SPECIAL **WORKERS AGE** SUPPLEMENT

Vol. IV. No. 3. Jan. 19, 1935.

For a Labor Party in the United States

DRAFT RESOLUTION APPROVED BY THE PLENUM OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE COMMUNIST PARTY (OPPOSITION)

I. PRESENT ECONOMIC SITUATION

1. The revival in production and exchange, occasioned by the numerous artificial stimuli administered by the Roosevelt Administration, has fallen far short of the expectations of the New Dealers. The decisive indices have for months been either stagnant or going downward. The present levels continue lower than the "flush" days of the summer of 1933, despite the momentary spurt recently brought on by seasonal factors and by the improvement in confidence resulting from Roosevelt's entente cordiale with Biggest Business.

A Year of Codified Chaos

2. Industrial employment and payrolls fell markedly in November. The relief rolls continue to mount. Private industrial production has not been revived in spite of billions of dollars in subsidies through the New Deal. Unemployment continues not only grave but mounting. The first year of the New Deal has proved to be a year of most rapid concentration of wealth, extension of monopoly and impoverishment of the masses. One year of the New Deal, of capitalist planning, has turned out to be a year of codified, of planned, chaos. The very machinery of the New Deal has broken down. The New Dealers, deserting the very foundations of their plans, (abandonment of price-fixing, etc.) are in full retreat.

II. PRESENT POLITICAL SITUATION

1. Outstanding among the new developments in the political life of the country is the accelerated and tremendous growth of the government bureaucracy. With the extension of government participation in ever-more phases of economic and social life of the country, state capitalism continues to develop at a terrific pace, bringing with it an ever-greater merging of the machinery of government with the machinery of big business.

2. Dissatisfaction remains widespread but vague, confused, and hesitant. In this fashion the growing feeling for something new and different manifested itself in an endorsement of Roosevelt as a symbol of those forces seeking something new and different but still safe. The discontent is still far from the level of nation-wide radicalization. Its very medium of expression, overwhelmingly within the framework of the two party system, momentarily thru the Democratic Party, is itself an index of the lack of any revolutionary upsurge in the United States.

Democratic Party Is Instrument of Big Business

3. The victory of the Democratic Party was complete, particularly in a mid-term election. Adroit maneuvering by the White House, skillful and timely use of the relief funds, inept and disjoined resistance by the Republican Party ,as well as lack of program and orientation by the latter, account much more than Democratic achievements for the Roosevelt victory. All in all, Biggest Business today finds the Democratic Party a more suitable and fitting instrument of the times.

Republican Party Is Far From Crushed

4. Tho badly defeated, the Republican Party is far from crushed. In the face of a Democratic landslide, it still managed to draw nearly 42 out of every hundred popular votes as against the Democrats' 54. Its actual strength is greater than its voting strength in the House and Senate. It is presently in a crisis, arising out of the shifts in class composition and newly developing class realignments, flowing from five years of continuous economic crisis. Momentarily, the Republican Party has been rudely shaken in the rural sections, its erstwhile tower of strength. Merely because its dominant leadership has so far stubbornly clung to the threadbare phrases of stand-patism and obstinately refused to readjust itself in the least, does not mean that the Republican Party is to be written off. It continues as the second pillar of the two-party system, still serving as the foundation of political reaction in the country.

Insignificant Vote for Communist and Socialist Party

5. Except in isolated localities, the vote of the working class parties, Communist and Socialist, was utterly insignificant. Amongst the great mass of the working class population, as well as amongst the toiling masses in the rural areas, both the Socialist and the Communist Party are of no serious consequence.

The Two-Party System Remains

6. The social and economic consequences of the crisis are shaking the foundations of the whole American political system, the two-party system. From the classical party of state rights, the Democratic Party is being transformed into the Party of aggressive, centralized government executive power. From the Party of the "little fellow," it has become the Party of the very biggest magnates, the Party of closer collaboration with Big Business than any Republican administration ever was. The Democratic Party has become the instigator of trustification and the organizer of the monopolists. The Party of Jefferson and Jackson has become the Party of Wilson and Roosevelt—from the Party for the preservation of Jeffersonian traditions and "democratic rights," it has become the Party brazenly and boldly demanding and hastening ever-increasing power of the executive arm of the government at the expense of the legislative and of the enhancement of the powers of the Federal Government at the expense of the States. Precisely because the Republican Party has, to date, continued its archaic approach, clinging desperately to the rather dull appeal of rugged individualism, it has lost its favored position to the Democrats. It has not yet recovered from its 1932 defeat. It continues torn by contradictory forces reflecting new political factors in their embryonic stages. Some Republican strategists try to alarm and arouse Wall Street support by blowing the old Hoover horns which were so decisively discredited in the 1932 campaign. Others, fearing the encroachment of Big Business and concentrated government executive power, try to pick up the Jeffersonian appeals, discarded by the Democratic Party, to stir the people with the feeble echoes of cries sounded more than a century ago. In both cases the Republican Party's strategy is bad and mirrors the process of confused readjustment and reorganization. However, unless some new political factor arises, the Republican Party, because of its still great popular base, will be able to come back at the expense of the inevitable failures of the Democratic Party and the unavoidable weakening of the still-flourishing Roosevelt myth.

Elements of Decay of Two-Party System

7. The forces undermining the two-party system continue to develop. The sweeping endorsement in the last election for the Democratic Party is much more a vote going across and beyond party lines than a Democratic victory. What we now have in the Democratic Party is a momentary but monstrous hodge-podge. Recent years have witnessed a marked trend towards all important legislation being enacted by Congress thru votes based much more on bloc and economic sectional lines cutting across Party lines rather than by means of Party lines. The differences arising over legislation in Congress are becoming increasingly differences **within** rather than **between** Parties, in utter disregard of so-called traditional Party differences. These trends are a reflection of the deep-going process of changing class relations occasioned and precipitated by the economic forces let loose by the crisis. Further manifestations of the disintegrating two-party system are to be found in the mood amongst the masses expressing themselves in one direction around such figures as Bilbo and Long in the hitherto solid Democratic South, and in another direction, in the "Epic" outbreak of Sinclair in California, once a rock-ribbed Republican satrapy, the victory of La-Follette's Progressive Party in Wisconsin, and in Olsen's so-called Farmer-Labor Party victory over the Roosevelt-Farley machine in Minnesota.

Government As Strike-Breaker

8. Like a red thread thru the unfolding new political situation in all its varied manifestations, runs the unbroken tendency of the government to multiply and intensify its activities as a strike-breaker.

III. LABOR IN THE PRESENT SITUATION

1. In a political sense labor's articulate strength is today insignificant. The general staff of the biggest body of organized labor in the country, the A. F. of L., is still wedded to the clap-trap of political non-partisanship, to the suicidal policy of "reward your friends and punish your enemies", to the policy of rejecting and resisting independent working class political action.

Unrest Mounts In Working Class

2. But amongst the workers discontent and unrest are mounting. Witness the great influx into the trade unions. Note the country-wide strike wave, the rising militancy in strike struggles, the increasing sympathy for striking workers and the rise of sympathetic and general strikes. A significant index of this growing dissatisfaction, of this first stage of radicalization, is the increasing interest in and support of independent working class political action in the form of a Labor Party. Within recent months numerous locals of the A. F. of L. have taken up this issue with system and persistency. Likewise, such powerful international unions as the United Textile Workers of America, the International Ladies Garment Workers and the Hotel and Food Workers have strongly endorsed the demand for a Labor Party.

Structural Changes In Working Class

3. The crisis has set in motion forces hastening the transformation of the whole structure of the American working class. The weakening of United States imperialism's position in the world market, as a result of the international crisis and the American crisis, has served to undermine seriously the base of the labor aristocracy. Thus, the gap between the latter and the rest of the working class has been narrowed. Skill lines and demarcations between skilled and unskilled and semi-skilled have become fainter. Even the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. at the last convention recognized the vanishing of craft lines. On the breadlines, black and white workers alike have suffered the same misery and been subject to miserable "relief". The complete disappearance of immigration as a factor has served to weaken the division between foreign-born and native worker. The very composition of the trade union movement, the A. F. of L., has been organically altered. In short, five years of the devastating economic crisis have witnessed a marked increase in the homogeneity of the working class in the United States.

