. failed to understand. They have landed in a political blind alley mechanically condemning any "skipping through the bourgeois democratic phase" and endeavoring to guide the historical process by means of circular letters. If we are to understand by the bourgeois democratic phase, the completion of the agrarian revolution by means of a "democratic dictatorship" then no other but the October Revolution rashly "skipped" through the bourgeois democratic phase. Should it not be condemned for having done so? Why is it that that which was historically inevitable was the highest expression of Bolshevism in Russia, whereas it proved to be "Trotskyism" in China? Apparently owing to the same logic on the basis of which the theory of the Martinovs, who for over twenty years have fought Bolshevism in Russia, was declared suitable for China. But can such a comparison at all be made with Russia? The slogan of a democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry—we object—was built up by the leaders of the E.C.C.I. exclusively and entirely by the method of analogy, but a formal and literal analogy and not a material and historical analogy. An analogy between China and Russia is absolutely admissible if we find the proper key to it, and this analogy was excellently made use of by Lenin and not *post factum* but beforehand, as if he had foreseen the future blunders. Lenin had to defend the October revolution, that is the conquest of power by the proletariat, hundreds of times, NOTWITHSTANDING THE FACT that the bourgeois democratic tasks had not been fulfilled. Precisely BECAUSE OF THAT, PRECISELY FOR THE FULFILLMENT OF THAT, replied Lenin, in answer to the pedants who in their arguments against the capture of power referred to the economic immaturity of Russia for socialism which was "unquestionable" for Lenin. (Vol. 18, Part 2, Page 119). In reply to this pedantry Lenin said on January 16th 1923:

"It does not even occur to them for instance that Russia, standing on the border of civilized countries, and countries which were for the first time by this war definitely drawn into the vortex of civilization (all Eastern countries, the non-European countries) therefore could and should have manifested some originality along the general lines of world development by distinguishing its revolution from all preceding revolutions of the Western countries and introducing certain new elements in approaching the Eastern countries." (Ibid., page 118).

The "originality" which brings Russia CLOSER to the Eastern countries was seen by Lenin in the fact that the young proletariat had at an early stage to take hold of the broom so as to clear the road from feudal barbarism and every other kind of rubbish for socialism.

If, consequently, we are to proceed on the basis

## Stalin Gains a New Friend

THE Stalinite press has not wearied of repeating that the "bourgeoisie and the entire counter-revolutionary bourgeois press has welcomed the renegade Trotsky to its bosom." It is entirely true that there is no basis in fact for this statement. On the contrary, as we have already proved in previous issues of *The Militant*, all the forces of reaction within and outside the labor movement have rejected the program of Trotsky and the Opposition. The bourgeoisie correctly see in Stalin their hopes for a "moderate course" in the Soviets and the Comintern and that is why they are stacking their chips on the Centrist regime. We are now able to point out another friend that Stalin has gained among the bourgeoisie by his exile of Trotsky. In *Current History* of April 1929, the organ of the big bourgeoisie owned by the reactionary *New York Times*, there appears an article entitled "Trotsky's Banishment by Soviet Dictators" from which we take the following characteristic excerpt:

"As regards the present trend of policy in Russia under Stalin's leadership, Trotsky's analysis confirms the general impression that the Soviet regime grows continuously more conservative. The issue between the Stalin and Trotsky factions is joined over the agrarian policy and the treatment of the peasant landowner. The Trotsky faction has demanded dominance for the industrial wage earner in politics and rigorous suppression of peasant individualism in the economic structure of the country. The policy of the Stalin group has been opportunistic rather than doctrinaire, but has tended to concede greater freedom of action to the peasant, with a resultant increase in his economic and political power. Trotsky condemns this as a 'zig-zag policy back to middle class domination.' Taking account of the strenuous

of Lenin's comparison between China and Russia, we must say—from the viewpoint of the "POLITICAL NATURE OF THE GOVERNMENT", all that could have been obtained through the democratic dictatorship has in China been tried out first in Sun Yat Sen's Canton, then on the road from Canton to Shanghai which was crowned by Shanghai coup d'Etat, then in Wuchang where the Left Kuomintang appeared in its chemically pure aspect, i. e., according to the instructions of the E.C.C.I., as an organizer of the agrarian revolution, but in reality as its hangman. The social content of the bourgeois democratic revolution will have to be completed by the first period of the coming dictatorship of the Chinese proletariat and the rural poor. To advance now the slogan of a democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry when the role not only of the Chinese bourgeoisie, but also of democracy has already been tested through and through, when it has become absolutely certain that "democracy" will in the coming struggle play even a more despicable role than in the past, simply means to create the means of covering up the new forms of Kuomintangism and to put up a trap for the proletariat.

