

New Policies or Old Fallacies?

Analyzing the Recent Party Statements

by Jay Lovestone

Today, we have a general strike involving practically every spot and phase of the spindle industry. But the only evidence that the Communist party can present of its influence in this historic struggle is the fact that strike-breaking Governors, open-shop leaders, and labor-hating employers yell Communist and shriek about Reds in order to paint a false picture of the strike.

Bluff and Bombast Still Prevails

In the face of this calamitous condition, the Central Committee of the party can do nothing but resort to costly bluff, plain misrepresentation, or unadulterated self-hypnosis. For instance the newest trade union resolution brags:

"The overwhelming majority of the strikers in recent months were workers organized in the A. F. of L. unions, clearly showing that the A. F. of L. workers are more and more accepting the policies of the party and the revolutionary trade union movement." (our emphasis).

About such bombast my old friend and comrade, Stalin, would say: "It is enough to make a horse laugh." However, laughing horses are not the best ones to enter in a race, especially when the race is an ever-sharpening class war. Where are the revolutionary trade unions? In the mining industry? Perhaps the Secretariat of the party has organized some super-underground mines beneath the pits where the living coal miners

are digging black diamonds and dollar nuggets for their employers! Perhaps amongst the railroad workers, where the TUUL hasn't even a single member to take in a whiff of coal dust from an engine or run the risk of getting a grease spot on his overalls! Perhaps in the "Silk City" of Paterson, where that alphabetical permutation and combination, known as the NTWU, which recently, with much self-satisfaction, heralded its own demise! Perhaps in Gastonia, where once the party had a real basis for effective work! Very likely the Central Committee has in mind the "National Mirror Polishers Industrial Class Union of Oshkosh"! This much we are prepared to grant. What is fair is fair and what is true is true

Some Embarassing Questions Come Up

We can not applaud too lustily the Central Committee of the party finally recognizing the fact that "the overwhelming majority of the strikers in recent months were workers organized in the A. F. of L. unions." At the same time, we can not condemn too heartily the fact that despite this trend, the Central Committee, in the same spacious resolution, thus hastens to doff its cap to union-splitting policies and to embrace warmly dual-unionism.

"This action of the M.W.I.U. further demonstrated not only that the M.W.I.U. is a force among the seamen, but in general the possibilities and the role that the T. U. U. L. Unions can play in the development and leadership of the struggles of the workers thru the application of the united front policy." (Our emphasis.)

Here a number of embarrassing questions appear on the scene. What is this "United Front" that the resolution speaks of? Is it the united front between the UTW with its 300,000 members and the NTWU, with its incalculable membership? Is it the united front between the non-existent miners' unions of the TUUL (NMU) and the hundreds of thousands in the U.M.W. of A. affiliated to the A.F.L.? Furthermore, how can the Central Committee explain away its present position of recognizing (against its will, it is true) the growth of the A. F. of L. when but a few years ago it denounced us from Moscow to Hollywood for resisting the theory that the A. F. of L. can no longer grow. We would appreciate it if Comrade Browder were to tell the membership of the Party what he now thinks of the following statement made by Comrade Foster in January, 1929:

"What is the future of the A. F. of L. and the craft unions generally? Are they definitely in decline as labor organizations? This question of perspective of the A. F. of L. becomes very important because in it is involved the question of whether or not there is a real base for the development of the new industrial union movement. . . .

"The A. F. of L. is definitely in decline as a labor organization. It can not and will not organize the unorganized." (William Z. Foster, the Communist. January, 1929.)

Incidentally, would Comrade Browder to-day agree with Foster's following boast?:

"The development of this struggle (the miners' strike) under the leadership of the National Miners Union, fully supports the program of building the new unions. It is a blow in the face to such people as the Lovestoneites. All the croakings that the NMU is isolated from the masses, has been dealt a deadly smash. . . . It would be interesting indeed to see Lovestone come here and tell the workers to go back into the strikebreaking UMW." (From the Communist of July, 1931, William Z. Foster.)