4. Regardless of what significant developments have occurred in the political situation, as a result of the crisis, one factor, from labor's point of view, continues dominant and decisive to distinguish the American political situation from that prevailing in all other leading countries. In the United States, the workers have yet to break from the political parties of their enemy class and to organize themselves politically as a class, as a distinct mass working class party on a nation-wide basis.

IV. THE ORGANIZATION OF A LABOR PARTY

1. In the sharpest contrast to the wave of militant strikes is the absence of a mass political party of the working class which can mobilize millions of workers. In fact, the United States is the one highly developed country under capitalist democracy in which the great bulk of the working class is not yet politically independent. The mass of workers has yet to learn that their economic struggle must be supported by political struggle, if the fruits of even the most victorious economic conflict are not to be lost thru some government measure (injunction, use of troops, appointment of Study Commissions). This has been the experience of labor time and again primarily because many workers who fight the employers on the economic field (trade unions) support the bosses on the political field (Democratic and Republican Parties) on a national, state-wide and municipal basis. No real improvement of their immediate conditions is possible for the workers, and, still more, no abolition of the whole capitalist system and exploitation and oppression is conceivable while the workers continue so unorganized and even fighting against each other on the political field.

Labor's Declaration of Independence

2. A vital next step in developing the class consciousness and defending the class interests of the proletariat is the establishment of a mass Labor Party of the workers who (in alliance with the impoverished farmers) will wage the immediate struggle against the Republican and Democratic Parties. Such a Party will unite, regardless of individual differences, all existing workers' organizations, trade unions, workers' political parties and groups, cooperatives and workers' fraternal organizations around the issue of independent working class political action. Such a Labor Party will be based not on individual membership but on organizations of labor, primarily the trade unions as its basic units—membership by organization and bloc. The formation of a Labor Party will signify for the workers thus affiliated thru their respective organizations the **beginning** of their political emancipation, historically speaking the next big progressive step. Politically, it would mean the declaration of independence by the American working class from the big parties of capital.

3. No worker can or should (and least of all the Communist worker) demand that the Labor Party should be a revolutionary party or even a party radical enough to accept Communist leadership. It is not at all improbable that at the outset there may be "at the head of the Labor Party reformist Labor traitors, similar to those in England, or even worse. Nevertheless, the formation of such a party may, for a time, represent a definite step forward in the American labor movement and the Communist Party (the Communist movement) is obliged to participate in this party, if only the latter permit, in a sufficient degree, freedom of criticism and agitation by the affiliated organizations." (Resolution of Executive Committee Communist International—1925).

Labor Party as Against Third Party

4. The Labor Party is not a party of the most advanced and conscious militants in the working class. Therefore, the Labor Party cannot be the organization that will seize and hold political power or bring final victory to the working class. This is the historic task of the Communist Party. The Labor Party can and must be made to serve as an organization for advancing, in the largest measure possible, the immediate interests and the elementary political consciousness of the working class and thus check the political aggressiveness of the bourgeoisie.

5. One cannot underscore too heavily the distinction between a Third Party and a genuine Labor Party. In the specific, concrete, American situation a Third Party would be a third capitalist party, expressing the interests of the petty-bourgeoisie and serving as an instrument in the hands of the lower middle class against the higher and bigger capitalists. Such a capitalist, third party would substantially be committed, like the Republican and Democratic Parties, to the maintenance and perpetuation of capitalism as a system. Only, it would seek to achieve this thru defending the interests of another section (the smaller) of the owning class. As such, a Third Party represents a class having interests fundamentally different from those of the working class, and would be a party of different class composotion and leadership from that of a Labor Party. To the extent that Third Party forces worm their way into a Labor Party movement, they hinder its development into a distinct Party of the proletariat breaking politically with the capitalist class, with the capitalist system.

V. HISTORICAL BASIS OF A LABOR PARTY IN THE UNITED STATES

1. Why does the [illegible] toward a mass party of the workers in the United States take the form of a Labor Party? Why a Labor Party based on the trade unions, on collective membership, in the United States and Social-Democratic Parties based on individual membership in other countries? In those countries where the organization of the trade unions preceded the organized mass political expression of the working class, (England, Belgium, United States, etc.), there, the Labor Party type developed. On the other hand, in those countries where they had the Social-Democratic type of Party, (Russia, France, Germany, etc.), we find that there the trade union organization came afterward and was organized by the mass political organization of the workers.

2. What is the basis of these variations of working class development? In certain countries (England, Belgium, United States, etc.) industrial monopolist, or imperialist, development split the working class, at an early date, into two parts—into an aristocratic group of better paid and the rest, the vast majority of unskilled, semi-skilled, underpaid and unorganized. In these countries the trade unions were formed first and the political parties much later. The labor aristocracy, split apart from the rest of the working class, found that it could satisfy its demands thru a limited form of organization, like a craft union. The labor aristocracy developed a bourgeois ideology and in part, for a time, even its material interests coincided with those of the bourgeoisie. The great majority of the working class, the real proletariat, thus deprived of the better organized and more educated workers, was, at first, unable to organize itself even on a limited trade union scale, let alone on the broad, all-inclusive, general class or political scale.

Some American Peculiarities

3. Why has a Labor Party not yet developed in this country? In the United States the split in the working class was intensified by the reinforcement of the division between skilled and unskilled by the division into native and foreign born. The bourgeois ideology and bourgeois political organization in working class ranks was also historically intensified by the prolonged period of relative economic opportunity, the lack of class fixity, and the consequent bourgeois-mindedness of the working class. These and similar historical peculiarities explain the fact that the American working class has not yet even reached the stage of a labor party as have the workers of England and Belgium.

4. However, once the labor aristocracy felt its privileges being undermined, hundreds of thousands of unskilled and semi-skilled workers poured into the unions, which but yesterday were primarily the organizations of skilled, aristocratic workers. With the sharpened attacks of the capitalists and their government on these privileges and on the very trade union organizations themselves (thru court decisions, etc.) came the first steps towards political organization—a working class political party based on the trade unions, a Labor Party. This was the historical process in Great Britain and this has been the historical process slowly unfolding itself and still very far from completed in the United States.

VI. BASIC FACTORS FOR A LABOR PARTY

1. The slogan for a Labor Party is fully in line with the present stage of development of class-consciousness in the American labor movement. It appeals particularly to the hundreds of thousands of militants and progressives in the trade unions who are ready to band themselves against capitalism as a social system but still find the Communist and Socialist parties too radical, too sectarian, and numerically insignificant.

2. Given the present low stage of class-consciousness in the United States, the Labor Party slogan is the only one that will appeal to the whole working class, regardless of where its particular sections stood but yesterday or still stand today politically. It makes the broadest appeal against the so-called, non-partisan politics of the reactionary burocracy in the unions.

Workers Forced To React Politically

3. The very marked growth of a powerfully centralized government in the United States, with its vast burocracy extending its hands daily into more walks of life, itself tends increasingly to lend a political character to the every day struggles of the workers. More and more the government is intervening against the workers in their struggles for decent conditions, better pay and the right to organize. Particularly, under the N.R.A. does the government play an ever-greater and more diversified role as a strike breaker. The objective logic of this whole trend is a condition in which the workers are more and more compelled to react against the government, to resist its measures, to react and act politically. Here is a basic factor for a Labor Party.

4. The very growing homogeneity of the American working class is also a primary factor for a Labor Party movement. The narrowed base of the labor aristocracy, the reduced gap between the skilled and the unskilled, the softening of the differences between the foreign and native-born due to the end of immigration, are among the forces

(*Continued on Page 4*)

The Road to Real International Communist Unity

Reply of the National Committee Communist Party (Opposition) to the Letter from the Communist Party of December 29, 1934.

TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF
THE UNITED STATES:

Dear Comrades:

We wish to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of December 29, published in the Daily Worker on the same date. We certainly greet the fact that you have finally reached the point of entering into direct relations with us, that you have apparently given up the position maintained until recently, that it is "against revolutionary principles" so much as to join a united front movement in which we participate. This change of attitude is indeed a very healthy one. It is a step in the right direction which we hope and trust will be followed by others until complete Communist unity is reached.

