

Toward Socialism

Pre-convention Discussion Bulletin
of the BILL HAYWOOD COMMUNIST CLUB
of Illegally Expelled Members of the
C.P.U.S.A.

Issue No. 10 - February 20, 1949

Subscription \$1.00 per year; 15¢ each

Editor: Francis Franklin

B. Rosenstein, Sec'y, P.O. Box 92
Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N.Y.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A Powerful Weapon Against the Wall St. Imperialist
War-Mongers:- George Marion's "Bases and Empire,
a Chart of American Expansion".....1
For a Genuine Youth Movement and a Federation of Organ-
izations Fighting for Peace.....2
The Present Left-Wing Crisis in the Trade Unions (Part 1).3
Communist Morality (Continued from last issue).....11
A Friendly Exchange of Ideas With Comrades in
Alameda County, California.....13
A Misquotation in "Political Affairs".....14
Organize a Real Fight for the Dismissal of the
Indictment Against the Present Leaders of the Party....14

* * * * *

A POWERFUL WEAPON AGAINST THE WALL STREET IMPERIALIST WAR-MONGERS:-
George Marion's "BASES AND EMPIRE, A CHART OF AMERICAN EXPANSION"

An American author has published - at his own expense - a powerful weapon against the war-mongering imperialists of Wall St. He could find no publisher in the U.S. WHO would publish his book! Newspapers like the N.Y. Times and the late "liberal" Star (successor to P.M.) have refused to take paid ads for this book.

The author is George Marion, former writer for the Daily Worker. His pamphlet, The Free Press: Portrait of a Monopoly, was, in our judgment, the only really good pamphlet, written by an American writer, issued by the Party since the Duclos criticism.

Marion's recent book, Bases and Empire, A Chart of American Expansion, is a powerful marshalling of the facts (gathered entirely from the most conservative and reactionary sources) to demonstrate the enormous extent of American economic, political, and military expansion since the end of World War II. Here is a handbook of facts proving irrefutably who is the aggressor and who is planning systematically for a third World War today, viz. Wall St. Here is a detailed factual outline of the world-wide military preparations by the U.S. Government that have been going on uninterruptedly since the last War, that were commenced even during the last war to the detriment of the conduct of the anti-fascist war itself.

This book should be printed by some organization fighting for peace in a cheap, paper-bound 25¢ edition and spread in mass over the four corners of the U.S. It should become a factual guide book for thousands of agitators for peace who should arouse the people of the U.S. in every organization, in every community of every urban center, in every hamlet, and every rural area. The people of the U.S. just simply do not know these facts. As Marion himself points out, the people of the U.S. live behind the one real "Iron Curtain" in the world today, the iron curtain of the corrupt, lying American press (a monopolistic business, not a means for the dissemination of truth).

George Marion's book was reviewed most favourably in the July 1, 1948 issue of the official organ of the Communist Information Bureau, For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy! It also received a lengthy and favourable review in Pravda, December 2, 1948. Reviewing it in Masses and Mainstream, Joseph Starobin called it "The kind of work that should be loaded into an old truck and taken from town to town, handed out at the county fairs and the village cross-roads.....The book is a primer for those who want to stop the cold war before it knocks us all cold." Louis Adamic's magazine, Trends and Tides, published in Milford, N.J., declared, "This is by far the most important book for Americans, so far published.....If you don't buy another book this year, buy this!" It has been praised in the columns of Milton Howard and Barnard Rubin. It also received one routine review in the Daily Worker.

It is understandable that a powerful weapon against imperialism such as this book would be boycotted by the bourgeoisie and its kept press; but why is this book, which was praised by Communist Parties abroad, boycotted by our Party? While a token acknowledgment was made of the book by certain columnists of the Daily Worker, no attempt has been made to push this book. International Publishers would not publish it. It was published by the author on April 1, 1948, but the Workers Bookstore at 50 East 13 Street has not carried it. When people have inquired for it at the Workers Bookstore, they have been told that the Bookstore does not carry it-without any further explanation. When people have asked for it at the Jefferson School Bookshop and at the Bookfair, some of them have been told

that the book is "out of print", although this is false! The book is not pushed by the Daily Worker or the Party literature apparatus. It is not mentioned in lists of recommended books published in the Daily Worker. Apparently few Party members or sympathizers know of its existence. We ourselves learned of the facts we are here reporting only by a whole series of accidents.

Obviously an investigation is called for. The following should be investigated:- (1) Alexander Trachtenberg's failure to publish this book so as to insure it a wide distribution; (2) the failure of the present management of the Daily Worker to push this book; (3) exactly what the National Educational Committee and Literature Department of the Party have done in reference to this book.

No Party spokesman has attacked this book. It has been praised by the few Party writers who have commented on it (Starobin, Howard, Fast, Rubin). It appears that not only is the literature of the world Communist movement under a partial ban by the present leadership, but that obstacles are placed in the way of American writers who make powerful exposes of American imperialism.

We urge all our readers to buy this book, to study it, to popularize it among their friends and in mass organizations, to demand that it be pushed at Party meetings and in the Party press, and to see to it that a campaign is organized for its use as a weapon in a powerful peace movement of the whole American people.

It may be obtained from Marion's own firm: Fairplay Publishers, 25 West 44 Street, Room 414, New York 18, N. Y.

* * * * *

FOR A GENUINE YOUTH MOVEMENT AND A FEDERATION OF ORGANIZATIONS FIGHTING FOR PEACE

Back in the 1930's, the Party was in the forefront in organizing a powerful movement against war and fascism. The Young Communist League played an outstanding role in helping to build a strong and dramatic youth movement. There was such a broad and active federation of youth organizations as the American Youth Congress. Among the students, there was the American Student Union, which mobilized other organizations for the dramatic student anti-war strikes, which helped to arouse the whole population. Among the population at large there was the League Against War and Fascism, a broad federation of organizations which enlightened and aroused large numbers.

A powerful anti-fascist peace offensive by labor and the whole American people is needed today as never before.

In our opinion, the young workers and students in and around our Party, without further delay, without the heavy and meaningless mumbo-jumbo of resolutions that never lead to action, but with the truly inspiring enthusiasm of youth itself when devoted to a good cause, should begin to lay plans for the reorganization of the Young Communist League. The aim of the Young Communist League should be to study and to fight.

The youth should study Marxism itself at the source - not dull and misleading outlines, but, for current events analyzed by theory, the Cominform bulletins and New Times and, for basic theory, the Communist Manifesto; Engels, Socialism, Utopian and Scientific; Marx, Wage-Labor and Capital and Value, Price and Profit; Lenin's, Imperialism, State and Revolution, The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky, "Left-Wing" Communism: An Infantile Disorder, The Task of the Youth Leagues; Stalin's Foundations of Leninism, Dialectical and Historical Materialism, the History of the C.P.S.U.; Dimitroff's Report to the Seventh World Congress. Here is a good projected systematic course of study for beginners. The youth should read and study these books themselves. These works are not too hard to understand, and are all available in pamphlet form. It is a revisionist falsehood that people cannot understand Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin themselves. These writings are not altogether easy, but nothing good in this world is easy. With determination, they can and should be mastered, and no outline of any sort or any lecture of any sort can be a substitute for them. They are full of fire and spirit, as well as scientific content. They are not dull and pedantic. And when they are mastered, one who uses his head is armed against revisionism.

