

SPARK

A MARXIST MONTHLY

Published by the P.R. Club, Communist Party (Expelled)
P.O. Box 34, Tremont Station, N. Y. 57, N. Y.

VOL. I, No. 2

PRICE: 15c

MAY, 1947

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| How Late Is It? | 3 |
| Letters to Spark | 4 |
| Toward a Marxist Party— Reactions to NCP's Letter & Dunne's Pamphlet.. | 7 |
| Barnard Rubin for General Secretary of the CPUSA A Reaction to the Daily Worker | 12 |
| Reprint: "Political 'Neutrality' in the Trade Unions" by Lenin | 15 |
| SPARK'S Declaration of Intentions | 20 |

EDITORIAL BOARD

Louis Julia

Martha Samuel

I. Jacob

SPARK is obtainable by writing to the above address or
at the following Newsstands:

L. Sachs Newsstand—Southwest corner of 42nd Street near 5th Avenue
42 E. 14th Street Newsstand — near University Place, N. Y. C.

HOW LATE IS IT?

Very late.

How vrey late may be indicated through the telling of a short, *absolutely true* fairytale called "The Conservative Communist."

There was once a progressive organization. Every day, the honest liberals in it became more militant—through experience. Every day, the communist browderocities in it became more conservative and cowardly—through the self-pollution of opportunism. It came to pass that on election night, the militant liberals were electing militant liberals. In desperation there arose one who blew the charitable note of checks and balances: there should also be conservatives in office to represent the minority. Thereupon he suggested the election of a communist browderocity! The organization, endowed with a good sense of humor, elected this communist browderocity as a *conservative check on its own liberal militancy*—or militant liberalism. There was one wag who said on this night, "Far be it from me to hound a shilly-shally compromiser who is also a communist. I'm no redbaiter."

Moral: When Communists run as Conservatives, IT IS VERY LATE.

Co-moral: Dialectics was always like this.

* * *

The progress and militancy of the American labor movement is buried in a mess of sellouts. The tombstones read: "strategic retreat," "expediency," "consolidation," etc. One rather indecent monument rises above all the rest: Unity—or else . . ." The N.A.M., sitting astride a little mound called "premature," spits an 11½-15c pattern at labor. Labor leadership, from a memorial plot called "Gompers" squeaks a demand for—11½-15c. This is quite a militant song and dance pattern—*for a cemetery*.

Such a pattern covers an iota more than nothing measured by the micro-calipers of NAM good judgment. Remember, this is not a minimum—rather, a straitjacket. Any union (telephone strike) which tries for more is defeated—→ not by the NAM—but by the Murray pattern. The Murray pattern is the Green pattern—is the *Daily Worker* pattern.

Such patterns generate anti-labor omni-

bus bills and give the green light to the NAM. Why has labor only mumbled resistance when it has the power, size, and financial security to deliver a terrific counter-blow? It is afraid of its own militancy in the face of the conservative sobriety of the whining C.C.C.C. (Conservative Communist Cautious Counsel) It even rebbaits—finally—at the repeated requests of the reds.

The rank and file union men say a general strike would fix the Hartley-Taft Bill. It certainly would. It would prevent the illegalization of the American labor movement and the first installment of actual fascism. But the rank and file are as dangerous to their "leaders" as NAM to the rank and file.

A militant fight for Eisler would free him. A real fight in every case *today* could win. But we have to unteach the fancy lessons of compromise where compromise is unneeded. Where the P.R. Club has fought and won, the C.P. has not only not helped—it has sabotaged. But on the other hand, rank and file CP'ers have worked with us, and after a good fight well won have shook hands with us. The fairytale of renegecy fades away.

Despite the "patterns," the P.R. Club feels that if the times demand an offensive, we're for starting one despite the atmosphere of compromise and retreat. It is wrong to feel that a few correct actions isolated in an over-all confusion are wasted. Rather they are symbols—and a beginning. Needed are people with feet on the ground and with plenty of convictions *to make beginnings*.

To those in the C.P. we say, we have been in a continual united front with you, and it has worked. These CP'ers who have found themselves working with us will find it increasingly hard to digest the renegecy fairytale. Also, the C.P. leadership will find it hard to digest those members who have worked with us.

To everyone who agreed with SPARK, we say start with us *now*, to fight on the offensive on every issue. In this way we'll provide a few examples in the smashing of the plans for war and fascism, and in this way we'll move quickly towards a Marxist party and the fight for Socialism.

LETTERS TO "SPARK"

Dear Comrades:

In "Left Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder", Lenin makes it clear that it was the persistent and successful fight of the Bolsheviks against opportunism which helped to keep the Russian party relatively free of 'left' errors. It is not surprising therefore that a movement which under the misleadership of the CPUSA has permitted itself to become bogged so deeply in the swamp of opportunism and bureaucracy, should now find itself plagued also with leftist disorders.

The main impediment to a real Marxist party remains the unreconstructed 9th floor hierarchy which continues to pursue the policies (which it equally with Browder helped to formulate) under the sham of anti-Browder slogans. It is imperative however that in building a real Marxist party we guard equally against 'left' errors which currently mark the approach of some comrades and groups who are sincerely seeking a way out of the morass.

The appearance of the first issue of "Spark" is therefore an exciting and significant event. I am particularly impressed by your "Draft Transitional Program" with which I find myself in complete agreement. You have, I believe, correctly identified and rejected the chief 'left' errors now being circulated as Marxism, errors which if carried to their logical conclusion would isolate the vanguard from the workers and petty bourgeoisie. By so doing you have not weakened, but have indeed greatly strengthened the fight to purge our movement of its phony leaders and their revisionist policies.

Carry on. You will receive much help from within the Party.

Member C.P., Brooklyn

* * *

Dear Friends of the P.R. Club:

Hercules had an easier job in cleaning the Augean stables than a Communist has in following a Marxist line in the C.P. Nevertheless, it is a job that has to be done and the problem is how to

do it. My own experience has shown that two factors have to be taken into consideration. The first is that the present C.P. leadership is thoroughly corrupt and cannot be expected to change. Dennis, Foster & Co. have for so long been making obeisances to the bourgeoisie that it is a delusion to expect them to stand up straight. The job to be done is to expose them. The second factor is that the C.P. rank and file is worth saving. But it is necessary to lead the rank and file out of the morass of opportunism into which the leadership has led them.

How can the opportunist leadership be exposed? A Marxist within the C.P. can expose the role of Foster and Dennis by most vigorously carrying out those parts of the C.P. program that the leadership gives lipservice to, but makes no effort to carry out. I have found that the C.P. has a positive horror of fighting for its own program. In mass organizations the official line means vacillation on points like support of the veto in the UN, fighting against redbaiting, and support of the S.U. The same horror of the struggle is evident in the trade unions, in cultural organizations, in the civil rights organizations etc. The C.P. rank and file learns a practical lesson when they see that the person most active and vocal in fighting for the party program is the one most critical of the leadership of the C.P. and its opportunist role.

