

PARTY PRE-CONVENTION DISCUSSION SECTION

The Minority on the Results of the Plenum

Only One Line In the C. E. C. Majority

Statement by Comrades Lovestone and Pepper

The following is a contribution to the discussion in the Workers (Communist) Party, offered by the Foster-Bittelmann Minority of the Central Committee.

1. The actions of the Plenum of the C. E. C. just closed, must be viewed from the standpoint of the struggle against the war danger. All the tasks of our Party, as well as the situation within our Party, must be considered primarily from the viewpoint of developing the most effective means of mobilizing our membership and the working masses for an effective struggle against American imperialism and the war danger. To effectively do this all deviations from the correct Communist line, particularly the underestimation of the war danger, must be eradicated and our Party must be unified on the basis of the line laid down by the Sixth Congress of the Comintern for the struggle against the war danger and capitalist rationalization.

2. The discussions at the Plenum just closed, has brought about a somewhat new situation in our Party. The Minority submitted a thesis dealing with the economic and political situation and the tasks of our Party, which emphasized the rapidly developing war danger, resulting in the sharpening inner and outer contradictions of American imperialism, the leftward drift of the working masses, the rightward trend of the labor bureaucracy and its efforts to graft the unions onto the war machine of U. S. imperialism, and the increased opportunities for our Party to develop and lead mass struggles especially of the unskilled and semi-skilled workers. The Polcom Majority, on the other hand, saw only an almost endless wave of prosperity and the entrance of American imperialism into a new "golden age." They saw it brought about by the industrialization of the South, the recovery of agriculture, the unobstructed conquest of Latin America, etc., with no sharpening of the inherent imperialist contradictions and no increased opportunities for working class struggle. The C. E. C. majority has shown itself to be suffering seriously from "prosperity" illusions. The sharp discussion for four days around the Majority and Minority theses resulted in exposing much more clearly the various political tendencies in the Party and in bringing to light certain shiftings within the C. E. C. Majority.

3. The C. E. C. Majority was compelled at this plenum to practically withdraw the original Lovestone thesis (signed by Comrades Lovestone, Pepper and Gitlow) and to present another thesis (the Pepper thesis) signed by Comrades Weinstein, Bedacht and Patrick. Thus the C. E. C. Majority stands before the Party with two theses which on the surface would appear to contain different lines on many fundamental questions. For the first thesis Comrade Lovestone made the report and political argument. This thesis openly defends and further develops the open opportunist orientation of the C. E. C. Majority which is responsible for most of the Right errors committed by the Party. Comrades Lovestone, Wolf and Nearing most fully and openly express this Right orientation. For the second thesis, which apparently supplants the first thesis of the C. E. C. Majority, Comrade Pepper made the report and political argument. While retaining fully the essence of the open opportunist orientation of the first thesis (that of Lovestone), the Pepper thesis undertakes to pay lip service to the basic contention of the C. E. C. Minority that the main source of the Right danger in our Party comes from overestimating the power of American imperialism and underestimating the possibilities for struggle against it. But the Pepper thesis, instead of pointing out that the C. E. C. Majority is itself guilty of such overestimation, covers up the Right mistakes of the C. E. C. Majority which arise from their overestimation of the power of American imperialism, by blaming this tendency upon Scott Nearing alone. This thesis, championed by Pepper, Weinstein and Bedacht, differs from Lovestone thesis, pretends also to pay lip service to the Minority's correct line of struggle on two fronts against open opportunism, the Right danger, and against the Trotskyist-Cannon opposition, opportunism covered with Left phrases.

4. The political meaning of the appearance of the C. E. C. Majority before the Plenum with two theses and two spokesmen seemingly contradicting each other on policies of basic importance, is as follows: (a) Under the pressure of the C. I. and Y. C. I. and under the pressure of the C. E. C. Minority and the membership, the C. E. C. Majority felt compelled to retire to the background its openly opportunist orientation as embodied in the first thesis submitted by Comrade Lovestone, and to retire also to the background Comrades Lovestone, Wolf, and Stachel as leaders of the Majority. Instead they felt compelled to put in the foreground the so-called new thesis and also to bring forward Comrades Pepper, Weinstein and Bedacht.