While studying, the youth should fight, just as, while fighting, it should learn to study. A Young Communist League is necessary to rally the youth to fight the draft, to fight military preparations, to fight for peace, to fight for jobs, to rally the youth into and around the trade unions, to fight for civil rights, for the rights of the Negro people, and against all forms of racial or national discrimination, to fight for education, to fight against fascist crime, against the fascist efforts to corrupt the morals of the youth, to preserve the achievements of human culture in the past against fascist bestiality, to disseminate among the youth the spirit of internationalism, to spread everywhere with the inspiring fervor of youth the glorious teachings of socialism and what it will mean for our toiling, poverty-stricken people, who, surrounded on every hand by corrupt movies, blaring radios, and screaming newspapers, are starved not only for decent food, clothing, houses, and places where they can lead a healthy social life, but also

for genuine culture. Young Communists, fired with the crusading moral zeal of a truly glorious cause, can bring new life and a hope based on reality to tens of millions.

The existing Progressive Party and such organizations as the Civil Rights Congress must be built, as we have emphasized repeatedly. But where is there a truly broad organization that seeks to rally all the organizations of the whole people, regardless of political belief or other issues, for peace? A powerful federation of organizations demanding an end to war preparations and concrete steps for peace is absolutely demanded by the times. Into such a federation, broad sections of the churches, large numbers of religious organizations, especially religious youth organizations (Y's, Epworth Leagues, Baptist Young People's Unions, etc.) can be won, as they were into the American Youth Congress and the League Against War and Fascism during the 30's. All that is required is the will and energy to mobilize them.

The people of this country have not forgotten what they learned of the Soviet Union during the war. The Red Flag of the U.S.S.R. was flying all over the U.S. during the war. Much truth about the Soviet Union reached the whole people during the war. Our people do not hate the Soviet Union, and do not want to fight it. We should have learned from the recent election that the masses do not take the press as gospel. The press does not reflect the way they think. And Truman's denunciations of Communism on behalf of greedy bankers, manufacturers, politicians, generals, and admirals are no reflection of how the people think. They elected him because they hoped he might really stand for peace and democratic measures to bring a better life to the American people. They did not elect him to continue to foment war among nations.

In our judgment, concrete, practical plans should be launched to mobilize a broad federation of organizations to fight for peace. Any Communist who in this mobilization should attempt to "capture" it, who does not work in the true spirit of the united front should become suspect of trying to disrupt it. The task of Communists is to exercise leadership by fighting actively side by side with the people, not to try to capture organizations. Only by working honestly with people can Communists give any real leadership. Any other approach drives people away, and driving them away is not giving leadership.

In any federation of organizations fighting for peace, the trade unions are the most basic and important. And this is the lesson that must be brought to all Americans, viz. that only by rallying around labor can they accomplish their aims. Labor is the decisive force in the world today. To labor belongs the future. This is the basic message of Communism.

* * * * *

THE PRESENT LEFT-WING CRISIS IN THE TRADE UNIONS

While the Communist Party is the organization whose primary function is to be the vanguard of labor, the trade unions necessarily constitute the main bulwark of labor. It is the unions which constitute the basic, primary, mass organizations of labor. There can be no more important problem confronting any Communist Party than its relations to the trade union movement. This is the mass organizational problem of the Communist Party of paramount importance.

It is indicative of the degree of parliamentary illusions bred by all bourgeois-democracies that a major portion of the discussion of our present Party crisis has revolved around election campaigns and Party electoral policy. The discussion of this problem is certainly of great importance and must be continued, for clarity on this question has by no means been achieved anywhere. However, it is unfortunate that, by comparison, relatively little serious discussion has occurred of Party policy in the trade unions. This is the most basic aspect of the mass work of the Party. Not only is the task of building the Progressive Party into a powerful farmer-labor-Negro people's party which will stand as a bulwark against fascism connected with the task of developing a sound Party trade union policy, but building the Progressive Party into a genuine farmer-labor party depends upon the mobilization of the trade unions for an effective fighting, class-struggle policy. No aspect of Party activity can be approached seriously if there is not the most earnest attention to this most fundamental of all problems - the relation of the Party to the trade unions.

On no question does greater unclarity prevail in the present Party organization.

Recent events (especially the C.I.O. Convention at Portland, Oregon) have forced upon the attention of all Party and non-Party Communists and sympathizers the realization that the Communist Party has suffered a major defeat in the unions and that this defeat flows not simply from the blows of reaction but from erroneous policies that have been pursued consistently for a number of years.

Enemies of the Communist movement wish to hide these errors or to prevent a thoroughgoing analysis, so that the Party may continue to make either these same

errors or other errors that are just as bad. All real, i.e. honest Communists, on the other hand, recognize that a thorough-going analysis is necessary as the means for rectifying disastrous mistakes. These real Communists will soon learn to spot who are the enemies who try to prevent such an analysis. Certainly they are not going to expect the "reports" of those who conceived and executed the erroneous policies of recent years to throw light on how to rectify the present situation.

It is correct Marxist procedure to approach all problems historically. There was a time when Communist policy in the unions in the U.S. proved itself by success to be basically correct. Recent events have proven that a correct policy was at a certain point abandoned (not in 1945, as Browder is now arguing, but long before 1945).

The ignorance of Party history that has been perpetuated by the present Party mis-leadership is enormous. Therefore, we are going to introduce our discussion of the Party's trade union policy by a brief survey of the history of the Party's relations to the trade unions. The whole basic policy of the Communist Party after 1919 and until the early 1940's represented a decisive break from the previous trade union policies of the former left-wing movements of the American labor movement. We shall, therefore, give a brief preliminary summary of the policies of the old Socialist Labor Party, the Socialist Party and the I.W.W. in relation to the trade unions.

We believe that attention to this history will prove extremely helpful in finding a correct solution to the present crisis.

1. The Trade Union Policies of the Old Socialist Labor Party, the Socialist Party, and the I.W.W., 1886-1919 - Oscillation of the American Left-Wing between Sectarian Dual Unionism and Opportunist Class Collaboration.

The old Socialist Labor Party in the early years of the history of the A.F. of L. made efforts to get the A.F. of L. to adopt its program for socialism. When it inevitably failed in this sectarian effort, the Socialist Labor Party led the small number of workers under its influence out of the A.F. of L. and formed tiny dual unions under its own leadership. So bitter became the sectarian feud of these dual left unions against the A.F. of L. that socialist workers at times were even ordered by their "socialist" leaders to scab on A.F. of L. strikes! When members of the S.L.P. protested against such stupid and suicidal policies, the leadership of the S.L.P. resorted to the most merciless policy of bureaucratic expulsions of its own membership. Whole organizations of the S.L.P. were expelled all over the country.