Of course it is not by any means a question of calling the Communist Party of China immediately to revolt to capture power. The tempo depends entirely upon the circumstances.

The revolution is now subsiding. The half-concealing resolutions of the E.C.C.I., and the tales about imminent revolutionary onslaughts, while numberless people are being executed and a terrific commercial and industrial crisis rages in the country is criminal light-mindedness and no more. After three overwhelming defeats an economic crisis does not rouse, but on the contrary, depresses the proletariat which, as it is, has already been bled white, and the executions only destroy the politically weakened party, the formation and strengthening of firm organizational links in all spheres of the labor movement. The organization of rural nuclei, leadership and unification of partial, at first defensive and later offensive, battles of the workers and the rural poor is now necessary.

How will a new mass movement begin? What circumstances will give the proletarian vanguard at the head of the multitudinous millions the necessary revolutionary impulse? This cannot be foretold. Whether simple internal processes alone will be sufficient or whether an impulse will have to be given from without, the future will show.

TO BE CONTINUED

socialization program as applied to agriculture by the present Soviet government, we need not accept Trotsky's prediction as to the outcome of the present agrarian policy; nevertheless, it is clear on the record of Russian events during the past year that the destiny of the country is falling into the hands of moderate men, and its economic life is reflecting to an increasing degree the middle class mentality of the small land-owner." (Page 172, our emphasis.)

The *New York Times* is one of the keenest organs of the American imperialists. When the Soviets, under Lenin and Trotsky, followed a rigid proletarian revolutionary course, the *Times* led the reactionary press with the most venomous, lying attacks upon Russia and Bolshevism. It knew its enemy well. It still knows its enemy well and it sees him chiefly in Trotsky and the Opposition he leads. It also knows upon whom to lean for support. The *Times*, the spokesman for American imperialism, is joyous in the knowledge that "under Stalin's leadership . . . the Soviet regime grows continuously more conservative"; that "the policy of the Stalin group has been opportunist rather than doctrinaire" (read: Leninist); that "the country is falling into the hands of moderate men."

## A Comrade for Minor

In the reactionary anarchist journal, *The Road to Freedom* for March 1929, its editor, W. S. Van Valkenburgh writes a leading editorial on the Kronstadt uprising of 1921 and Trotsky. Van V. is one of those who make up in venom for what they lack in intelligence. He says of Trotsky:

"Oceans of crocodile tears are being shed for this arch fiend of the Bolsheviki—betrayed of comrades, murderer of men, women and children, who, like a petty Napoleon, now resides in exile vainly awaiting a valiant return to the scenes of his erstwhile orgies. The Ides of March have ever boded ill for those who yearn for freedom but not yet has history written down such a wanton welter of useless human butchery as that for which Leon Trotsky is personally responsible."

Van V. should make his way to the editorial office of the *Daily Worker* where he can find his ex-anarchist friend Robert Minor. Minor, at least, does not shed "oceans of crocodile tears for this arch fiend" Trotsky. On the contrary. Should Minor and Van Valkenburgh ever get together to discuss Trotsky what a charming picture of effusive agreement we would have! Minor should really get in touch with Van. He will find in him a co-thinker and a comrade in the war against "Trotskyism."

