

# 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. 5

PRICE: 15c

AUGUST, 1947

## Table of Contents

Towards a Marxist Party— Magic Caps and Monsters (Part II) .....	3
Three Letters from Los Angeles .....	9
Trotskyism—Open or Suttal .....	12
Reprint: Excerpts from F. N. Oleshchuko On the Struggle Against Fascism .....	18
Not Robots .....	20

### EDITORIAL BOARD

Louis Julia

Martha Samuel

I. Jacob

SPARK needs contributions urgently. Please send money orders,  
cash and stamps to the above address.

SPARK is obtainable from above address and at  
42 E. 14th Street Newsstand — near University Place, N. Y. C.

## TOWARDS A MARXIST PARTY

### *Magic Caps and Monsters*

#### II—EXPELLED COMRADE PERSEUS\*

##### 1. Polemic

If Comrade Perseus of the CPUSA draws his magic cap down over eyes, ears, and nose to protect him from the mythical monsters of split, disunity, factionalism, and contests of opinion, *Expelled* Comrade Perseus faces *related* monsters and wears a similar cap. Because Comrades expelled from the CPUSA should be the impetus behind progress towards a real Communist Party both inside and outside the CP, whatever mistakes are made *outside* confuse CP members inside and retard progress from every angle. The dangerous use of the magic cap inside the CP is directly affected by its use outside—and so, the expelled magic cap is the more dangerous at a time when Comrade Perseus, inside, is discarding his.

The expelled magic cap facilitates major incorrect attitudes and positions. Through its faithful use, Expelled Perseus can reject (1) the responsibility of an orderly polemic, (2) work with the rank-and-file of and in the CP, (3) everything in CP history and words and ideas currently "lip-serviced" by the CP, (4) the third party as the American application of the People's Front, (5) the U.N. and the possibilities for world cooperation, and (6) the will of people to influence events as against a vulgarized inevitability. In this issue we can consider only the first two points. These are important in laying the basis for the rest of the discussion (to be continued in SPARK No. 6).

Once Comrade Perseus recognizes and fights opportunism in the CP, he realizes that he must have open discussion. When he becomes Expelled Perseus, he finds the others who oppose opportunism and with them begins to work towards a real CP. Now Perseus is open-minded. All differences of opinion are legal—in fact, a little too *sacred*: to each his own. He feels that contest of opinion is incorrect and self-destructive. Perseus pulls at his cap and muses: "How can we countenance polemic among anti-opportunists when we have all we can do to start from nothing and build?" True, it's a shame. More—it's punishment: a burp from our sour, undigested history—and unavoidable. The proof for the need of polemic lies in the very lack of unity and, in turn, in the very lack of important organizational advances. There is still no national Marxist organ for the United States. There is only the beginning of a systematic linkage between groups. The time is here to "bat it out." The word "Marxism" plus the mood "militancy," set in the beautifying fog of fake unity, don't equal leadership.

There is no time like the beginning to forge (unavoidably with some heat and pressure) ideological unity. It would be great Communist efficiency to start a real CP for the U.S. with the right ideas. What a fantastic waste—to encourage a

\*Part I—Comrade Perseus, an Appeal to CP Members appeared in No. 4.

mutual-admiration hodgepodge which will disintegrate in the face of the first problem. Perseus can consider his personal opinions immune only until the first time he attempts collective action which never materializes on the *liberal plane of the equality of correct and incorrect ideas*. The PR Club has participated with other groups in attempts at collective action which came to naught because there was no ideological unity.

There is a difference between the ordinary run of criticism in a good Party and polemic. When basic differences which are not easily resolved occur (especially after periods of confusion and even degeneration), open argument designed to destroy the roots of dangerous misconceptions is needed. Unfortunately, it usually produces some temporary bad feelings between future friends. Fortunately, it also produces permanent enemies and isolates them from a movement to which they owe no sincere allegiance.

What is the correct method of polemic? One should state clearly one's own ideas—or nothing can be clear. Any later changes must be made openly with a self-critical analysis. Quiet, subtle revision, sneaked through to protect "infallibility," causes confusion, mistrust, and a subordination of a Party's interests to personal or cliqueish designs. *This point is on the agenda now* when new revolts in the CP must modify a wrong approach among some expelled people.

Having made clear one's own ideas, one must present the ideas under attack accurately, carefully quoting from the material con-

sidered. (Wild paraphrase is a little suspicious.) The important points should always be clearly separated from minor points; agreement on important points should not be dissipated during arguments on details. In such polemic the reader has the basis for a factual examination, the basis for checking theory with practice.

This SPARK has tried to do. The first issue of SPARK (April) offered a *Draft Transitional Program* "with the intention of stimulating the exchange of more definite opinions." It thought "a 'babel tower' of good and bad ideas inevitable at this stage"—that unity could come only through "open, definite statements"—that "where this has been lacking we have found fictitious unity—and sometimes foul play." It "encountered three main 'left' errors in connection with the fight against imperialist war and fascism . . . The first is the belief that participation in any form of Popular Front is merely disguised support for Capitalism . . . A second left concept is the opposition to the UNO . . . The third left error is the misconception of Marxist "inevitability." The same program asked for simultaneous work outside and inside the CPUSA, avoiding an a priori formula for the materialization of a real CP. "To work with the attitude of salvaging as much as possible is to prepare for either eventuality."

Our forecast of these errors was based on a realization of the long history of opportunism in the CPUSA and based on our own lessons in fighting opportunism before the liquidation of the Party and be-

fore the Duclos letter. We did not progressively "burn up" as B's letter in this issue implies. We foresaw the main areas of argument in the first place and struck out. After this, we developed and intensified our polemic as the dangerous ideas in our movement developed.

Not everything is good, as B says in his letter. We are certain he realizes that Trotskyite Sutta—at least—is not so good. The case of Sutta should engender in us a little more vigilance and a little more critical appraisal of "anti-opportunist" writings. We can't countenance anti-Soviet "potshots" or redbaiting. On these we are biased.