We will not attempt to enter into a controversy as to our alleged political and organizational collapse. The facts speak for themselves and speak louder than words. Our program and our standing in the labor movement need no defense. We believe it to be far better all around to drop all of these extraneous issues and to discuss frankly the real questions involved.

Ideological Clarity Is Basis For Unity

Real Communist unity can be achieved only on the basis of ideological clarity. The attitude of a revolutionary organization towards its mistakes, Lenin teaches us, is an index of its serious political character. In your letter you quite properly suggest that we should "recognize our mistakes" but you do not find it necessary to indicate what these mistakes are. In the course of the five years of our existence, our organization has had occasion many a time to re-examine its policies in a critical spirit and to acknowledge and correct grave errors. On the fundamental issues, however, on those issues which separate us from the party leadership, we cannot see the slightest reason for changing our position; on the contrary, we find our position fully confirmed by experience and now being approached by the Communist International, altho hesitantly, partially and indirectly. Let us examine these basic issues and see which errors are to be recognized.

The Real Meaning of "Exceptionalism"

1. **On "exceptionalism."** If we sweep aside the whole smokescreen of misrepresentation and distortion that has been raised on this question, our position can be summarized in the following words taken from our original statement of principles ("The Crisis in the Communist Party," February 1930):

> "We take our stand upon the theory of the irregularity of development of capitalism and upon the necessity for a concrete application and adaptation of the general line of the Comintern to the irregular, concrete conditions in each country. . . . The policies of the Comintern at every stage should be based upon an analysis of the world situation (which tends to give a certain correspondence to the tactics of each party) and upon an analysis of the concrete conditions of each country (which tends to give concrete differences in the tactics of each party)."

Against this view, the party leadership at that time proposed the theory of "mechanical uniformity," openly denying the necessity of concreteness and flexibility in tactics and even finding it possible to declare that "the character of the crisis is not **modified for any** section of world capitalism." (Answer of the Polburo to the Appeal of the Convention Delegation, September 1929). On this major question self-criticism and acknowledgement are due and overdue but it certainly cannot come from our side.

We Foresaw The Economic Crisis

2. **On the estimation of the crisis.** It is, of course, pure fiction to declare, as does Comrade Stachel, that we were expelled from the party because we "denied" the crisis. As far back as February 4, 1928, Comrade Lovestone stated officially before the whole party:

> "What is in sight? It cannot yet be said at this time that we are facing an immediate deepgoing economic crisis. But the continuing development of the contradictions of American capitalism is proceeding at such a pace that **the coming of a deepening crisis is unavoidable in the near future."**

And on March 7, 1929, he again emphasized:

> **"A crisis, a deepgoing crisis, tho it may not yet be the final basic crisis of American capitalism, is long overdue.** . . . Superficially this stock-market speculation may appear to be a windfall of prosperity. Actually it **is the signal of a storm that will bring devastation in its wake once it begins to sweep the country."**

In contrast to these clear and unequivocal declarations, the statements of the party leaders were very confused and contradictory. For a time the whole party press was ringing with assertions that the last and final crisis of American capitalism had come; those were the unfortunate "third period" days. Then suddenly we were informed by Comrade Manuilsky, speaking for the Communist International, that "American capitalism will rapidly capture the leading positions in the world arena. . . . A new period of colonization is opening in the history of American imperialism" (Pravda, April 22, 1930). Today it is surely unnecessary to ask which estimation of the crisis was correct and which errors will have to be rectified.

Our Analysis of Fascism Stood The Test

3. **On Fascism.** In your letter you charge us with failing to see the danger of Fascism. Surely you do not expect this to be taken seriously! You are well aware that we were the only ones to attempt a serious Marxist analysis of the social basis and historical role of Fascism, in the course of which we had to combat not only the false theories of Trotsky but also the unrealistic and exaggerated conceptions finding expression in such outbursts in the Daily Worker as: "Already Fascism is spreading over the land. Already it is moving North, South, East and West!" You must recall also that we were the first to raise a cry about the acute danger of Fascism in Germany and to propose effective means of meeting it, at a time when in party and Comintern circles there was great political confusion and a marked under-estimation of the immediate menace of the Hitler movement. In fact, our analysis of Fascism and the tactics we proposed to fight it have been so thoroly confirmed by the events of the last two years that the party itself is now turning to them and is beginning to adopt them piecemeal.

Social Democracy and Social Fascism

4. **On the attitude to the Socialist movement.** For years the theory of "social fascism," as formulated in Comrade Stalin's classical words, "Social Democracy is the moderate wing of Fascism," dominated the entire outlook of the party leadership. "The fusion of Social Democracy with the capitalist state," Comrade Manuilsky told us at the tenth plenum of the E.C.C.I. (July 1929), "is not merely a fusion at the top. This fusion has taken place from top to bottom, all along the line." No question of cooperation or joint action with the Socialist parties as organizations could possibly be raised. Indeed, in 1928, it was branded as "opportunistic" even to address an open letter to the S.P.! Of course, we have always rejected this whole conception as altogether opposed to ordinary political common sense. We have always insisted that the Socialist parties are workers parties with reformist programs, that their influence over the workers has to be fought but that they must be approached and treated as **workers** organizations. Today, in its practise, the party is beginning to correct its attitude to the Socialist movement altho it has unfortunately not yet made the corresponding change in its official theory.

We Championed Broad United Front

5. **On the United front.** How long ago was it that the united front tactics were openly rejected by all the leaders of the Comintern and our party? Certainly no joint action with the "moderate wing of Fascism" was possible. At the sixteenth congress of the C.P.S.U., held towards the middle of 1930, Comrade Molotov, reporting on the policy of the Communist International, declared:

> "The essence of the tactics 'class against class' consists in the rejection of all alliance with the Social Democracy. Only three years ago the Communist parties still used to make these temporary alliances with the Social Democracy but the transition to the tactics of 'class against class' has liquidated all such alliances."

One year later, the Pravda, commenting on the results of the eleventh plenum of the E.C.C.I. went even further: "There can be no block with the Social Democratic workers against Fascism" (April 24, 1931). This sectarian attitude was covered up with all sorts of talk about the "united front from below," which, as we all know today, is no united front at all.

We, on the other hand, always championed the policy of the united labor front with all our might and repeatedly called the attention of the party to the disastrous consequences of its course. Today our warnings are universally recognized as justified and the party leadership is slowly readopting the united front tactics, altho still refusing to recognize the logic of its own acts.

For A United Trade Union Movement

6. **On trade union policy.** It is here, of course, that our most serious differences have always been manifested. Today everybody can see how thoroly incorrect the tactics of the party have been in this field and to what they have led. The conservative unions were not even recognized as labor organizations but were branded as "company unions" or even as "Fascist" bodies. "The conservative unions," Lozovsky told us in 1930 (Pan-Pacific Monthly, April 1929), "have become part and parcel of the capitalist state," and Comrade Browder applied this conception to America when he declared: "The A. F. of L. is plainly a Fascist organization without any of the protective coloring of Socialist phrases which distinguishes social fascism" (The Communist, May 1930). Exactly the same view was embodied in the official resolution of the seventh convention of the party in 1930.

Out of this basically wrong conception emerged the whole system of dual unionist tactics, which have weighed like a nightmare upon the party for six years. By the very highest in the Comintern we were instructed to disrupt and smash the mass unions. "That we want to break up the reformist trade unions," Lozovsky told us, "that we want to weaken them, that we want to explode their discipline, that we want to wrest the workers from them, that we want to break up the trade union apparatus—of that there cannot be the slightest doubt." (A. Lozovsky, in the February 15, 1932 issue of the R.I.L.U. Magazine). The mass organizations were to be split and dual "Red" unions formed everywhere as rival bodies. "A stubborn fight is required of the R.I.L.U. adherents in the reactionary unions," the fifth congress of the R.I.L.U. decided in 1931, "in order to win the workers in these **organizations** to the class struggle and **to transfer them,** in compact groups, **to the corresponding Red trade unions."**

You are well acquainted with the long and determined struggle waged by us against these suicidal tactics and you surely remember how many times we have warned of the ruin into which the party was bound to fall unless it changed its course. Unfortunately, our warnings have proved only too well grounded and here too a change of course is beginning to make itself felt, tho it has not yet touched the basic policies involved.

