

Knowingly and unnecessarily to endanger the underground work of the Party; 6) In any way to betray the Party trust.

Sec. 4. Formal charges and investigation shall be required in all cases. Upon presentation of charges the accused members or units may be suspended pending investigation.

Sec. 4. Branch executive committees shall have the right to expel a member subject to the approval (not to take effect pending approval) of Party sub-district executive committee having jurisdiction.

Sec. 5. Groups may be expelled or re-organized by their respective branch executive committees, subject to the approval of the sub-district executive committee having jurisdiction.

Sec. 5. Groups may be expelled or re-organized by their respective branch executive committees subject to the approval of the sub-district executive committee having jurisdiction.

Sec. 6. Branches may be expelled or re-organized by their sub-district exec. com. subject to the approval of their district exec. com.

Sec. 7. A local or a sub-district may be expelled or re-organized by the district exec. com. subject to the approval of the C.E.C.

Sec. 8. Districts may be expelled or re-organized by the C.E.C. subject to the approval of the convention.

Sec. 9. Sub-district executive committees may take up charges against any member, group or branch in their sub-district. District exec. com. may take up charges against any member or unit in their district.

Sec. 10. Federation executive committees shall have the power to expel any member, and expel or re-organize branches or groups of their federations subject to the approval of the C. E. C. of the Party.

Art. X. Party Press and Propaganda

Sec. 1. The C.E.C. shall publish the official underground organ of the Party, which shall be issued at least once month.

Sec. 2. The C.E.C. shall issue a Party bulletin which shall be distributed to the membership free of charge.

Sec. 3. Literature issued by the Party shall be under the supervision of the Editorial Committee and under the control of the C.E.C.

Sec. 4. No subdivision of the Party, except Fed. exec. com., may publish papers or books without the permission of the C.E.C. Over their own signature, locals may issue leaflets, dealing with matters in their locality, subject to the approval of the C.E.C. or such District Committee as may be so empowered by the C. E. C.

Sec. 5. All legal and illegal Party press and publishing machinery, including federation press and establishments shall be unconditionally and fully subject to the Party in general to its C.E.C. or such other Party units as may be expressly authorized by the C.E.C.

Sec. 6. Editors of all central organs of the Party, including legal and Federation organs, shall constitute the Board of Party Editors, which shall function for the unification of policy and expression in the Party press, and to keep them always in conformity with the principles, policies and decisions of the Party.

Sec. 7. No members of the Party shall contribute articles or editorials of a political or economic nature to the bourgeois press, except by permission of the C.E.C. of the Party.

Sec. 8. The C.E.C. shall provide for the organization of classes for the training of propagandists, and study classes in the various Party units for the education of the membership in Communist theory and tactics.

Sec. 9. The C.E.C. shall provide for the organization of Communist Party nuclei, composed of C.P. members only, in the shops, in the unions, and in other workers organizations; within the army and navy, and ex-soldiers organizations.

Letter to a French Syndicalist on the Communist Party

By L. TROTSKY

Dear Friend!

You are in great doubt regarding the Third International in view of its political and party character. You are afraid that the French Syndicalist movement may be taken in tow by a political party. Allow me to expose my views on the subject.