And, of course, we would especially appreciate if Comrade Stachel, that venerable leader of the American trade union movement, would to-day express his judicious opinion of the following evaluation made by us as against Lozovsky's, which he then denounced as anti-working class, anti-Soviet, anti-Communist, anti-revolutionary and what is even worse, anti-Stalin:

"There could be nothing more fatal to the American labor movement in general and to the revolutionary movement in particular than the illusion that the A. F. of L. can no longer grow and has no future. It is silly to look at the existing American Trade union movement with its 3,000,000 members as stationary, unchangeable. . . . The outlook is clearly for an ingress into the trade unions, for sharpened class conflicts involving millions of workers in trade unions as well as millions of sorely pressed unorganized. In the course of these struggles the unorganized are likely to pour into the unions a decisive force, the leaven germinating a new spirit of struggle, militancy, and power in these organizations." (Workers Age, May 14, 1932.)

What Kind of Work In The A. F. of L.?

Feebly and desperately the Central Committee strives to become a little more practical thru a new note, somewhat less jarring to the ear. In capital letters we find its resolution calling on the members: "To finally overcome and root out all under-estimation of work in the reformist unions." What kind of work? Constructive or destructive? Building and transforming the conservative unions into militant industrial unions or working inside to smash them? To do what Lozovsky proposed? The Central Committee of the Party must immediately make clear to the membership and to all workers whether it still accepts the following instruction of Lozovsky, the head of the Red Trade Union International:

"There is no need to shout from the housetops 'destroy the unions' as was done in Germany. But that we want to break up the reformist trade unions, that we want to explode their discipline, that we want to wrest from them the workers, that we want to explode the trade union apparatus and to destroy it—that that there can not be the slightest doubt." (Lozovsky in the RILU Plenum, February 15, 1932.)

Is this what the resolution means when it speaks of "the tremendous importance of developing work in the unions?" Fortunately, we need not wait for another verbose document. In the wooded foothills of this resolution we can see what's at the bottom of it all by lifting the camouflaging foliage. Here we find the Central Committee cursing against "the hiding of the face of the Party!" Here we find the command "to strengthen the work and leadership of the T. U. U. L. and other independent unions under our influence." Here we find the Central Committee placing the same quantitative and qualitative emphasis on work in the company unions as

The Resignation of Ger

Richberg and Swope - Heirs

by Economist

The news has just come, in the polite language of the press that General Johnson has resigned from the NRA. In the opinion of the writer this was in the offing for a long time. The general is too out-spoken in his anti-labor policies for the administration's comfort. His diatribes against labor, in the form of condemning strikes in general and the Textile and San Francisco strikes in particular, correspond in essence to the anti-labor nature of the NRA. The general's bluntness however does not fit in with the administration's diplomacy and subtlety in soft-soaping its policies against labor. It isn't good politics, according to New Deal methods, to state ex-

actly the need for suppressing labor's militancy and the need for quasi-public unionism. Roosevelt's game is to say nothing and appear impartial. And, at the same time, to act partially in organizing capital (trade associations must formulate the codes) and disorganize labor thru recognizing minority representation, company unions, and non-recognition of the closed shop.

All this has been done by the president with the greatest of finesse and caution so as not to arouse the suspicion of workers who may fight, objectively, against

ity of whom are less than two years in the party, that we bear no illfeelings against the present leadership of the party because it now proclaims as a virtue exactly that which it once branded as a vicious crime. Yet, we are compelled to demand honesty in principles and consistency in revolutionary action. How can the Central Committee speak in its Trade Union Resolution about "the treacherous role of the social-fascists" and, then, on the same page (page 15) of the same issue (September 15) of the same paper (Daily Worker) appeal to the general staff (National Committee of the SP) of American social-fascism to "come together with us upon an agreed program of the most immediate needs," and "to move boldly and decisively for uniting all forces of the revolutionary working class?"