One is faced with an even greater task when exposing the tactic of the leadership of omitting Marxist principles from the party program and thus making the membership forget these principles. I refer particularly to the leadership's role in denying the responsibility of a Communist Party in bringing Socialist ideology to the working class. I refer to the Party program of concentrating on reforms and depriving the workers of the struggle for socialism.

One of the keystones of a good Communist Party is the fight for a working class culture, for socialist ideology. To achieve this every Marxist in the C.P. must battle for the study of Marxism

among the C.P. rank and file. When an educational program is planned in the branch, we must insist on studying the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin. And when the membership is exposed (and when are they not) to the social-democratic views of the Dennis clique, we must show how these views are in conflict with Marxism. For it is only by attack on the vulgarity, the emptiness, the hypocrisy, and the opportunism of Dennis & Co. that we can bring the C.P. membership back on the road of Marxist study and action.

JOE BARNER

N.Y. C.P. Members Circle

* * *

Dear Sirs:

I have received and read SPARK, and I like it. Inclosed find two dollars as a contribution to your good work. Please send me four copies of SPARK for use among others.

The Party here in Chicago has long been without a Marxian base. The Lincoln School taught revisionism and the party membership here is nothing much more than a New Deal edition of what was left after Browder and others got through liquidating. A new party is necessary from many points of view; but especially so as to free what is left of the agents and spies who remain in the old organization. But they have done their work and shortly like rats will desert the ship's hulk to enter anything new, that may be set up in this country. Be on guard! Best wishes.

Name withheld

Chicago, Ill.

* * *

"LETTER FROM THE N.C.P."

Our group, the New Committee for Publications (NCP), having been invited to comment briefly on the first issue of SPARK, has singled out from among the many questions raised the particular matter that NCP regards as the most important of all: the task of bringing into existence a bona fide Communist Party in the United States, a party that will be guided by the principles that have made the Russian Communist Party the model for the world.

Early in the leading article, the editors of SPARK write of "the need now for the greatest clarity regarding immediate problems—not for a finished, detailed program for a non-existent Communist Party." (Page 1, col. 1, your emphasis.)

Unfortunately, no such clarity is forthcoming. For such a statement holds that there are, on the one hand, immediate problems—and then, on the other hand, there is the fact of the non-existence of a truly Communist Party in this country.

Do the editors think that the non-existence of a bona fide CP in this country is something *other* than an immediate problem? Apparently they do. NCP does not.

The fact is that the working class of the U.S. cannot accomplish a single one of its immediate tasks unless there is first brought into existence a real CP. It is quite false to encourage the notion that *without* such a real CP the proletariat can nevertheless make "some progress"—for to hold this is to revive the old, discredited spontaneity theory, the theory that without conscious Marxist leadership (and hence without a bona fide CP) the proletariat will move along "spontaneously." We note that the original ISKRA came into being, in part, to fight against the spontaneity theory—it is too bad SPARK has borrowed only the name.

The editors have more to say on this matter, to be sure, but far from introducing any of that "greatest clarity" they bemuddle the matter still more.

They tell us that the situation could be remedied (*could* be!) either by a sort of self-reform (no doubt a "spontaneous" reform) by the existing U. S. Communist Party as a whole—or else by the formation of a new "Marxist" party (and why "Marxist" instead of Communist?).

The political crisis of the movement, however, requires a good deal more than idle speculation as to what *could* happen.

Who is there, after all, who is unable to play the game of listing all "possibilities" and of declaring very profoundly that the eventual outcome is bound to be some one of the "possibilities?"

If we understand rightly what you

mean when you say, "to decide now which of the alternatives we will end with is forming the theory before the fact because the basic data has not yet shown itself," (page 8, col. 2) then what you have said is this: that *after* the outcome is *already* known, then and only then can a theory be arrived at.

But who is there who needs any such theory as that?

There is doubt as to the future, you say in effect, therefore we should all wait until the future becomes the present, until what is going to happen actually happens, whereupon it will be possible to form a theory as to which was the right course of action some little time ago! That is just making a mockery of theory.

The whole purpose of Communist theory is exactly to help people arrive at the correct plan of action *in advance* of the outcome's being known. The purpose is to enable workers to select from among all the many "possibilities" the particular plan of action that corresponds to their class interests in the real situation.

The type of "theory" you propose, one that is altered to suit whatever seems convenient at the time, is one of which we have all already had plenty from the existing CPUSA.

Simple common sense supplies a much better solution. If the need of a bona fide CP in the U. S. is fundamental and immediate (and it is!), and if no such CP exists in the U.S. (and none does!), then it is obviously necessary to start a *new* Communist Party, based on the principles of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, at the earliest possible moment. That this is very difficult to do is undeniable; it is equally undeniable that it must be done.

The source of this error on your part and of other errors—among which may be cited the strange way in which dictatorship of the proletariat is put, the "it is idle to place the question: Is the organization for or against capitalism?" remark on united front tactics, the pacifist character of your

"anti-war" position—is in an actual contempt for theory as such, we think.

There do in fact exist many questions in Communism that are difficult. But the fundamental necessity for a Communist Party, the fundamental strategic aim of establishing a workers' and farmers' government in order to replace capitalism by socialism, the class position of the Communist movement on the war question (which is *not* a pacifist position)—these matters are not "obscure." On the contrary, the Communist position is one that has been established for not fewer than 30 years. They are not "open" questions from a theoretical point of view—nor is the position of Lenin and Stalin any secret.

NCP has thought of *SPARK*—and of the earlier *S.O.S.*—as good signs of the growing realization that CPUSA is a fake and a dangerous fake—that as a whole CPUSA is dominated not by Bolshevik ideology, but by Menshevism, and that CPUSA's practical policy is simply a 1947-U.S. model of social-democracy in the true Kautskyite, Trotskyite, Lovestoneite, Browderite tradition.

We have welcomed the appearance of *SPARK* and *S.O.S.* as such signs—and as media that have potentialities for great good to the movement. This is why NCP has done what it could to help circulate these publications.

But the extremely careless, slap-dash, almost facetious manner in which the editors have put into print—and under the slogan "A Marxist Monthly," with *ISKRA* connotations, at that!—the most disappointing mish-mash of theory indicates to NCP that these potentialities for good have by no means been realized. That these mistakes be rectified is both desirable and possible—however, that is mainly up to you.

With Communist greetings,

The New Committee for Publications—
by Carolyn Burkhart (chairman) and
Lyle Dowling (editor). P.O. Box 77,
Gracie Station, New York 28, N. Y.