It is instructive to observe that the main stronghold of the bureaucratic leadership of the S.L.P. was the New York organization. Those who think that the main center of the progressive labor movement in the U.S. is in New York City (the smug illusion of many New York radicals) are profoundly in error. In fact, New York City has been the traditional organizational stronghold of a stifling bureaucracy within both the old Socialist and the present Communist movements in the U.S.

The stupid sectarianism and tyrannical bureaucracy of the S.L.P. leadership gave rise to the emergence of the Socialist Party. Not only did the class-conscious workers who saw through the insanity of S.L.P. sectarianism help to form the S.P., but large numbers of workers who had never even considered joining the S.L.P. flocked into the new S.P., which advocated carrying the message of socialism to the broad masses of workers in the A.F. of L. in a non-sectarian manner. Executing this policy meant that all Socialists should become loyal members of the A.F. of L., working to build the A.F. of L. and fighting its battles, without seeking to impose upon it a program for which it was not ready. The S.P. was thus founded, among other things, on the correct general principle of working in a non-sectarian manner to build the A.F. of L. into the fighting mass organization of labor, while simultaneously working patiently to convince the workers of the necessity for socialism. Labor leaders like Eugene V. Debs and Big Bill Haywood together with thousands of rank and file followers thus entered the S.P., which became a relatively broad and popular movement within the labor movement and throughout the country as a whole.

While the S.P., unlike the old S.L.P., rooted itself in the American labor movement, it swung over in the course of time to the opposite extreme of opportunism and class collaboration. It tried, under the influence of lawyers and other middle class professional men, as well as of trade union officials, to buy off capitalist attacks by watering down its program to the utterly Utopian concept of the purely peaceful victory of socialism at the polls. It failed to work out disciplinary methods for collective action, and its members who held functions in the A.F. of L., unchecked by rank and file control, for which S.P. organization did not provide, became indistinguishable from any other trade union bureaucrats. Socialism as a program was relegated solely to election campaigns. S.P. members functioned solely as individuals in the unions. There were no fractions or shop branches and no S.P. discipline for its trade union members.

A crass example of S.P. opportunism in the unions was seen in the A.F. of L. Convention in 1916. The S.P. Convention had adopted a resolution against the entry of the U.S. into the Imperialist War. There were many Socialist delegates at the A.F. of L. Convention, which followed the S.P. Convention; but not one of those Socialist delegates raised the issue of war in the A.F. of L. Convention, although this was the major issue confronting the whole world at the time. Failure to carry into the A.F. of L. the fight for the S.P. program against American entrance into the imperialist war heralded the subsequent complete betrayal of that program and the actual support by the S.P. leadership of the entrance of the U.S. into the imperialist war.

The growth of S.P. opportunism within the A.F. of L. had led, long before the World War, into a left-wing split from the S.P. This took the form, first of all, of the emergence of the I.W.W. as a militant movement of class-struggle with a revolutionary perspective. For a time after its formation in 1905, the I.W.W. grew rapidly and swept the country, organizing many tens of thousands of the most exploited workers whom the class-collaborationist A.F. of L. and the Socialists within the A.F. of L. had made absolutely no effort to organize.

The I.W.W., in its relations to the A.F. of L., represented a swing from one extreme to the other. Abandoning all effort to mobilize the millions of workers under the influence of the class-collaborationist A.F. of L. leadership, i.e. abandoning all effort to convert the A.F. of L. into an instrument of the class-struggle, the I.W.W. launched, as had the S.L.P., upon the suicidal policy of dual unionism. The result was that, after an initial rapid growth, it began to decline drastically. William Z. Foster reported in his book From Bryan to Stalin how, just prior to the first World War, the I.W.W. was filled with discussions over why the I.W.W. did not grow.

While the I.W.W. declined, a second left-wing movement grew within the S.P., a left-wing movement which developed first over opposition to support by S.P. leadership to the Imperialist War and afterwards in support of the October Russian Revolution and of affiliation to the new Communist International.

The new C.I. rallied the support of the left-wing of the S.P., which constituted the majority of the S.P., and of the best elements in the I.W.W. These united in the new C.P., which succeeded in unifying itself after great difficulty, resulting from bitter conflicts between two groups of left-wing socialists who, for a short period, formed both a Communist Party and a Communist Labor Party.

2. The Basic Policy of the Parties of the Communist International in Relation to the Trade Unions.

The strength of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik), which had led the Russian proletariat in alliance with the poor peasantry and oppressed nations of the old Tzarist Empire to power, lay in its theoretical generalization of its experience - the experience of three revolutions, involving a long and bitter fight against both opportunism and "left"-sectarianism as a product of opportunism. The experience of the Bolshevik Party, which was generalized in Leninist theory, was of international significance, because the struggle of the Russian proletariat in the "junction point of imperialist contradictions" was necessarily a fight against world imperialism.

The Bolshevik Party was thus able to teach the Communist Parties of the new Communist International how to avoid that oscillation between opportunism and "left"-sectarianism in the trade unions which we observed in the U.S. in the swing from S.L.P. dual unionism to S.P. class-collaboration and back once more to I.W.W. dual unionism. How to avoid deviations from the revolutionary path either to the right or the "left" is one of the major lessons of Leninism.

The policy of the C.I. in reference to the trade unions was always to strive to work within the unions (no matter how reactionary) for the aim of building them in accordance with their express reason for existence into the fighting, democratic, mass, class-struggle, industrial organizations of labor and always to work against splits and for unification on such a fighting, class-struggle basis.

The C.I. emphasized the basic principle of the Communist Manifesto that Communist Parties have no interests separate and apart from the working-class as a whole. Their aim, therefore, is never to impose their program upon the unions or to dominate them, but to build them, to arouse them to fulfill their own tasks, to enlighten them through the generalized experience possessed by Marxists on how to fulfill these tasks.

Regarding the unions as the main bulwark of labor, the C.I. sought to rally the rank and file workers everywhere to fight for trade union democracy and against every form of bureaucracy. This it emphasized was identical with the fight for class-struggle and against class-collaboration. The class-collaborationist agents of the employers in the unions always buttress up their opportunism, which is contrary to the interests of the union membership, by bureaucracy.

Everywhere it has always been Communist policy for Communists to base themselves upon the trade union membership, upon the rank and file, to champion the interests of the rank and file, to arouse the rank and file to decide all questions for themselves and not to capitulate to bureaucrats who betray their interests.

Far from cherishing any desire to intervene or interfere in the trade unions, it has always been Communist policy to help build the unions most effectively to fulfill their functions and to expose and drive out of the trade unions those who seek to intervene and interfere in them.

The trade unions are organizations of labor, whose interests are diametrically opposed to the interests of the employers. Were this not so, there would be no occasion for the existence of unions and of trade union struggles. This being the case, who is it that really tries to intervene and interfere in the affairs of the unions? Obviously it is the employers, who, as is well known, have traditionally sent into the unions spies and provocateurs of every sort and who resort to every device for securing either the open and direct or subtle and indirect bribery of union leaders. Do not the Republican and Democratic Parties, the Catholic hierarchy, the N.A.M., the press, and innumerable other organizations of the employers openly try to dictate to the unions? Did not a Federal judge at the recent Portland Convention of the C.I.O. have the impertinence openly to propose that trade unionists work for their Wall Street employers in the effort to consolidate their employers' exploitation of our European trade union brothers?

