

From Istanbul to Copenhagen

From Istanbul to Copenhagen and back by a whole series of means of locomotion—boat, automobile, train—there is something that might have furnished an interesting theme for an able writer. Yet you cannot find even an attempt in this direction in the press: a few pen-pushers confined themselves to invented interviews, like that in the *Petit Journal*, whose correspondent, it appears, met Trotsky last year on the island of Majorca! But this indignity did not prevent the press from revealing on several occasions—by information, by distortion or by silence—its sentiments towards the various stages of the trip. Let us set down the position of those who claim to express "public opinion", the position of the capitalist governments and also the attitude of those proletarians who were encountered along the route.

Let us pass over everything which smacks of fantasy, imagination and a taste for scandal. Objective reports, or rather strict information, are rarely to be found. The Italian press preserve a prudent restraint: a few French papers did the same; the socialist *Populaire* in particular had no illusions concerning the social democratic tribune accepted by Trotsky to deliver his justification for the October against the social democracy. Not a single paper gave any sort of an objective exposition of the ideas of the Left Opposition.

The Anti-Bolshevik Fury

On the other hand, the anti-Bolshevik hatred, the rury of capitalism which has retained an ever-smarting souvenir of the October and the years of the civil war, expressed itself with a terrific violence in the canards of the various countries. In France, in the big press, it is the *Journaux* that took front place by its veritable provocations. The courageous act of the bolsheviks, showing the whole world proletariat the emptiness of the ideas of capitalist fatherland, of national defense—the signing of the Brest-Litovsk treaty, is denounced by the *Journaux* as "treason." It seeks to exploit all the chauvinistic and conservative sentiments of the petty bourgeoisie against the Russian revolution. It is quite normal on the part of an organ which was one of the most rabid supporters of czarism, of Russian loans—not out of benevolence, to be sure—and whose "patriotism" did not cause it to overlook its treasury during the war. In the Belgian press, the anti-Communist hatred expressed itself with just as much frenzy, but in addition it had that special imprint which a few grotesque provincial put upon it. In the Antwerp *Maasin*, the editors deplore in an inimitable style, the police measures... because they did not permit "the curses" to reach the ears of Trotsky. In reality, the police measures could not prevent a number of shouts of sympathy from reaching our comrade.

To be sure! a number of Danish journals made a good deal of noise about comrade Trotsky's presence in Copenhagen. The "repulsive Communist", the "Bolshevik agitator", "blood covered hands"—the expressions have not changed since 1917. The reactionary Danish press gained an ally in the person of prince Aage, whose sole distinction lies in having served as an officer in the Foreign Legion. This individual found it in place to recall the noted phrase: "There is something rotten in the state of Denmark". Prince Aage never thought of the fact that among the characters of Shakespeare there are not Hamlets but also clowns and buffoons.

The Danish socialist paper, *Socialdemokrat* at first sought to exploit the act of its government in granting a visa for eight days. It presumptuously pretended that the social democracy had made it possible for Trotsky to emerge "for an hour from the prison where his friends confined him". But Trotsky's speech put a damper on their pretensions: Trotsky was not affected by their efforts; he had remained the Communist, the warrior of October. Four years of exile had done nothing to make his lean towards democracy.

A number of papers, in Denmark and in other countries, displayed their disappointment over the fact that in his speech Trotsky did not engage in polemic against the Stalinist policy and that on the contrary he gave an exposition, based upon scientific conceptions, of Marxism, of Leninism, the most magnificent and clear-sighted justification of the Russian revolution, putting in the shade all the ritualistic and hollow phrases which the official Stalinist propaganda spreads throughout the world. Naturally, the bourgeois and the social democratic press could not appraise the indirect manner in which our comrade combated Stalinism. Some expressed their astonishment and their discontent without restraint: "The October revolution, stage in the historical rise of humanity—this was the quintessence of the declarations. But Trotsky does not say the least little word about his conflicts with Stalin and his exile. The question must be put frankly as to why Trotsky accepted the invitation of the social democratic students..." wrote the *Hamburger Fremdeblatt* of November 2, 1932. In the report of *Socialdemokrat*, you can read: "applause which had only a polite character". "Trotsky affirmed, and it was quite superfluous, that he was a Communist". "In the first half, Trotsky bore himself as a professor delivering a lecture...but after a while, he spoke loudly and gesticulated, turning to all sides, striking the table...his voice acquired a great force. He was an impassioned agitator..." What stupor among the indolent social democrats!