TOWARDS A MARXIST PARTY

Spark's Reaction to N.C.P.'s Letter and Dunne's Pamphlet

NCP's Letter

Spark has neither the space nor the inclination to "counter-attack" the tone of NCP's letter. We will discuss only the ideas involved.

NCP thinks we do not consider the problem of a Marxist party an immediate one. We do. We must restrict our quotes (for space limits) so please refer to our Draft Transitional Program in Spark No. 1. On page 3, we outline the immediate problems. The most specific section of our program is the "Fight for a Marxist Party" (p. 7) in which we say we must begin now.

NCP accuses us of faith in C.P. "self-reform." On the contrary, we wish other groups would consider our plans for simultaneous work within and without the C.P. and the grouping of Party members into organizational contact with us. We have already found a few "sparks" in the C.P. who will gradually draw a valuable section in the right direction. This is the hardest and least gratifying job—to stick it out in the C.P. Read Joe Barner's letter in this issue. Casualties (expulsions) are to be expected much as the Nat'l Committee would like to avoid them, because they draw crowds. Let us be modestly patient in dealing with honest C.P. members who are still sifting their mess—and *who are perhaps not up to the more advanced confusions of some of us.*

NCP wonders why the name Marxist Party. We took pains to avoid a teapot tempest over this (p. 8): "Obviously then, we need a Marxist party in the U.S. (whatever its name may be)". We deliberately used a small "p" for party, and alternated our terms between real C.P. and Marxist party. The Lenin reprint in Spark No. 1 also explains why the word Marxist. (It might be well to avoid, however the strange fate of France which once had at the same time a

French Socialist Party and a Socialist Party of France.)

NCP says we are ambiguous concerning the eventual outcome of the present movement. Spark said (p. 8), "To work with the attitude of salvaging as much as possible is to prepare for either eventuality." We believe all of the basic data has not yet shown itself because some of it has still to materialize with our help. The data needed is: how many Marxists can we find in a hurry, how many honest people in the C.P. to consider our ideas, how many newcomers to the revolutionary movement can we draw? Despite the deadly situation in the C.P., let us watch for every spark and advise continued membership in the C.P. This does not hinder, but helps work towards a new bona-fide C.P. One word cures won't get us socialism or a real C.P. NCP's "earliest possible moment" does not reach us; we reach it—the hard way.

NCP says we put the "dictatorship of the proletariat" in a strange way. Our phrase was "dedicated to the constant struggle for Socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat." This unavoidably brief statement from a declaration of intentions may not be colorful or Shakespearean—but strange? Does the NCP mean strange and incorrect, strange and correct, or just "strange"?

NCP objects to our statement that "it is idle to put the question: Is the organization for or against capitalism?" We think this is one of the old sectarian approaches. Let's be specific. Is an ALP or an AVC or a PCA against capitalism? No. Do any of its progressive ideas when put into *militant action* help to weaken capitalism by proving the power of mass action? Yes. On the other hand its reactionary and confused actions help to perpetuate capitalism. (So do progressive ideas which live only in lipservice.) Does this ques-

tion determine our membership in organizations or our united fronts with organizations? If not, what does the answer net us—only what was obvious in the first place? This question is usually raised from a sectarian angle which slides over different levels of understanding and contradictions within classes and strata. The NCP (NCP Report No. 26) thinks that Wallace wants to heave the atom bomb at the S.U. Such inaccuracy is a disservice and was probably arrived at basically from the question—is Wallace for or against capitalism.

The progressive ideas of non-Marxist organizations, put into vigorous mass action, weaken capitalism, teach people through their own experiences the bankruptcy of capitalism and their own great power. An AVC chapter preventing an eviction is attacking capitalism savagely, but the AVC stands for free enterprise. The PCA chapter which produces vigorous action vs. the Hartley Bill is attacking capitalism's indispensable offensives. The presence of real Communists and not NCP's question in such situations is the key.

NCP says we have a pacifist anti-war position. NCP should have mentioned the longitude and latitude. As it is, we don't know on what basis this statement was made. In our program we say "militant in its fight against every act and preparation of our government for imperialist war and fascism; outspoken in its defense of the first land of socialism, the S.U. and of all progressive struggles throughout the world." Read the sections on China and Yugos-

"Dunne's Pamphlet"

A few days ago, the P.R. Club received copies of William F. Dunne's pamphlet, "The Struggle Against Opportunism in the Labor Movement—For a Socialist United States." C.P. members who do not think in terms of Socialism should benefit from this pamphlet. But the leftism in it undoes some of the good. We will try to explain our reactions by comparing Dunne's ideas with ours on the basis of the three main tasks

lavia in our S.O.S. We have yet to find the acrobat who could believe in the dictatorship of the proletariat, support every movement for colonial independence, and be a social pacifist.

At some accusations, we wonder.

Underneath all our sins is the contempt for theory, says NCP. Our S.O.S. was based on the need to rediscover theory—to study. The P.R. Club has tried to study hard because study has become a great responsibility in the present chaos. We have all learned a lot from our own weekly class in the course of which we have re-studied "Foundations of Leninism", "What Is To Be Done", "Left-Wing Communism", "Wage-Labour & Capital", "Value, Price & Profit" and at the moment "Imperialism". We have supplemented this not only with other Marxist classics, but with a parallel consideration of the documents of our present movement.

We are logically suspicious of any theoretical attitude which does not include the "Jimmy Higgins" testing and application—in mass organizations and on the street corners.

The "Fundamental necessities" missing from our program according to NCP are there for the reading. If you haven't the first issue, write for one. In our next issues we hope to deal with other important ideas of NCP. In this we have restricted ourselves to its letter.

(We have sent you an S.O.S. with this issue because it saves a lot of repetition. It is also well to consider in May what was said in October. We invite discussion on the S.O.S. too.)

as outlined in our Draft Program last month.

1. The fight for Socialism.

Although Dunne agrees that there is no contradiction between the fight for Socialism and immediate demands, in practice he ignores this. He provides insight into his real attitude when he says (p. 13): "Socialist class consciousness was weakened as a result of the New Deal program of reforms within the

capitalist system, aided and abetted by . . . 'the notorious revisionist' leaders of the C.P." Isn't it rather useless to blame the capitalist class for weakening Socialist class consciousness? We expect that—with or without reforms. We have to blame the opportunism of the pseudo-Marxists for destroying Socialist consciousness. While we are trying desperately to save some New Deal gains won only through our pressure, Dunne's analysis of the New Deal undermines the struggle for immediate demands and propagates a main fear of the Socialist Labor Party—the fear of reform.