Indirect bribery (the prospect of government jobs, of flattery from the rich and powerful) is the most effective form of bribery. Very few labor leaders would ever even dream of selling out labor in return for a check passed across the table directly in return for services rendered. (The betrayers of labor like to deceive even themselves.) But many succumb to indirect and other forms of bribery or intimidation. Those delegates to the Portland Convention who were not insulted at the proposal by a Federal Judge, introduced with honor by C.I.O. leaders, that C.I.O. leaders represent the Wall Street employers in their efforts to exploit and crush European labor and who did not show the "gentleman" who dared to propose that C.I.O. leaders be international scabs the door, succumbed to either flattery or intimidation or both. The men who invited this Judge there, who applauded him, and who did not tell him that his proposal that they scab on European labor was an impertinent insult were intervening and interfering in the affairs of the C.I.O. Men who titter with pleasure before a condescending Judge who proposes that they be scabs are certainly not representatives of the workers who constitute the membership of the C.I.O., hence do not represent the C.I.O. Such men are trying to convert the C.I.O. from a labor organization into an instrument of the employers, into an organization of international scabs. This is a fact. If Communists or anyone else had gotten up and said this in plain working-class language, as was their trade union duty, they would have been fighting for the C.I.O. against its internal enemies.

The aim of Communists thus has always been to fight for the trade unions against those who from without or from within seek to interfere in their functioning as organizations representing labor against the employers.

To state all the above in just this simple and truthful manner is the speech that Communist delegates at the 1946 C.I.O. Convention should have made in a militant fight against the red-baiting Declaration of Principles of that Convention and which the C.P. should then have reprinted in millions of copies for the education of the C.I.O., A.F. of L., R.R. Brotherhoods, and other trade union members.

The Communist Parties always supported industrial organization as the best form of labor organization, as the form best adapted for mobilizing all of labor against all the employers. American Communists were pioneers for the C.I.O. long before it appeared and its most valiant organizers when it arose.

Trade union democracy vs. bureaucracy; class-struggle vs. class collaboration; industrial organization vs. narrow craft organization; solidarity with the workers of all lands vs. the chauvinist, war-breeding imperialism of the employers; trade union unity vs. splits and divisions which help the employers - these have always been the basic slogans of Communists in relation to the unions, the main bulwark of labor.

The employers have always operated through caucuses in the unions under the direct or indirect guidance of the employers. The A.C.T.U. is a recent example. To fight such caucuses of the employers, Communists have always maintained that Communists, the majority of whom are rank and file workers, should work collectively through their own caucuses standing for the above principles. The guarantee against any Communist "machine" or any other machine in the unions is the basic Communist insistence on trade union democracy, on the inclusion within Communist caucuses (fractions) of a majority of rank and file workers. All Communists are supposed to make the same proposals, i.e. to work together according to a single policy, but Communists demand that all proposals, including their own, be presented to the entire trade union membership for full discussion and for democratic decision. While demanding the right of all trade unionists to submit their proposals to the union membership, Communist trade unionists submit their proposals absolutely to the majority decisions of the union membership, and demand that all other trade unionists do the same. If Communists correctly fulfill their

function of representing the real interests of labor, their proposals will in the long run be adopted. If Communists make mistakes; on the other hand, they want the non-Party workers to correct their errors. In fact, it is Communist policy actively to seek non-Party discussion and criticism of all their proposals. Communist policy can be effected only if voluntarily adopted on the basis of understanding by the non-Party masses. If real Communist policy is adhered to in the unions, then no one can interfere in or dominate the affairs of the unions.

Such were the general policies of the Communist Parties toward the unions as enunciated by the C.I. on the basis of the experience of the Bolshevik Party of the S.U. and which were adopted by the C.P.U.S.A. as a section of the C.I.

3. The Trade Union Policy of the C.P.U.S.A. from 1919 to 1937.

In the U.S., the A.F. of L. leadership expelled all known Communists from the A.F. of L. unions shortly after the formation of the Communist Party. The membership of the A.F. of L. meanwhile had fallen below three million, and the well paid leaders of the A.F. of L. made no effort to organize the tens of millions of unorganized workers, who were the most bitterly exploited and poverty-stricken. Especially did it neglect the needs of the Negro people, a people consisting overwhelmingly of the most bitterly oppressed toilers. The A.F. of L. leaders regarded the A.F. of L. as an organization to secure certain craft privileges - largely through friendly deals with employers - for its own craft members, from whose dues their own high salaries came. Such a narrow craft policy served well the interests of the employers. Its adoption indicated that the A.F. of L. as an organization had been won over, through its leaders, to the side of capital, and was an instrument for holding back the organization and class-struggle of American labor as a whole.

In this situation, the young C.P., assisted by the international experience of the C.I., worked out the following general policy.

(1) It decided that all Communists who had not, contrary to the interests of the working class, been expelled from the A.F. of L. as known Communists should continue to function as loyal members of the A.F. of L., seeking to build and develop it in every way. It decided that such Communists, who would meet in regular Party fractions (or caucuses) should seek to organize broad rank-and-file committees, which should fight (a) for trade union democracy (which would include the right of workers of any political or religious belief as well as of any color or nationality to be legal members of the A.F. of L.); (b) for a policy of organizing the unorganized; (c) for sharp struggles against the employers; (d) for industrial organization; and (e) for solidarity with the workers of all lands.

(2) Those Communists who had been, in violation of trade union democracy, expelled from the A.F. of L., the Party proposed should work through regular Party fractions in a non-Party mass organization called the Trade Union Educational League, the function of which was to propagate at large among the unorganized as well as the organized workers the general policies of trade union unity regardless of political belief, of organizing the unorganized, of trade union democracy, of class-struggle, of industrial unionism, and of international labor solidarity.

As a result of criticisms from the C.I., the Trade Union Educational League was converted in 1929 into the Trade Union Unity League, the difference between the two organizations being that, while the former had engaged largely in propaganda, the latter actually undertook on its own initiative to organize as many of the unorganized as possible into industrial unions based on the principles of class-struggle, trade union democracy, industrial unionism, and international labor solidarity.

It was never the policy of the Party or of the T.U.U.L. to organize dual unions. The T.U.U.L. undertook to organize only those unorganized workers whom the A.F. of L. refused to organize, and the major slogan of every T.U.U.L. union, as the name of the federation implied, was trade union unity. It demanded the re-admission of the expelled Communist workers into the A.F. of L., and demanded that the A.F. of L. admit the T.U.U.L. unions into its own organization on this condition. It proposed to dissolve completely into the A.F. of L. upon condition that the A.F. of L. admit workers regardless of political belief and that it abandon its policy of not organizing the unorganized.

Every correct policy is subject to distortion, and the C.P. and T.U.U.L. unions made many mistakes, many of which were severely criticized by the C.I. However, the basic policy of the Party was the above, and was proven by experience, as we shall demonstrate, to be correct.