Who Is Who Among Social Fascists

We greet even this turn, confusing, contradictory, and inadequate as it may be. There can be no real united front effort by the CP until it honestly and frankly declares that it has decided to break with its past anti-united front policies. In the same appeal to the National Committee of the SP, the Central Committee of the CP, in loyal but cowardly fashion, bows before the "authoritative words of Comrade Stalin," to the effect that the Social-democratic parties are a wing of the Fascist front. Is this the best road to the united front? The Central Committee of the CP is really heartless in the way in which it works its imagination overtime when it says: "We have never classed the members and adherents of the Socialist Party as social-fascists, but on the contrary consider them our class brothers. We have nothing to repudiate or correct in our expressed positions on this question . . ."

Well, well! Does the Central Committee of the CP still agree with the following statement which Pravda, the fountain head of all official Communist theory and practice, made about the united front and Social-democracy?:

"There can be no compromise or block with the Social-democratic workers against fascism and social fascism." (Inprecorr Vol. II, No. 23.)

Would the Central Committee endorse this line adopted at the Eleventh Plenum of the ECCI?

Well, let's quit putting embarrassing and irritating questions. The CPO. is convinced that, under the pressure of objective conditions and under the pressure of the constructive criticism and practice of the ICO with its effective, tactical line, the Communist International will, sooner rather than later, return to sound revolutionary policies, to the Leninist strategical course. From what we know of our American party, which we helped found, which we led and built under the most unfavorable objective conditions, it appears that here in the United States the official Communist movement will make its return to a correct line more slowly, more hesitatingly, more confusedly and less consistently, less frankly, than in other sections of the Comintern.

The C. P. O. pledges itself to work with redoubled effort to smooth the way, to facilitate the course, to hasten the day of the return of the Communist movement

to the NRA but are taken in by their misplaced faith in an individual—Roosevelt.

In recent months there has been a mounting discontent against the general on the part of the trade unions, expressed in resolutions asking for his removal. It has reached the point where the president fears that the organized workers would begin to direct their animus, aroused by Johnson's policies, to the administration. If this happened, the pro-labor myth of the NRA would be blasted. In order to avert such developments he is sacrificing the individual, who is the center of popular discontent, and is preserving the virginity of the NRA in the eyes of the exploited masses. With this obstacle removed, Roosevelt can proceed on his way, hatching more schemes, cloaked in sweet phrases glorifying the role of labor and dedicated to the objective of preserving the rule of finance capital.

Recalls Cates-Johnson Controversy

This procedure of easing Johnson out has, what may be termed NRA precedent. In the early beginnings of the NRA there arose the famous Cates-Johnson controversy. Dudley Cates had come out, very openly, for vertical unionism under government control—a form of fascist unionism which would have usurped the powers of independent class unionism. If such an open avowal of reactionary policy were adopted by the administration, it would have brought the most bitter resistance from organized labor, including the conservative AFL bureau-

crash full pou was spo late a se requ tha not lies ing NR beg of gro div rec gre pol mory NR in ti of ov tio int coo dic (V te) do nin ch sh th

NI gne sm int an th

the Associated Press dispatch carries the news to us that an airplane, carrying machine guns, tear gas, bombs, etc. to the textile barons in the Rhode Island textile strike, was wrecked and its contents destroyed while making a forced landing in a mountain town in Pennsylvania.

The manufacturing of these weapons of war upon labor are at present largely the monopoly of the Federal Laboratories, Inc. of Pittsburgh, Pa., which boasts in its prospectus that it is the oldest and largest manufacturer of chemical protective devices in the country. What these mean to the working class can easily be gleaned from the pictures in the pamphlet and their captions. They show gas attacks upon strikers in the American steel strike, Fayette County coal strike, Los Angeles communists' riots, Wisconsin milk strike, New York State milk strike, Ambridge, Pennsylvania—end of a stubborn strike, West Virginia coal strike, Weirton West Virginia strike and against California communists.