Dunne says the "winning of the working class for a Socialist program" is the "main, immediate, and central task." (e.g., p. VII, 12, 13, 17, etc.) We agree. But somehow this task shoves the other tasks aside and thus digs itself a little sectarian foxhole. Dunne wants Socialism, but he has no plan for a Marxist party or for the fight against imperialist war and fascism. The proof lies in his 16 point program (p. 85) for Socialism which is meaningless by *incompletion*.

Since a majority of the U. S. does not yet accept our ideas, we, a minority, *as we fight for Socialism*, must unite with other groups on platforms short of Socialism. We must always gauge the degree of advancement of the U. S. working class and help it learn through its experience. Since Dunne accepts this idea (p. 22), how can he say (p.22): "winning a million workers for a Marxist Socialist program . . . would pretty much settle the question of Communist participation in united fronts for a program of immediate demands . . ." etc. The American workers would laugh at the perspective of a program of *no leadership on immediate demands pending a million supporters*. Our program said the correct solution was in dealing "with the immediate problems within the perspective of three main tasks: the fight for Socialism, the fight against imperialist war and fascism, and the fight for a Marxist party. All three must be fought for simultaneously or there is no perspective, no meaning and nothing achieved." They complement and generate each other. Dunne's 16 points have no value. With the recurring word Socialism, we agree—

all of us. So does the Nat'l Committee of the C.P. What else does it offer? Dunne has not taken a stand on any controversial point (even those developed in the body of the pamphlet don't materialize in the 16 points)—and so he has not helped the movement towards a Marxist Party.

2. The fight for a Marxist Party.

Dunne has not offered the merest hint on how to proceed to a real C.P. Only definite plans beget hard earned results. He still has his first word to say on this. And if his first word is Socialism, well, what's his second word?

3. The fight against Imperialist war and fascism.

If Dunne's fight for Socialism is limited by its isolation, and if the fight for a Marxist party is neglected, the fight against war and fascism is presented in a dangerous way—a detour leading not to a Marxist Party, but to utter confusion. Dunne says correctly (p. 14), "Class relationships in major sections of the world have been changed in favor of the working class and its allies." But Dunne says this holds true for the U.S. (p. 44).

The facts are otherwise. While Socialism is on the advance in other parts of the world, the opposite is true of one major part—the U. S. The U. S. has emerged from the war as the major capitalist power, and the U.S. working class emerged with its greatest strike movement, completely sold out by every level of its leadership, up to and because of the C.P. A realization of such an actuality should force us to include the consideration of the problems of unity and leadership of the working class and its allies in the U. S. to new independent action against war and fascism. Again we repeat, this never contradicts our constant fight for Socialism.

What is Dunne's dilemma? First, he speaks of the need to fight war and fascism (p. 11, 16, 85, 86, 70, etc.). Then he attacks the anti-fascist fight (p. 64) because the C.P. leadership gives lipservice to it. We shouldn't give up sex because the Daily Worker claims it has always supported it. Let us expose the hypocrisy of C.P. lipservice—but

never consign correct ideas to the oblivion of the Daily Worker.

On the same page, Dunne attacks "a petty bourgeois program supposedly designed to save capitalist democracy in the U.S. from fascism." The C.P. has a petty bourgeois program, but we say we do fight to save bourgeois democracy when Fascism threatens. All our progress towards Socialism is easier under capitalist democracy than under capitalist Fascism.

Dunne says this is not 1935 because then Fascism was a threat supported by outside money, and a war against the Soviet Union was being planned (p. 71). The situation in Europe and Asia is different today, and the main axis crushed, but it is hard to believe that Dunne doesn't know that the Pax Americana has taken its place, supported by its own money, and planning its own war against the S. U.

On the same page, Dunne succumbs to the great relaxer—inevitability. Fascism is permanently present as a threat in capitalism, so abolish capitalism. True. We will. But are we going to abolish capitalism today, and if not, hadn't we better bestir ourselves to at least postpone and control a few of capitalism's inevitabilities? What is more vulgar than the transformation of a Marxist understanding of inevitability into political paralysis. We can prevent war today and be threatened tomorrow—but every postponement gives a better position for the final riddance of capitalism. We hope our readers will reread Plekhanov on "The Role of the Individual in History."

Dunne says pointedly that this is the period of wars and revolutions. True. Is that an answer to the need for a popular front in America—and if so, was it an answer in 1935?

Dunne has collected an unnecessary confusion of preconditions for fascism. (On page 5 of SPARK No. 1 is a synthesis of this part of Dimitroff's *United Front*.) He has quoted Dimitroff but not on the main points. Dunne falls for the "havenot" and "no-self-sufficiency" arguments—the daily squawks of the Anti-Comintern Axis. We hope you will check Dunne's ideas by reading Dimitroff's invaluable pamphlet. (We'll be

glad to send you a copy. Also the Plekhanov.)

On page 67, Dunne claims the right to "American exceptionalism" (with more literal truth than he may suspect) on the question of fascism because he feels there is no analogy between Axis countries and the U.S. At a time when bi-partisan cohabitation is a proving ground for contemplated fascist operations, Dunne says our traditional parties cannot introduce fascism. He says our traditions protect us (p. 68). (Shades of Browder.) Our traditions are so confused and misrepresented by now, that even Dunne incorrectly resents a few of the good ones (that Communists should be "the most consistent fighters for Democracy", "a genuine patriotic force", and "upholders of the democratic traditions of Lincoln and Jefferson." We agree with Dunne about "the true defenders of national security and national interest." This one is suspicious in the U. S. of 1947.)

Dunne says fascism rises against the revolutionary threat (D-p. 68). But doesn't U.S. Capitalism see that threat today in the leftward moving world? Dunne says the defeat of the Socialist Revolution is a precondition for fascism (p. 66). But hasn't what little true Socialist leadership there was in the U.S. been destroyed? Even the unions and progressive organizations are getting the works.

Dunne gives more preconditions for fascism (economic crisis, increase of hardship, skepticism, shrinkage of markets and profits) . . . But don't these face the U.S. now? On p. 71, Dunne says fascism does not come to overwhelmingly proletarian countries. There is nothing in the causes or the preconditions for fascism that bears this out. On the other hand, (p. 71, 72) Dunne, forgetting his previous argument, now proves that preconditions are here—the weakening of capitalism, the increase of proletarian organization, the world Socialist threat, sharpening of capitalism's contradictions.

From here on, Dunne gets very maneuvering—either there is a Fascist mass party and a threat of fascism, or there isn't, and stop hollering (p. 72). We ask, "Since when don't we fight

to prevent threats from materializing?" Or do we wait for the fascist putsch to start fighting? Dunne says there is—or there isn't. "These are not issues with which to chippy around" (p. 75). But in 87 pages of 8-point, Dunne never answers his own question.