(b) Apparently the C. E. C. Majority proposes to give to the Party a new thesis and a new leadership headed by Comrade Pepper instead of Comrade Lovestone. The new thesis while pretending to

recognize that the overestimation of the power of American imperialism, and the underestimation of the possibility of struggle against it, constitute the chief source of the Right danger, yet in essence it retains in full the right wing analysis and orientation of the old thesis (Lovestone, etc.), and is developing a series of propositions of a dangerous Right wing character such as that there is no perspective for the building up of the new industrial union movement and the theory of the rebuilding of the A. F. of L. The so-called new leadership (Pepper-Weinstein-Bedacht) is just as fully attached to the Right opportunist orientation of the C. E. C. Majority as was the old leadership of the Majority, (Lovestone, Wolf, Stachel).

(c) The Party must recognize that this maneuver of the C. E. C. Majority is an effort to meet the pressure of the C. I., Y. C. I., and the membership without in reality changing the line or radically changing the leadership.

5. One of the outstanding characteristics of the Plenum was the effort of the C. E. C. Majority to build up a new issue in the convention discussion, namely, the so-called "reservations" of the Minority to the decisions of the Sixth World Congress. On this we wish to declare the following:

(a) The Minority never considered its declaration to the Sixth Congress as being in any way a reservation to the general line adopted by the congress for application in all sections of the C. I., including the United States. The Minority of the Party delegation to the congress voted for the main thesis and for all other theses and decisions adopted by the congress.

(b) The C. I. itself never considered our declaration to the Sixth Congress as being a reservation to its main line. The conclusive proof of this is the fact that neither during the congress nor since has the C. I. told us that we had such reservations. Had the Comintern been of the opinion that our declaration was equivalent to a reservation on the main line, the Comintern would have plainly said so and would have properly urged the American Party to draw all necessary conclusions.

(c) The C. I. did not do it. The ECCI has just sent a letter to our C. E. C. severely criticizing "the misleading statements contained in the declaration of the C. E. C." on the decision of the Comintern on the American question. In drafting this letter the ECCI said that it "had before it the Daily Worker of October 2nd containing four documents, including a lengthy statement issued in the name of the C. E. C. headed 'The Comintern Decision on the American Question.'" One of these four documents was a brief declaration by the Minority of the Polcom stating that the Minority of the Polcom agreed with the declaration of the Minority of the Party delegation to the Sixth Congress. The C. I. did not view the statement of the Minority as being a reservation. We find no reference to this statement in the latest ECCI letter.

(d) We are unalterably opposed to the attitude of reservations to the line of the Comintern. That is why we fought against the efforts of Comrades Pepper and Lovestone to "exempt" the American Party from the general line of struggle against the Right danger laid down at the Ninth Plenum of the C. I. That is why we also fought the C. E. C. Majority's opposition to the decisions of the RILU and Y. C. I. (original draft of Lovestone thesis to February Plenum, articles in the Communist by Comrades Pepper and Lovestone, failure to endorse the Fourth Congress RILU decisions, suppression of the Y. C. I. letter and the issuance of the Polcom letter against it, etc., etc.). This attitude of Comrades Pepper and Lovestone was severely criticized at the Sixth Congress and in the American Commission by leading members of the Comintern, as being an effort to formulate a "Monroe Doctrine" for the American Party. That is, Comrades Pepper and Lovestone were criticized for tendencies to exempt the United States from the application of the C. I. general line. The C. E. C. ignored these criticisms and persisted in its old tendency toward a "Monroe Doctrine." The ECCI sent their latest letter to the CEC saying "that the Right danger is the main danger for the American Party. The next Party congress must investigate the objective sources of the Right danger and the struggle against it, discussing all Party problems from the standpoint of the struggle against the Right danger inside the Party and the social reformists' influence among the workers."

(e) The C. E. C. Majority still persists in the old tendencies of Comrades Pepper and Lovestone toward a "Monroe Doctrine." This is clearly seen in its two theses, both of which are in disagreement with the Communist International general line. But to cover this up, to confuse the Party and to prevent the membership from deliberately and consciously discussing the problems before the Party, the Central Executive Committee Majority, now led by Comrade Pepper, is building up into a convention issue our declaration to the Congress by declaring it as "reservations." We must

The Foster-Bittelmann Opposition in its new statement, "The Minority on the Results of the Party Plenum," makes a rather belated attempt to criticize the Thesis on the Economic and Political Situation and the Resolution against the Right Danger and Trotskyism adopted at the last Plenum of the Central Executive Committee. At the Plenum itself the Opposition was unable to prove any section of the analysis given by the Central Executive Committee or to meet the critical views destroying the whole artificial edifice of their pseudo-analysis.

After their decisive defeat at the Plenum (and the ideological defeat the Opposition suffered at the Plenum was even greater than its organizational defeat) the Foster-Bittelmann Opposition tries to "change the subject" to get away from the painful memories of the Plenum discussion on the estimation of the world role of American imperialism, of the mutual relations of the internal and external contradictions of the imperialist world, on the estimation and prospects of the mass struggles in America.