Labor Party Slogan Still Potent

7. **On the Labor Party.** One of the big issues constantly in dispute between us since our separation from the party is the Labor Party question. We have always vigorously championed the policy of supporting and stimulating the development of a Labor Party, based on the trade unions and other labor organizations as the first real step in the political emancipation of the workers as a class. Since 1929 you, on the other hand, have repeatedly condemned this policy in the plainest language. "The radicalization of the working masses," the Seventh convention of our party decided in 1930, "which leads definitely to an ideological separation of the workers from the capitalists turns the Labor Party slogan into a possible instrument with which capitalism can delay this separation."

Amplifying the same viewpoint, Comrade Bedacht reached the conclusion that "propaganda for a Labor party can no longer represent propaganda for independent political action but becomes propaganda for an under-cover instrument of imperialism." (The Communist, December 1929). As late as December 1934, the Central Committee, in estimating the results of the elections, insisted that "more than before it is necessary to fight the dangers of Farmer-Laborism along the lines analyzed in the Open Letter." (Daily Worker, December 1, 1934).

And now, suddenly, without even a gesture of explanation, Comrade Browder announces in a public address: "We Communists are prepared to join hands with all our forces, all our energy, all our fighting capacity, with all who are ready to fight against Wall Street, against monopoly capital, in the formation of a broad mass party to carry on this fight, into a fighting **Labor party based on the trade unions, unemployment councils, farmers organizations, all the mass organizations of toilers . . .**" (Daily Worker, January 7, 1935). Is advocacy of a Labor party one of the "mistakes" we are expected to acknowledge?

We Cannot Disavow Correct Views

We have examined these points in some detail because we want to make clear how politically unreasonable and contradictory we think it is for you to ask us to repudiate our position at a time when its correctness is recognized everywhere and when it has been confirmed by life itself. Especially must we regard it as politically unreasonable for you to call upon us to disavow our views when, in many respects, you are beginning to approach them yourselves altho you have not yet found it possible openly to recognize this fact.

Pretense of Infallibility Must Be Dropped

Self-criticism, the acknowledgement of error, is not a penitential rite, nor is it a device for face-saving. It is a means of political clarification and the correction of mistakes. It is a means of convincing the masses of the political responsibility of the party and of the sincerity of its policies. We earnestly appeal to you, therefore, to throw aside all false pride or hollow pretense of infallibility and to present to the workers an honest, realistic critical estimate of the course of the party during the last few years, clearly indicating the source of the grave errors that have been committed and fully explaining the new policies necessary to correct them. This would be an act worthy of a mature and responsible party, seriously aspiring to become the revolutionary vanguard of the American working class. This would be an act, furthermore, vitally necessary for the political re-education of the party membership whose sudden changes in the line of the party, carried thru without any attempt at explanation, can only confuse and demoralize.

Party Democracy— The Root Problem

In your entire letter you do not mention a single word about inner-party democracy or about the system of leadership existing today in the Communist International. This is a serious omission for, in a certain sense, it is here that the root of the matter is to be found Had the most elementary democracy existed within the party during the last five years, had we been allowed to present our views in accordance with party statutes, had it been possible for comrades to examine and criticize party policies as they were being applied, we are convinced that the false line, which has brought the party nothing but isolation and discredit, would have been corrected long ago and the disastrous split in our movement avoided. For thru party democracy it becomes possible for differing viewpoints, within the limits of Communist fundamentals, of course, to exist and express themselves freely within the party without impairing its discipline or weakening its fighting power. Party democracy, as Lenin taught us, is the mechanism whereby the party collectively directs, controls, criticizes and corrects itself. The denial of party democracy, the installation of an arbitrary regime within the party, has destroyed this mechanism and has made it impossible for the party to steer a proper course in the difficult situation in which our movement finds itself. We cannot emphasize too strongly our belief that, for genuine unity, the restoration of party democracy is vitally necessary.

For Collective Leadership

The same thing is true about the system of leadership in the Communist International. Gradually things have come to the point where the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, instead of being the "first among equals" in the Comintern, holds the entire monopoly of leadership in its own hands. No heed at all has been paid to the advice Engels gave to the German workers: "If the German workers proceed in this way, they may not march exactly at the head of the movement—**it is not to the interest of the movement that the workers of one country should march at the head of all**—but they will occupy an honorable place on the battle line . . ." As a result, policies and methods, quite proper for other sections, are being mechanically transferred to the parties in the capitalist countries where conditions are fundamentally different and where these policies and methods are totally out of place and can do nothing but harm. No real political initiative or self-direction is permitted to the individual parties so that their ideological development is stunted and their maturing into a real vanguard of the proletariat made impossible. Just as we call for the restoration of democracy within our party, so do we urge the necessity of establishing a system of international collective leadership in the Comintern and of affording the various parties their proper measure of initiative and self-direction necessary for their political growth and maturity.

In your letter, you call upon us to give "full and active support to the activities of the party in all fields, especially in the trade unions." We believe that this question of practical cooperation is a very important one and we would like to place before you the situation as it appears to us.

Basis For Cooperation On Trade Union Field

We would be glad indeed to help bring about cooperation on the trade union field. But if such cooperation is to be of any benefit to the Communist movement, it will be necessary for you to break completely and openly with the theory and practise of dual unionism. So far, the party has made some hesitant and partial moves in this direction. But unfortunately the underlying dual unionist orientation and aims still remain. There has been no official repudiation of the old policies; there has been no clear official formulation of the new course. Some "Red" unions have indeed been liquidated and this we greet. But we cannot help noting that other "Red"

(*Continued on Page 4*)

C.P. and C.P.O. Exchange Correspondence

Communist Opposition Plenum Sends Wire to Communist Party

On December 29, the Plenum of the Communist Opposition sent the following wire to the Communist Party:

December 30, 1934—12:30 A. M.

EARL BROWDER
COMMUNIST PARTY
50 EAST 13 STREET

SOME VERY IMPORTANT POINTS YOUR LETTER REPLYING OUR LAST COMMUNICATION NEED CLARIFICATION. AFTER SERIOUS CONSIDERATION WE PROPOSE YOU SELECT CENTRAL COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVES TO OUR PLENUM TO CLARIFY MATTERS. PLENUM WILL ARRANGE SPECIAL SESSION CONVENIENCE YOUR SUBCOMMITTEE. STRONGLY URGE YOU DO SO INTEREST COMMUNIST UNITY. PLEASE REPLY PROMPTLY.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE C.P.O.
JAY LOVESTONE, SECRETARY.

Browder Replies for the Communist Party

COMMUNIST PARTY U.S.A.

December 31, 1934.

To the National Committee, "Communist" Opposition.

Your telegram just received. Our letter is entirely clear, so that there is certainly no principle question that requires debate before you establish your attitude on these matters. When you give a decisive indication of the direction in which you intend to move, then, if that direction is toward acceptance of our basic proposals, we will be prepared to discuss the problem of how to carry them out, at your plenum or after.

This letter is delivered by Comrade Jerome, who is authorized by us to observe your discussion on the question and report back to us, if you so desire.

Secretary, CPUSA
(signed) EARL BROWDER

Communist Opposition Proposes Joint Committee to Discuss all Problems involved involved in Achieving Unity

COMMUNIST PARTY U.S.A. (OPPOSITION)

January 5, 1935.

Earl Browder, General Secretary
Communist Party, U.S.A.
35 East 12 Street,
New York, N. Y.

Dear Comrade Browder:

We have been considering a reply to your recent communications to us.

Unfortunately your answer to our telegram came after the full sessions of our National Committee had been closed. The Buro of our National Committee, together with as many members of the National Committee as were still left in the city, gave most earnest consideration to your reply to our telegram. We decided to clarify further our position in another statement to you. Besides, we have chosen a representative and authoritative subcommittee to confer with a similar subcommittee of the C.C. of the Party with a view of facilitating clarification and unity.

Could you please let us know when our representatives could meet with yours? Such a meeting at an early date would be very helpful in the situation and we desire it before further action by us.

With Communist greetings,

JAY LOVESTONE.
Secretary.

Lovestone Replies to a Party Functionary

The Present State of the Party's Tactical Course; Is There a Fundamental Change in Trade Union Line? Our Part in Ultra-left Course

January 8, 1935.