The core of Dunne's mistake is something he often finds it hard to accept—the issue of Socialism versus Fascism. He dares not state it so clearly so he says freedom or fascism (p. 16) and then slips in a definition of freedom as Socialism. Such oracular double talk is designed for historical wear and tear. Dunne has many thoughts on Fascism. He says *there is no possibility of fascism in the U.S.*; he says *stop the fascist threat*; he says *slogans of the anti-fascist struggle are opportunist*; he says *the fight is between fascism and socialism*.

Logically—in his scheme of things,—Dunne attacks all third parties. He never considers one clear concept; the *anti-fascist, anti-imperialist, non-redbaiting, farmer-labor party* in which the real C.P. could participate, *retaining its independent role*. This to him (p. 82) is not a C.P. affair. He seeks careful protection, however, (p. 83) in approving of Communist United Front agreements, but he rejects all application of this lipservice—or at best, he'll consider it after one million manna socialists materialize from heaven—if not from experience.) May we call this new Dunne theory the parachutist approach to a Marxist Party?

Dunne sees only imperialist interests at work in the United Nations (p. 46, 47), nor does he take a stand for the U.N. We "estimate" that Dunne is against the U.N.—and in queer company. He objects to the "petty bourgeois prattle" about the U.N. How does the S.U. policy fit into that? the U.S. government is out to kill the U.N.

Does Dunne agree? We would like to point out that Trotskyites who attempted to infiltrate into our group took as their operational base Dunne's position on the U.N.

On the World II, Dunne offers the two contradictory aspects of the war (p. 33). But were the liberation aspects and the imperialist aspects equal? Did they cancel each other out? Communists should say: it was a just war which destroyed the Fascist Axis and saw more Socialism at its end, but also a war in which imperialist foul play threw the main burden on the S.U. in the hope of a Soviet Pyrrhic victory. This Dunne does not say.

Finally, we ask Dunne these questions:

1. How do we work towards a Marxist Party organizationally? Do we work in the C.P.? Who are the "Marxist Socialists" you call on to build a real C.P.?
2. What are the main ideological obstacles in the way?
3. Do you think our 3 point orientation correct?
4. Do you agree that no present member of the Nat'l Committee C.P. can be allowed in a bona fide C.P.?
5. Is there a threat of Fascism in the U.S.?
6. If so, should a real C.P. work towards a popular front movement in the U.S.?
7. Is there a real threat of war?
8. If so, how do we fight it—besides the word Socialism?
9. Do you support the U.N. as long as the veto is upheld?
10. Do reforms hinder progress to Socialism?



BARNARD RUBIN FOR GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE C. P. U. S. A.

A Reaction to the Daily Worker

Were the National Committee of the C.P.U.S.A. consistent, it would see how logical our proposed choice for General Secretary. *Once you've read "Broadway Beat", you know what the Daily Worker stands for.* Think how effective such an advertising campaign would be: "Join the Communist Party for the choicest gossip—our General Secretary is now none other than Barnard Rubin."

Alas, the National Committee is not consistent.

Blurb follows: it's truth! it's coverage! it's leadership! it's culture! it's a paper for the common man—see!—with quota daily of pinup and rape.

Does it tell the truth? Yes, in much the same fashion as the N.Y. Times, "All the News That's Fit to Print." The favorite method of the Daily for telling the truth is by omission.

On Sept. 29, 1946, an article headlined "Lehman Asks 'Full Clear' Agreement with USSR" explained that in a broadcast over CBS Lehman took issue with the foreign policy program of Ives, the Republican Senatorial candidate, and spoke for "Great Power unity." On October 2nd, an editorial "Lehman's Policy", stated: "As for the Administration's foreign policy itself, Lehman tried hard to support it, while criticising it very softly." And, "There is no doubt of the difference in stature between a Lehman and an Ives." It appears that Lehman did not quite support but "tried hard to support" the Truman foreign policy—even criticized it though "very softly." On the evidence of the D.W. we should have voted for Lehman.

Unfortunately however, the N. Y. Times has a luxurious habit of printing texts. On Sunday, Sept. 29th, it carried the text of Lehman's speech. Lehman said: "The Democratic Party of this State in its platform adopted three weeks ago in Albany pledged sup-

port to the 'forthright and vigorous foreign policy of the Administration.' To this policy, as a candidate for the U.S. Senate, I pledge my full support."

Recently Lehman made public his wholehearted support of the "Truman Doctrine" in Greece and Turkey.

On Sept. 20, 1946, Max Gordon stated in an article "A Dangerous Tendency": "The basic assumption that there is solid unity between the two major parties on questions of foreign policy is wrong and dangerous." This was and remained the main line of the D.W. throughout the election campaign.

On Sept. 26, 1946 in the N.Y. Times a synopsis of an article on Wallace's removal by M. Marinin in Pravda stated that Wallace's retention in the gov't till then had "maintained the feigned observance of the preservation of Mr. Roosevelt's policy."

On Nov. 6, 1946 the N.Y. Times and the Herald Tribune carried synopses of an article in RED STAR containing a lecture on October 22nd by Boris Vronski. "Vronski said the difference between the Democrats and Republicans was never so 'insignificant' as now and that their approach toward a similar viewpoint 'has found extremely clear expression in the sphere of U.S. foreign policy which in effect amounts to a firm position towards the S.U.'"

"The two parties exist, Mr. Vronski asserted, simply to split the masses 'under the guise of differences' and thus prevent the formation of a third party." "Although the Democrat party leadership donned 'the Roosevelt mantle' for election purpose, Vronski said, 'Democrats as well as Republicans are waging with equal determination an offensive against the vital interests of the American popular masses.'"

"The readers of the D.W. never had the benefit of the above-quoted opinions from the socialist Soviet Union, opinions

which were in absolute contradiction to those of the D.W. and the C.P.U.S.A. In fact on every subject affecting the U.S., there has been a veritable boycott on news and opinion from the USSR's leading journals Pravda, Red Star, New Times, etc. This was topped off the other day when Morris Childs, Editor of the D.W. in a featured dispatch from the S.U. saw fit to censor Stalin's statements to Stassen. In the transcript of the interview which took place on April 9th printed in the N.Y. Times on April 15, 1947 Stalin stated: "We do not see any big difference between the Republicans and Democrats." This statement was omitted from Childs' dispatch of that date.

As we go to press, the full text of the Stalin-Stassen interview has just been released and forced the Worker of May 4th into an exposed position. Knowing that the readers of the D.W. have never had the benefit of the above-mentioned quote, the "Editor, D.W." includes in parentheses the previously censored statement in order to avoid the charge of revising an official text. The rest of this section of the originally released excerpt did not have to be included in the *twilight* of parentheses since the D.W. had no objection to printing it originally. "The Devil seeth not the Soul, but Everyman can see the Conscience of the Daily Worker—in parentheses." (Kilroy).