Bourgeois and social democrats were not alone in their discontentment with Trotsky's speech. If it did not corre-

What Happened Along the Route of Trotsky's Trip?

spond with their views, it corresponded just as little with the interests of the Stalinist faction.

During his passage through France, en route to Denmark, the Stalinist *Humanite* was very reserved. The hateful campaign of the bourgeois press most certainly have dictated such an attitude to it. Let us point out to the fact that, for example, Bacamond, declared to one of our comrades: "If we had anything to say to the bourgeoisie, it would be: the workers settle their differences among themselves and the bourgeoisie has nothing to do with our quarrels." We are heartily in agreement. It is more than deplorable that the TASS agency did not follow this advice. On the way back, *l'Humanite* contented itself with a few empty comments; it had to pay its tribute to Moscow. The bureaucracy of the French Communist Party found the way of covering itself up before its superiors: that's the only thing that mattered.

The Danish Communist paper, *Arbejdsbladet*, bi-weekly, was obliged to give an important place to "Trotskyism". Never has the Danish party known any Left Oppositionists; isolated from the Comintern, "Trotskyism" had never been fought in this tiny party. This time, Stalinism let go in full. But not a single new argument: upbuilding of socialism, five year plan...at the meetings organized by the Danish party. Opposition comrades who had come to Copenhagen re-established the facts—in spite of the difficulties in language—and the Stalinist campaign was shot full of holes. It is from Moscow, that is, from Stalin, that the worst provocations had to come. The fear expressed in this title of *Pravda* "The Lion Has Escaped", led Stalin to a direct and open denunciation to the international police against a so-called "international conference" of the "Trotskyists" in Copenhagen. Soviet diplomacy also made its contribution: above the interests of the proletarian state, it put the interests of the bureaucracy and the Stalinist faction.

The capitalist governments of the states through which Trotsky had to pass, conducted themselves variously, some with a measure of correctness, others with more cynicism and crudeness, but all with the same intention: guard Trotsky closely, prevent him from entering into contact with the proletarians, the Communist movements. The Italian Fascist government, which really has no need of justifying its reactionary nature, permitted itself a cheap gesture and authorized Trotsky to visit Pompei. The "democratic" and "social democratic" governments which must give guarantee to their capitalism, felt themselves obliged to act in a very strict manner. At Copenhagen, not a single day of extension of the visa; two days were left him before the departure of the boat; it was an affair of state, order was endangered. Belgium—where the social democracy has such strong positions—did not permit a single one of Trotsky's traveling companions to disembark. An illegal measure from the standpoint of bourgeois legislation itself; but what matter: a few hours of promenade would surely have put the foundations of capitalism in danger...And "democratic" France, of the right of asylum to the Gorgulovs and all the White scoundrels, not a minute more than necessary was granted. Herriot, during his visit to Russia in 1923—had promised that when he would be minister, the decree on expulsion issued against Trotsky in 1916 would be recalled if he wished to come to France. Empty promise! A sojourn in France for a few hours would have "made the mother sick". When the voyage threatened to check the pre-established plan by a single iota, there was not one government that did not cast off its mask of hypocritical politeness and reveal the fear that inspired it.

In spite of all imaginable measures, the feelings of the proletarians, of the revolutionists, showed themselves on various occasions during the voyage. We will say nothing about the comrades charged by their various sections of the Opposition to assure security; they did their duty and they laugh at what the bourgeois and the social democrats have to say about it.

The bourgeois press is not accustomed to giving much space to the demonstrations of the Communist party. But for once, it changed its habits and exaggerated the hostile demonstration organized by the Stalinists during the disembarkation at Esbjerg, which was limited to a few jeering whistles and nothing more. On the other hand, it preserved silence about all the demonstrations of sympathy towards the organizer of the Red Army.

In Greece, there not only was no Stalinist demonstration at Piraeus—it was the pretext invented by the Greece police for refusing Trotsky authorization to visit the city—but our Archio-Marxist comrades made demonstrations on the quay, later in accompanying Trotsky's wife, comrade N. I. Sedoff, during her visit in Athens and finally above all, the demonstration organized at night time by the Corinth nucleus and party members who during the passage of the boat through the Corinthian canal, shouted: Long live Trotsky—Long live the Commune!