An examination of SPARKs will show that we have criticized only on the basis of ideas—not on the basis of personality or tone. B's letter was certain that NCP would react to our criticism with an outburst. The fact is that NCP has reacted only with anger and innuendo, but not with criticism. While it implied that SPARK did not allow it space, it never dared consider our position or its own defense in its weekly *Report*. This caution (in print *only*) is characteristic of NCP's attitude towards other positions.

In a letter to the Siberian Committee (Geneva, Oct. 30, 1904, Lenin bitterly wrote, "Even K. Kautsky announced in his letter to "ISKRA" that veiled polemics are worse than any others, for the question becomes tangled, hints remain obscure, straight answers are impossible."

The criticism involved in polemic should be helpful. Obviously SPARK isn't helped by the comrade

who calls us "immature." We were not told *on what point* we were immaturely incorrect and why. We have no collector's interest in the categories of immature, pre-mature, mature, or over-ripe. (Or were we "immaturely correct?")

The leisurely hobby of insinuation should be omitted—such as NCP Report's hoarse bark that SPARK was "illiterate." At that, the article had not the courage to name SPARK—only to identify it through reference to SPARK material. Only one thing is constructive in the letters from B and R in this issue—and that indirectly. They tell us how they feel, and that is important in taking inventory of our movement today. To their credit, they tell us frankly—a good basis for better feelings one day.

By now we are a little tired of enigmas. Our opinion is pretty low of Enigma Darcy who operates fluently behind the scenes, but refuses to commit himself. We know that Darcy's position is Dunne's, but even Dunne doesn't receive open support. It seems that if Dunne has appointed himself the "Pharoah" of the anti-opportunist movement, Darcy has appointed himself the "Sphinx."

In a letter which we cannot print in this issue, Fergus McKean criticizes us for not proving in more detail from the classics. He has a good point—but we have a precipice at the end of the page where the type falls off and laughs at our measly 16 pages. The extensive quoting in McKean's "Communism Versus Opportunism" is of great value. In this little magazine we have to quote briefly and choicely.

mutual-admiration hodgepodge which will disintegrate in the face of the first problem. Perseus can consider his personal opinions immune only until the first time he attempts collective action which never materializes on the *liberal plane of the equality of correct and incorrect ideas*. The PR Club has participated with other groups in attempts at collective action which came to naught because there was no ideological unity.

There is a difference between the ordinary run of criticism in a good Party and polemic. When basic differences which are not easily resolved occur (especially after periods of confusion and even degeneration), open argument designed to destroy the roots of dangerous misconceptions is needed. Unfortunately, it usually produces some temporary bad feelings between future friends. Fortunately, it also produces permanent enemies and isolates them from a movement to which they owe no sincere allegiance.

What is the correct method of polemic? One should state clearly one's own ideas—or nothing can be clear. Any later changes must be made openly with a self-critical analysis. Quiet, subtle revision, sneaked through to protect "infallibility," causes confusion, mistrust, and a subordination of a Party's interests to personal or cliqueish designs. *This point is on the agenda now* when new revolts in the CP must modify a wrong approach among some expelled people.

Having made clear one's own ideas, one must present the ideas under attack accurately, carefully quoting from the material con-

sidered. (Wild paraphrase is a little suspicious.) The important points should always be clearly separated from minor points; agreement on important points should not be dissipated during arguments on details. In such polemic the reader has the basis for a factual examination, the basis for checking theory with practice.

This SPARK has tried to do. The first issue of SPARK (April) offered a *Draft Transitional Program* "with the intention of stimulating the exchange of more definite opinions." It thought "a 'babel tower' of good and bad ideas inevitable at this stage"—that unity could come only through "open, definite statements"—that "where this has been lacking we have found fictitious unity—and sometimes foul play." It "encountered three main 'left' errors in connection with the fight against imperialist war and fascism . . . The first is the belief that participation in any form of Popular Front is merely disguised support for Capitalism . . . A second left concept is the opposition to the UNO . . . The third left error is the misconception of Marxist "inevitability." The same program asked for simultaneous work outside and inside the CPUSA, avoiding an a priori formula for the materialization of a real CP. "To work with the attitude of salvaging as much as possible is to prepare for either eventuality."

Our forecast of these errors was based on a realization of the long history of opportunism in the CPUSA and based on our own lessons in fighting opportunism before the liquidation of the Party and be-

fore the Duclos letter. We did not progressively "burn up" as B's letter in this issue implies. We foresaw the main areas of argument in the first place and struck out. After this, we developed and intensified our polemic as the dangerous ideas in our movement developed.

Not everything is good, as B says in his letter. We are certain he realizes that Trotskyite Sutta—at least—is not so good. The case of Sutta should engender in us a little more vigilance and a little more critical appraisal of "anti-opportunist" writings. We can't countenance anti-Soviet "potshots" or redbaiting. On these we are biased.

An examination of SPARKs will show that we have criticized only on the basis of ideas—not on the basis of personality or tone. B's letter was certain that NCP would react to our criticism with an outburst. The fact is that NCP has reacted only with anger and innuendo, but not with criticism. While it implied that SPARK did not allow it space, it never dared consider our position or its own defense in its weekly *Report*. This caution (in print *only*) is characteristic of NCP's attitude towards other positions.

In a letter to the Siberian Committee (Geneva, Oct. 30, 1904, Lenin bitterly wrote, "Even K. Kautsky announced in his letter to 'ISKRA' that veiled polemics are worse than any others, for the question becomes tangled, hints remain obscure, straight answers are impossible."

The criticism involved in polemic should be helpful. Obviously SPARK isn't helped by the comrade

who calls us "immature." We were not told *on what point* we were immaturity incorrect and why. We have no collector's interest in the categories of immature, pre-mature, mature, or over-ripe. (Or were we "immaturely correct?")

