

Bulletin

OF THE WORKERS PARTY

CONTENTS

A PANACEA REARS ITS UGLY HEAD - By Bea Grey	1
THE JOINT WP-SWP LEAFLET AT THE GREEK PICKET LINE (HOW THE SWP LINE GIVES LEFT SUPPORT TO STALIN- ISM) - By Ernest Erber	4
A NOTE ON CONTENT WITH A LETTER ON TONE - By Irving Howe	9
CAUTION AND WHAT IT MEANS - By Ben Lawton	13
APPROACH - By Ben Lawton	15
CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN WORKERS PARTY AND CIC: From WP to Secretariat (5/26/47)	18
From Secretariat to WP (6/21/47)	21
From WP to CIC (8/30/47)	25
RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY MEXICAN SECTION ON THE METHOD OF REPRE- SENTATION (July 19, 1947)	36

A PANACEA REARS ITS UGLY HEAD

By Bea Grey

* * *

With all political eyes in America directed towards the 1948 elections, it is only fitting for the party to take account of its labor party position and of what has happened to the labor party movement.

The main motivation for raising the labor party slogan in the past was the existence of a movement for such a party. Today that movement does not exist and has been dead for a number of years. There is instead a movement for a new type of third party, that is a third party with labor support. Whether we call this new party a labor party or a third capitalist party is immaterial, as long as we recognize its character to be different from past conceptions of both. The movement for a labor party led by the trade unions and their leaders has been set back indefinitely, however.

As a result, there has been a change in motivation and content of the slogan but one that has not been openly recognized and clearly understood by the party. Due to the changed character of the "labor party movement," the campaign for the slogan has taken on a more and more abstract and ultimatic aspect. "Build a Labor Party" has merely been substituted for the old sectarian formulation: "Only Socialism can solve the problems of the working class," and tacked on to the end of almost every article in LABOR ACTION. Nor is it any better when both formulations are used together.

We have always said that support of the labor party movement is not a principled question and that "in our tactics we have always taken our point of departure from the concrete political situation and the tendencies of its development" (Labor Party Resolution, p. 19). But for us today, the creation of the labor party has become a life and death question, it is the indispensable bridge to socialism. According to the statement of the November 1946 plenum of the National Committee on the "Letter of the IKD to the WP Convention," the campaign for the labor party is the central strategy of the political activity of the party as a whole, the "political essence of our 'plan' in the U.S. today." In this way the labor party slogan has been elevated to new heights of importance. No longer is a tactic meeting the political necessity of the day, it is now the grand strategy of the revolution in America.

In 1938, Burnham, one of the main theoreticians of labor partyism, writing in THE NI (P. 72, Col. 2) emphasized the reformist character of the labor party and the necessity for the revolutionary party to give no guarantees or raise false hopes for such a party. We should on the contrary "warn against the illusion that such a party can solve any major problem of the working class." Our motivation is decidedly different when we say today in LABOR ACTION (April 21):

"Labor can go to the leadership of this nation and stay there. Labor can reorganize this country. Labor can reorganize the world. Labor and only labor can heal the wounds of the world and clean up the mess which capitalism has made. For this labor must be political-

ly organized... Not under Wallace and Pepper. Not under the Roosevelts, the Trumans, the Deweys, Bilbos and Tafts, but under labor's own banner and program and with labor's own party."

Is it not clear that this type of ranting sows illusions rather than dispels them.

In a joint article with Burnham in August 1948, Shachtman pointed out the danger of our party becoming a labor party party, on "that will carry on an abstract general universal and perpetual campaign for a Labor Party." With LABOR ACTION raising the labor party slogan at the end of articles on housing, rent, miners strike, anti-labor bills, etc., it would seem we had not avoided that danger. The slogan has just become a substitute for a concrete proposal or for direct intervention by the party in the political struggles of the people. Steeped in the ideology of "lack of forces" we are content to just preach Labor Partyism as a way for labor to save its soul and ours with it.

Having practically ignored the political arenas that already exist or made only feeble attempts to get into them, the WP looks forward to the labor party as the made-to-order arena for us, the "dream"-arena. From a prediction on the development of the labor movement in America, the labor party has become a must, a matter of life and death as far as the success of the WP is concerned. The N.C. statement says:

"Our political task in this country today is summed up in the struggle to establish the proletariat as a class for itself, as a politically independent class with its own class goal... Once the American proletariat has established a class party of its own, the revolutionary Marxists would have before them an extremely favorable organized political arena in which to function and - given the necessary intelligence - to grow rapidly."