In Denmark, between Esbjerg and Copenhagen, at many of the stores, railroad workers, metal workers...came to shake Trotsky's hand. A German worker expressed his hope of seeing our comrade return to Russian right away.

We do not report Antwerp here, for the narrative is contained in the open letter to Vandervelde.

Finally, during the return, at the North Station in Paris, the engineer and fireman of the train saluted Trotsky; and in the Lyons station, while journalists and photographers waited in vain on the quay, on the other side of the train a score of railroaders came to shake Trotsky by the hand, greeting him with the "Rot Front" of the German Communists.

The voyage is at an end. Trotsky is back in Prinkipo. An important episode in the life of the Left Opposition and of the revolutionary movement has been concluded. The leader of the world proletarian revolution has spoken before thousands of auditors; his voice was carried by radio over the vast territory of the United States; by means of the film, thousands upon thousands of people will be reached. In the wall erected by world capitalism, to which the Stalinist faction brings its support in the form of calumny and falsehood, a large breach has been made. Nothing can fill it up again.

AT MARSEILLES

The return voyage of our comrade Trotsky ended according to Hoyle; the nervousness of the police, the provocations of the reactionary press—and the insults of *l'Humanite* showed without a doubt that Trotsky, that the ideas he embodies, remain the implacable foes of capitalism and of everything that demoralizes the proletariat.

At the moment when *l'Humanite* tried to besmirch our comrade, here is whom it joined in chorus: let every party comrade read these provocations in *l'Ami du Peuple* (12-5-32): "One of the greatest assassins of all times, which called himself 'Bronstein' or 'Braunstein' in the ghetto and whom the papers respectfully call M. Trotsky, has paid us the honor of a visit. It might be feared that the relatives of the Russians butchered by the Bolsheviki would not take kindly to the butcher. 'Monsieur Trotsky' was guarded by our police much more effectively than the Ukrainian Hetman Petliura and M. Doumer, president of the Republic.

"A facetious deputy has demanded from M. Herriot's ministry if the costs of this solicitude, in accordance with the Franco-Soviet pact, will be reimbursed to our poor budget by the Soviets. The reply is to appear, according to the rules, in the *Journal Officiel*.

"As 'Monsieur Trotsky' was to proceed to Copenhagen, a Danish prince who served as an officer of the Foreign Legion, became indignant that his people forgot so quickly the exploits of the monster: a Danish princess was the czarina of

Russia her two sons and tiny children were massacred by order of Trotsky. Was it necessary to repeat: 'There is something rotten in the state of Denmark'?"

At Marseilles, the boat for Istanbul had left. By force, the police sought to embark our comrade on an Italian freighter. Trotsky refused to travel 15 days in this manner. He addressed the following telegram to Herriot, Chautemps, De Monzie, with a copy to the socialist leader Bium and the party leader Thores:

"Together with my wife, I have received authorization to pass through France, from Constantinople to Copenhagen and return. At Dunkirk, my friends informed me that by losing the boat we would be forced to remain 8 days in France, near Marseilles, which did not enter into our traveling plans. We made arrangements accordingly. Upon our arrival in Marseilles we were put on an Italian boat 'Campidoglio', in spite of the fact that this unexpected turn disorganized the new arrangements made. We ascended the boat without objection in order not to create an incident. We then learned that this boat is not indicated in our voyage and that it takes 15 days to get to Constantinople which, without speaking of the material difficulties, would be entirely prejudicial to the health of my wife and me. When I tried to explain to the special commissioner that I cannot leave on this boat, he threatened me with violent measures.

"The transit visas, even the strictest, do not signify, at least without previous formal advice, the right of the police to hold me as a prisoner and to force me to take a boat which is absolutely contrary to that indicated for my trip. I hope that the French government will prevent this abuse. I am ready to quit France by way of Italy, and I hope that the Italian government will not refuse me a transit visa through Venice, which would permit me to leave France tomorrow or the day after.

"I await your reply on the quais of Marseilles, with my wife surrounded by police agents. The declaration of the police chief that he can take no responsibility for the attitude of the Russian Whites cannot change my decision, which is dictated by the circumstances.

L. TROTSKY.

"P. S.—I have just learned that the police are going to put us in a hotel in order to set us on the Italian boat by force, if the Italian land visa is not given us before our departure."