The leisurely hobby of insinuation should be omitted—such as NCP Report's hoarse bark that SPARK was "illiterate." At that, the article had not the courage to name SPARK—only to identify it through reference to SPARK material. Only one thing is constructive in the letters from B and R in this issue—and that indirectly. They tell us how they feel, and that is important in taking inventory of our movement today. To their credit, they tell us frankly—a good basis for better feelings one day.

By now we are a little tired of enigmas. Our opinion is pretty low of Enigma Darcy who operates fluently behind the scenes, but refuses to commit himself. We know that Darcy's position is Dunne's, but even Dunne doesn't receive open support. It seems that if Dunne has appointed himself the "Pharoah" of the anti-opportunist movement, Darcy has appointed himself the "Sphinx."

In a letter which we cannot print in this issue, Fergus McKean criticizes us for not proving in more detail from the classics. He has a good point—but we have a precipice at the end of the page where the type falls off and laughs at our measly 16 pages. The extensive quoting in McKean's "Communism Versus Opportunism" is of great value. In this little magazine we have to quote briefly and choicely.

Often, we can refer only to the source. Sometimes we have been forced to summarize carefully a page of Dimitroff because of space limits. Then it is dismaying to see those thoughts attacked as opportunism. We hope our regular reprint is an indication of our attitude.

McKean, the L.A. group and others, have suggested an organ representative of all the anti-opportunist groups. We have tried this with others, but an organ did not materialize because there (1) was no ideological unity, and (2) in the absence of such unity, there was, unfortunately, no acceptance of the principle of open polemic. It's never too soon to try again, but we could all help avoid needless fiascos by making our positions clear beforehand. This is a responsibility of every group and individual now. And this is the main content of our argument for polemic and our original reason for issuing SPARK: to pull all positions into the open, to make differences clear, and to accelerate the discussion in order to help pave the way for a representative organ. All this will pave the way, in turn, for a real CP.

## 2. Work in the CPUSA

The PR Club has repeatedly argued that it is incorrect to decide now which of the two concentrations—in or out—will produce a real CP in the U.S. The effectiveness of our organizational and ideological contact work will decide that. There can be no reform in the CP by its leaders. There will be revolts by the rank and file, but these alone will not do the trick. There *can* be a rescue of the CP or an important part of it through the

organization of a strong anti-opportunist movement outside with extensive links inside the CP and with international factors helping these two conditions. In other words, if there develops a clear corps outside, coordinated with "illegal" activity inside the CP, then the pressure of the opinions of our brother parties can either make possible a rescue of the CPUSA or take its membership—even if the NC boys refuse to part with the formal apparatus. It is important to realize that the good advice of our brother parties is for the time incapacitated by the fact that after their advice, the present NC would adopt the advice nominally, immediately give it lip-service—and BURY IT. On the other hand, Communists and workers generally would have no clearly defined national organization to which to turn.

The present NC must be taboo. It belongs in no Communist Party. The leadership of the real CP would have to be fresh and trustworthy. While we must damn the leadership, there must be no smug condescension towards the rank-and-file of the CP. Opportunism is an extensive disease. If the CP'ers have wrong ideas, so do many of the expelled people. There is no room for "categories," and a pompous, self-righteous attitude towards CP'ers is as ignorant as a Communist's immodest attitude towards a non-Communist. At the same time it is important to tell CP'ers bluntly what "their" responsibility is. (There is a group of CP members, whether leaders or not, whom we will have to watch for a long time to come: those who know better but

wait for the "safe" time to chime in—fair weather pilots of "revolutionary upsurge." They have developed the facility for drifting with any trend and not ruffling their respectability. These authorities can always "go far" but can never be depended on for vigilance or real integrity. They will be ready at any time to greet an accomplished Marxist party with a prepared "leadership sermon.")

R's letter blames us for our moral tone and idealist attitude towards CP members. He writes, "It seems to say that CPUSA members are to blame if they don't suddenly see that their party is opportunistic and try to change it. A new CP would open the eyes of many who are not hopelessly corrupted." This sounds pretty good but there's a "booby-trap" ahead. R, it seems, defends CP members long enough to criticize us, and having finished criticizing us, he's finished with their defense. The very next sentence reads, "But are there many such?" We won't hairsplit the word "many." The point is that a job is being done in the CP, and R's attitude impedes the job.

The Leninist conception of combined legal and illegal work applies within the Party itself. We are illegal in the CP. Therefore we work in it illegally (and we do) for contacts, salvage operations, for links, for the development of a corps inside. We do this so that the rank-and-file may learn through their experience as we did. We work for that coordination which will prepare a climax capable of destroying opportunism as a "respectable" force (i.e., operating in the

name of a CP).

McKean writes us that the only reason for work inside would be "to lead a small split or to secure a more advantageous moment to publicly denounce the Party and resign from it." And even then, he feels that this must take only a few days or at the most 3 weeks. On what basis can we set such a limit? There are many factors. The CPUSA's pressured NC has at different times frantically applied the tactics of "rapid expulsion," "no expulsion," and "delayed expulsion." More important is the perspective of better accomplishments to be had by staying in longer—until a situation is "ripe." Revolts in the CP will logically occur in waves, but these waves are made, and we have to make them. There must be real Communists in the CP, to reject the daily dish of opportunism. Of course, they can be effective only in coordination with the open front of anti-opportunism outside the CP.

McKean states that it is dangerous to encourage workers to stay in the CP because "an opportunist environment generates opportunism in all concerned." "An opportunist party is bound to attract not the revolutionary workers but opportunist types." Until there is something better than the CP, one cannot decide that the CP attracts only opportunists. As a result of their experiences workers still approach the CP and it is criminal to confuse their budding socialist ideology with the accomplished opportunist crime of the CP—rotting pseudo-Socialist ideology. Lost in the swamp of sellouts today, there are a few correct spontaneous actions that teach workers, that send them in the di-

rection of a CP. True, they do not know that this CP is a fake, that even its defense (?) of the Soviet Union is lipservice. But for this let us not relegate them to the category of opportunists.