Dear Comrade:

First of all, let me assure you we welcome your letter as a sign of the fundamental health and vigor of the main mass of the membership of our Party—the Communist Party. As you know, we have never made the slightest concessions to the Trotsky doctrine that the C.I. and its various sections have become hopelessly degenerated. You may be interested to learn that in recent weeks we have received letters, of the type you sent us, from a number of comrades thruout the country. To us these letters are encouraging in more ways than one. First of all, they confirm our estimate of the basic vitality of the CP, of its genuine Communist character insofar as principles are concerned. Then, these communications prove beyond challenge that our propaganda and efforts for correct Communist tactics and for a unified CP have been very far from in vain.

A Change Of Technique On Trade Union Field

We do not deny that in recent months the official CP in this country has begun to change its methods of work in the trade-union field. We maintain, however, that the turn of the CI in this country has, to date, on the trade union field, been rather one of technique and not of objective. I do not question for a moment that the CP has begun to liquidate whatever there was of quite a number of its "Red Unions." However, the C.P.'s fundamental conception of the bona fide trade union movement, of the A. F. of L., continues to be false. This contention of ours is confirmed by the following types of facts:

1. **General evaluation of the A. F. of L. as a hostile, anti-working class organization, the decline and demise of which are to be welcomed.** This is borne out rather crudely by the reports of Bill Dunne on the San Francisco Convention of the A. F. of L. In these reports in the Daily Worker Comrade Dunne went out of his way to emphasize that the A. F. of L. membership has not grown as much as some people thought, that the estimate of its membership must be revised sharply downwards. I cite here only a typical but rather authoritative instance.

2. **By the speedy and unrestrained endorsement of, and encouragement to all splitting efforts directed against the A. F. of L., no matter by whom such efforts are initiated or directed.** This was painfully borne out in the Daily Worker's dispatches during the recent Maloney "strike" in the hard-coal field. Every coal miner knows that Maloney is just as corrupt and at least, (if not much more), as reactionary as even the hard-boiled United Mine Workers of America, (U.M.W. of A.) bureocracy. Yet, merely because Maloney has been trying to split the U.M.W. of A. and to organize a dual union, tho it be really only a racket, his efforts in this direction are hailed and his disastrous results magnified in the spirit of welcoming them as achievements.

3. **The type of work conducted by the CP and the TUUL in the A. F. of L. since they have ordered their members and followers to join the conservative unions.** I have in mind specifically the destructive conduct by the official Party Comrades and their followers in the Paterson silk workers' ranks, in the United Textile Workers local unions. Smashing union hall doors, breaking up union meetings, are surely activities inside the A. F. of L. unions. But what the purpose of such "working inside the A. F. of L."? What is the goal to be achieved thru such methods? What motive serves as the mainspring of such vigorous activities? This is smashing and breaking up the unions from within. Obviously it is a different form of activity, in the sense that it is no longer taking pot shots from without, i.e. frontally attacking the A. F. of L. unions from the outside. The form has changed, but the substance, the content, hasn't; the purpose remaining unchanged—to undermine, to destroy and not to strengthen, to build.

4. **The attitude shown towards the CPO forces and their followers in the trade unions by the CP ranks and followers after their entry into the trade unions.** For years the CPO comrades and their followers have labored, under the severest handicaps (slimy and bitter attacks from Rights and Ultra-Lefts) to lay the foundation for a constructive, genuine progressive trade union movement. Yet, the very first job that the CP members were ordered to tackle in those A. F. of L. unions, where such progressive organizations have been built up, has been to attack these militant movements to try to disrupt, to slander them. Under CP and TUUL orders combinations have been entered into with the vilest henchmen of reactionaries against the leftward moving forces and practise of dual unionism. So far the party has made some hesitant and partial moves in this direction. But unfortunately the underlying dual unionist orientation and aims still remain. There has been no official repudiation of the old policies; there has been no clear official formulation of the new course. Some "Red" unions have indeed been liquidated and this we greet. But we cannot help noting that other "Red" unions are still left in the city, gave most earnest consideration to your reply to our telegram. We decided to clarify further our position in another statement to you. Besides, we have chosen a representative and authoritative subcommittee to confer with a similar subcommittee of the C.C. of the Party with a view of facilitating clarification and unity.

Could you please let us know when our representatives could meet with yours? Such a meeting at an early date would be very helpful in the situation and we desire it before further action by us.

With Communist greetings,

JAY LOVESTONE.
Secretary.

The Letter from a Party Functionary

Dec. 20, 1934.

Communist Party (Opposition),
51 West 14th St.,
New York City.

Comrades:

I am a member of the official Communist Party, a functionary, in one of our red trade unions (if you please) and of late a consistent reader of the "Workers Age". Before stating my purpose in writing to you I wish to state that I am in complete agreement with your position on trade union policy long before I knew the stand of your C.P.O. on this question, and I fought strongly in the fraction of our union against the line pursued by the C.P. Also, during the time I have been reading the "Workers Age" I have been convinced of the sincerity of the comrades in the CPO in hoping to see unity and an increasing strength of the official Communist Party, unlike the vicious Trotskyite group that is only succeeding to create disunity and confusion amongst the class-conscious workers.

However, there are certain theories that you accuse the C.P. of harboring that seem very stupid to me on the part of the comrades in the CPO.

Now that we are transferring our "main emphasis" on working within the AFL and liquidating our red unions (refusing to admit our mistake), you accuse us of wishing to smash the AFL as our only purpose in going in.

I consider this a foolish conception by the comrades of the CPO viewed from the following light: Now that we are liquidating our red unions and going into the AFL to smash them as you say, what form of economic organizations (trade unions), which is our most powerful weapon, are we going to utilize in a revolutionary situation to strike against the bourgeoisie and seize power?

This theory on your part I believe is not a sincere one, but only an attempt at justification of the refusal of your leaders in the AFL (needle trades, etc.) to admit the workers of the TUUL unions to enter the AFL, where the red unions are liquidating.

In all of our Party literature we have time and again stated that our object in working within the AFL was to revolutionize and rally the workers inside the reformist unions around our program, and at the same time to strive for every elective post within the unions.

And then again your quoting John J. Ballam of the TUUL "that the AFL unions are part of the strike-breaking machinery of capitalism", as being a wrong analysis and equivalent to calling them outright fascists, is incorrect in my opinion.

In the last strike wave that has swept the country the workers have definitely repudiated and shown to the bosses that they will not tolerate company unions and that the next best thing the machinery of the state and the bourgeoisie will do and is doing is to endorse and put forward the burocratic leadership of the AFL as a strikebreaking agency to stave off any militant actions by the workers against the bosses. Making it more imperative for the party to work within the AFL.

Comrades, I have noticed in the Dec. 15 issue of the Workers Age in the trade union page, on the question of whether Lovestone and his supporters **initiated** the dual union policy, emphasizing the work initiated at the beginning of the article, and at the conclusion in announcing the article for the next issue.

Comrades, I don't know how you are going to deal with this question, but whether you initiated or supported this policy of dual unions when in the party makes no difference. But what I want to know is how long after your supporting this policy of parallel unions, assuming that Comrade Stachel is correct, did you first come out publicly and oppose it? And if you did publicly oppose this policy a while later, which would still be to the credit of the Bolshevik foresight of Comrades in the CPO, in estimating correctly the futility of parallel unions before the Official Communist Party did (and refuse to admit it), have you made a public statement criticizing yourselves for supporting this move of red unions when you were in the party?

I think, Comrades, these are very important points. And if the CPO has not at any time criticized themselves for supporting this policy when in the party in a Bolshevik manner, you are doing the same thing our Official Party sometimes does—avoids real Bolshevik self-criticism.

And also Comrades, I wish you would explain your opposing the entrance of workers from TUUL unions into the AFL (dressmakers, textile) when all along you have been calling for the liquidation of the TUUL and for one union in every industry.

Your theory that we wish to smash the AFL does not hold any water, but only shows your inability to answer this question adequately.

Or perhaps Comrades this is a maneuver on your part to remain entrenched within the AFL where you control (rallying the workers around a militant program and not betraying them as you are often accused) in order to put pressure on the Party to reunite the CPO with the official CP. A maneuver, I believe, which would be justifiable under the circumstances.