In the end, the Italian transit visas were granted. The French police, which was above all concerned with Trotsky not gaining any contact with the French workers, authorized the departure through Italy.

l'Humanite, by its whole attitude during the voyage, characterized itself principally by its cowardice, and devoted a few lines of information to the last incident.

—VERITE.

New York United Front

Party's New Turn in Right Direction Contains Serious Dangers

(Continued from page 1)

In a word wherever changes have been made in the party policy, as indicated above, have not only been in the right direction, but more specifically, they have been in the direction advocated by the Left Opposition during all the time when its advocacy was equivalent to little better than "Left Social-Fascism" in the eyes of the Stalinists.

But when we say above that "we can agree with" the change in policy represented by the New York conference call, we also have in mind several distinct reservations. Without setting down frankly our inability to accept the present turn unreservedly, we should be guilty of dereliction of duty. When the ruling group in the party made a sharp turn away from the opportunist Right wing course of five years ago, and swung abruptly to the Left—at that time also in the direction indicated by the Opposition—we did not make the mistake of swallowing everything uncritically. We raised our voices then to admonish the party against the infantile and extremist aspects of the Leftward turn of Centrism. The failure to heed the warnings of the Opposition brought the now well-established results.

The same holds true this time also, even if in reverse order. In the first place, the party leaders have made the turn behind the back of the party. The inevitable consequence of such a practice will be revealed tomorrow: the bureaucracy will accuse the rank and file militants of having failed to carry out or understand properly the "correct general line". The militants will be unable to understand and execute the policy of the party unless the party states plainly: (1) that there has been a turn; (2) what is the nature of the turn and the reasons for it; (3) that the policy of yesterday was false. "One uncondemned error always leads to another or prepares the ground for it." Not the least reason for the injurious consequences of the unopposed-front-at-all policy of the "Third Period" was the failure to explain what was fundamentally wrong with the opportunist "united fronts" with Chiang Kai-Shek and Purcell which preceded it, and the failure to condemn them clearly. This maxim holds true in the present case with just as much vigor.

If the party fails to explain clearly why the socialist and A. F. of L. unions were social-Fascist or outright Fascist yesterday, with which no united front was admissible, whereas today a united front with these elements is a "need" that brings "good results"—it will not only fail to generate concerted and intelligent action by the party members, but it will

fall also to mobilize under the banner of the united front call those non-Communist workers who, only the day before, were repulsed by the old policy.

Opportunist Aspects of Change

In the second place, we must call attention to another aspect of the change of front. The years of leadership of bureaucratic Centrism in the Communist movement have proved beyond the peradventure of a doubt that it is incapable of pursuing a consistent Leninist policy. It swings like a pendulum between Right wing opportunism and infantile ultra-Leftism. Class conscious militants cannot permit the struggle for relief from the scourge of unemployment to be confined within the narrow channels into which the reformists of all shades seek to divert it. Not only from strictly party platforms, but particularly in the united front movements, the Communists must strive patiently to enlighten the workers to the fundamental truth that purely parliamentary action is at best a secondary, auxiliary weapon. The main emphasis must always be placed upon the militant fight of the masses, in their organizations, in demonstrations, in all the forms of the struggle outside the poisoned, sterile atmosphere of capitalism's legislative halls.

With these considerations in mind, the call of the Trade Union Committee is open to the most serious criticism. The only concrete proposal for action contained in the call is expressed in the extract already quoted above. The conference is being called solely for the purpose of discussing the "advisability of carrying through a state-wide workers' conference to map out a legislative program in defense of our interests." We are not concerned with quibbling over words. Yet the whole phrase reeks with the spirit of those arch-respectable petty bourgeois "legislative campaigns" so dear to the hearts of the A. F. of L. lobbyists, or the ambitious Socialist party statesmen of the Waldman-Solomon-Thomas-Blanchard school. Whoever makes the slightest concession to this spirit, which the reactionaries and reformists have so sedulously cultivated in the minds of multitudes of workers, is doing a distinct disservice to the movement.

Without in the least ignoring or rejecting the tribune offered the workers, employed and unemployed, by the legislative chambers of the ruling class, without undervaluing the value of working class demonstrations and the presentation of our demands before the state and federal Capitols, our main task remains the mobilization of the workers for struggle outside the parliamentary halls of capitalism. The very first appearance in the Communist movement of any tendency to minimize or ignore the primary importance of this task, must be promptly combated and checked. Only by the extra-parliamentary mobilization of the masses will our demands upon the legislature gain that momentum and force which will compel action by the capitalist law-makers. Any other conception is an opium dream or outright deception.