The T.U.U.L. organized many thousands of workers in areas the A.F. of L. was not touching. Perhaps its most outstanding contribution to the organization of the American working class was to carry the message of militant unionism to the heart of the South - especially among the bitterly exploited textile workers of North Carolina and the miners of eastern Kentucky. Here these unions advanced the fighting slogan, "Black and White, Unite and Fight". The strike of Gastonia, N.C. was perhaps the most famous of the T.U.U.L. struggles.

In these struggles, many mistakes were made. Party organizers flew sporadically from one trouble spot to another, left when strikes were defeated, and did not learn how to consolidate their struggles organizationally by concentration, thus often squandering organizational results. Nevertheless, the message of class-struggle vs. A.F. of L. class-collaborationism was carried dramatically to tens of thousands.

The educational and organizational activities of the T.U.U.L. bore positive fruit in 1934. Following the adoption of Clause 7A of the N.R.A., which granted labor the right to bargain collectively through the union of its own choice, many thousands of hitherto unorganized workers in the South and elsewhere began pouring into the A.F. of L. In the course of this wave of organization, the famous General Textile Strike of 1934 occurred. In the face of the general wave of organization, the A.F. of L. did not dare to continue to reject the demand of the T.U.U.L. for unity and thus for admission into the A.F. of L. The entrance of 15,000 Communist-led workers into the A.F. of L. was an outstanding event in the history of the American labor movement.

All of these Communist-led workers were staunch champions of industrial unionism, class-struggle, trade union democracy, organizing the unorganized, and international labor solidarity. Experience in struggle during the bitter depression years had proved the importance of industrial unionism as well as of class struggle and of organizing the unorganized. It was thus no accident that the famous Committee for Industrial Organization (the C.I.O.) was formed within the A.F. of L. shortly after the admission of the Communist-led T.U.U.L. unions. The Communists were certainly not solely responsible for the emergence of this Committee, but everyone knows that it was the Communists alone who had been campaigning for years for industrial unionism and that they played a leading role in preparing the ground for the emergence of this Committee and in building it. All the red-baiting of the employers and of the old A.F. of L. bureaucrats fighting for their craft jurisdictions, could not hinder the growth of the Committee for Industrial Organization, which was so obviously in the interest of the workers as a whole.

In this way, the Communist Party played a major role in preparing the ground for and in actually building the great C.I.O., which constituted the most epoch-making and dramatic step forward in the whole history of American labor.

Everyone who does not remember it should be informed that the C.I.O. did not voluntarily secede from the A.F. of L. It was formed originally as a Committee of the A.F. of L. It was C.I.O. policy and C.P. policy to build the A.F. of L. itself into the united mass organization of American labor. The function of the A.F. of L. Committee for Industrial Organization was to organize the unorganized into industrial unions (i.e. unions organizing not just crafts, but all the workers of a given industry) within the fold of the A.F. of L.

Certain old-time A.F. of L. bureaucrats saw a future for themselves in this powerful upsurge of labor for a more effective form of organization, and thus went along with the C.I.O. Other A.F. of L. bureaucrats feared the new movement of rank and file workers, fearing that they would be ousted from their well-paying and cozy jobs. The A.F. of L. bureaucrats, who had long ago stifled democracy in their unions, succeeded in expelling from the A.F. of L. those A.F. of L. unions who had formed the A.F. of L. Committee for Industrial Organization. The full responsibility for splitting the A.F. of L. thus rested on the shoulders of the A.F. of L. bureaucracy. The A.F. of L. would today be the mass united labor federation in the U.S., sixteen million strong, had not the majority of the A.F. of L.'s own leadership followed such a narrow-minded policy.

C.P. members, after the expulsion of the C.I.O. from the A.F. of L., went with their unions in accordance with C.P. policy. Those whose unions remained in the A.F. of L. did the same. Those whose unions were expelled as members of the C.I.O. became members of the new labor federation. In each instance, it became the basic policy of all C.P. members in both A.F. of L. and C.I.O. to work for the re-unification of the trade union movement into one single fighting mass trade union federation, which would grant democratic rights to union members, organize the unorganized, allow industrial organization, conduct sharp struggles against the employers, and establish friendly ties with the workers of other lands.

Almost everyone knows how loyally and effectively thousands upon thousands of C.P. members, drawing no salaries and holding no positions in most cases, labored to build the C.I.O. into the powerful organization it became, the organization which for the first time successfully organized steel, auto, Southern tobacco and textile workers, etc. etc. and secured contracts for the workers in these industries through major victorious struggles. Rank and file Communist workers all over the U.S. proved themselves to be the most devoted and loyal trade unionists. Everyone knew this, and the employers' press screamed itself hoarse against the whole C.I.O. as a "Communist" organization. These simple Communist workers, however, drawing no pay and seeking no soft, well-paying, bureaucratic jobs, won such respect from their non-Communist fellow-workers that not many of even the hundreds of thousands of staunch Catholic workers in the C.I.O. paid the slightest attention to this red-baiting. The C.I.O. brought them a better life. The Communists in the C.I.O. were working cooperatively with all workers, and in an extraordinarily

devoted manner, to secure this better life. Red-baiting fell on unheeding ears. The presence of Communists in the C.I.O. was fully legal. Non-Communist workers in one C.I.O. union after another showed their recognition of the devoted work of Communists in working unselfishly to build the C.I.O., by electing many known Communists - in the teeth of venomous, red-baiting, reactionary attacks - as officers of their unions.

All these facts should have been presented in the speeches which Communist delegates should have made at the 1946 C.I.O. Convention in opposition to that resolution which falsely accused Communists of "interfering" (?) in the C.I.O. Their speeches should then have been printed in millions of copies for the education of the millions of members of the C.I.O.

The role of thousands of Communists in the C.I.O. was something new in the history of American labor and in the history of the American Communist Party.

The appearance of the C.I.O., the open recognition of Communist workers as an important and influential force within the C.I.O., and the election of numerous Communists to leading posts in the C.I.O. unions proved that the basic policy of the Communist Party (guided by the C.P.) during the period from the formation of the T.U.U.L. until the time of the powerful organizing drives of the C.I.O., i.e. from 1929 to 1936, had been correct. By means of that policy, the C.P. played a decisive role in creating and building the C.I.O. That the C.P. was respected by millions of workers was proven by its legality in the C.I.O. and by the election of numerous Communists in the face of intense redbaiting to leading posts.

4. The Problem of Explaining how Communist Success in the American Trade Unions during the Late 1930's Has Been Converted into Defeat in the 1940's.

Communists continued to play a leading and respected role in the C.I.O., and the C.I.O. simultaneously forged ahead with the support and devotion of millions until very recently. Communists began to lose ground during the War at the time when they began to preach Browder's theory of permanent cooperation with enlightened employers. Then shortly after the close of the second World War, Communists in the C.I.O., in spite of having verbally rejected Browder's class-collaborationist policy, began an unexpected and even ostentatious retreat before even reactionary whispers, not to speak of roars. The more they retreated, the more furious became the reactionary pursuit, just as a pursuing dog chases furiously when the cat finally breaks and runs. The faster the Communists retreated, the more rapidly they lost mass support and respect. Backed into corners and isolated from the rank-and-file, they have now been thrown out of office and even in some cases out of the union in one union after another. This reactionary drive against the Communists is continuing. The confidence of the masses won in the battles from 1929-39 has been temporarily lost. Everything, however, indicates that the masses have not abandoned progressive principles. Quite the contrary. Nevertheless they have lost their respect for the C.P.U.S.A. This is a fact, and it never hurt anyone to look a fact straight in the face. Cheerfully to talk about how beautifully the sun is shining while a storm is raging is the way of fools. To report a fact is not to gloat over it. It is an ugly fact that the strong position of the C.P. won in the unions during the decade of the 1930's has been lost during the decade of the 1940's.