## 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:

- Malden, Mass.:** Comrade Dublin, 15 Semmett St.  
**Boston, Mass.:** Shapiro's Bookstore, 7 Beach St. near Washington.  
**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. Bryar, 2211 East 55th St.  
**Youngstown, Ohio.,** Denis Plarinos, 387 East Federal St.  
**Detroit, Mich.,** Barney Mass., 8720-12th St., Apt. 2; "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.; Horsley's Bookstore, 1623 W. Madison.  
**Springfield, Ill.,** Joe Angelo, 431 No. Wesley St.  
**San Francisco, Calif.,** McDonald's Bookstore, 76 Sixth Street.  
**Los Angeles, Calif.,** Western News Stand.  
**Richmond, Calif.,** Rosa Powell 704 McDonald Ave.  
**Kansas City, Mo.,** Buehler's Book Store, 220 W. 12th St.  
**St. Louis, Mo.,** Foster's Book Store, 410 Washington Avenue.  
**Seattle, Wash.,** Raymer's Bookstore, 1616 Fourth Ave.  
**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.

## What! No Unity?

As soon as it was announced in the Party press that the Party convention had achieved a blissful unity, it was only natural to expect that a week or two later the new "united leadership of the C.E.C." would publish a declaration against the "remnants of factionalism." We were not disappointed in our expectations. They were fulfilled to the letter by the statement of the Central Committee in the *Daily Worker* of March 23, 1929. After four full columns of windy flub-dub on the world historical import and significance of the achievements of the Party convention, the unparalleled success in liquidating forever and aye the factional struggle, of meeting successfully the burning tasks confronting the Party, the exhausted reader is informed of the shocking fact that

"It has been drawn to the attention of the Central Executive Committee that, here and there, an insignificant handful of comrades entirely unrepresentative of the spirit and line of the Sixth National Convention which represented the firm will of the membership to eradicate all vestiges of factionalism and fully to unite the Party, are, in defiance of the Open Letter of the Communist International and the decisions of the Sixth National Convention, attempting to rekindle the factional strife in our ranks."

Needless to say, something has to be done about this. Can it be possible that the Bittelman-Foster boys are at it again so soon after signing for unity on the dotted line and then swearing to it?

Surely they must be satisfied! Wasn't Union Square filled with jubilant Foster-Bittelmanites—they had united again, you know—only a couple of weeks ago, imbued with the spirit of gaiety and flushed with victory at the thought that Foster was to be made secretary of the Party? Didn't the Party convention go on record against Bucharin and for Stalin, the patron saint of the minority? Didn't these same Fosterites whisper to themselves that everything was turning out beautifully, that a new epoch had opened up in the Party?

We are ready to admit reluctantly that we had a few "reservations." The truth of the matter is that we simply couldn't see it at all. We examined the list of the members and candidates of the new Central Committee of the Party and we uneasily beheld that in the "united" C.E.C. the minority has less members than in the previous C.E.C. In addition, a number of old familiar faces are missing, faces that would help to make up a good picture of a united happy family. Where is Bittelman? Where, we ask, the Aronbergs, Wagenknechts and Costrells, not to speak of the numerous Gomezes? Gone, and almost forgotten. Not one of them was made a member of the C.E.C., nor even a candidate, nor an alternate, a deputy, a proxy, nor an acolyte nor a neophyte.

And in the big "unification" spree a few other heads were lopped off. Wagenknecht has been guillotined and his place in the I.L.D. is to be taken either by Juliet Stuart Poyntz (God help us!) or by J. Louis Engdahl (God help us again!), for both of them are faithful servants of the Lord.

In the T.U.E.L. the gray-haired patriarch of unity, Johnny Ballam, fresh from the California split, has been made national secretary, while those he dispossessed must ruminate on the course of events and the base ingratitude of man. Even Weinstone has been told what's what. He, you must understand, made the fatal error of vacillating a bit during the convention on the question of the Comintern decision regarding Foster. He even had the temerity to form a new faction for half an hour "to support the line of the C.I." Over this erring sinner who is Party District Organizer in New York has now been appointed a new commissar, B. Lifschitz, who is sure to guide the Wobbling William along the straight and narrow.