Their gas riot gun (price \$60) is highly spoken of by the Federal Laboratories, Inc. as a perfect weapon for dispersing mobs, quelling prison riots, routing barricaded criminals, guarding pay rolls, protecting public and private property.

Federal riot guns are used by leading state constabularies, most large penal institutions, Royal Canadian Mounted, Federal Reserve banks, United States Bureau of Investigation, Armored Car

in the United States to the tactical line of revolutionary, Leninist, realism. This is the main highway, really the shortest road, to the very much-needed unification of the Communist movement in the United States. Here is our historic mission. Here we shall fight to score a decisive victory—for our party and our class—the Communist party and the American proletarian.

New Policies or Old Fallacies?

Analyzing the Recent Party Statements

by Jay Lovestone

Today, we have a general strike involving practically every spot and phase of the spindle industry. But the only evidence that the Communist party can present of its influence in this historic struggle is the fact that strike-breaking Governors, open-shop leaders, and labor-hating employers yell Communist and shriek about Reds in order to paint a false picture of the strike.

Bluff and Bombast Still Prevails

In the face of this calamitous condition, the Central Committee of the party can do nothing but resort to costly bluff, plain misrepresentation, or unadulterated self-hypnosis. For instance the newest trade union resolution brags:

"The overwhelming majority of the strikers in recent months were workers organized in the A. F. of L. unions, clearly showing that the A. F. of L. workers are more and more accepting the policies of the party and the revolutionary trade union movement." (our emphasis).

About such bombast my old friend and comrade, Stalin, would say: "It is enough to make a horse laugh." However, laughing horses are not the best ones to enter in a race, especially when the race is an ever-sharpening class war. Where are the revolutionary trade unions? In the mining industry? Perhaps the Secretariat of the party has organized some super-underground mines beneath the pits where the living coal miners

are digging black diamonds and dollar nuggets for their employers! Perhaps amongst the railroad workers, where the TUUL hasn't even a single member to take in a whiff of coal dust from an engine or run the risk of getting a grease spot on his overalls! Perhaps in the "Silk City" of Paterson, where that alphabetical permutation and combination, known as the NTWU, which recently, with much self-satisfaction, heralded its own demise! Perhaps in Gastonia, where once the party had a real basis for effective work! Very likely the Central Committee has in mind the "National Mirror Polishers Industrial Class Union of Oshkosh"! This much we are prepared to grant. What is fair is fair and what is true is true

Some Embarassing Questions Come Up

We can not applaud too lustily the Central Committee of the party finally recognizing the fact that "the overwhelming majority of the strikers in recent months were workers organized in the A. F. of L. unions." At the same time, we can not condemn too heartily the fact that despite this trend, the Central Committee, in the same spacious resolution, thus hastens to doff its cap to union-splitting policies and to embrace warmly dual-unionism.

"This action of the M.W.I.U. further demonstrated not only that the M.W.I.U. is a force among the seamen, but in general the possibilities and the role that the T. U. U. L. Unions can play in the development and leadership of the struggles of the workers thru the application of the united front policy." (Our emphasis.)

Here a number of embarrassing questions appear on the scene. What is this "United Front" that the resolution speaks of? Is it the united front between the UTW with its 300,000 members and the NTWU, with its incalculable membership? Is it the united front between the non-existent miners' unions of the TUUL (NMU) and the hundreds of thousands in the U.M.W. of A. affiliated to the A.F.L.? Furthermore, how can the Central Committee explain away its present position of recognizing (against its will, it is true) the growth of the A. F. of L. when but a few years ago it denounced us from Moscow to Hollywood for resisting the theory that the A. F. of L. can no longer grow. We would appreciate it if Comrade Browder were to tell the membership of the Party what he now thinks of the following statement made by Comrade Foster in January, 1929:

"What is the future of the A. F. of L. and the craft unions generally? Are they definitely in decline as labor organizations? This question of perspective of the A. F. of L. becomes very important because in it is involved the question of whether or not there is a real base for the development of the new industrial union movement. . . .