I gather this last conclusion from the manner in which your editorials are written, looking forward to the day when the existing differences will be eradicated and the CPO will be back in the ranks of our Party to fight for the emancipation of the working class and for a Soviet America!

Comrades, I would appreciate a clarification on the above questions either through your paper or by mail.

A PARTY MEMBER

The Acid Test of A Bolshevik Party

Apparently the CP was decidedly beside the mark, thoroly wrong in its analysis and estimate of and perspective for the development of the American trade union movement. This in itself is not at all helpful, but not necessarily suicidal. The very best of us can make a mistake in analysis. What is tragic and costly in the whole situation is that the Party has not faced this serious error on its part in a frank, honest, Leninist manner. The acid test of a Bolshevik Party, of a revolutionary proletarian party, is to be found in its attitude towards mistakes. May I emphasize this and refresh your memory by recalling Lenin's view of the conduct of a revolutionary party towards mistakes. Lenis said:

> "The attitude of a political party towards its mistakes is one of the surest and most important tests of its seriousness and of its ability to discharge its duties towards its class and the laboring masses. To recognize a mistake openly, to find out its causes, to analyze the situation which occasioned it, to examine carefully the means of repairing it—this is the make of a serious party, that is what, in the case of a party, is called one's duty, educating the class and so the masses."

Mystification vs. Clarification

Instead of this honest and responsible approach, what has the CP leadership done? What has the leadership of the Comintern done? To make mistakes is forgivable; to hide them and persist in them is unpardonable; to avoid responsibility and fasten blame on others, to seek for scapegoats and hurl them, instead of the mistakes, down the abyss is criminal. Thus we do not consider it particularly honest for the C.I. Magazine No. 18 of recent date to state as follows:

> "The opinion which has existed that the A. F. of L. is dead as a door-nail, that it is losing its members, that it will not organize the unskilled workers, that it does not penetrate into the basic branches of industry, and that, therefore, there is no need to reckon with it has resulted in a great deal of harm. Such views were at one time expressed among the revolutionary miners' union leaders (at the time when the U.M.W.U. of A. had organized 85 per cent. of the entire mining industry), in the textile workers' union and even in the steel union."

Do you not see, Comrade, that the expression "some Comrades" is really used here as a blanket to cover the entire ECCI and the entire Central Committee, foisted upon our Party after our expulsion? Far be it from me to deny that these committees can be rightfully called "some Comrades," but why make a mystery out of an obviously simple and painful fact? Such mystification is no road to clarification, is not Bolshevik self-criticism; it is only an open sesame to confusion in principle and chaos in strategy. Such confusion may be very impressive, but it is also very harmful.

The CP Owes An Explanation

I am in entire accord with you in your conclusion that to smash unions is a very dangerous business. However, it will be impossible for the CP to convince the workers who have had a taste of its line in the last six years or so that it has really changed its tactics, unless the CP, thru its entire press and propaganda machinery, makes a clean, open, and honest break before the whole working class with its unclean recent past on the trade union field. We do not say this in any sense of trying to force the CP leadership to go to Canossa. We do not have the slightest interest in playing the game of "I told you so." We are not trying to rub it in instead of bringing a plaster. All we demand is that nothing be hidden from the working class, insofar as Communist principles and policies go. This is not a new demand for Communists to make. Marx made it long ago in the Communist Manifesto. When we make this demand we are not asking for concessions; the CP owes this to the working class, and to itself.

We Have Facilitated Transfer to A. F. of L.

By the way, Comrade, I really do think it would be worth while for you to investigate for yourself fully the facts as to the role of our Comrades on the question of admitting erstwhile TUUL members into the A. F. of L. unions. The Daily Worker's imagination has been working over time on this question. It is an unchallengeable fact that in the International Ladies Garment Workers Union (ILGWU), our comrades, holding positions of influence, have utilized their influence consistently and systematically, to facilitate the acceptance of and the entry into the A. F. of L. unions by former TUULers. In Local 22 of the ILGWU Comrade Zimmerman, and in the Knit Goods locals Comrade Nelson, have gone out of their way even to lower initiation fees, even to lower the cost of membership books, and in general to compel the conservative leaders to remove all obstacles to the admission of the TUUL members into the genuine unions. In Paterson, Comrade Keller championed the entry of what there was left of the National Textile Workers Industrial Union.

Quite naturally, adhering to our policy, we will not allow one inch of ground to CP members and followers who, immediately upon entry into A. F. of L. unions, begin their work inside these organizations for disruptive and destructive purposes.

Is Government Endorsing The A. F. of L.?

It appears to me, Comrade, that you have not yet fully liberated yourself from the false Party attitude towards the American trade union movement when you say:

> "In the last strike wave that has swept the country the workers have definitely repudiated and shown to the bosses that they will not tolerate company unions and the next best thing the machinery of the state and the bourgeoisie will do and is doing is to endorse and put forward the burocratic leadership of the AFL as a strikebreaking agency to stave off any militant actions by the workers against the bosses. Making it more imperative for the party to work within the A. F. of L."

This is really a carry-over of the crassly false decisions of the Tenth Plenum on the trade unions. Just try to test this conception of yours in the fire of life, in the light of reality. Without doubt, the leadership of the United Textile Workers (McMahon-Gorman) are astronomical distances away from progressivism. Yet, did the Government conspire with these leaders to declare and direct the textile strike, which was the greatest strike this country had seen in more than a decade? General Johnson was as much a part of the Government as any one in those days. Did he shower words of friendship on Gorman? What lessons do you draw from the Weirton case? And what lessons do you draw from the Houde case? It is very simple to divide the world in two parts: we Communists—and the rest operating as a grand but hostile conspiracy. Pardon my strong language here. This is tommyrot, not Marxism. This is ultra-left claptrap, not Leninism. Whoever thinks that the Government is going to back up the A. F. of L. in organization drives or strikes is just not thinking, or thinking very, very poorly at best.

For The Preservation Of The Unions

The big fight around which a mass revolutionary movement can be really built in this country (provided sound tactics are pursued) will come precisely around the issue of preserving genuine trade unionism, regardless of how conservative it may be at the particular moment. The CPO does not hesitate to proclaim unequivocably that it will spare no efforts or pains to resist any and every attempt that may be made by the Government and its servers, the employing class, to weaken unionism. We will pursue this course even towards the most conservative unions, towards a union led even by the blackest reactionaries, against all Government efforts to foster, in any way at all, round-about or frontal, company unionism or corporate unionism. Unionists must learn one thing before all else—that the class struggle is not a simple process which can be reduced to a mechanical two-sentence formula.

Our Role In Dual Union Line

Now, about our role in the C.P.'s launching the dual unionist course. Yes, Comrade, we did play our part in initiating the dual unionist policy of the Party. Frankly, we played more than our part, because we should not have played any part at all. We knew better even in 1928. We did this as disciplined Communists, submitting, tho disagreeing. We resisted the line of the Fourth Congress of the Profitern, which detoured the Communist Party from correct trade union policies. Thus, when we were the leadership of the Party we never printed in the Daily Worker or any of the Party publications the trade union resolutions of the Fourth Congress of the Profintern. Incidentally, it may interest you to learn that none other than Comrade Foster was most vigorous in helping us resist this dual union line. By the way, none other than James P. Cannon was most energetic in his support of Lozovsky's union-smashing policies, enunciated at and adopted by the Fourth Profintern Congress early in.1928. Please consult the articles by Comrade Foster and myself in the July, 1929 issue of the **Communist** for confirmation of this contention on my part.

As We Saw It In 1929

I repeat: We submitted to the dual union policy under discipline and challenged it after putting it in practice for a few months, after testing it in life, the final test. When we resisted it, the crash came. As early as 1929, but a few months after my expulsion, we prepared a pamphlet called "The Crisis in the

(*Continued on Page 4*)

The Road to Real Communist Unity

(*Continued from Page 2*)

unions are being obstinately retained and comrades are being disciplined for urging their dissolution. We cannot help noting, also, that the party attitude to the mass unions remains essentially the same; they are still looked upon as alien, enemy organizations. We cannot help noting finally that Comrade Stachel, in his recent report to the Political Buro, in speaking of the "independent federation of labor," declared that "altho we retain the slogan, we cannot use it immediately." (The Communist, November 1934). To retain this slogan means dual unionism, lock, stock and barrel. Under the circumstances, therefore, and until there is some real change in basic orientation and aim, we are forced to regard the recent shift in party policy on the trade union field as no more than an adaptation of the old sectarian course to the new situation created by the general collapse of the "Red" unions and their complete loss of influence among the workers. Cooperation will become possible the moment a serious step is taken to consciously scrap the sectarian and dual unionist principles that still underlie party trade union policy.