We have temporarily jumped in our brief survey of the history of the relations between the C.P. and the unions from 1937 to the present, in order, by sharply presenting the contrast, to pose the problem, which requires present solution:-
Why did this happen?

The sniveling answer, "He hit me!" is the answer of a fool, because yesterday the strong boy who is now being licked was also hit, and he then fought back and himself licked the same people who today are licking him.

It is everywhere recognized that, in spite of the demogogy of Truman, the defeat of Dewey indicates that the masses of workers are today just as progressive - in fact, more so - than they were in the decade of the 1930's. Moreover, the American labor movement has not been defeated in any major struggle. Its spirit is not broken. The answer, therefore, is not to be found in the growth of reactionary sentiments among the masses. Even where such reactionary sentiment grows, the answer is not to be found in reactionary propaganda alone, for it was in the teeth of such propaganda, which is inseparable from the class-struggle, that Communists first won their greatest support in the unions.

What then is the answer?

It is an old saying among the folk-wisdom of all lands that in times of prosperity one should prepare for adversity and in times of adversity for prosperity. Success should go to no one's head, for as the Bible says, "Pride goeth before destruction and a haughty spirit before a fall". Wise men thus do not give way to despair in the midst of defeat, but seek that wisdom which will enable them to turn defeat into victory. Such was the spirit which defeated fascism in the recent war. Such is the spirit which Communists in the American labor movement must display today.

This old maxim of folk wisdom gives the main clue to answering the problem which has just been posed.

Our Party, in the midst of its dizzying successes in the trade unions during the late '30's, did not take the proper steps to prevent its success from being turned to defeat. That success now has been turned into defeat. However, this defeat itself is not absolute or final. It is temporary, and contains within itself the seeds of a new and stronger victory. The seed which will convert present defeat into future victory is to be found through learning from that defeat. It is to be found not only in recognizing the defeat, but in studying it. That defeat results from inevitable mistakes that were made by the Party not in 1945, as Browder now, with very transparent superficiality, is trying to say in the effort to defend his own past errors, but in the very midst of its greatest success. The seed of defeat, which flowered after 1945, will be found to have commenced its development in the very midst of the successes of the late 1930's. The successes of the 1930's were the culmination of a preceding movement. So the present defeat is the product of a process of development, which has continued from the late 1930's, without interruption and in fact with acceleration stemming from Foster, Dennis, Williamson & Co., until the present.

Finding the answer to the loss of confidence by the workers in the C.P.U.S.A. under its present leadership is not a personal problem. It is not to be solved by people who want to exonerate or blame any particular leader or group of leaders. Browder wants to exonerate himself and blame Foster. Foster, Dennis, and Williamson want to exonerate themselves and blame Browder. This is a petty approach to the problem, with which labor itself is utterly unconcerned.

The growing confidence of the masses in the American labor movement for the C.P. which occurred during the 30's and the loss of respect for the C.P. by the masses during the late 40's are major historical facts in the history of the whole American labor movement. The understanding of those facts must be approached with complete objectivity.

Any objective approach to these facts will reveal that Browder, Foster, Dennis, Williamson, and the entire leadership of the C.P.U.S.A. (and of course, although obviously to a much less extent, the membership, which includes ourselves, who followed that leadership) made errors both before and after 1945. If any of the four gentlemen named wishes to help the C.P.U.S.A. to get out of its present crisis, he must subject his own "leadership" to the same cold scrutiny, required by the objective light of science, as that which he pretends to focus on his opponents.

What were the errors made by our Party both before and after 1945 which led to the present debacle in the unions? What caused them? And how may these errors, which have had results so harmful to the American trade union movement as a whole, be corrected?

These are the problems.

Williamson declared in his Plenum Report of February 1948 (March P.A.) that during the discussion following the Duclos criticism, the Party did not subject its trade union work to a thorough analysis. He declared that the Party refrained from doing this on the basis of the "theory" that trade union work was less affected by Browderism than other spheres of Party activity!

There were many comrades, some of us among them, who were demanding a thorough-going analysis of our trade union activity in 1945. Many asserted that trade union work was affected most adversely by Browderism. We did not anywhere or at any time run into the "theory" Williamson referred to in 1948! But we did hear remarks in 1945 from leading Party people in the unions like the following word-for-word quotation from one individual, "Why the state of affairs in the unions is so bad that to bring it out in the open would destroy the Party!" - a statement somewhat different from the "theory" referred to by Williamson in 1948!

It now seems that failure to open the abscess festering in the total body of Party comrades functioning in the unions has temporarily almost destroyed the role of the Party as a force in the unions. Not even after his belated and incorrect statement in P.A. in March, 1948, did Williamson and his colleagues in the leadership open up or allow a real analysis of the functioning of the Party in the unions. They were in fact at that very moment expelling comrades who called for such an analysis, and they have continued this stifling of all real discussion thereafter. In spite of the now swollen character of the abscess, however, there is a "healthy core" of living tissue among the Communists in the unions and elsewhere. Therefore, it is necessary for all Communists who belong to the "healthy core" now to apply the lancet of analysis.

(TO BE CONTINUED)

(We urge comrades on their own initiative to grapple with the problems here presented. We urge them to consider the problems in the light of the history we have tried to summarize in the above article. We believe that keeping this history in mind will make much easier the task of understanding and overcoming the present crisis.)

COMMUNIST MORALITY
(Continued)

In our last issue, we demonstrated, in answer to one bourgeois slander, that Communists do have moral principles. In answer to another bourgeois slander of an opposite variety (viz. that it is illegitimate for scientists to make moral judgments), we demonstrated that science does not demand the repudiation of morality. We emphasized that Communists have declared war both against bourgeois "morality" and also against the servile role assigned to science by capitalist society. We posed the question, "What is Communist morality?"

3. Communist Morality to Be Found in the Communist Program of Action and in the Rules for Party Membership.

From the time of Aristotle, philosophers have generally made a distinction between what they have called theoretical philosophy and practical philosophy as the two major divisions of each and every philosophy. The aim of theoretical philosophy has always been to explain the nature of the universe as it actually exists (its being or becoming); while the aim of practical philosophy (often called ethics) has always been to determine, if possible, what ought to be or how men ought to act, i.e. the nature of what men call good conduct or duty. In a word, the former deals with the true (what is, including what has been and will be); the latter with the good (the human conduct which men praise and think ought to exist). The one is concerned with actual existence; the other, with the practical conduct of life, with proposals for changing existence.