As anyone can see, the campaign is no longer predicated on an existing movement for a labor party or on the chances such a party has for developing but rather on the assumption that the American labor movement, and we with it, must go through this stage or we are doomed. According to this view, it is inconceivable that the American working class will skip the labor party stage as we conceived of it, that is a reformist party based on the trade unions. Certainly the latest developments would indicate that this sort of party is pretty much out of the question; that instead we will be confronted with a New Deal type of party garnering the workers votes, but with the organized trade unions as such remaining on the outside. In other words, our "most favorable political arena" would be excluded. If the party strategy is completely upset, we should be filled with despair. We have almost forgotten that this development might be a good thing. We have almost forgotten that we characterized the labor party as a necessary evil, an obstacle in the path of the revolution but nevertheless an experience that the workers may have to go through, and we with them. As a matter of fact, given the economic and political crises that are ahead for the American workers, a revolutionary party that operated effectively in leading their fights could emerge the only alternative to this new third party.

Instead we tell the workers that only a labor party will stop fascism and destroy capitalism. Of course, we know that we mean a

revolutionary labor party, but for a worker who reads the paper it's all right to let him think that "labor organized in its own party" will do this. But even more dangerous than creating these illusions among the workers, is the illusion created among the members of the party that only with the labor party "plan" in America can we hope to gain "mass support and authority," "act effectively like a party" and "like the actual spokesman and leader of hundreds of thousands and millions." Why is it excluded that we attain this position in the American labor movement, if we functioned with "the necessary intelligence," in all other political arenas open to us today, including the coming third party of Wallace. This type of ballyhoo and romantic hope building in connection with the labor party that is no longer on the order of the day, stems only from a lack of confidence in the ability of our party to intervene in contemporary American society. It is a natural consequence of the "lack of forces" theory that has been inhibiting the party for years now.

Considered soberly, the labor party slogan is an important weapon in tearing the workers away from the two-party system when they are already in motion on one or several progressive issues. Raised in this way, it would move people away from bourgeois politics and in a desirable direction. No more than that. But the way the labor party is being thumped for today, it has become the panacea for the party and society as well. As far as the workers are concerned, we will have to do a lot of explaining when we start attacking their labor party. And as far as the party is concerned such a build-up for the labor party means stagnation and sterility while we wait for it to develop.

Most prophetic of all the predictions on the labor party is the statement by Burnham and Shachtman in their aforementioned article:

"The Labor Party tactic is not given for all time... If the trend is swallowed up in a third party, the slogan will lose its effectiveness."

If this contention is accurate at all, it would seem the party would have to devise some other strategy for its "plan" in America today.

#

THE JOINT WP-SWP LEAFLET AT THE GREEK PICKET LINE
(How the SWP Line Gives Left Support to Stalinism)

By Ernest Erber

* * *

The manner in which the Russian position of the Socialist Workers Party gives left support to Stalinism was demonstrated in the difference between our two parties on the contents of the joint leaflet distributed at the WP-SWP picket line protest before the Greek consulate on behalf of the arrested Greek Trotskyists on June 7th.

Both parties agreed that the slogans to be carried on the picket line should be exchanged for mutual approval and that the leaflet to be distributed be a joint statement of both parties on the issues involved. There was no difficulty on the slogans since a picket line appearing before the Greek consulate had to carry placards that were directed against the Greek regime and its American supporters, the Truman Administration. However, precisely because the Stalinists are the ones who are mainly associated in the public press with the fight against the Greek regime and the Truman Doctrine, it was important that our demonstration be distinguished from them, if only by means of the leaflet. I raised this question upon my first discussion with George Clarke, City Organizer of the SWP. He declared that he saw no need for it and that only harm could come of an attempt to "drag in" the issue of Russia and Stalinism. He took the view that it would require a thesis to adequately deal with the question of Stalinism. Since he was to prepare the draft for the leaflet, I stated that I would raise the question again in specific form when the draft was ready.

When I was handed the draft at a later date, I found that it did not only omit any mention of Stalinism or Russia, but that it did not even deal with the Trotskyists' role in Greece in a manner that would describe them as internationalists, opposed to any foreign domination of Greece. Upon my suggestion, the third paragraph was drafted and inserted. My attempts to include any references to Stalinism or Russia explicitly were met with obstinate resistance.