The D.W. tried to minimize the importance of the redbaiting CIO resolution and its even more damaging statement prohibiting local bodies from taking a stand on any but "local issues." Most party members have little knowledge of the damaging results of this resolution. The article in last month's "Spark", "Hari Kari on the Ninth Floor", gives a report of these. Just as the Daily in the days of Browder did not print the Duclos article 'til after the *World-Telegram* had, so it did not mention the redbaiting stand of Lewis Merrill 'til after P.M. carried it, days after it was known.

We now come to the editorials that lead the working class and progressives. Apparently somebody on the D.W. went to journalism class and learned that in refined newspapers such as the New York

Times, the Daily Worker, etc. a certain lofty and if possible impartial tone is recommended. The editorial mentioned above, "Lehman's Policy," which comments that Lehman could have spoken more sharply against Byrnes, ends:

"Surely, he will have to do that in the Senate. Now is the time for clarity."

Is this not a wonderful combination of wistful and wishful thinking which places no burdens on anybody, neither for action nor thought. Another prediction of the D.W. editorials is its prophetic sense even as in the above. In the editorial "GOP Tactics" on Sept. 27, 1946, the following is stated: "The labor movement will undoubtedly take the lead in this struggle for vitally needed meat."

"Delegations, wires and other forms of pressure need to be centered on Washington at once to see that the gov't acts in this crisis."

Here at last is a call for action. And one which is echoed over and over again. Delegations and wires would seem to solve all problems. But the fact is that in the past year they have solved none. As long as the labor movement *limits itself* to these forms the onslaught of reaction will continue. Congress and our own State legislature knew very well that the majority of people were for OPA, Nursery schools, etc. But this did not deter them for they had nothing to fear from an unorganized voiceless people—the American people.

The C.P. has been so addicted to telegrams and the fond illusion that maneuvers solve all problems that it neither explains the true motives of our gov't nor suggests appropriate drastic mass action. We read over and over again the hope-happy "It is to be hoped", "it is rumored, "it is surely clear." But nothing is clear from these editorials. The task of a Communist paper is to make the actual facts so clear that the workers themselves will know what to do. Lenin answering the charges of the opportunists in "What Is To Be Done" said Iskra "tried to explain the inseparable connection that exists between unemployment and the capitalist system as a whole; it uttered the warning that 'famine is coming.'"

Contrast this with the above mentioned "GOP Tactics" on the meat situation which did not deign to discuss the ironic implications of a meat famine in a "meat-packed" land.

On May 2, 1947 an editorial on "The Palestine Debate" concluded:

"We're not happy that the attitude of Communist leaders of other states is so sensible, and that the position of our own government is stupid and inexcusable. *We're not cheering for the Russians, or the Poles or the Czechs.* (Our italics).

"We're ashamed that our country, born in a battle for independence, and pledged to the principle of free discussion, has fallen into the hands of men who believe in neither." (Dear reader, it is now ASPIRIN TIME.)

The feature articles in the Daily are of course led by Barnard Rubin. To describe the level of his column only one example is necessary. A few months ago, in mentioning a French play coming to N.Y., he said it was "decadent but terrific." Perhaps he thinks the works of Arthur Koestler, Victor Kravchenko and other Trotskyites and Fascists "terrific." In all honesty, one must inform D.W. readers that Walter Winchell is far more exhaustive on births, marriages, and divorces, and Leonard Lyons on the higher type of gossiped-politics.

Fiction in the D.W. comes via Samuel Sillen's attacks on the "left renegades", thus sparing the frantic political columnists the task. David Platt has exactly the same standards as a bad capitalist movie reviewer. And Mike Gold's horse has learned to swallow any number of bitter pills. (He said of the Browder scuttling of Socialism several years ago, "This is too bitter a pill for even a horse to swallow." The key to the general cultural level of the D.W. is in its adoption of the bourgeois mode of thought. Most of the columnist probably realize how "decadent" they are in comparison to Barnard Rubin.

As for the political columnists, the less said the better. For our purposes, hack Max Gordon and hack George Morris offer a daily strip-tease which exposes the bankrupt curves of the C.P.U.S.A. Our Washington correspon-

dent Rob Hall has the virtue of suffering at the gatherings of Big Business, and writes appealing letters to his "Dear Boss" (Dear reader, it is now ASPIRIN TIME), asking that he be spared such gruesome assignments. As for "Dear Boss", he was busy keeping us up on the state of the Moscow subways and Kremlin walls. Anyone but a "left opportunist" would certainly find reason to believe in Socialism as a result of Mr. Childs' penetrating studies from the Soviet Union.

Suddenly on a page on lynchings, we find a picture of a luscious all-American bathing beauty—"Queen of Tomatoes." That's all. Our minds relax—what a considerate newspaper: to give us in the midst of the ugly news of lynching—"cheese cake."

Finally we come to that favorite subject of D.W. readers—its language. The Daily is always willing to print an article or letter criticising its language. No doubt the editorial board sighs with relief and says—there's no danger as long as all roads lead to criticism of our language. We want the language that the working class understands, cries the Daily daily. But somehow it is unable to achieve this aim. Day after day the political and editorial articles save work for the printers. We suspect the printers have a file somewhat like the rubber stamps described by Ilf and Petrov in "Little Golden Calf"—consisting of whole paragraphs such as: "We must consolidate our forces for the coming struggle," (with apologies—struggles are seldom mentioned in the D.W.). "It must be done, it can be done, it will be done." "First and foremost is the fight against Republican reaction," and last but not least "Labor Unity or Else."

Here is a political slogan to end all political slogans. It's a simple one based on good American usage:

"Gimme the dough—or else!"

"Gimme the gun—or else!"

Or else—a peculiarly American phrase—probably reached its height in the gangster films from which the above sentences are quoted. It is so appropriate for the "simple" American working class. It doesn't bother them with al-

ternatives—just the deep dark pit of or elseness.

Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin had something to say—something important, scientific and hardhitting, and strangely enough the working classes of all nations were able to understand their language although it was not based on two-syllable words exclusively. Workers think and speak more clearly than anyone else because they understand their class position better than any other group. Workers the world over have read and understood "The Communist Manifesto", "Wage-Labour & Capital", "Value, Price and Profit." The American worker is no exception. Engels in his introduction to "Wage-Labour & Capital" dealing with the difference between labour and labour-power remarks: "I must render an explanation: to the workers, in order that they may understand that we are not quibbling or word-juggling . . . ; to the bourgeois, in order that they may convince themselves how greatly the uneducated workers, who can be easily made to grasp the most difficult economic analyses, excel our supercilious 'cultured' folk, for whom such ticklish problems remain insoluble their whole life long." If readers cannot understand the D.W. language, it is not because it is advanced but because it is obscure, stilted and confused Dennis double-talk.