But surely all these little items should not make the minority to act so violently as to cause the Central Committee to scold and threaten them with such vigor. The minorityites should have even more of the spirit of patience and humility since they have no spirit of struggle. Even now Bittelman is putting his case before Stalin and rest assured that the minority will get a crumb or two. Then they can tighten their belts, put up their collars, bow their heads and prepare for a hard year of ideological and organizational unity under Lovestone and Stalin. They will no doubt be consoled with the thought that the Old Army Game is hard to beat and things could be worse—but not much.

# Letters from the Militants

## A LETTER FROM A COMMUNIST FARMER

Williston, North Dakota  
February 4, 1929

Dear Comrades:

You wanted our views on the agrarian situation. The way we see it, the small farmer is being put out of business much faster than was expected by the economist. In the out-lying townships in 1912 nearly every quarter of land (160 acres) had a family or head of household living on it, with three to four school houses in the township; today in many of the same townships, there is no school, the houses are empty, and every township that has no consolidated school has most of the schools closed. Hundreds of farm houses are empty and falling down. The banker, after closing out the horse farmer or the badly in debt one-tractor farmer, rents the land to the more successful machine farmer who usually has no children and hires all his help from the town. He is equipped with two tractors and more, a combined harvester, and thresher. He is not concerned about politics or in any way interested about the wage slave. A year or so ago he would have taken stock in a cooperative grocery store, but last fall a big retail store, the Red Owl, came into Williston. This gives them their groceries at a lower cost so they seem to be satisfied. In short, the prairie country is fast developing to a small number of farmers on large tracts of land, and a few business houses in the town.

The big cities will not let any new industries develop in the agrarian districts as a few of today's big railroad engines can haul supplies for the machine farmer who is middle class. But, we can see his finish because of the industrialization of farming by big capital that will continue competition for a while longer on wheat and farm products,—hence the reason for the veto of the McNary-Haugen bill. The renter and the small mortgaged land holder do not know how they are going to live, they tell me this daily. These make a great field for the left wing Communist to work. The trouble is that they have been deceived by the Nonpartisan League and have hardly the money to contribute to their own movement.

Many of these farmers, when off the land, are for the most part competing for jobs, and in fact those with the old scab wage laborer are running all of the industries in the plains and farming country towns. They work eight hours in the shop then build a house or dig a ditch up town; on economics they are as dumb as the lower animal, and are not concerned about their fellow men at all. If they have any money left after paying their bills, they buy moonshine, whisky, or play poker after they have worked the sixteen hours.

We all are for the Trotsky program. I suggest that all party members of the world, like-wise non-party workers and farmers, should read the book "Ten Days That Shook The World" by John Reed, who was in the midst of this Russian revolution. In this book, you will see that Trotsky was always on the side with Lenin. If Trotsky ever was a traitor or if there ever was a drop of traitorous blood in his veins, as the lying Daily Worker would have you believe, surely he would have used his power when a word from him would have turned the whole tide of the revolution against the workers and peasants of Russia. Later, when he was Commander in Chief of the whole Russian Army that crushed the five imperialist invasions, could he not have directed the army into the hands of the enemy? Read this book, and you will find that a man with the iron and steel of Trotsky never could change and fight the class he once defended.

Comrade Minor in the Daily Worker of January 28 tries to make the readers of that paper believe that Lenin for fifteen years before the revolution fought Trotsky because of his Menshevik ideas. We of the opposition are not surprised to see such falsehood come from the managing editor who before and until a year after the Russian revolution, opposed the tactics used by Lenin and Trotsky to win the revolution. Well do we remember his article in the "Liberator" entitled "I Changed My Mind a Little," which was written long after the revolution started. In this article, he did not whole-heartedly agree with the program put over by the two great leaders of the revolution.

Fraternally yours

A. C. MILLER.

## ACTIVITY IN KANSAS CITY

Kansas City, Mo.

Dear Comrade Abern:

Received the call for the national conference of the Communist Opposition in Chicago, May 17th. Kansas City will have at least one delegate present. Kansas

City comrades have pledged \$100 to the weekly Militant and enclosed is a check for \$20 as a starter on the pledge. (We have confidence in our three generals.) Keep up the good fight.