Obviously these two major divisions of philosophy are interrelated. It is a major criticism made by Marxist philosophy that in previous philosophies generally there was insufficient recognition of the actual relations between these two, that in actual fact there existed a divorce between theory and practice. Earlier philosophers, Marx said, had sought mainly to interpret the world, while what was necessary was not only to interpret it, but to change it.

The mere fact that Marxism enunciates the principle of the unity of theory and practice indicates that it does enunciate a moral principle of conduct. As is well known, what Marxism advocates in general is its program of action, which is a program of action for the working-class and its allies as a whole. Since the leadership of the working-class and its allies by the vanguard party of the proletariat is an essential element in this program of action, it is obvious that for Party members in particular there are extremely high moral requirements, which are to be found in the principles of Party organization and the rules for Party membership.

Accustomed to think in bourgeois terms, it does not occur to many people that the principles of Communist morality are to be found in the Communist Program and the principles of Party organization. That seems too simple. People look for some set of abstract principles (a "Ten Commandments") separate and apart from the Party Program and the rules for Party membership and for Party organization. However, Communists have no set of purely abstract principles. Dialectical materialism rejects all moral metaphysics just as it rejects all metaphysics.

To ascertain the nature of Communist morality, therefore, it is necessary to study the Communist Program and the rules for Party membership and Party organization.

In undertaking this study, it will quickly become apparent that here is no ordinary morality (i.e. bourgeois, feudal, or slaveholder morality such as has been known in the past) and furthermore that there is nothing utopian about Communist morality. What Communists advocate is not some arbitrarily desired type of conduct which cannot and will not ever be followed by more than a few erratic individuals. It will become clear quickly to anyone who studies the Communist program and the Communist principles of Party organization that the Communist program and its Party rules depend upon and flow from its theory, and that one cannot learn the Communist program or engage in Communist organizational activity without learning that theory. There is nothing like this absolute unity of theory and practice in any bourgeois organization. It is a distinctively unique characteristic of the Communist Party, and he who has not grasped it is still under the influence of bourgeois ideology and is far from being a Communist.

To state this unity succinctly, Communists do not advocate something at variance with reality, but neither do they advocate adjustment to what now exists. On the basis of theoretical analysis of actually existing society, Communists declare that Communism will be the inevitable historical product of the class-struggle generated by and essential to capitalism. In other words, Communists do not enunciate a purely moral program, do not advocate socialism as something that just "ought to be". They advocate it as something that inevitably will be. On the other hand, Marxism recognizes that this inevitable product of social development will not (like the formation of a mountain) come about independently of human consciousness, but as the inevitable result of the inevitable conscious activity of the proletariat and its allies. That conscious activity is being determined and will continue to be determined on an increasing scale by the recognition of necessity which the absolute worsening of conditions for the working class under capitalism forces upon the working class. The unifying link between Communist theory and Communist practice is to be found in the conscious recognition of necessity, from which recognition inevitably results conscious Communist activity.

Communists are those who have, because of uneven development, recognized this necessity in advance of the working class as a whole. Their own recognition impels them, therefore, to carry that recognition to the working class. This is the function of the Communist Party - to carry the recognition of necessity (i.e. theory which demonstrates this necessity) to the entire working class, to convert the spontaneous practical struggles of the latter into class-conscious struggles, in a word, to unite theory with practice.

4. Excerpts from Lenin's Account of the Character of Communist Morality.

In his famous speech, The Tasks of the Youth Leagues, delivered to the Third All-Russian Congress of the Russian Young Communist League on October 2, 1920, Lenin simply, eloquently, and beautifully presented the whole question of Communist morality. He declared:-

".....The whole object of the training, education and tuition of the youth of today should be to imbue them with Communist ethics.

"But is there such a thing as Communist ethics? Is there such a thing as Communist morality? Of course there is. Often it is made to appear that we have no ethics of our own; and very often the bourgeoisie accuse us Communists of repudiating all ethics. This is a method of shuffling concepts, of throwing dust in the eyes of the workers and peasants.

"In what sense do we repudiate ethics and morality?

"In the sense that they were preached by the bourgeoisie, who declared that ethics were God's commandments. We, of course, say that we do not believe in God, and that we know perfectly well that the clergy, the landlords and the bourgeoisie spoke in the name of God in order to pursue their own exploiters' interests. Or, instead of deducing these ethics from the commandments of morality, from the commandments of God, they deduced them from idealistic or semi-idealistic phrases, which were always very similar to God's commandments.

"We repudiate all morality that is taken outside of human, class concepts. We say that this is deception, a fraud, which clogs the brains of the workers and peasants in the interests of the landlords and capitalists.

"We say that our morality is entirely subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat. Our morality is deduced from the class struggle of the proletariat....."

"The old society was based on the principle: 'Rob or be robbed, work for others or make others work for you, be a slave-owner or a slave'. Naturally, people brought up in such a society imbibe with their mother's milk, so to speak, the psychology, the habit, the concept: 'Either a slave-owner or a slave, or a small owner, a small employee, a small official, an intellectual - in short, a man who only looks after himself, and does not care a scrap about anyone else'.

"I own this plot of land and I do not care a scrap about anyone else; if the others starve, all the better, the more will I be able to get for my grain. I have a job as a doctor, or an engineer, or a teacher, or a clerk, and I do not care about anyone else. Perhaps, if I toady to and please the powers that be I shall keep my job and even climb up into the ranks of the bourgeoisie. A Communist cannot have such a psychology and such sentiments. When the workers and peasants proved that they were able by their own efforts to defend themselves and create a new society, a new Communist upbringing began, an upbringing in the midst of the struggle against the exploiters, an upbringing in alliance with the proletariat against the self-seekers and small owners, against the psychology and habits which say, 'I seek my own profit and I do not care about anyone else'.

"This is the reply to the question of how the young, rising generation should learn Communism.

"It can learn Communism only by linking up every step in its studies, training and education with the continuous struggle the proletarians and the toilers are waging against the old exploiting society. When people talk to us about morality we say: For the Communist, morality consists entirely of compact united discipline and conscious mass struggle against the exploiters. We do not believe in eternal morality, and we expose all the fables about morality." Morality serves the purpose of helping human society to rise to a higher level and to abolish the exploitation of labour". (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. IX, pp. 474-5, 477-8).

The last sentence of the above quotation beautifully summarizes the whole basic Marxist conception of morality.

"Morality serves the purpose of helping human society to rise to a higher level and to abolish the exploitation of labor".

This statement at once indicates that Marxists recognize both an absolute element in morality, namely that whatever furthers the development of human society is absolutely good, and a relative element, namely the recognition that since human society does develop, that which furthers its movement to a higher stage cannot be the same at all times, that there can be no eternal good, but that what is good is so in relation to that stage of society through which humanity is passing at the given period in its history.

(TO BE CONTINUED IN OUR NEXT ISSUE)

A FRIENDLY EXCHANGE OF IDEAS WITH COMRADES IN ALAMEDA COUNTY
CALIFORNIA

Another encouraging indication of the developing fight for the reconstitution of our Party has come out of California in the form of "A Message from Alameda County Communists" calling for an organized effort to "save the Party from the wreckers". This publication may be obtained from Joe Studevart, 2265 - 83rd Avenue, Oakland 5, California.