At the Plenum Comrade Foster declared Comrade Bittelmann to be the greatest living Marxian on the American continent, stating that he himself is only a simple worker in the vineyard of Bittelmann. Comrade Bittelmann, on the other hand, raised his claim of being the leading Marxian within the Communist International, expressing his disagreement with the unanimously adopted theses of the World Congress on the international situation, which was introduced by Comrade Bucharin in the name of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, approved by the Russian delegation, and assumed its final shape with the cooperation of fifty-odd sections of the Communist International.

Comrade Bittelmann put forward the wholesale charge that the thesis introduced by Comrades Gitlow, Lovestone and Pepper is a right wing document, because it overestimates the strength of American imperialism and underestimates the degree of radicalization in America. The charge was supported most emphatically by the learned Marxians of the Opposition, such as Comrades Gomez, Costrell, Hathaway, Grecht, etc., all of whom spoke overtime to prove that, although they disagreed with the analysis of the Comintern, which also "overestimates" the strength of American imperialism and "underestimates" the degree of radicalization in America, this is not their fault but that of the Central Executive Committee, and that if the World Congress did not accept their views, the worse for the World Congress.

The Plenum exposed the political bankruptcy of the Foster-Bittelmann Opposition completely. Comrade Foster made the solemn declaration that Comrade Bittelmann is the ideological leader of the Opposition; Comrade Bittelmann made the modest statement that he could not contradict Comrade Foster; while the other comrades of the Opposition tried to plug up the holes in the sinking boat of the Opposition, and produced much opportunistic confusion, defending the theories of partial disarmament, of the Smith vote as the clearest expression of radicalization, of the primacy of internal over external contradictions, and the short-lived but cute "apex" theory.

The wrong tactics of the Bittelmann-Foster Opposition at the Plenum resulted in a heavy loss of their followers, some of them going over to Cannon, most of them coming over to the correct position of the C. E. C. The Bittelmann-Foster Opposition is now executing a retreat and is trying to bring order into its scattered ranks by issuing its new statement. The new statement develops a new "theory." The Party is not surprised at this, because it has been the habit of the Opposition to invent in each of its statements a new theory. The ten points of the new statement try to make the Party membership believe that there are two lines within the C. E. C.: one the "Lovestone line" and the other the "Pepper line," and that the two contradict each other. They put forward the ridiculous charge that the thesis which they call the "Lovestone thesis" has been withdrawn, and that a new thesis, which they call the "Pepper thesis" (they thus designate the Resolution against the Right Danger and Trotskyism), has taken its place.

It will be enough to mention certain facts to ridicule this charge out of existence:

- 1. The thesis, which they call the "Lovestone thesis," has been indeed "withdrawn"—by adopting it—by an overwhelming majority and printing it in the Party press.
2. Pepper declared himself against the so-called "Lovestone thesis" by—being one of its authors and by signing it in the face of the whole Party.
3. Lovestone took a stand against the so-called "Pepper thesis" by—helping to clarify some of its formulations and by voting for it.

insist upon the discussion being conducted upon the basis of the real issues and disputed questions as directed by the Comintern and not upon such false issues. 6. Outstanding in the Plenum was the total failure of the Central Executive Committee Majority to appreciate the importance of building new industrial unions for the organization of the unorganized.

PAINTS LEADERS OF SOVIET UNION

50 Paintings Will Be Exhibited Soon

(Continued from Page One) finished colonies show in helping the colonists, giving them house room and making them feel at home while their houses are being built. "Colony 62," in the Crimea, has in it ten "mountain Jews," from Kavkaz, who look like real mountaineers, brot their own stone and timber and built their houses within three months. The harvest in the Crimea, says Horowitz is fairly good, as in other parts of the U.S. S. R. outside of the Ukraine, where a lack of rainfall did damage.

Pravda Comment A showing of the picture in Moscow, states Horowitz, brot much favorable comment in Pravda, Izvestia, Rabotchie Gazetta, and other papers. Horowitz was born in Russia, came to America in 1906 and studied in Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, which in 1917 bought a still life painting from him for its permanent collection. He had an exhibition in New York last May which was favorably commented upon by the New York press critics, and as a result of his work in this exhibition he was selected by Agrojoint for the Russian commission.

The Opposition must be very short of political arguments if it resorts to such a ridiculous statement as that Pepper is against the thesis which he signed and is for the Resolution against the Right Danger and Trotskyism, which was introduced to his report at the Plenum but which was signed by three other comrades who are the authors of the resolution.