That last issue of the Militant is a good one. Each new issue seems to be better than the previous one. It won't take us very long here in Kansas City to have more subs for the Militant than they have for the Daily Worker. Enclosed you will find four new subs with \$4 check. We have mailed out many samples and we are going after the subs from now on. We also mailed out the issue with the Opposition Platform so that should give everybody a pretty good idea of our Program if they can read at all. Now if they are interested at all I think we can at least get \$1 out of them for a 12 months' sub. The Militant is sure doing the work here in K. C. It is bringing rebels back to life again.

K. C. welcomes the new Weekly Militant.

A. A. BUEHLER

## KRUSE CRUSHES TROTSKY IN CHICAGO

Chicago, Ill.

Dear Comrades:

I have received your letter asking for help in making the Militant a Weekly and want to say I heartily approve of such a step if enough funds can be secured to insure success. I have had so many causes to help lately that I am am continually in a tough situation but just the same I feel I must help as much as I'm able to.

Here is a news item you may or may not already know about.

Sunday, March 17th, the Paris Commune celebration here took place in Temple Hall. I was elated to see several comrades selling the Militant at the door as I went in. They sold a lot, too. It was the poorest Commune meeting I ever saw, only about 300 being present. It was started an hour and 15 minutes late. I. Feingold, I. L. D. secretary here, in the collection talk, called for \$10 and \$5 bills from us sucked-dry class fighters, but got none, and not many dollars either. I thought it a bad blunder. Wm. F. Kruse, district organizer of the Communist Party, gave the final talk on I. L. D. He broke into such a fit of rage in speaking of "Trotskyism" that he actually gnashed his teeth. "Down with Trotsky! Down with all the American Trotskyists!" he shouted.

(Good way to build the I. L. D.—Ed.)

The entire left wing movement in Chicago seems in spite of all efforts to be going back fast. I am,

Yours for true Communism,

WALTER P. SUKUT.

## THE WORK IN ST. LOUIS

St. Louis, Mo.

Dear Comrades:

Received your letter regarding the proposed conference in Chicago for May 17th and other information.

We are presenting our program to all Party and League members in St. Louis and expect to see things change after the convention. The local comrades are proud of the leadership as expressed by you comrades who are working around the Militant and wish to express our fullest agreement with the platform of the Opposition and further urge you comrades to carry on this fight to an ideological conclusion covering our entire platform and not to make a fake unity with the bureaucratic leadership.

At our next meeting we will take up the question in regard to the form of organization and also for a detailed discussion on our program. We will then send you some suggestions on these questions. We are planning to liquidate our debt to you and also plan to hold an affair within the next two weeks and send in a donation.

I remain,

Comradely yours

ELMER McMILLAN

## WHO ARE THE EXPELLED COMMUNISTS

JOSEPH KELLER—Joined Proletarian Party in 1921, then left this pseudo-Communist party to work among the Slovakian workers in Slovak Socialist Federation. Helped swing it into Workers Party in 1924 and was one of the leading Communist workers among the Slovakian workers in the country, particularly in the Cleveland District. During a recent visit of the Hungarian Horthy reactionaries, he was clubbed by the police during the demonstration for carrying a placard denouncing Horthy's blood regime. A short while later, he was clubbed by a Stalinite at a mass meeting called by the Opposition in Cleveland to discuss the viewpoint of Trotsky!

ANTHONY REFUGEE—Joined the Socialist Party of Italy in 1910 and the Communist Party in 1921. Communist member of the municipal council of Trieste. Instructed by the Party to leave Italy in 1923. Joined Workers Party of America in 1924. Member of the Italian Bureau since 1925. Foundation member of the Anti-Fascist Alliance and member of its executive committee. One of the most active leaders in the Anti-Fascist movement and on the picket line during strikes in New York.

B. MORGENSTERN—Joined Young Workers League in 1925 and Party in 1926. Became section organizer of League, then Negro Work Director of Philadelphia District and head of Agit-Prop department. Member of District Committee and Bureau and at one time of Secretariat. Worked for Joint Action Committee in I. L. G. W. U., participating in strike where he was arrested. Arrested also in pocket-book makers strike, in Sacco-Vanzetti campaign, for distributing leaflets, for Hands-Off-China demonstration in Washington, Hands-Off-Nicaragua demonstration in Washington, served 30 days in jail for Porter demonstration in Washington, and arrested in Chester, Pa., during textile union campaign.