We don't believe in wasteful recruiting to the CP. There is, however, a simple logic operating in advice to stay in and work. The members who are too far gone at the moment don't accept such advice anyway; those who do accept our advice will stay in with a conscious, disciplined purpose and direction. These cannot be corrupted. Lenin said that a Communist who is dependable can operate in any corrupting circumstances. To remain incorruptible by *avoiding* corrupt territory is a leftist virtue—a "cloistered virtue."

We must have a calm organizational plan—not one based on anger towards a miseducated membership in the CP. Where there is something to be gained for a real CP we'll work. We repeat, we've found some of these valuable people, and those who haven't should look harder—but not decide they don't exist.

R wonders at the low rank-and-filism and the lack of political reason in our expulsion. Can R consider it low rank-and-filism and un-

political to have called Browder's ideas opportunism, revisionism, tailism,—and even pragmatism long before the liquidation of the CP and long before the Duclos letter; to have exposed Foster and the fake reform after the Duclos letter; to have built a new branch specifically to fight opportunism inside the Party and thus earn the designation of "best club" in N.Y.C.; to have educated a branch in anti-opportunist literature and work until it was prepared to force the issue with an "S.O.S. to All Communists" from a Party branch; to have followed this up with a polemical magazine designed to project a program and fight both right and left deviations in the Expelled movement?

Our anti-opportunism *is in the record*—available to anyone who is interested. We have not had the space for it in SPARK.

There has to be a system to the fight for a real CP. We laid our plans during the war, and we have followed them. The attitude that produced an S.O.S. is producing new plans, new revolts, and new declarations in the CP—even in unexpected parts of the U.S. The most heartening letters and news, unfortunately, we have been unable to print. *But there are whirlwinds in the bowels of the CP.*

SPARK is eager to receive the detailed opinions of its readers—whether for publication or not. We welcome your suggestions and criticism.

We will be glad to help you obtain any literature not easily available in your locality.

## THREE LETTERS FROM LOS ANGELES

Dear Comrades: July 12, 1947

Fourteen years ago without knowing why, I was an anti-Communist. Somebody gave me a *Daily Worker* to read. It sounded very good. In two weeks I was a member of the CP—because the D.W. sounded good. Almost everything I read sounded good.

In '41 they told us that we would have to break up the Industrial Branches—that didn't sound good. When I read Browder's "Peace and Teheran," that didn't sound good. I was afraid that those comrades that I had just recruited, on the basis of fighting for Socialism, would accuse me of bringing them in under false pretenses if they read "Peace and Teheran." I was ashamed to sell it to my contacts, to whom I constantly spoke about Socialism, for fear that they would accuse me of misrepresentation.

Then, Duclos' letter came. That sounded very good. But, in a short while everything that I read in the CP press and literature didn't sound good. Last year I was expelled from the Party. I picked up the *Militant*—that didn't sound good. I read *Labor Action*—that sounded terrible.

Somebody must have put my name on NCP's list. I started to read NCP—that sounded very good. I read Darcy's letter—that sounded good. I read Burt Sutta's pamphlet—that sounded good. I read Dunne's pamphlet—that sounded good. I read correspondence from San Francisco—that sounded good. I read SOS and SPARK—that sounded good.

SPARK and NCP who published

regularly, were getting better all the time. Then what happened? All the various groups started to attack Dunne and Dunne's pamphlet. So, I took Dunne's pamphlet and burned it up, and I rubbed Dunne's name off the list. Then Sutta was attacked, so I burnt Sutta's pamphlet and rubbed his name off the list. Darcy and Keith were attacked, so I rubbed them off the list.

But, there was still SPARK and NCP. In the second issue of SPARK, NCP attacked SPARK in a letter in a very sarcastic manner, with which I disagreed. Then what happened—SPARK got burnt up and in their third issue devoted the whole pamphlet to an attack on NCP. So, I rubbed NCP off the list and burnt up their material.

But we still had SPARK left. I am afraid to read NCP's next attack on SPARK, as then I will have nothing to read, and I will be back where I was when I was expelled from the CP.

As I said before, when I read all of the various reports, analysis, etc., I thought they were all pretty good. I still think that every one of these groups have something to offer. Many of the people, with whom I have spoken, also feel the same way. I think that instead of all of these groups attacking one another where they differ, that they should learn from each other what is good. Every group with which I've come in contact has developed in their thinking with each new discussion, report, etc. If they continue working with one another, helping and learning from one another, we will arrive at

the same conclusions, some sooner, some later. But, if we continue to attack one another and just harp on the mistakes and errors, we will weaken and destroy the very things which we are striving to build. Let us not attempt to be Purists.

We will all make mistakes and continue to make them, but these will be overcome in the course of our development. Let us have more self-criticism—constructive criticism—and, by all means, let us attempt to work collectively instead of in opposition to one another. B.

P.S.—Just received a bulletin from SFCC—that sounds pretty good, too.

Dear Sirs: Aug. 18, 1947

I think Allinger's criticism in SPARK No. 4 is quite timely. SPARK must not carry on a "warfare" against other groups such as NCP which has certainly done a very useful job and is doing one. All I can say is that NCP, Dunne's booklet, and SPARK have each in their own way helped me a great deal in understanding the present situation. I must say though that SPARK is weakest and that I think that it is because it doesn't see that a new CP is necessary and tends to fall into an idealistic form of criticism of CPUSA members. There is a kind of moral tone in this criticism which I find objectionable. It seems to say that CPUSA members are to blame if they don't suddenly see that their party is opportunistic and try to change it. A new CP would open up the eyes of many who are not hopelessly corrupted. But are there many such? Also the differences between the political line of SPARK and the CPUSA are

not too clear. If there isn't too much difference why get out of the CPUSA? Somehow the SOS letter though it was a great help to me and others wasn't clear enough on the main thing—what was the political reason for the expulsions? Neglecting to make this clear made it seem an expression of low rank-and-filism.