The Opposition has permanent inner troubles and internal fights for "leadership." The letters of the various leaders and sub-leaders and sub-sub-leaders of the Opposition to each other and against each other reveal the fact that there was a serious fight within the Opposition between Cannon and Foster for "leadership" and simultaneously a struggle between Dunne and Cannon. Later a new struggle developed for "leadership" between Comrades Foster and Bittelmann. The results are known to the whole Party: Cannon is out of the Foster group, and Bittelmann is today the undisputed leader, members of the Opposition, in their correspondence, mentioning Comrade Foster only as the "ex-Chief."

The present Opposition is an unprincipled coalition of comrades who have only one aim, as it is stated many times in their correspondence, the overthrow of the so-called "Lovestone leadership," and who differ in political questions frequently and in many respects. It was just a few months ago that Comrade Foster refused to fight the present Central Executive Committee as a Right wing, and refused to make a report in Moscow against the trade union policies of the Central Executive Committee. We quote here a letter dated Moscow, August 31, 1928, which is signed by Comrades Bill Dunne, Hathaway, Gorman, Sam Don, Max Salzman, Harry Heywood, and Manuel Gomez and which states:

"At the same time the comrades of the former Foster group were having similar difficulty with Foster. He hesitated also in opening the fight against the Lovestone group as a right wing group and proposed to merely fight against certain right mistakes. On the criticism of Losovsky, the failure to endorse the R. I. U. Congress report, and the mistakes in the miners' struggle, he resisted every effort of the group to deal with these questions in the group, and in his speeches he tried to avoid them. In the American Commission, Bittelmann had to make the report because of Foster's refusal to admit the mistakes on the R. I. U. questions and the mistakes in writing the reply in the July Communist to the article of Cannon defending Losovsky. These questions were discussed in a very sharp manner in our group meeting here and resulted in certain tendencies toward a realignment of groupings in the Party."

The Opposition is trying to hold together its disintegrating following by the building up of a Frankenstein of disunity in the ranks of the Central Executive Committee. This policy is only the sign of the political bankruptcy of the Opposition, and is nothing by the continuation of their policy of "speculation" on so-called inner differences.

We want to state before the whole Party that since 1922, since the first discussion with the present Bittelmann-Foster group about how not to make a united front in Chicago and against the influence of the Fitzpatrick A. F. of L. group upon certain sections of our Party, we have always been working together politically very closely, that in all Party discussions in the last six years we have shared the same views and tried to combat, together with Comrade Ruthenberg, the erroneous opportunistic political opinions of the comrades around Bittelmann and Foster.

In the present Party discussion we state with the utmost emphasis that the so-called "Lovestone thesis" is the product of collective work, in which not only the signers of the thesis, Comrades Gitlow, Lovestone and Pepper, participated, but also other comrades, such as Comrades Weinstein and Minor, and that the Resolution against the Right Danger and Trotskyism is the result not only of the work of the comrades who signed it—Comrades Bedacht, Patrick, and Weinstein—but embodies many suggestions of Lovestone and Pepper also. There are no two lines in the majority of the C. E. C. There is only one political conception; there is only one leadership, which is neither the leadership of Lovestone nor of Pepper, nor of any other individual. It is the collective leadership of the C. E. C. It is a leadership which is based on common policies and on the support of the overwhelming majority of the proletarian membership of our Party.

JAY LOVESTONE, JOHN PEPPER.

ter, so little did Lovestone understand the problems of organizing the unorganized. The Pepper thesis, supported by speeches by Comrade Weinstein, laid down an even clearer opportunist perspective by laying a theoretical basis for the liquidation of the new unions and the rebuilding of the A. F. of L. The thesis on the present situation and the tasks of the Party, submitted to the Party Plenum by the Minority of the C. E. C., on the other hand, earnestly and sincerely reviews the objective causes of the Right errors committed by both groups of the Party. The Minority thesis lays down a correct analysis of the role and perspective of American imperialism, of the radicalization process which is taking place among the semi-skilled and un-

skilled workers, the movement to the right of the labor bureaucracy and its role of integrating the trade unions into the war machine of American imperialism, the increasing class differentiation on the farms and the urgent need of developing the class struggle on the farms, the utmost stress on developing the New Communist International line on Negro work, and for a perspective of sharpened class relations and class struggles highly intensified by the growing war danger. The Minority thesis lays down a correct line for struggle against opportunism on two fronts—against the open opportunism, the Right danger, which is the main danger, and against the opportunism covered with Left phrases, the Cannon-Trotsky opposition.