Some Specific Prerequisites

Cooperation in the dressmakers union will become possible just as soon as the "Left Group" (which is under party control) speaks out unreservedly against dual unionism, severs its connections with the Industrial Union, gives up its disruptive tactics, breaks its alliance with the most reactionary and discredited forces in the union and comes to the support of the progressive movement.

Cooperation in the silk workers union will become possible just as soon as the party drops its reckless activities tending to wreck the organization, breaks relations with corrupt and questionable elements and comes to the support of the progressive movement.

Cooperation in the shoe workers union will become possible just as soon as the New York local (which is under party control) stops functioning as a dual union within the union, just as soon as the party calls a halt to the attempts to demoralize and break up the organization and comes to the support of the progressive movement.

Cooperation in the miners union will become possible just as soon as the party ceases its flirtations with such reactionary cliques as the Capellini-Maloney union in the Anthracite, (merely because it is a dualist breakaway movement), and adopts a healthy, constructive attitude towards the progressive elements in the U.M.W.A.

Cooperation in the automobile unions will become possible just as soon as the party changes its present dual unionist orientation in regard to the M.E.S.A. and the "independent federation of labor," calls a halt to all maneuvers leading to splits and comes to the support of the progressive forces in the A. F. of L. auto unions.

Cooperation in the teachers union will become possible just as soon as the "Rank and File Group" drops its anti-union attitude, dissolves the dualist Classroom Teachers Group and comes to the support of the progressive movement.

In brief, cooperation on the trade union field will become possible just as soon as you break with dual unionism all along the line and readopt Leninist trade union tactics, just as soon as you officially dissolve the T.U.U.L. and all "Red" unions in this country, just as soon as you decide to throw your forces in support of the growing progressive movement in the A. F. of L. unions.

The Struggle Against War and Fascism

In our original letter we proposed cooperation in the building up of an effective movement against war and Fascism. We emphasized that, if it is to mean anything at all, such a movement must be a workers movement based on the trade unions. Self-deception will not do here. It is easy enough to say that the American League against War and Fascism "represents already millions of workers, farmers, students, intellectuals, etc." but what good does it do? Everyone knows that the American League is now a very narrow organization, practically divorced from the labor movement, embracing hardly more than a few Communists and sympathizers together with some liberals, pacifists and churchmen. It is an undeniable fact that the American League is not today nor can it ever become the organizational vehicle of a real movement against war and fascism. Only a new movement, on a new and sound foundation, with a program, approach and methods of cooperation calculated to appeal to the American workers in their organizations, can hope to crystallize the widespread anti-war and anti-Fascist sentiment among the working masses. It is manifestly the duty of the Communists to stimulate the development of such a movement and, for this object and on this program, we again offer our cooperation.

For A United Unemployed Movement

Fruitful cooperation is also possible in the unemployed movement. The vital necessity of one united non-partisan organization of the unemployed, organically tied up with the labor movement, is recognized everywhere. We, on our part, have contributed our share to this end. If now the Unemployed Council will only break all connections, direct or indirect, with the dual unionist T.U.U.L. and come out openly and sincerely for one united non-partisan organization of the unemployed, effective cooperation between us will be assured.

We have stated our position on practical cooperation in the various fields of our work as clearly and as plainly as possible because we believe that no good can come from vagueness or ambiguity on such matters. In a word: Cooperation between us in any field of work becomes possible and greatly desirable the moment you drop the sectarian tactics that have been a blight upon our movement for so long and adopt genuinely constructive policies in line with the teachings of Marx and Lenin and the best traditions of Communism!

Let Us Clear The Way For Unity

But even more important than practical cooperation is the question of political clarification to which we refer in our letter. We agree with you that "there is certainly no principle question that requires debate" but there are surely very serious questions of strategy, tactics and methods on which we differ. Would it not be of great advantage all around if these differences could be cleared up or at least reduced to a minimum? And how can this be done better than by joint discussions conducted in a free, frank and comradely manner? It is difficult for us to understand your persistent opposition to our proposals for bringing about a better political understanding between us so as to pave the way to complete unity.

We wish to urge you again to accept our suggestion to set up a joint committee to encourage and regulate the mutual discussion of the disputed questions thru the exchange of articles in our papers, joint discussion meetings, etc. If you feel that our political position is weak and our program false, then you should certainly welcome these proposals since they would enable you to expose all our errors and shortcomings. We, on our part, are quite ready to stand by the consequences of such a discussion.

International Aspects Of Unity Problem

Any step towards unity we may take here in this country will be of great value internationally. For basically the problem of unity is a world-wide one. The division in the world Communist movement is international and so are the issues on which it is based. In the long run Communist unity will not be complete unless it is on a world scale, unless it is the unification of the Communist International with the International Communist Opposition. But every genuine advance we make in the United States will encourage the movement towards unity everywhere. And it is to join us in making this advance that we appeal to you again!

Fraternally,

NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMUNIST PARTY U.S.A.
(OPPOSITION)

JAY LOVESTONE, Secretary

Roy's Life Still In Great Peril

BOMBAY, India.—Manabendra Nath Roy, outstanding Indian revolutionist, a collaborator of Lenin on numerous studies of the colonial question, and a leader of the Communist International until expelled in 1930, is slowly dying in the Barreilly Central Jail, where he has already served 3 of a 6 year sentence for "conspiracy against the British Crown."

Following protests in India, by the parliamentary representatives of the Independent Labor Party of England and from the United States, Roy had been removed to the Almora Jail, where the climate was not as harmful to his tubercular condition. He had begun to improve when he was again transfered to Barreilly Central Jail.

The restrictions are even greater than they were before. The special diet he

had received at Almora was withdrawn. His complaints of pains in the chest, coughing, exhaustion and blood expectoration, have gone unheeded. Medical attention is refused. To make matters even worse he has been forced to stop work on the three books he was preparing (Spiritualism and India's Mission In The World; Exposition Of The Latest Scientific Theories; and Indian Philosophy) because of the refusal of the authorities to permit him the use of writing material. The excuse given is that he might send out messages. Even Roy's iron constitution has given way. We must urge all our friends to protest again and quickly,—before it is altogether too late.

So flagrant is this attempt to destroy one of India's revolutionary figures that a number of outstanding and important citizens in Bombay have issued a statement calling for his immediate release.

Lovestone Replies to a Party Functionary

(*Continued from Page 3*)

C.P. U.S.A.—Statement of Principles of the C.P. (Majority Group)". In this pamphlet we sharply, tho not as clearly as today, after five years of critical examination and constructive practice, condemned the united front and trade union policies of the C.P. Let me cite from this pamphlet but two relevant quotations:

"The real nature of the fantasies of 'social fascism' and the ultra-left phrases of 'revolutionary waves', etc. is shown in the complete rejection by the ECCI of the tactics of the united front. Lenin and the Comintern repeatedly pointed out that united front tactics must be applied until the barricade struggles—and after...

"The false revisionist line in the mobilization of the masses comes to the sharpest expression in the new line in trade union work. This new line is in essentials a sectarian anti-trade unions course, amounting in effect not only to a rejection of the tasks of the Communists in the mass organizations, but even to a repudiation of the essential role of the trade union movement—whether under reactionary or revolutionary leadership—as the elementary form of the class organization of the proletariat.

" . . . The ECCI draws the absolutely false conclusion that the trade unions as such have ceased to be centers of class organization and have been transformed into 'agencies and appendages of the capitalist state'. It is clear that such a thoroly anti-Marxist conception is only the 'trade union' phase of the story of 'social fascism' ".