First of all I must say that the French syndicalist movement, whose independence is causing you such anxiety, is already completely in the tow of a political party. Naturally, neither Jouaux, nor his nearest assistants (Dumoulin, Merheim and others) are members of parliament as yet and formally are not members of any political party. But this is simply a division of labor. In fact, in the matter of syndicalist movement Jouaux is carrying the same policy of coalition with the bourgeoisie, as the French Socialism of the Renaudel-Longuet type is carrying on in parliament. Should the Board of the present Socialist Party be requested to give a programme to the General Confederation of Labor and to appoint its leading personnel—there is no doubt that the party would approve the programme of Jouaux-Merheim and allow these gentlemen to continue to occupy their posts. Should Jouaux & Co. be elected as members of Parliament and Renaudel and Longuet placed at the head of the Confederation of Labor—nothing whatever would be changed in the internal life of France or in the fate of the French working class. You certainly will not deny this. The above mentioned circumstances prove however, that it is not a question of parliamentarism or anti-parliamentarism, or of a formal party membership. All the old labels are worn out and do not answer to the new contents. Jouaux's anti-parliamentarism resembles Renaudel's parliamentary cretinism like two drops of water. Official syndicalism may repudiate the party—by tradition—as much as it likes, party policy, etc., but the bourgeois parties of France in the secret depths of their hearts can wish for no better representative at the head of the French syndicalist movement than Jouaux, as they cannot wish for any better "Socialist" parliamentarians than Renaudel-Longuet. Naturally, they are criticising and blaming them. But this is being done only in order not to weaken altogether their position in the labor movement. The matter lies not in parliamentarism or in syndicalism—these are only forms—but in the substance of the policy which the advance guard of the working class is carrying out by means of the syndicates, as well as the parliament. A bona fide Communist policy that is to say, a policy directed towards the overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie and its state order, will find its revolutionary expression in all branches of life of the working class, in all organizations, institutions and organs, into which its representatives may penetrate: in syndicates, mass meetings, in the press, in the party organizations of Communists, in the secret revolutionary circles, working in the army or preparing an uprising, lastly, in the parliamentary tribune, if the advanced workers will elect a bona fide revolutionary representative.

The task of the working class is to expel the bourgeoisie from the power, to annihilate its apparatus of violence and oppression, to create organs of its own labor dictatorship for crushing all resistance of the bourgeoisie and for a more rapid reconstruction of all social relations in the spirit of Communism. Whoever should under the pretext of anarchism, deny this task—the dictatorship of the proletariat—is no revolutionist, but a petty-bourgeois grumbler. There is no place for him in our midst. We shall speak of this, however, later on.

Hence, the task of the proletariat consists in suppressing the bourgeois order by means of a revolutionary dictatorship. But in the working class itself, as you know, there are different levels of class consciousness. The task of the Communist revolution in its totality is clear only to the more class-conscious revolutionary minority of the proletariat. The strength of this minority lies therein that the firmer, the

more decisively and assuredly it acts the more support does it find on the part of the numerous and more backward working masses. But in order that millions of workers who are artificially retained by capitalism, the Church, Democracy, etc. in the mire of prejudices, should not lose their way, but should find the requisite expression for their desire to obtain a complete liberation, it is necessary that in all the branches of life, the working class should find at its head its best, most class-conscious representatives who always remain true to their colors and are always ready to give up their lives for the cause of the working class.

You, revolutionary French syndicalists, have approached the question rightly when you state that the syndicates alone including the wider for the revolution, that an initiative minority is necessary which should educate the masses and give the workers in each concrete case a definite programme of action.

What must such an initiative minority be? It is clear that it cannot be grouped according to professional or local distinctions. The question does not lie in the advanced metallists, railwaymen or joiners, but in the more class-conscious proletariat of the whole country. They must unite, draw up a definite programme of action, strengthen their unity by a firm internal discipline and thus secure their leading influence over the whole struggle of the working class, all its organizations and first of all over the syndicalist unions.

How then would you call this initiative minority of the proletariat, united by the Communist programme and preparing to lead the working class to an open attack against the fortress of capitalism? We call it the Communist Party.

—But, you might say, in such case this party has nothing in common with the present French Socialist Party?—That is quite correct. That is why to make the difference appear stronger, we speak of a Communist Party, not of a Socialist Party.

—However, you still speak of a party?

—Of a party, yes. Certainly, one might most successfully prove that the word "party" has been greatly compromised by parliamentarians, professional chatterboxes, petty-bourgeois charlatans, etc., etc. But this relates not only to parties. We have already agreed with you that the labor unions (French syndicates, English trade unions, German Gewerkschaften) have been sufficiently compromised by the shameful role which they, in the person of their leaders, played during the war and for the most part are playing now. However, that is not a reason for repudiating the word "Syndicate." You will agree that the question lies not in the terminology but in the substance of the matter. Under the name of Communist Party we understand a union of the proletarian advance guard in the name of the dictatorship of the proletariat and a Communist revolution.