Statements of fact that are not proved show a lack of integrity. In SPARK No. 4—"Why is the CPUSA snubbed by the great CP's of the world . . ." (page 4) "And then there will be a CI . . ." (page 6) Do you have any evidence to prove such statements?

Perhaps SPARK doesn't see the depth of the problem today and sees the solution as an easy one, accomplished by superficial changes of leadership or the introduction of more "democracy" into the CPUSA, or some such panacea, instead of the real problem of fighting opportunism in the U.S. working class movement with all its ramifications, and building a revolutionary movement.

I don't mean my criticisms to sound as harsh as they seem, as I am forced to write this hurriedly and am not too good at expressing myself, but I do look forward to seeing an improvement in the style of work that SPARK is doing.

Yours truly, R.

August 21, 1947

Dear SPARK Comrades:

Have read with great interest your No. 4 issue about comrade P and must express my agreement, on the whole, with the position you have taken. You have made "seven league strides" since your No. 1 issue.

I feel that this fight for a revolutionary, Marxist Party is one that must be waged both from within and without the party. The core of any such movement has to be from such peoples, and it requires a determined straggle not to become a sectarian movement, isolated from both, and or, party people and non-party people.

Here in L. A. there are a minimum of Marxist study circles, and the fight will be waged on our attitude towards those who are still in the party. To ignore and to hold in contempt those who remain in the CP is to permit the corrupt leadership to carry on their corrupt practices without any effective opposition. As we who leave the party should know, it took for us each a different length of time to see the CP for what it is. Our development is not even, and we must recognize that factor in evaluating what effect life will have on the various honest people who still believe that there is no other movement, i.e., the present CP, possible at the present moment.

I know there are some comrades in L.A.—expelled—who sit back and bemoan the lack of activity towards the exposure of the present leadership. These same comrades refuse to help those within the party to carry on an effective fight against the corrupt leadership, for a convention, etc. They even don't want to talk to party members, as they consider them hopeless. Is that any different from the CP members who refuse to talk to expelled comrades? These same expelled ones even wonder why we don't get another "Duclos" letter. Is that attitude dif-

ferent from that of CP members who wonder why the European CP's don't help us to fight against our Imperialists?

I can see that revisionism and its incorrect thinking has struck its roots deep into the comrades—both in and expelled. It requires a determined effort to get out of the marshes of Menshevism and back to the highlands of Bolshevik thinking. It requires patience and Marxist understanding.

For these reasons, I am glad to subscribe to SPARK, and trust we can carry on together towards a revolutionary party capable of storming the citadel of capitalism and its main ally, social democracy.

Comradely, E.

Frisco, August 24, 1947

Dear Comrades of the PR Club:

At the meeting of the Working Committee of the SFCC, the article entitled "A Letter from Frisco" which was written by me and was printed in the July issue of SPARK, was read and discussed and this writer was corrected in re an error where I stated, "The Committee did, I believe, at one of the meetings I was absent from, endorse SPARK's "Draft Transitional Program" with one or two minor corrections. I do not have the minutes with me so can not say which ones."

I was informed by the Committee that the body has at no time endorsed any program. What was done was that the action referred to was by one of the Marxist classes. The Working Committee requests that if possible, you make this correction in an early issue of SPARK.

Comradely greetings,

H. ALLINGER, for the SFCC.

## TROTSKYISM—OPEN OR SUTTAL

(The following excerpts are taken from a letter sent to the different anti-opportunist groups in the U.S. Some of the documentation has been omitted because of space limits. The complete letter may be had on request.)

August 20, 1947

Dear Comrades:

We have recently received and read the article by Burt Sutta entitled "The 'SPARK' and the Fight for a Revolutionary Party." Undoubtedly you have received a copy. We hope you have read it carefully and will agree with our letter. The PR Club feels that because this article is clearly Trotskyism, it is the duty of every group and individual in the anti-opportunist movement to repudiate the article and break all connections with Sutta. Furthermore, we will not have any relations with any group (or individual) which finds it possible to countenance Sutta and Trotskyism.

In discussing Sutta's article, we will not defend our position, we will not defend the position of the S.U., and we will not polemicize with Sutta because "we cannot permit a literary discussion with the Trotskyite smugglers" (Stalin). We are interested only in pointing out the Trotskyism, with the valuable aid of Sutta's own words. Through omission, implication, distortion, *but mostly through actual* statement, Sutta attacks the Soviet Union Stalin, the New Democracies of the Balkans, the CPSU and the Communist Parties throughout the world. We believe the Soviet Union's policy is correct and we believe those who

attack it are not Communists nor do they have any place within the Marxist movement. Furthermore, we think unimportant the liberal question of the conscious or unconscious factor in Sutta's Trotskyism. All his thoughts lead to one conclusion—the destruction of the S. U. That is enough to judge by.

The PR Club did not criticize Sutta's earlier pamphlet (which was ambiguous enough to deceive many people) because after private discussions with him, we felt that his ideas would appear in more crystallized form. At the last of our discussions with Sutta before SPARK was first issued, we warned him that his position approached Trotskyism. His reply was that this worried him too, that the arguments of a certain Trotskyite seemed valid. He also attacked the French and Italian parties vehemently. In a letter to us, he expressed his intention of writing an article to this effect, as well as one criticizing SPARK's "Draft Transitional Program." Apparently it served his purposes to combine the two—by using his criticism of SPARK as a vehicle through which to attack the SU and the CPSU.

Sutta says "... The Soviet Union, in its participation in the UN, does not use this bourgeois organization as a platform from which to preach Socialism, or to expose the contradiction between the workers and the capitalist states. Its role in the struggles there is to hide the class differences among the 'Great Powers.' The terms most widely used by the Soviet delegates are not class

terms, but terms that reflect the petty bourgeois classless approach to society. The commonest ones are: 'Peaceloving (!!!?) nations,' 'freedom-loving peoples,' etc. The Soviet Union tries in the UNO to paint itself not as a nation different and hostile to the capitalist states, but as the same in every respect. For that reason they have managed to appear before the workers not as the champions of Socialism, but as another nation which is always raising objections on points of procedure.