"The X Plenum did not have the political courage to declare openly for the immediate inauguration of a policy of splitting the unions; it would have been 'untactful' and 'premature'. It satisfied itself with general declarations as to the 'permissibility' of splits 'under certain conditions' and with the putting forward of certain 'organizational' proposals of profound political significance which would in effect mean the setting up of dual organizations immediately, as, for example, the proposal (of Lozovsky) to set up 'independent commissions opposed to the reformist unions' to lead strikes, to make terms, to conclude wage and hour agreements, etc. and to 'maintain their existence after the struggle in order to see that the agreements are carried out, ' i.e., to set up new unions in fact.

"It is well known what Lenin thought of such split tactics. But unfortunately our 'leaders' of today ha forgotten entirely the lessons cc tained in Lenin's pamphlet on Let ism."

We Have Learned From Experience

So much for Party history. What i especially important at this momen however, is that we broke with our shor spell of dual unionism more than fiv years ago, while the official C.P. ha yet to break with it. For Stachel an his aides de camp to condemn us fc having played a small part in the dua union epidemic while he has yet to brea with it or even slightly disavow tl plague, is not exactly Communist cor duct—not exactly integrity of princ ple—not exactly Bolshevik self-criticisi and not exactly conducive to the best ir terests of the C.P. and, therefore, c the working class.

If you will examine the first numbe of the **Revolutionary Age** and the earl numbers of **The Workers Age,** or th three volumes of **Where We stand,** yo will find that we have had a self-criti cal attitude, that we have not hidde our errors in the trade union or an other field. When any worker or com rade points out to us errors we hav made, we are prepared to discuss thes with him or her. If convinced, w should be more than ready to adm them, to correct them, and to do every thing possible not to repeat them.

Finally, I cannot stress too strongl to you, Comrade, that we are in heart iest agreement with you in your genu ine desire for Communist unity. W feel that we cannot underscore too heav ily our honest wish for the speediest, genuine and complete Communist unifi cation. To us this is an absolute prere quisite for working-class unity. In our effort to achieve such Communist unity we have not resorted to slander, mud slinging, or petty maneuvering. We have at all times tried to criticize the false tactics of the Party in a constructive manner. To the best of our ability we have at all times tried to pit against the false Party practices our own sound tactics. The influence we have won in the trade unions and the political prestige our organization has gained after five years of bitter and difficult struggle, are due entirely to our firmness in principle and to our vigorous fight for sound Leninist tactics.

We Fight For Party Democracy

One point your letter has entirely omitted. I refer to the problem of Party democracy, to the task of restoring democratic centralism in the various sections of the Comintern as well as in the C.I. Here I also have in mind the need of building up an authoritative, democratically elected, collective leadership for the Comintern. As you know, we set the restoration of Party democracy as an absolute prerequisite for Communist unity. I would appreciate hearing from you about this phase of the Party crisis.

I do hope I have cleared up the questions you have raised. If not, just don't hesitate telling us so. Just do not be slow in questioning either what is unclear, or raising any other questions that may have arisen for you since. We have always contended that, thru a comradely discussion, clarification can be arrived at and the Party line corrected. In this sense do we particularly welcome your letter and the letters we are now receiving from other Party comrades.

Yours for a return to sound Leninist tactics and Party democracy.

JAY LOVESTONE.

For a Labor Party in the U.S.A.

(*Continued from Page 1*)

making for a more unified working class; that is, for the proletariat being able to act more unitedly and more on a general class basis, on a national mass political basis.

Labor Party To Resist Fascist Measures

5. The Labor Party question assumes special timeliness and interest for the greatest mass of workers in the face of certain features of the New Deal in its larger aspects. Under the guise of "impartiality" and "social interests" the New Dealers are working up step by step a technique for government ownership of the unions, in reality for corporate or Fascist unions, for sapping the very life-blood of the trade unions, as genuine labor organizations—all ostensibly in behalf of a so-called larger or more social interest! Besides, Roosevelt's much over-advertised program of social legislation will only become an obstacle to genuine social legislation and a source of still more and greater burdens imposed on the workers, unless they organize themselves politically as a class in defense of their own interests.

Union Growth As Base For Labor Party

6. The developing fighting mood among the workers has given rise in recent months to a great expansion of the A. F. of L., to a vast influx of masses, about 2 millions, mainly unskilled and semi-skilled, into the trade unions. In this influx of masses we find not only a great force for the reorganization of the craft unions into industrial unions, for setting up a new structural form for the whole A. F. of L. but also for the bona-fide unions, sooner rather than later, serving as the basis for a Labor Party movement. Hence, the Labor Party issue is today more timely than it has been in at least ten years.

VII. OUR OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGY IN THE LABOR PARTY CAMPAIGN

1. The Communists, as the vanguard of the proletariat, must not only be able to point out clearly the objective basis of this trend towards a Labor Party in the United States. We must also be able to stimulate this historically progressive trend in a country which has relatively the most politically backward working class in the world.

2. "Why must the Communists act thus? Because it is their task to remain in closest contact with the masses in order to influence the latter continually in a revolutionary sense, However, mere agitation and propaganda, even the best, is not sufficient for revolutionary influence on the masses. For this purpose the masses require their own revolutionary **experience.** They can obtain essential elements of this experience in the Labor Party, even tho the latter be directed by reformists. In that case the masses, after their disappointments, will learn to know the treasonable role of the petty-bourgeois reformists, and that is very important. Furthermore, they will gain valuable experience in the independent political organizations of the working class". (E.C.C.I. resolution—1925).

Trade Union Masses Must Be Aroused

3. Our agitation for a Labor Party is not something abstract based merely on our analysis, but is to be tied up with the every day immediate interests of the workers, particularly the burning need for social insurance, the right to organize, the menace of company unions, etc. It is on this basis that the Labor Party movement will serve as a most effective weapon for breaking down the prejudices against independent working class political action spread among the working masses thru generations by the capitalists. It is in this sense that the Labor Party will serve as a further entering wedge into great masses of workers whom we have not been able to reach directly thru their immediate struggles or who are not yet approachable with the direct Communist appeal.

4. Every bona fide trade union and labor organization, regardless of color or nativity of its membership, so long as it is opposed to the capitalist class political parties (Democratic and Republican) should be affiliated to the Labor Party and be part of the Labor bloc participating under one banner in the election campaigns. Every such affiliated body maintains its own distinct organization as part of the federated Labor Party and has the right to engage in constructive criticism as well as exercise full freedom for propagating its own principles. Inside the Labor Party every organization (Communist, Socialist, trade union) has a right to try to have its members nominated as standard-bearers on the Labor Party ticket in the elections.

Role Of The Communists

5. Thru our model construetive activity among the labor party organization and members, we Communists should be able not only to draw the more militant and advanced workers into our ranks but should also be able to help move the whole organization leftward. In both fashions we will be thus laying a better basis for a healthy, united, mass Communist Party in the United States

6. We should not connect the Labor Party with any aims achievable only by a Communist Party; such as the Proletarian Dictatorship, Soviet Power, etc. At the same time we must conduct, constructively, campaigns inside the Labor Party for more leftward demands, attuned, of course, to the need of maintaining the broadest organizational base for the Labor Party. Given such broad unity of action thru a Labor Party, we have here an engine of effective mass struggle against Fascism, War, and capitalist reaction in general.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

1. The Communist Party (Opposition) should, thru propaganda, agitation and thru its influence in the trade unions, do everything in its power to stimulate and hasten the historical process of a Labor Party development in the United States. In our doing this, we are hastening the transformation of the workers from pawns of the two big bourgeois political parties into conscious forces moving and fighting in their own behalf.

2. While recognizing the great likelihood that a Labor Party would, at the outset, have a confused program, lacking clarity in its policies, inadequate from the proletarian revolutionary viewpoint, it would still mark a distinct forward step for the American working class.

3. The development of a mass Communist movement rooted in the soil of the country is in very large measure bound up with the development of a genuine mass Labor Party movement. Thru constructive activities, thru systematic, Marxist-Leninist education, the C.P.O. can, today, as a banner bearer in the fight for a Labor Party, or tomorrow, thru the unified Communist Party being part of an existing Labor Party, tremendously enhance its mass influence and help insure a mass base for a Communist Party, the founda tion for a proletarian dictatorship and a socialis society in the United States.

Dec. 31, 1934.