## HE WRITES WHAT MANY THINK

New York City, Feb. 15, 1929

Editor, The Militant,

Dear Comrade:

With revolutionary workers all over the world interested in learning the latest developments of the deportation of Trotsky, they are compelled to read the capitalist press for their information. Especially is this true in the United States. Members of the Workers (Communist) Party must read the New York Times and other capitalist newspapers to learn what is going on in relation to this disgraceful act of the Soviet government. The Daily Worker makes no mention whatsoever of this question in its news columns, in spite of the fact that it is usually very eager to publish as much news as possible with a Moscow date line. Does Robert Minor think that by ignoring the story he will make the Communist workers forget about this act, which should make all Party members blush with shame. While the news columns are silent, Minor raves against Trotsky in the editorial columns of the Daily Worker. But of course, nobody takes Bob, of "I Change My Mind a Little" fame seriously. He is nothing more or less than a flunkey of the Mussolini minded C.E.C.

The writer of these lines has been a supporter of the Ruthenberg group of the Party since the 1925 national convention. I supported the Lovestone group of the party until several months ago, when Comrades Cannon, Abern and Shachtman were expelled. Since then I have studied the Trotsky platform and find myself in agreement with it on the questions of Socialism in one country and the Chinese revolution. On the other questions I have not as yet reached any conclusion. Nor have I decided whether or not I agree with Trotsky organizationally or with his international allies. After further studying the question I will make my decision. On one point I am convinced. Even if Trotsky is wrong, he is a sincere man, and all talk of his being a counter-revolutionist is nonsense.

I will not sign my name to this letter, as I do not want to be expelled from the party.

"PARTY MEMBER SINCE 1919."

## TO ALL ESTHONIAN COMMUNISTS!

The struggle in the world Communist movement between the Militant Opposition and the followers of the Bureaucratic Stalin machine now controlling the Russian Communist Party is getting sharper everywhere. The Opposition is fighting to bring its revolutionary viewpoint to the misled Party members in every country—including Russia.

In order to hasten the fulfillment of our revolutionary task, every language group should assist in the movement, discuss the burning questions raised by the Opposition in group meetings and take their stand on the side of the teachings of Marx and Lenin represented by the Leninist Opposition.

The members of the Esthonian language group will do their share in the struggle. It is necessary that all Esthonian comrades in the country, who have the Russian Revolution at heart, communicate with the New York group of Esthonian supporters of the Russian Opposition which has just been organized.

We must consolidate the efforts of all Esthonian Communists in this country for the purpose of countering weekly, who systematically misrepresent the views and activities of the Opposition. They follow blindly in the footsteps of the Daily Worker, except where they try to outdo the latter in agitating for and provoking actual violence and gangsterism against the militant Opposition.

To work, comrades! Address all mail concerning the Opposition work among the Esthonian Communists to Esthonian Group, P. O. Box 120, Madison Square Station, New York, N. Y.

P. SCWAHLBE, Secretary, Esthonian Group.

## ANOTHER BOSTON MEETING

Boston, March 25.

The second public meeting of the Opposition Communists was held here Saturday night at the Chelsea Labor Lyceum. Comrade James P. Cannon spoke on "The Platform of the Opposition" to an audience which filled the hall—one of the largest Communist meetings held in Chelsea for a long time.

Comrade Cannon spoke for nearly two hours without a single interruption. After the lecture questions and discussion followed, all of which was conducted in an intelligent and constructive manner. The workers present who attach great importance to the world problems involved in the struggle in the Communist International, had to come in hear the Opposition point of view and to put some questions on their own account. They were in no mood to tolerate hooliganism and none was tried.

The party bureaucrats established a "picket" on the sidewalk outside the hall—a trick copied from the Right Wing fakers in the Needle Trades—who kept shouting, like bally-hoo spiels at a fair, that "a notorious counter-revolutionist is speaking inside." This brought quite a number of curious people who paid twenty-five cents apiece to see the new attraction which they had not even heard of before.