We refrain from dwelling here on other shortcomings of the call. It would have been far more in harmony with the requirements of the situation had it been issued formally to all the working class organizations directly, without resorting to the petty and ineffectual evasion of appealing only to "branches" and "locals". Furthermore, it is not correct to confine the objective of the movement to the demand for unemployment insurance. Especially now must the demands for immediate relief, for long term credits to aid and recognition of the Soviet Union, and the six-hour day without reduction in pay, be put forth in an unemployment program, not as disconnected demands, but as inseparable parts of a whole.

But bearing all these reservations and criticisms in mind, the fact nevertheless remains that the movement initiated by the Trade Union Committee is a distinct step forward. That the Communist League of America (Opposition) will support it, will help advance it with all the resources at its command, goes without saying. It should meet with the support of every worker, employed or unemployed, and of every working class organization.

—M. S.

The Stalinist Policy in the Chinese Peasant War

(Continued from page 1)

in the ranks of the K. M. T. militarists acute and serious.

The responsibility for the defeats of the peasant detachments is due largely to the lightmindedness of the Stalinists. First, their evaluation of the present situation in China is erroneous. In the political resolution of the latter part of 1932, the official Chinese Communist Party writes:

"In evaluating the present situation, we must point out the fact that the comparative relationship of class forces in our country has undergone a change which is wholly to the advantage of the workers and the peasantry as well as to the Red Army and the Soviet movement. The strength of each section of the Kuo Min Tang has been weakened, whereas on the contrary, the workers and peasantry and the Soviet government have grown and been consolidated. The Red Army has become a large and strong force, the Soviet power reigns over a territory of several tens of millions in population. The advance of the Red Army has brought it to lay siege around Nanchang, Chian, Wuhan and other principal and semi-principal cities. The policy actually pursued in the past of not occupying large cities, does not now harmonize with the facts. The enlarged Soviet districts must draw in the fragmentary districts into one whole, and given the advantages of political and military conditions, must occupy one or two important central cities. This will constitute the beginnings of the first triumph in one or several provinces. This is now on the order of the day for the whole party and the Soviet movement."

Policy Change Is Injurious

Here we ask the Stalinists: Is the strength of every section of the K. M. T. actually weakened? To what degree are they weakened? Only the Stalinists, who shut their eyes to the facts, do not see them. At a decisive moment, the Kuo Min Tang militarists find it quite easy to unite and to wage a brutal attack upon the armed forces of the peasantry. The exaggerations of the Stalinists do not help the peasant troops at all, on the contrary, it does them a great injury.

In the second place, the political line of the Stalinists is to have the village surround the city, to have it lead the workers, and not to have the proletariat lead the peasantry. The victories of the Stalinists come out of the military advances of the peasant detachments and not from the power of the workers, and as a result, the Stalinists are leading the party onto the road of a peasants' party.

Moreover, the political mistakes exercise an influence on the military defects. The Stalinists, in order to harmonize the situation with their false evaluation ("first triumph in one or several provinces") are giving up the guerrilla tactics which are favorable to the partisan

troops, and replacing them with pitched battles which are unfavorable to the peasant detachments, but warmly welcomed by Chiang Kai-Shek, who is able to give his heavy cannon and airplanes a more decisive role to play. In guerrilla warfare, cannon and airplanes play little part, the former being almost totally ineffective owing to tremendous weight and difficulty of transportation. This was clearly revealed in the events of Western Hupeh and on the borders of Anhwei and Honan. Before the peasant detachments adopted the tactics of pitched battles, their defeats were very few and rare. On the contrary, they always gained victories which even the bourgeois press had to acknowledge. The Stalinists became dizzy with rejoicing over these triumphs and loudly proclaimed the coming of a revolutionary situation, changing the guerrilla tactics into tactics of pitched battles. They assembled the fragmentary peasant detachments as a whole—"the Red Army"—and attacked large central cities, fighting for "the first triumph in one or several provinces". But the facts showed that the "Red Army" was not only unable to deal the enemy the fatal blow, but on the contrary, it suffered many heavy defeats and had to retreat to the Northwestern part of China.