"In its desire to be agreeable, the Soviet Union has taken many steps that cannot be defended. The worst of these was the agreement to turn over to the United States as colonies (trusteeships) the islands conquered from Japan. That a Socialist state could be the sponsor of a motion calling for the enslavement of millions of people to the U. S. imperialists is incredible. The entire line on disarmament, likewise . . . Why the S.U. pursues such a policy in the UNO, I do not know. I do know of no way in which Marxists can support such a policy, which does nothing but disarm and demoralize the working class on a world scale" (p. 13, 14).

Could any state based on the principles of Marxism be accused of worse? Could any worker reading this article find any reason to defend the S.U. or fight for Socialism? Let the following quote from Stalin answer any doubts concerning the insidious method of attacking the very foundations of the Soviet Union and world Socialism.

"The chief conclusion to be drawn is that the working class of our

country, having abolished the exploitation of man by man and firmly established the Socialist system, has proved to the world the truth of its cause. . . .

"It must be confessed that the bourgeoisie and its agents among the working class have to some extent succeeded in poisoning the minds of the working class with the venom of doubt and scepticism. If the successes of the working class of our country, if its fight and victory serve to rouse the spirit of the working class in the capitalist countries and to strengthen its faith in its own power and in its victory, then our party may say that its work has not been in vain." (P. 61-62, "From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union" by J. Stalin.)

Sutta paints a black picture of the outcome of World War II. On P. 9 he states, "There is not a single major power in Europe where the working class was able to prevent fascism within capitalism."

He omits the fact that the temporary defeat of the working class was followed by tremendous victories, that at present fascism has been able to triumph anew only in Greece—and even there the question is by no means decided . . . Burying socialism, Sutta continues: "The amazing thing about the situation this time is not the strength of the workers' movement and the weakness of capitalism but the opposite." And further, "After this war in which on the field of battle, the Socialist system proved its superiority to the decaying capitalist one—after all this there is *not one proletarian revolution anywhere in the world!*" (P. 2, Sutta's italics.)

That "on the field of battle," the S.U. proved its superiority, Sutta has to concede because, after all the S.U. did "win." But Sutta neutralizes this concession with the courageous conviction that the Soviet Union is *weaker now*. (See below.) Sutta proceeds to prove the weakness of the working class of the world by citing as examples, fascist Germany where literally every revolutionary worker was wiped out before the attack on the S. U. could even begin, and "Pax Americana" U.S.A. where the working class is disunified, where there is no Communist Party, and where Fascism is on the upswing. He omits the great triumphs of the working class *all over the world . . .*

He attacks as opportunist our statement that: "The prevention of Fascism depends on a real Communist Party; on a militant united working class; on the correct attitude of the working class to its allies; and on vigilance and a properly timed offensive" (from SPARK's "Draft Transitional Program.")

This statement is nothing more than an accurate summary (because of space limits) of the four conditions for preventing fascism given by G. Dimitroff in "United Front Against Fascism" (p. 22, New Century Publishers). The reader will note this by checking the source. Of this formulation of Dimitroff, Sutta warns: ". . . the entire reformist position not only of the PR Club but of the CP is based upon the position of the PR Club quoted above as against Lenin's position" (p. 6).

No this is not the position of the

CPUSA, but it is the position of the leaders of world Communism, of Dimitroff and Stalin, of the Seventh World Congress of the C.I. And these leaders, Sutta pits against Lenin . . .

By quoting Lenin on ". . . the absolute inevitability of a dictatorship of the extreme reactionaries (Kornilov in Russia, Kapp and Co. in Germany) as the only alternative to a dictatorship of the proletariat" (p. 6), a situation which was not in reference to fascism but to the particular period when Germany and Russia were in a state of civil war with the possibility of achieving the dictatorship of the proletariat, Sutta concludes: "Thus the position of Lenin is that either the fascist dictatorship or the proletarian dictatorship is the only choice." This Lenin never said in the above quote or elsewhere, and this has been repeatedly refuted by the world Communist movement today.

In line with his opposition to the bona fide Communist position of fighting fascism is his opposition to the third party of which he states: "In the U.S. it is the slogan of the reformists and the petty bourgeoisie also. It is the talk of a party which is worthy of being called "vanguard" to aspire to lead the workers to socialist consciousness and not to drag socialism back to trade unionism."

But our characterization of the third party was defined by Dimitroff as "a specific form of the mass people's front in America that should be set up in opposition to the parties of the trusts and the banks, and likewise to growing fascism. Such a party of course will be *neither* So-

cialist *nor* Communist. But it *must* be an anti-fascist party and must *not* be an anti-Communist party." (Dimitroff, *United Front Against Fascism*, P. 40. Italics in the original.) Furthermore, it is quite well-known now that the Soviet Union believes that such a party is necessary in the U.S.A. Boris Vronski, whom we have often quoted in our material, has written a pamphlet on political parties in the U.S. indicating the necessity for a third party.

Sutta says (1) that we "counterpoise the present bourgeois-democratic form of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie against the fascist one." *This is true*. Sutta continues (2) "They state, by implication, that *in this form* the will of the people is decisive and that *in the fascist form*, the will of the bourgeoisie is decisive" (p. 6). Only Sutta's considered distortion could make us responsible "by implication" for the second part of the above statement, *which is in direct contradiction to the first*.

In "State and Revolution" (p. 59), Lenin says: ". . . the democratic republic is the nearest approach to the dictatorship of the proletariat . . ."

Now let us follow Sutta's systematic burial of the Soviet Union. "The Soviet Union emerged from the war not stronger, but weaker . . . The current five year plan calls for the same pre-war level of production and the complete rebuilding of the devastation caused by the war only in 1948:

"To state that there is no longer a capitalist encirclement of the Soviet Union is obvious nonsense"

(p. 2).