"The A. F. of L. is definitely in decline as a labor organization. It can not and will not organize the unorganized." (William Z. Foster, the Communist. January, 1929.)

Incidentally, would Comrade Browder to-day agree with Foster's following boast?:

"The development of this struggle (the miners' strike) under the leadership of the National Miners Union, fully supports the program of building the new unions. It is a blow in the face to such people as the Lovestoneites. All the croakings that the NMU is isolated from the masses, has been dealt a deadly smash. . . . It would be interesting indeed to see Lovestone come here and tell the workers to go back into the strikebreaking UMW." (From the Communist of July, 1931, William Z. Foster.)

And, of course, we would especially appreciate if Comrade Stachel, that venerable leader of the American trade union movement, would to-day express his judicious opinion of the following evaluation made by us as against Lozovsky's, which he then denounced as anti-working class, anti-Soviet, anti-Communist, anti-revolutionary and what is even worse, anti-Stalin:

"There could be nothing more fatal to the American labor movement in general and to the revolutionary movement in particular than the illusion that the A. F. of L. can no longer grow and has no future. It is silly to look at the existing American Trade union movement with its 3,000,000 members as stationary, unchangeable. . . . The outlook is clearly for an ingress into the trade unions, for sharpened class conflicts involving millions of workers in trade unions as well as millions of sorely pressed unorganized. In the course of these struggles the unorganized are likely to pour into the unions a decisive force, the leaven germinating a new spirit of struggle, militancy, and power in these organizations." (Workers Age, May 14, 1932.)

What Kind of Work In The A. F. of L.?

Feebly and desperately the Central Committee strives to become a little more practical thru a new note, somewhat less jarring to the ear. In capital letters we find its resolution calling on the members: "To finally overcome and root out all under-estimation of work in the reformist unions." What kind of work? Constructive or destructive? Building and transforming the conservative unions into militant industrial unions or working inside to smash them? To do what Lozovsky proposed? The Central Committee of the Party must immediately make clear to the membership and to all workers whether it still accepts the following instruction of Lozovsky, the head of the Red Trade Union International:

"There is no need to shout from the housetops 'destroy the unions' as was done in Germany. But that we want to break up the reformist trade unions, that we want to explode their discipline, that we want to wrest from them the workers, that we want to explode the trade union apparatus and to destroy it—that that there can not be the slightest doubt." (Lozovsky in the RILU Plenum, February 15, 1932.)

Is this what the resolution means when it speaks of "the tremendous importance of developing work in the unions?" Fortunately, we need not wait for another verbose document. In the wooded foothills of this resolution we can see what's at the bottom of it all by lifting the camouflaging foliage. Here we find the Central Committee cursing against "the hiding of the face of the Party!" Here we find the command "to strengthen the work and leadership of the T. U. U. L. and other independent unions under our influence." Here we find the Central Committee placing the same quantitative and qualitative emphasis on work in the company unions as

The Resignation of Ger

Richberg and Swope - Heirs

by Economist

The news has just come, in the polite language of the press that General Johnson has resigned from the NRA. In the opinion of the writer this was in the offing for a long time. The general is too out-spoken in his anti-labor policies for the administration's comfort. His diatribes against labor, in the form of condemning strikes in general and the Textile and San Francisco strikes in particular, correspond in essence to the anti-labor nature of the NRA. The general's bluntness however does not fit in with the administration's diplomacy and subtlety in soft-soaping its policies against labor. It isn't good politics, according to New Deal methods, to state ex-

actly the need for suppressing labor's militancy and the need for quasi-public unionism. Roosevelt's game is to say nothing and appear impartial. And, at the same time, to act partially in organizing capital (trade associations must formulate the codes) and disorganize labor thru recognizing minority representation, company unions, and non-recognition of the closed shop.