All that we have mentioned here clearly proves the erroneousness of the Stalinist political line. Of course, Stalin himself will deny this and in a very distant future he will make somebody responsible. In the period of opportunism, the man "responsible" was Chen Du-Hsiu. In the period of putschism, it was Tsiu-Tsiu Bo, and during 1929-1930, it was the "Li Li San line". Who will be the scapegoat now? We do not yet know. But the clever Stalin has undoubtedly selected somebody whose name we shall soon learn. The fact is that so-called Chen Du-Hsiuism, Tsiu-Tsiu Bolsim and Li Li Sanism are taken together, the true expression of Stalin's own line. We do not assert, of course, that no mistakes were made by Chen Du-Hsiu, Tsiu-Tsiu Bo and Li Li San, but their errors pale into insignificance before the "international line" of the Stalinist leadership.

It is well to note the fact that the Stalinists who charge the Left Opposition with being "liquidators", have removed the Central Committee of the Chinese party into the "Soviet districts". This proves that the Stalinists are not "liquidators" but the banner-bearers of "run-awayism". They have left behind the urban proletariat: such a flight is no small matter. The development of the "Red Army" has brought the Stalinists to the attempt to realize the fantasy of the village laying siege to the city, that is, the line of the peasantry "leading" the workers. What will be the result of such an idea and course? This: the Chinese Communist Party will be led by the Stalinists along the road of a pea-

sants' party. Every one of us should watch the developments with the most serious attention.

—P. K.

December 12, 1932.

THE S. L. P. and THE DICTATORSHIP CLEVELAND.

At a meeting here of the Socialist Labor Party addressed by one of its leaders, Verne Reynolds, our Opposition comrade, Joseph Keller, asked the speaker a question: "Since the SLP denies the necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat, how would you proceed through the transitional period, that is, the period from capitalism to socialism, without using force to crush the resistance of the capitalists and to eliminate the parasitic elements of the old order?" Reynolds, as is usually the case with the SLP men on this point, attempted to minimize the importance of the question with the aid of a little comedy. Several supporters of the Stalin faction who were present felt compelled to protest against the failure of the speaker to answer the question properly. After the meeting, these comrades, who are taught that the Left Opposition is everything but what it really is, learned with considerable surprise that comrade Keller was a "Trotskyist!"

—J.

Cannon Speaks at Right Wing Forum

As our readers know from the reports and analyses which the *Militant* carried, the Right wing of the Communist movement internationally is in the process of disintegration. In Czechoslovakia it has gone over bag and baggage to the social democracy. Not so long ago that redoubtable Trotsky-eater and defender of the infallible line, Bert Miller, accompanied by a small number of satellites, deserted the soiled banner of Lovestone for the shoddy progressiveness of Muste.

Now the Lovestone group is in the throes of a serious internal division over the Russian question. The people who proclaimed the correctness of the Stalinist line—for Russia—contend with the contradictions which their false position and their entire course have created.

The serious situation in Soviet economy has its repercussions in the American stronghold of the Brandler International. Under the pressure of their rank and file the Lovestone leadership is resorting to maneuvers to wriggle out of their contradictory position. Giffow assails the Stalinist policies as "Trotskyist". Lovestone, still pursuing visions of power and position, is attempting to ingratiate himself with Browder, Amter and the other pillars of American Stalinism. Of this nature was his "unity" conference of last spring. For the same reasons they recently invited the Left

Opposition to speak at one of its forums. The League accepted and sent comrade Cannon to speak on—What the Left Opposition Stands For.

Comrade Cannon spoke on Sunday, January 8, to a crowd of some 300 Left Oppositionist, Lovestoneite and party and YCL members. The meeting lasted until one o'clock. In the discussion period the Weisbordites made a united front from below in attacking the Left Opposition by attempting to discredit its representative. Their stock in trade were isolated, half quotations and gossip in the Hearst "exposure" style.

Benjamin, Wolfe and Zam were the Lovestoneite heavy artillery. All three made a miserable showing. They made no effort to counterpose any point of view of their own to the presentation of our stand by comrade Cannon. What they accomplished was a terrific exposure of their bankruptcy. This was apparent to all not blinded by Lovestoneite patriotism. And even on these workers a serious impression was made by the unavailability of our position.

It is almost unnecessary to report that this meeting was entirely peaceful. Four years have not passed in vain. The black-jack and knife assaults committed against us have passed into the limbo of history. We think that the Lovestoneites will think twice before resorting again to this method of ideological argument. These are now the exclusive property of the Stalinist regime in the Comintern,