. . . What chicanery it is for Sutta to pick the year 1948, which is *only half way* through the five year plan and let the reader assume that this is the end of the five year period. The Russian Five-Year Plan is from 1946-50 as stated in the title of the plan. In the words of the Law:

"The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.R.R. declares that the principal aims of the Five-Year Plan for the Rehabilitation and Development of the National Economy of the U.S.-S.R. in 1946-50 are to rehabilitate the devastated regions of the country, to recover the pre-war level in industry and agriculture, *and then considerably to surpass that level*."

. . . Only Sutta's wishful thinking based on lies could produce a Soviet Union weaker.

In discussing the specific conditions prerequisite for the emergence of the Balkan New Democracies, E. Varga (in "Democracy of a New Type" in *Labour Monthly*, August, 1947) includes: "3. The moral, diplomatic, and economic support which these countries find in the Soviet Union. Without this support the states of democracy of a new type would be hard put to it to withstand the attacks of reaction, both external and internal. Very edifying in this respect is Greece."

The Balkan Democracies can never be used as a springboard for an attack on the S.U. Gone is the time of cordon sanitaires surrounding the land of Socialism. (The Soviet Union's own estimate of its strength of course means nothing to Sutta.)

Sutta . . . says: "This concept of the possibility of peaceful collabora-



tion between the capitalist states and the Soviet Union is nothing more than an attempt to conciliate the two irreconcilable classes" (p. 3).

In answer to Alexander Werth, Stalin stated, "I unconditionally believe it is possible."

This and our statement that "The American people are tired of war" are what Sutta calls the "petty bourgeois idealist position." But this is what Stalin has stated over and over again—that war is not imminent because: "Not a single great power, even if its government were anxious to do so, could now raise a large army to fight another allied power, another great power, because now one cannot possibly fight without one's people—and *the people are unwilling to fight. They are tired of war.* And besides, there are no understandable objectives to justify a new war." (Interview with Elliot Roosevelt.) . . .

By misusing a statement from Lenin, Sutta insists that "the wishes of the workers or of the toiling masses" cannot influence the drive toward war. Sutta, however, does not believe that history is made by people, whose very struggles against war and fascism teach them the necessity for Socialism. As Lenin so often pointed out, workers learn through their own experience, and it is not enough to argue as Sutta does over and over again, that no immediate demands can be won without first attaining Socialism. It is this mechanical approach which underlies his lack of faith in the victory of the working class—a *common denominator of Trotskyism.*

How does Sutta's burial procession move? He states that there is

*greater and greater reaction* after this war, that the S.U. is weaker, that there is *no possibility of peaceful collaboration* between the S.U. and the capitalist countries, that *the people will not be able to stop the inevitable war.* But if all this is true, what is the conclusion: *that the weaker Soviet Union will be defeated in the inevitable war!* . . .

With all the finesse of a veteran Trotskyite, Sutta proceeds to give "necessary tactical" lipservice to the S. U.:

"It is necessary for all who are for the Socialist Revolution to defend the Soviet Union. It is the job of the Marxists to point out that the S.U. represents a new type of state—the dictatorship of the proletariat. We must constantly remind the workers and toiling masses that the S.U., with all its difficulties and mistakes, is a million times better for them than the best capitalist state."

Sutta is no arithmetical moron. He knows that *capitalism* x 1,000,000 = *Socialism is untrue.* Therefore the Soviet Union is not Socialist. Simple arithmetic. The above quote is written with a subtle choice of words lifted from the "Militant" and "Labor Action," Trotskyite rags. Sutta even gives lipservice to fighting Trotskyism, as have other Trotskyites who attempted to infiltrate into our group. A purely tactical statement: "Without this we will degenerate to the level of Trotskyites."

As for the Trotskyite position (on the UNO) in their own words, it is exactly Sutta's own in his definition of the role of the proletariat:

"We oppose imperialist wars and wars against the workers' state, the S.U. We oppose the UNO for it is behind the cloak of fine speeches there that the bourgeoisie conceals its moves to war. We know that only the transfer of power from the capitalists to the workers can prevent war and oppose the UN because it creates illusions among the workers and diverts them from the revolutionary struggle" (p. 11-12).

But these are simply the stock phrases of the Trotskyites. Sutta "brilliantly" omitted the next ingredient—talk about the "bureaucracy" that runs the Soviet Union.

Throughout Sutta never uses the word Communist in relation to the present day bona fide Marxist movement because he does not believe it is Communist. Put differently, he does not believe present day world Communism is bona fide Marxism. His unnamed attacks against Stalin in particular, as well as Dimitroff via the warnings against faith in "great men" is all too obvious. With care and conscientiousness, this concealed Trotskyite believes that by concealing the name of Stalin throughout the article, he can hide his anti-Stalinism. Merely substitute Stalin for "great men" in such statements as the following and you will have a true picture of where Sutta stands:

"We do not believe that because 'great men' (Stalin) say something, it therefore becomes true" (p. 13).

"Only Marxism bases its theory not on the ideas of this or that great man, (Stalin) but upon the world as it actually exists."

On the other hand, with the inevitable technique of the Trotsky-

ites, Sutta does base himself on a few selected words of one great man—Lenin—and does his best through misapplied quotations to create a chasm between Lenin and Stalin. Simultaneously, this exposes his hypocrisy on the subject of "great men" and his misuse of one against other, Stalin vs Lenin. . . .