All this has been done by the president with the greatest of finesse and caution so as not to arouse the suspicion of workers who may fight, objectively, against

ity of whom are less than two years in the party, that we bear no illfeelings against the present leadership of the party because it now proclaims as a virtue exactly that which it once branded as a vicious crime. Yet, we are compelled to demand honesty in principles and consistency in revolutionary action. How can the Central Committee speak in its Trade Union Resolution about "the treacherous role of the social-fascists" and, then, on the same page (page 15) of the same issue (September 15) of the same paper (Daily Worker) appeal to the general staff (National Committee of the SP) of American social-fascism to "come together with us upon an agreed program of the most immediate needs," and "to move boldly and decisively for uniting all forces of the revolutionary working class?"

Who Is Who Among Social Fascists

We greet even this turn, confusing, contradictory, and inadequate as it may be. There can be no real united front effort by the CP until it honestly and frankly declares that it has decided to break with its past anti-united front policies. In the same appeal to the National Committee of the SP, the Central Committee of the CP, in loyal but cowardly fashion, bows before the "authoritative words of Comrade Stalin," to the effect that the Social-democratic parties are a wing of the Fascist front. Is this the best road to the united front? The Central Committee of the CP is really heartless in the way in which it works its imagination overtime when it says: "We have never classed the members and adherents of the Socialist Party as social-fascists, but on the contrary consider them our class brothers. We have nothing to repudiate or correct in our expressed positions on this question . . ."

Well, well! Does the Central Committee of the CP still agree with the following statement which Pravda, the fountain head of all official Communist theory and practice, made about the united front and Social-democracy?:

"There can be no compromise or block with the Social-democratic workers against fascism and social fascism." (Inprecorr Vol. II, No. 23.)

Would the Central Committee endorse this line adopted at the Eleventh Plenum of the ECCI?

Well, let's quit putting embarrassing and irritating questions. The CPO. is convinced that, under the pressure of objective conditions and under the pressure of the constructive criticism and practice of the ICO with its effective, tactical line, the Communist International will, sooner rather than later, return to sound revolutionary policies, to the Leninist strategical course. From what we know of our American party, which we helped found, which we led and built under the most unfavorable objective conditions, it appears that here in the United States the official Communist movement will make its return to a correct line more slowly, more hesitatingly, more confusedly and less consistently, less frankly, than in other sections of the Comintern.

The C. P. O. pledges itself to work with redoubled effort to smooth the way, to facilitate the course, to hasten the day of the return of the Communist movement

to the NRA but are taken in by their misplaced faith in an individual—Roosevelt.

In recent months there has been a mounting discontent against the general on the part of the trade unions, expressed in resolutions asking for his removal. It has reached the point where the president fears that the organized workers would begin to direct their animus, aroused by Johnson's policies, to the administration. If this happened, the pro-labor myth of the NRA would be blasted. In order to avert such developments he is sacrificing the individual, who is the center of popular discontent, and is preserving the virginity of the NRA in the eyes of the exploited masses. With this obstacle removed, Roosevelt can proceed on his way, hatching more schemes, cloaked in sweet phrases glorifying the role of labor and dedicated to the objective of preserving the rule of finance capital.

Recalls Cates-Johnson Controversy

This procedure of easing Johnson out has, what may be termed NRA precedent. In the early beginnings of the NRA there arose the famous Cates-Johnson controversy. Dudley Cates had come out, very openly, for vertical unionism under government control—a form of fascist unionism which would have usurped the powers of independent class unionism. If such an open avowal of reactionary policy were adopted by the administration, it would have brought the most bitter resistance from organized labor, including the conservative AFL bureau-

crash full pou was spo late a se requ tha not lies ing NR beg of gro div rec gre pol mory NR in ti of ov tio int coo dic (V te) do nin ch sh th

NI gne sm int an th

the Associated Press dispatch carries the news to us that an airplane, carrying machine guns, tear gas, bombs, etc. to the textile barons in the Rhode Island textile strike, was wrecked and its contents destroyed while making a forced landing in a mountain town in Pennsylvania.