At one time our Club sold more

Workers than any other in the city, but we knew all along that our contacts bought it out of a variety of motives—but never because it sold itself. Each week we had to resell it on the basis of struggles that were often not mentioned in it, or because the people trusted us because of the petitions on such cases as the Woodard and Leftridge, which we brought with us.

A Communist paper should be an organizer, an educator, a propagandist for socialism and the socialist way of thought. It should advance the thinking of the working class rather than trail far behind in its underestimation of the workers. It should be the spokesman of progress in every form—not only in politics, but in science and culture. The best writers and journalists would then be inevitably attracted to such a paper. The most militant workers would learn how to lead from it. It would help the American people out of the boredom and decadence of Hollywood standardization by exposing instead of promoting it. It is well known that Party members take for granted the inferiority of the D.W. as if it were a sad but inevitable condition. Only one thing can remedy this condition—a Marxist party, a Marxist leadership with roots in the American working class, and in Socialist ideology instead of the gossip niches of Barnard Rubin and the glories of Hollywood.

M. SAMUEL

REPRINT:

"POLITICAL 'NEUTRALITY' IN THE TRADE UNIONS"

By LENIN

(In each issue, we will reprint from Marxist literature a short excerpt of particular value to us at this stage of our movement. The following reprint is the most direct refutation we could find of the present Communist Party policy in the trade unions.)

The resolution of the Stuttgart Congress* on the relation between Socialist

*Of the Second International in 1907.

parties and trade unions is of great importance. As Kautsky points out, and as any reader of the resolution can see for himself, it at last puts an end to the recognition of the principle of 'neutrality'. The resolution contains no word on neutrality or non-partisanship. On neutrality, there is a thorough recognition of the necessity for close connections between trade unions and Socialist parties and for the strengthening of these connections.

The injurious aspects of the principle of neutrality were made manifest at Stuttgart by the fact that a half of the German delegation, in fact the representatives of the trade unions, were the most decided advocates of the opportunist standpoint. Propaganda in favor of neutrality has had really dangerous results in Germany, for it has played into the hands of the opportunists within the social-democracy. This fact must henceforth be taken into account, particularly in Russia, where the bourgeois democratic advisers of the proletariat who champion the neutrality of the trade union movement, are so numerous.

At the Stuttgart Congress, the opportunist and revolutionary wings of international social-democracy took up definitely opposed standpoints on a great number of the most important questions, questions which were answered in the spirit of revolutionary Marxism. The resolutions of this Congress, elaborated by the debates, should serve as a constant guide for every propagandist and agitator. The work accomplished at Stuttgart will do a great deal to promote unity of tactics and unity in the revolutionary struggle of the workers of all countries.

Our whole Party now recognizes that work in the trade unions must be carried on, not in the spirit of neutrality, but in that of the closest possible collaboration between the trade unions and the social-democratic parties. It is also recognized that the party character of the trade unions is only attainable by the work of social-democrats within the trade unions, that the social-democrats must build strong nuclei in the trade unions and that where it is illegal to establish trade unions, illegal unions must be created.

As Kautsky pointed out in his report to the Leipzig workers, the resolution of the Stuttgart Congress put an end to the recognition of the principle of neutrality. The advanced development of class contradictions, their recent intensification in all countries, the many years of experience in Germany—where the policy of neutrality strengthened opportunism in the trade unions, without in the least preventing the emergence of special Christian and liberal trade

unions—the extension of that particular sphere of the proletarian struggle brought about by united action on the part of the trade unions and political parties (mass strikes and armed insurrection in the Russian Revolution* as an example of the probable forms of the proletarian revolution in the west): all this has completely destroyed the basis of the theory of neutrality.

Within the proletarian parties, at the present time, the question of neutrality does not appear to give rise to any great divergence of opinions. But that is not the case with the non-proletarian, quasi-socialist parties of the type of our social revolutionaries who form, in reality, the extreme left wing of the revolutionary-bourgeois party of the intellectuals and progressive peasants.

It is extremely characteristic that of our people at Stuttgart, only the social-revolutionaries and Plekhanov defended the idea of neutrality. And that most unsuccessfully . . .

Plekhanov referred to Lunacharsky's remark that the neutrality of trade unions was defended by the German revisionists, and replied:—

"The revisionists say that the trade unions must be neutral, understanding thereby the utilization of the trade unions in the struggle against orthodox Marxism."

And Plekhanov concluded:—

"To do away with the neutrality of the trade unions will not help us. Even if we were to bring the trade unions into close and formal dependence upon the Party, if the 'ideology' of the revisionists gains the upper hand within the Party, then doing away with the neutrality of the trade unions would only mean another victory for the 'critics of Marx'".

This argument is an excellent example of Plekhanov's favorite method of avoiding the question and hiding the real nature of the dispute. *Should the ideology of the revisionists actually gain the upper hand in the party, it will cease to be a Socialist Party of the working class.* We are not dealing with the origin of such a party, or with the struggles and splits that would be caused. We

* Of 1905.

are dealing with the fact that in every capitalist country there now exist Socialist Parties and trade unions, and it is our business to determine the fundamental relations between them. *The class interests of the bourgeoisie inevitably give rise to the effort to limit the trade unions to a narrow and petty sphere of activities within the existing order, to keep the trade unions away from any association with socialism, and the theory of neutrality is the ideological garb of this bourgeois wish. The revisionists within the social-democratic party will always try to get along in some fashion or another within capitalist society.*

It is true that at the beginning of the political and trade union working-class-movement in Europe, it was possible to be in favor of the neutrality of trade unions, as a method of extending the original basis of the proletarian struggle at a time when it was relatively undeveloped and when there was no systematic bourgeois influence operating on the trade unions. But today, from the standpoint of international social-democracy, advocacy of the neutrality of the trade unions is entirely inapplicable. One can only smile when reading Plekhanov's assurance that: "Marx even today in Germany would be in favor of the neutrality of trade unions", particularly when such an argument is supported by a one-sided interpretation of a single "quotation" from Marx which ignores the whole of Marx's writings and the entire spirit of his teachings.

"I stand for neutrality, as Bebel understood it, and not in the revisionist sense," writes Plekhanov. To speak in that way is to swear by Bebel and yet to sink into the morass. No questions asked! Bebel is such a commanding authority in the international proletarian movement, such an experienced practical leader, a socialist with such a delicate sense of the requirements of the revolutionary struggle, that in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred he himself found the way out of the morass when he had made a false step, and also led out those who were willing to follow him.