8. The Cannon-Trotsky opposition must be combatted in the most energetic manner. While playing with revolutionary phrases and covering itself with "Left" words, it is nothing else but opportunism and constitutes a counter-revolutionary force. The Party must systematically expose the opportunist and counter-revolutionary nature of the Trotsky-Cannon opposition and combat militantly the demoralizing activities of the renegades (Cannon, Abern, Schachtman, etc.), striving to liquidate this opposition in the shortest possible time. The Party must condemn the bringing in of these renegades to the Party Plenum by the Political Committee Majority and endorse the action of the Minority in voting and speaking against their admittance. The Plenum speech delivered by Cannon confirms his already evident complete bankruptcy. Cannon has joined with all the enemies of the Party and the Comintern. He will endeavor to utilize the differences within the Party to further his attack against the Party and to further his anti-Party, counter-revolutionary activities. But the way to counteract these efforts of Cannon is not to slacken the fight against the Right danger as the Majority does, but to wage the fight on two fronts—against both the Right danger and the Cannon-Trotsky opposition. The Party must bend all efforts to protect the proletarian elements from demoralizing effects of the Trotsky-Cannon opposition. The Minority calls upon the Party to fight determinedly and energetically against Cannon and for the winning of every worker for the Party and the Comintern.

9. The reports and speeches of comrades in the Plenum from all over the country, showing many mistakes made in the work, indicate beyond all question that the Right danger is the main danger in the Party. The Lovestone majority has fought resolutely against raising the fight against the Right danger, denying that there was any such danger, or any Right wing in the Party. In the resolutions of the May, 1928, Plenum there was no reference to the Right danger or to any Right errors. When the delegation went to Moscow, the C. E. C. Majority resisted with indignation all efforts of the Minority to point out the existence of the Right danger in our Party and to fight against it. This Plenum shows that the Minority in exposing the Right danger has done a real service to the Party and is mobilizing the Party in spite of the C. E. C. Majority, for effective struggle against the Right danger. The Minority declares its intention to continue its determined struggle against the Right danger as expressed in the Political Committee Majority's over-estimation of the power of the American imperialism and under-estimation of the radicalization of the working masses. We will fight just as sharply against this latest attempt of the Political Committee Majority to cover up its basically Right wing orientation by means of empty maneuvers. The Minority calls upon the Party membership to struggle against both the Right danger and Trotskyism and for the unification of the Party on the basis of a broad Bolshevik proletarian leadership drawn from all groupings on the basis of a correct line for our Party.

10. The discussion at the Plenum contributed greatly toward emphasizing the actuality of the war danger. The Party must familiarize itself with the discussion which took place as a means of clearing up its understanding of the forces working toward further imperialist wars. The Party must consolidate its ranks and proceed to organize the workers for the struggle against the war danger. All problems now facing the Party must be approached from the standpoint of this struggle against the war danger. A successful struggle against the war danger and capitalist rationalization demands an intensive fight against the Right danger as the main danger, against the Trotsky-Cannon opposition, and against reformism and pacifism among the working class.

CUT OUT THIS BLANK Sign! Put Your Name on This List of GREETINGS! to the



THESE NAMES ARE TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE Birthday Edition of the Daily Worker WHICH IS TO APPEAR JANUARY 5, 1929

Name Amount Remit to Daily Worker, 26-28 Union Square, New York City COLLECTED BY: NAME STREET CITY STATE Rates: \$1.00 per name. All names must be turned in by December 29th.

1852 THE SAME ADDRESS OVER 75 YEARS 1928 METROPOLITAN SAVINGS BANK ASSETS EXCEEDING \$30,000,000 Interest starts the 1st of Each Month. Deposits made on or before Jan. 1st, draws interest from January 1st. Interest for 3 months ending Dec. 31, 1928, at rate of 4 1/2% per annum on all sums from \$5 to \$7,500 has been declared payable Jan. 16, 1929. Open Mondays (all day) until 1 P. M. Banking by Mail Society Accounts Accepted We Sell A. B. A. Travelers Certified Checks No. 1 THIRD AVE. Cor. 7th St.

! Special Performance ! THE SHANGHAI DOCUMENT and the MINERS' STRIKE FILM Sunday, December 30th, at 2:30 p. m. CZECHO-SLOVAK WORKERS' HOUSE 347 EAST 72nd STREET Auspices: Local New York, Workers' International Relief. For the Benefit of the Textile Workers. Admission 50 Cents