The manufacturing of these weapons of war upon labor are at present largely the monopoly of the Federal Laboratories, Inc. of Pittsburgh, Pa., which boasts in its prospectus that it is the oldest and largest manufacturer of chemical protective devices in the country. What these mean to the working class can easily be gleaned from the pictures in the pamphlet and their captions. They show gas attacks upon strikers in the American steel strike, Fayette County coal strike, Los Angeles communists' riots, Wisconsin milk strike, New York State milk strike, Ambridge, Pennsylvania—end of a stubborn strike, West Virginia coal strike, Weirton West Virginia strike and against California communists.

Their gas riot gun (price \$60) is highly spoken of by the Federal Laboratories, Inc. as a perfect weapon for dispersing mobs, quelling prison riots, routing barricaded criminals, guarding pay rolls, protecting public and private property.

Federal riot guns are used by leading state constabularies, most large penal institutions, Royal Canadian Mounted, Federal Reserve banks, United States Bureau of Investigation, Armored Car

in the United States to the tactical line of revolutionary, Leninist, realism. This is the main highway, really the shortest road, to the very much-needed unification of the Communist movement in the United States. Here is our historic mission. Here we shall fight to score a decisive victory—for our party and our class—the Communist party and the American proletarian.

New Policies or Old Fallacies?

Analyzing the Recent Party Statements

by Jay Lovestone

Today, we have a general strike involving practically every spot and phase of the spindle industry. But the only evidence that the Communist party can present of its influence in this historic struggle is the fact that strike-breaking Governors, open-shop leaders, and labor-hating employers yell Communist and shriek about Reds in order to paint a false picture of the strike.

Bluff and Bombast Still Prevails

In the face of this calamitous condition, the Central Committee of the party can do nothing but resort to costly bluff, plain misrepresentation, or unadulterated self-hypnosis. For instance the newest trade union resolution brags:

"The overwhelming majority of the strikers in recent months were workers organized in the A. F. of L. unions, clearly showing that the A. F. of L. workers are more and more accepting the policies of the party and the revolutionary trade union movement." (our emphasis).

About such bombast my old friend and comrade, Stalin, would say: "It is enough to make a horse laugh." However, laughing horses are not the best ones to enter in a race, especially when the race is an ever-sharpening class war. Where are the revolutionary trade unions? In the mining industry? Perhaps the Secretariat of the party has organized some super-underground mines beneath the pits where the living coal miners

are digging black diamonds and dollar nuggets for their employers! Perhaps amongst the railroad workers, where the TUUL hasn't even a single member to take in a whiff of coal dust from an engine or run the risk of getting a grease spot on his overalls! Perhaps in the "Silk City" of Paterson, where that alphabetical permutation and combination, known as the NTWU, which recently, with much self-satisfaction, heralded its own demise! Perhaps in Gastonia, where once the party had a real basis for effective work! Very likely the Central Committee has in mind the "National Mirror Polishers Industrial Class Union of Oshkosh"! This much we are prepared to grant. What is fair is fair and what is true is true

Some Embarassing Questions Come Up

We can not applaud too lustily the Central Committee of the party finally recognizing the fact that "the overwhelming majority of the strikers in recent months were workers organized in the A. F. of L. unions." At the same time, we can not condemn too heartily the fact that despite this trend, the Central Committee, in the same spacious resolution, thus hastens to doff its cap to union-splitting policies and to embrace warmly dual-unionism.

"This action of the M.W.I.U. further demonstrated not only that the M.W.I.U. is a force among the seamen, but in general the possibilities and the role that the T. U. U. L. Unions can play in the development and leadership of the struggles of the workers thru the application of the united front policy." (Our emphasis.)