Bebel was wrong when, with Vollmar, he defended the agrarian pro-

gramme of the revisionists at Breslau (1895); he was wrong when, at Eisen, he insisted on the difference in principle between offensive and defensive wars; he was wrong when he wanted to raise the "neutrality" of the trade unions to a principle. We readily believe that if Plekhanov will take the wrong turning only in the company of Bebel, then it will not happen often, and not for very long. In any case, we are of the opinion that one should not imitate Bebel when he is mistaken.

It is said—and Plekhanov emphasizes it particularly—that neutrality is necessary in order to organize all workers who have succeeded in realizing that their material conditions must be improved. But those who say this forget that the present stage of development in class antagonisms inevitably gives rise to "political differences" on this very question of how improvements can be won within the frame-work of modern society. *The theory of the neutrality of the trade unions, as opposed to the theory of the necessity for their close association with the revolutionary social-democracy, results unavoidably in this, that in the interests of this improvement, those methods are favored which involve a blunting of the class struggle of the proletariat.*

A clear example of this (connected by the way, with the evaluation of one of the most interesting episodes in the modern labor movement) is afforded in the same number of the "Sovrenny Mir", in which Plekhanov defends neutrality. Besides Plekhanov, we observe Mr. E. P. as the eulogist of Richard Bell, the well-known English railwaymen's leader, who concluded the workers' dispute with the companies by a compromise. Bell is called "the soul of the railwaymen's movement."

"There is no doubt," writes E. P., "that Bell, thanks to his calm, prudent and consistent tactics, has won the complete confidence of the Railwaymen's Association, whose members are ready to follow him everywhere without hesitation."

Such a standpoint is no accident; it is closely bound up with the very nature of "neutralism", which places in the foreground the unity of the workers for

improving their condition, and not their unity for a struggle which would be of service to the cause of the emancipation of the proletariat.

But this standpoint does not in the least correspond with the opinions of English socialists, who will probably be amazed when they learn that Bell's eulogist writes in the same journal with distinguished Mensheviks like Plekhanov, Jordansky and Co., without coming into opposition with them.

The English social-democratic paper "Justice" in its leader of November 16, writes as follows about the compromise between Bell and the railway companies:

"We fully agree with the condemnation by practically all the trade unions of this so-called peace treaty . . . It takes all meaning from the existence of trade unions . . . This senseless agreement . . . cannot be binding on the workers, and they would do well to reject it."

And in the next number of November 23, Bernet wrote an article on the agreement under the title: "Sold Again!"

"Three weeks ago the Railwaymen's Association was one of the most powerful trade unions in England; now it has sunk to the level of a benefit society . . . And this change has occurred, not because the railwaymen fought and suffered defeat, but because their leader, either deliberately or from sheer stupidity, sold them to the capitalists before any struggle had taken place."

The editors add that they have received a similar letter from "a wage slave of the Midland Railway Company."

But perhaps, it may be objected, this is an "exaggeration" of a "too revolutionary" social-democrat! No! The journal of the moderate I.L.P., which has never yet called itself socialist, the "Labor Leader", published in its issue of November 15 a letter from a railway trade unionist who, in answer to the praises with which the entire capitalist press (from the Radical "Reynolds" to the Conservative "Times") overwhelmed Bell, declared that the agreement entered into by Bell "is the most contemptible

that has ever occurred in the history of trade unionism," and that Richard Bell is the "Marshal Bazaine of the trade union movement!" Another railwayman demands that "Bell must be called upon to answer for this malevolent compromise, which condemns the workers to seven years' hard labor." And in the leading article of the same number of this moderate paper the compromise is referred to as "the Sedan of the British trade union movement." "There has never been such a favorable opportunity for demonstrating on a national scale, the strength of organized labor." "An unexampled enthusiasm" and will to fight prevailed among the workers. The article ends with a biting comparison between the sufferings of the workers and the rejoicings at a banquet attended by Lloyd George (a Minister playing the part of capitalist lackey) and Bell.

Only the most extreme opportunists, the Fabians, a body composed entirely of intellectuals, approved of the agreement and made even the "New Age" a paper friendly to the Fabians, blush for shame. That paper had to admit that, while the bourgeois Conservative "Times" published in full the statement of the Fabian Central Committee on his matter, "not one Socialist organization, not one trade union, not one important working-class leader" declared in favor of the compromise.

That is a model example of the application of neutrality in the hands of Plekhanov's colleague, Mr. E. P. It was not a matter of "political differences", but an improvement in the conditions of workers within the existing society. The whole British bourgeoisie, the Fabians and also Mr. E. P. were for an "improvement" at the cost of renouncing the struggle and of an unconditional surrender to capital—and all socialists and workers in the trade unions were in favor of a united working-class struggle.

Will Plekhanov now still continue to propagate "neutrality" instead of cooperation between trade unions and socialist parties? [All italics ours].

We have altered our table of contents to allow more space for a discussion of our Draft Transitional Program. Thanks for your letters and your financial help. We look forward to a widening discussion in next month's SPARK. SPARK No. 3 will depend, as did this one, solely on your contributions.

We welcome names and addresses for sample copies. We will be glad to send you at cost any of the literature mentioned in this issue.

Please make checks or money orders payable to: P. R. Club, at P.O. Box 34, Tremont Sta., N. Y. 57, N. Y.

Cash or 1½c stamps will also be appreciated.



April Table of Contents

Toward a Marxist Party — A Draft Transitional Program
 Hari Kari on the Ninth Floor
 Report from Frisco
 Free Eisler — Defend the Legality of the C.P.
 Reprint: Declaration by the Editorial Board of Iskra (Lenin)
 Our S.O.S. Answered

SPARK

A MARXIST MONTHLY

Declaration of Intentions

The aim of this magazine is to help bring into existence in the U. S. a bona fide Communist Party, guided by the principles of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin; dedicated to the constant struggle for Socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat; militant in its fight against every act and preparation of our government for imperialist war and fascism; outspoken in its defense of the first land of Socialism, the Soviet Union, and all progressive struggles throughout the world.

We believe the Communist Party U.S.A. is opportunist—that it has abandoned the theory of the class struggle and the principles of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, and that it has betrayed the American working class and its allies.

Therefore, it becomes the responsibility equally of members of the Communist Party U.S.A., expelled Communist Party members and non-Party Marxist to work towards a bona fide Communist Party:

1. By extending the current discussion both within and without the Communist Party on the role of a Marxist Party in the U. S. A.
2. By helping the development of varied Marxist circles such as study, contact, publication and expelled groups;
3. By establishing a publication for the purpose of unifying ideologically and organizationally the forces for a Marxist Party in the United States.