This Alameda County statement makes extremely valuable concrete criticisms of the functioning of the Party leadership in and around Oakland, California. It thus gives to the Party further evidence of the truly nation-wide character of the factionalist and liquidationist activity of the present leadership.

We believe that a few statements in this encouraging publication require discussion. It would be a miracle of course if all of us seeking a Party cleansing did not have many questions that require the widest and fullest discussion.

(1) A postscript in this statement declares that the comrades issuing it are making no programmatic proposals because they feel that they are not "sufficiently representative of the Party". We feel that this statement reflects that inadequate understanding of the nature of a Party discussion which years of bureaucracy have produced in the Party. One does not have to be "representative" to make proposals in a discussion. An individual, rank-and-file Party member has the right and duty to make such proposals. However, no proposal can be adopted as a decision without a majority vote by properly constituted representatives, i.e. by either delegates at a Convention or by elected committees. It is important, we are convinced, that every individual or group who comes forward with a statement against the present leadership should make positive proposals. Otherwise, it is impossible to tell whether that individual or group is making criticisms from a correct Marxist-Leninist position or not. Anyone, of course, can attack. It is necessary that in purging our Party, we clarify our own ideas and thus arrive at a correct positive position.

(2) We think that, in spite of the incorrect statement just criticized, the Alameda comrades did make certain theoretical and programmatic proposals which require discussion.

(a) On page 1, it is assumed, and as a basic premise for practical activity, that the working class "suffered a major defeat" in the recent November election. No argumentation is offered for such a statement. It seems to be taken for granted as self-evident. We consider such an assertion contrary to fact, and, believe it can lead to dangerous practical conclusions. Certainly the working class won no real victory in the 1948 election. However, failure to win a victory in an election where labor neither backed the bourgeois liberal Wallace nor put forward any other independent candidate is not equivalent to a major defeat. In our opinion, the most important fact in American political life is that labor has not suffered any major defeat. The fact that labor's vote elected the demagogical imperialist Truman in fact shows labor's strength. Labor is being misled and betrayed. But it has not been crushed. Its spirit is not broken. It can be rallied to halt American neo-fascism and its drive toward war. The recognition of this fact (and not the pessimistic underestimation of labor's real strength) should, we are convinced, be our basic premise.

(b) The statement seems to utilize the concept of a farmer-labor party against the actually existing Progressive Party. In our judgment, such a formulation would lead to bad consequences in practice. We think the correct formulation is this:- Let us strive to build the Progressive Party into a real farmer-labor-Negro people's party.

We are submitting these propositions for discussion by the Alameda County and other comrades in the spirit of the most comradely friendship. We will likewise welcome the open discussion of whatever differences comrades may have with any of our proposals. We are convinced that there must be ideological as well as organizational preparation for the revitalization of our Party and that those of us who are in revolt against opportunism can and must discuss all aspects of the many problems confronting us in a spirit of true comradeship. A correct positive tactical line will not spring miraculously from some future extraordinary Party Convention. The adoption of correct tactics by the Party must be carefully prepared by the most thorough-going nation-wide discussion on the part of all Party and non-Party Communists and sympathizers. For years the idea has been inculcated that comrades either express complete agreement or fight like enemies. This of course is false. The whole object of a Party discussion (which is now prohibited within the Party apparatus) is that questions may be aired, thrashed out, and resolved in a comradely spirit. Only thus can policies be hammered out as the product of collective thought.

We are convinced that the main weakness of the American labor movement historically has been its traditional dislike of theory, the product of its pragmatic capitalist environment. The most positive product of our Party crisis we believe is that it has forced upon the Party membership a real discussion which has actually been going on (often surreptitiously) ever since the Duclos criticism in spite of all efforts to stifle it. We believe that all of us should now con-

sciously undertake to take the steps that will assist the American labor movement to begin once and for all to overcome its theoretical backwardness.

Comrades in California, where there is more evidence of a struggle against opportunism than anywhere else, have been for a long while setting the entire Party an encouraging example. We urge all comrades to assist and learn from their fight.

* * * * *

A MISQUOTATION IN "POLITICAL AFFAIRS"

In the January, 1949, Political Affairs, John Williamson asserted, "From the camp of the Trotskyite and 'Left' phrasemongering Francis Franklin renegades comes an estimate of the role of the Communists at the C.I.O. convention as 'a Stalinist debacle.'" (pp. 42-3)

Our readers may refer to our last issue, No. 9, December 10, 1948, to see that no such statement was made. The only article on the Portland Convention was on pp. 9-10 of that issue. The only other article in which our editor has referred to that Convention appears in this issue.

People who make foolish assertions only expose themselves.

* * * * *

ORGANIZE A REAL FIGHT FOR THE DISMISSAL OF THE INDICTMENT AGAINST THE PRESENT LEADERS OF THE PARTY

We wish to emphasize again that criticisms of the present leadership of the Party do not exempt any anti-fascist from his duty to fight for the dismissal of the un-constitutional indictment against the National Committee of the Party for exercising its constitutional rights. This indictment is not directed simply against the twelve men on trial or awaiting trial. It is directed against all of us, against the whole American people. Whether one approves or not of the precise way in which the twelve indicted National Committee members and their lawyers are defending the Party and the working class at the trial in New York, it is our duty to rally the masses for the dismissal of the illegal indictment against them. The National Committee of the Communist Party is accused of nothing except the exercise of its constitutional rights, the Constitutional rights of the whole American people! It is illegal for anyone to be tried on such an indictment. The trial reveals the flagrant and cynical disregard of its own Constitutional law by the capitalist class of the U.S. The masses must be mobilized to fight capitalist reaction by demanding that this indictment be dismissed as a violation of Amendment One of the U.S. Constitution. Failure to realize this by any comrades expelled for fighting opportunism can only play into the hands of reaction. The issue is freedom of speech, press, and assembly in the United States.

* * * * *

LITERATURE ESSENTIAL TO EVERY PARTY OR NON-PARTY COMMUNIST OR SYMPATHIZER

Annual subscriptions to the Cominform Bulletin, <u>For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy!</u>	\$2.50 per year
	.10 per copy
Annual subscriptions to <u>New Times</u>	4.50 per year
	.15 per copy

Both may be obtained from Universal Distributors, 38 Union Square, New York City, N. Y.

A new set of Lenin's "Selected Works" in 2 volumes is available from Universal Distributors. The price of the entire set is only \$5. The set is almost as complete as the more expensive 12 volume set. A workman should not be without his tools. We urge everyone who does not have a set of Lenin already to buy this 2 volume set and to study it regularly and systematically.

* * * * *

The general aims and perspectives of the Bill Haywood Club are summarized in Issues No. 1, 6, and 7 of our bulletin, the last two being based on the results of the 1948 Party Convention.

* * * * *

PLEASE MAKE ALL CONTRIBUTIONS PAYABLE TO
B. ROSENSTEIN
Box 92
Murray Hill Station,
New York 16, N.Y.