Here a number of embarrassing questions appear on the scene. What is this "United Front" that the resolution speaks of? Is it the united front between the UTW with its 300,000 members and the NTWU, with its incalculable membership? Is it the united front between the non-existent miners' unions of the TUUL (NMU) and the hundreds of thousands in the U.M.W. of A. affiliated to the A.F.L.? Furthermore, how can the Central Committee explain away its present position of recognizing (against its will, it is true) the growth of the A. F. of L. when but a few years ago it denounced us from Moscow to Hollywood for resisting the theory that the A. F. of L. can no longer grow. We would appreciate it if Comrade Browder were to tell the membership of the Party what he now thinks of the following statement made by Comrade Foster in January, 1929:

"What is the future of the A. F. of L. and the craft unions generally? Are they definitely in decline as labor organizations? This question of perspective of the A. F. of L. becomes very important because in it is involved the question of whether or not there is a real base for the development of the new industrial union movement. . . .

"The A. F. of L. is definitely in decline as a labor organization. It can not and will not organize the unorganized." (William Z. Foster, the Communist. January, 1929.)

Incidentally, would Comrade Browder to-day agree with Foster's following boast?:

"The development of this struggle (the miners' strike) under the leadership of the National Miners Union, fully supports the program of building the new unions. It is a blow in the face to such people as the Lovestoneites. All the croakings that the NMU is isolated from the masses, has been dealt a deadly smash. . . . It would be interesting indeed to see Lovestone come here and tell the workers to go back into the strikebreaking UMW." (From the Communist of July, 1931, William Z. Foster.)

And, of course, we would especially appreciate if Comrade Stachel, that venerable leader of the American trade union movement, would to-day express his judicious opinion of the following evaluation made by us as against Lozovsky's, which he then denounced as anti-working class, anti-Soviet, anti-Communist, anti-revolutionary and what is even worse, anti-Stalin:

"There could be nothing more fatal to the American labor movement in general and to the revolutionary movement in particular than the illusion that the A. F. of L. can no longer grow and has no future. It is silly to look at the existing American Trade union movement with its 3,000,000 members as stationary, unchangeable. . . . The outlook is clearly for an ingress into the trade unions, for sharpened class conflicts involving millions of workers in trade unions as well as millions of sorely pressed unorganized. In the course of these struggles the unorganized are likely to pour into the unions a decisive force, the leaven germinating a new spirit of struggle, militancy, and power in these organizations." (Workers Age, May 14, 1932.)

What Kind of Work In The A. F. of L.?

Feebly and desperately the Central Committee strives to become a little more practical thru a new note, somewhat less jarring to the ear. In capital letters we find its resolution calling on the members: "To finally overcome and root out all under-estimation of work in the reformist unions." What kind of work? Constructive or destructive? Building and transforming the conservative unions into militant industrial unions or working inside to smash them? To do what Lozovsky proposed? The Central Committee of the Party must immediately make clear to the membership and to all workers whether it still accepts the following instruction of Lozovsky, the head of the Red Trade Union International:

"There is no need to shout from the housetops 'destroy the unions' as was done in Germany. But that we want to break up the reformist trade unions, that we want to explode their discipline, that we want to wrest from them the workers, that we want to explode the trade union apparatus and to destroy it—that that there can not be the slightest doubt." (Lozovsky in the RILU Plenum, February 15, 1932.)

Is this what the resolution means when it speaks of "the tremendous importance of developing work in the unions?" Fortunately, we need not wait for another verbose document. In the wooded foothills of this resolution we can see what's at the bottom of it all by lifting the camouflaging foliage. Here we find the Central Committee cursing against "the hiding of the face of the Party!" Here we find the command "to strengthen the work and leadership of the T. U. U. L. and other independent unions under our influence." Here we find the Central Committee placing the same quantitative and qualitative emphasis on work in the company unions as

The Resignation of Ger

Richberg and Swope - Heirs

by Economist

The news has just come, in the polite language of the press that General Johnson has resigned from the NRA. In the opinion of the writer this was in the offing for a long time. The general is too out-spoken in his anti-labor policies for the administration's comfort. His diatribes against labor, in the form of condemning strikes in general and the Textile and San Francisco strikes in particular, correspond in essence to the anti-labor nature of the NRA. The general's bluntness however does not fit