Very often under arguments directed against politics and party an anarchistic non-comprehension of the role of the state in the class struggle is concealed. Proudhon used to say: that the workshop (l'atelier) would eliminate the state. This is in so far correct, that the society of the future will become a gigantic workshop, liberated from all state elements, because a state is a compulsory organization of a class rule, whereas Communism will suppress all classes. But the whole question is by what means shall we arrive at a Communist society. Proudhon thought that the workshop would gradually by means of association supplant capitalism and the state. This proved to be a purely utopian idea: the workshop was supplanted by powerful factories, and over the latter rose the monopolising trust. The French syndicalists thought and even partly think now, that the syndicates as such would suppress all capitalist property and abolish the bourgeois state. But this is not correct. Syndicates are a powerful weapon in a general strike, because the ways and methods of a

general strike coincide with those of a syndicalist organization. But in order that a strike should really become a general one, an "initiative minority" is necessary, which would day by day and hour by hour carry on a revolutionary educational work among the masses.

This minority, evidently, must be grouped not in accordance with guild or industrial distinctions, but on the basis of a definite programme of proletarian revolutionary action. This, as we have said, is the Communist Party.

But a general strike which may be conducted best by means of the syndicate apparatus is not sufficient for the overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie.* A general strike is a means of defense, not a means of offense. We must bring down the bourgeoisie, wrench the state apparatus out of its hands. The bourgeoisie, in the person of its state, is supported by the army. Only an open uprising in which the proletariat collides face to face with the army, dealing cruel blows to its counter-revolutionary elements and carrying away with itself its best part—only such an open uprising of the proletariat is able to make it master of the situation in a country. But for such an uprising an energetic, intense, preparatory work is necessary: agitation, organizing, technical. It is necessary day by day to denounce the crimes and baseness of the bourgeoisie in all the domains of social life: internal politics, colonial brutalities, internal despotism of the capitalist oligarchy, baseness of the bourgeois press—all this must constitute the material for a bona fide revolutionary denunciation with all the ensuing revolutionary conclusions. These themes are broader than a syndicalist organization and its tasks. At the same time it is necessary to create organized supports for the uprising of the proletariat. It is necessary that in each local syndicate, at each factory, in every workshop there should be a group of workers closely bound together by a unity of ideas and capable at the decisive moment by their unanimous movement to carry along with them the masses, to show them the right way, keep them from making mistakes, and guarantee their victory. It is necessary to penetrate into the army. In every regiment there must be a closely welded group of revolutionary soldiers, ready and capable of passing over to the side of the people at the moment of collision and of calling to the whole regiment to follow them. These groups of revolutionary proletarians, united in their ideas, and organized, can act with complete success only as nuclei of a single centralized Communist Party. If we shall succeed in having in the different governmental and military institutions, our own faithful friends, open or secret, who would be in the course of all the events, all the plans and machinations of the ruling cliques and inform us duly of all, this would naturally be of great advantage to us. Equally we would only strengthen our own position if we would succeed in sending into parliament but a group of workers true and loyal to the cause of the Communist revolution, working in close unity with the lawful and illegal organizations of our party, absolutely subordinate to the party discipline, playing the part of scouts of the revolutionary proletariat in parliament one of the political general headquarters of the bourgeoisie—and ready at any moment to exchange the parliamentary tribune for the barricades.

Certainly, dear friend, this is not Renaudel,

*One must say however, that history has known general strikes which have been carried through almost without the help of the labor unions (the October strike in 1905). On the other hand the attempts of the French syndicates to carry through a general strike ended generally in non-success, in consequence of the absence in France of a leading revolutionary organization (a Communist Party) which would have day by day systematically prepared the uprising of the proletariat, and not only attempted simply from time to time to improvise decorative mass demonstrations.