Communists should always painstakingly defend the S.U. and explain endlessly to non-Communists. We should never succumb to a CPUSA-type witch-hunt in answer to sincere questions from new Comrades. But, let us *never* slip into a legalization of an anti-Soviet discussion among Communists. Why? Because *Anti-Soviet "Communism" is Trotskyism.*

The PR Club has tried to check its position against the writings, historical and current, of the world Communist movement. More than ever, all Communists, within and without the CPUSA must do this conscientiously. Notice how well the anti-UN, anti-third party ideas, the vulgarized inevitability attitude fits into the line of a Sutta. The S.U. stands for the UN, *for a third party in the U.S., for the attitude that people have a power to influence events.*

No Communist should ever adopt the unscientific mechanism of Sutta: "It is necessary, for example, that we regard the fundamental theories upon which we based our activities as members of the CP as wrong unless they can be proven right." Such an arbitrary attitude serves Sutta's purposes—not ours, his direction—not ours.

The PR Club's final thought is  
(Continued on Inside Cover)

**Excerpts:****F. N. Oleshchuko on Struggle Against Fascism**

(The following are taken from "The Struggle of the Democratic Forces for the Final Defeat of Fascism" delivered in Moscow in June 1946 by Oleshchuko, member of the CPSU.)

How can Fascism be destroyed? Some answer glibly that it can be destroyed if capitalism is destroyed.

History is made by people.... If there had been a united anti-Fascist front, the war would have been impossible. The disunity of the workers was what enabled Fascism to triumph. But there is nothing inevitable about Fascism. Its strength or weakness depends on the relationships between classes in a society.

What is the situation now? Fascism is defeated, true. But the bourgeois-capitalist world still retains the sources which feed Fascism. The same contradictions continue to exist in capitalism as did before. The tendency to beat down the working class, struggle against democratic liberation movements in the liberated countries, oppose the wishes of socialist countries—all these are bourgeois capitalist manifestations on the basis of which Fascism continues to exist.

The war brought great changes in the imperialist camp. The general result of the war was to weaken imperialism and capitalism. France, Italy and Germany, three great imperialisms, are all weakened. A great democratic movement exists in Bulgaria, Roumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Finland. The power of the Soviet Union has greatly increased. It all adds up to

a weakening of capitalism . . .

The U.S.A. and Great Britain are now supporting Fascism in the hope of using it to fight democracy and the Soviet Union. There is, of course, a much greater menace in the U.S.A. because it emerged the strongest of all capitalist countries, and imperialist circles in the U.S.A. are more and more preaching Fascist plans and methods.

The strength of world Democracy today is based on the existence of the Soviet Union which is the opposite pole to the U.S.A. and Great Britain in the struggle against reaction. . . .

The Soviet Union is one of the initiators of the Charter of the United Nations. It feels that international cooperation must be based on unanimous agreement on major issues. It has brought up the issues of Greece and Spain in an effort to show that it is impossible to build lasting peace unless we get rid of the Fascists who brought on this war. The Soviet Union energetically defends the principle of international cooperation, without which peace is impossible. The Soviet Union is prepared to make compromises when necessary, but not on principles.

The fact that the Soviet Union emerged from the war as the greatest power in the world and is constantly growing stronger has resulted in strengthening democracy in the world. If unity were to be accomplished among working men, there is no doubt that the forces of reaction could be beaten.

**TROTSKYISM—OPEN OR SUTTAL**

(Continued from Page 17)

a warning to ourselves and our friends. Sutta concluded (p. 18) "If we unite with the reformists in our movement, no, even if we tolerate them, they will inevitably conquer and destroy us." Sutta meant all of us—not just the PR Club. We are all "reformists" to the Trotskyites—and must be des-

troyed. Let our answer be vigilance against Trotskyite infiltration in our groups and for the continual expose of the Trotskyites in the U.S.

And when we find a Sutta in our midst, let us repudiate and isolate him.

The PR Club looks forward to hearing your reactions to our letter.

**Back numbers of SPARK are available**

APRIL: A Draft Transitional Program; Hari Kari on the Ninth Floor (on CP Redbaiting); Report from Frisco; Free Eisler—Defend the Legality of the CP; Declaration by the Editorial Board of ISKRA—Lenin.

MAY: Letters from CP members and NCP; SPARK's Reaction to NCP's Letter and Dunne's Pamphlet; Barnard Rubin for General Secretary of the CPUSA—A Reaction to the D.W.; Political Neutrality in the Trade Unions—Lenin; Declaration of Intentions.

JUNE: An Analysis of NCP's Position; Letters from Frisco and Phoenix; Letter from Marx and Engels on Opportunism; CPUSA Convention.

JULY: Magic Caps and Monsters (Part 1); Letter from Fergus McKean; Canada; Letter from Allinger, Frisco; Two Letters from Engels to Bebel; Fighting Trotskyism.

**Read NEW TIMES**

Published by the newspaper "TRUD"—Moscow.

Order from Four Continent Book Corporation, 253 Fifth Ave., New York. Universal Distributors, 38 Union Square, New York, 3 SPARK will be glad to send you a copy at 15c per issue.

**Read "COMMUNISM VERSUS OPPORTUNISM"**

The author Fergus McKean was formerly the head of the Canadian Communist (now Labor Progressive) Party in British Columbia. He resigned in August 1945, refusing to support the opportunist policy of the L.P.P. "Communism Versus Opportunism" (almost 300 pages) is a painstaking, lucid explanation of opportunism in theory and practice in Canada and the U.S.A.

75c a copy, order from the P.R. Club or from Fergus McKean, 2561 Cambridge Street, Vancouver, B. C.

# SPARK

A MARXIST MONTHLY

## **NOT ROBOTS**

"A guide to action—that is what our theory really is, and a Party which demands that its members know how to undertake their responsibilities in the development and carrying out of action, must make of its members not robots but men full of initiative, men conscious of the many-sided nature of the struggle, men who understand that it is better to make mistakes while doing, than "not to be wrong" while passively looking on at the unfolding of events.

"A sense of responsibility—this is what characterizes the Communists. This is the primary quality which the Party tries to develop to the maximum among its members, in all parts of its organization, so that each leader, if required by circumstances, can in a given situation, work on his own to take that action which corresponds to the people's interests."

*from*

"THE SOURCE OF COMMUNIST COURAGE"

*by* **JACQUES DUCLOS**