Clarke stated that if we were picketing in Bulgaria or Hungary the issue would be Russia and Stalinism, but that in the case at hand we had to direct our attack upon the Greek regime and the Truman policy. I countered with the contention that if we were picketing in Bulgaria or Hungary (a good analogy, however hypothetical), we would devote nine-tenths of our leaflet to Russian domination but would still devote one-tenth to American imperialism. The latter would be necessary to distinguish ourselves from the pro-American elements in those countries. This argument left Clarke unmoved. He kept repeating that the word "Trotskyist" was sufficient to distinguish us from the Stalinists.

Clarke added as an additional argument that if some Greek workers' organization with Stalinists in the membership were to join our demonstration, such an anti-Stalinist leaflet would act as a barrier. I replied that if pro-Stalinist elements joined, it would become a broad united front and we would find it impossible to put out joint political statements with them, since a united front is formed for action and not propaganda. A joint demonstration of the WP and the

SWP, however, was an action by two Trotskyist parties collaborating toward unity and a joint political statement was possible within the limits set by the programs of the two parties. Unable to agree, I took a draft of the leaflet for consultation with other members of the City Committee of Local New York.

In consultation with several members of the City Committee, a substitute paragraph was drawn up, together with a letter setting forth our reasons (both attached hereto), and sent to the SWP City Office. The only significant change that the substitute paragraph proposed was the addition of the words "...and are opposed to the armed imposition upon Greece of a Russian-puppet government." This formulation was carefully chosen to avoid any conflict with the political program of the SWP. The latter most certainly is opposed to an "armed imposition" of a "Russian puppet government" upon any nation, even though they favor the slogan of "CP to power." However, this formulation proved as unacceptable to the SWP as any of my previous arguments.

The nub of the political difference was not, of course, how to characterize the role of Stalinism or Russia; it was rather whether the line of the leaflet should seek to distinguish itself from the Stalinists or whether it should seek to find a common voice with them. The line of the WP is to seek to distinguish ourselves from the Stalinist movement at all times and under all conditions. The line of the SWP is to seek to identify themselves with the Stalinist movement wherever the absence of political differences in a specific situation permits it.

The line of the WP seeks to make the Trotskyist movement known everywhere as an anti-capitalist and an anti-Stalinist movement -- to provide an answer to the growing numbers in this country and in Europe who seek a movement that represents a Third Force, against capitalist barbarism and against Stalinist totalitarianism. This line would appeal especially to thousands of Greek-American workers in New York City who are opposed to the reactionary regime of Tsaldaris but fear that Greece may become another Bulgaria or Hungary.

The line of the SWP is to ignore the latter danger and to concentrate the attack solely upon the Greek regime and the Truman policy. Such a policy can only serve as a left support of Stalinism.

The refusal of the SWP to accept our substitute paragraph confronted us with the necessity of either issuing our own leaflet and breaking the solidarity and unity of the action or maintaining the latter through an acceptance of the SWP draft. The City Committee, meeting before the content of the leaflet was taken up with the SWP, had unanimously taken the line that the leaflet should contain a specific anti-Stalinist point. This latter motion was reported to the Political Committee and unanimously endorsed with the proviso that Local New York could issue a separate leaflet if it deemed it necessary.

The refusal of the SWP to include any reference to Russia or Stalinism now confronted us with the necessity of acting on the question of a separate leaflet. Knowing that the latter would have an adverse effect upon the spirit of solidarity upon the picket line and being aware of the desire of the open and concealed enemies of unity in the SWP to use any issue they could distort for purposes of

demagogic attacks upon our party's record in collaboration, we deemed it advisable in the given circumstances to refrain from issuing our own leaflet and to rely upon the sale of our press at the demonstration to set forth our views.

The experience of the demonstration, however, has given serious grounds upon which to question our course. To the extent to which it was possible to judge reactions to our demonstration, we can say that the bulk of the passers-by viewed it as a "Communist" (i.e. Stalinist) action. Any number of hostile challenges were called out like "What about Hungary?" and "Why don't you picket the Bulgarian consulate?" Though the area in which the demonstration took place (Rockefeller Center) is mostly frequented by white-collar workers and professionals, the same hostility against the demonstration on grounds of it being "pro-Russian" was evinced by taxi drivers, one of whom engaged one of our comrades in a furious argument until he was told that we are against both American and Russian imperialism.

Our acceptance of the SWP draft in an effort to deprive the enemies of unity in the SWP of demagogic arguments based upon distortions is also open to question, in view of what has taken place since. Our mere reticence to accept the SWP draft is now being cited in the SWP as further evidence of our "irresponsibility" and "truculence."

#

COPY OF LEAFLET DISTRIBUTED AT
PICKET LINE

STOP REIGN OF TERROR IN GREECE!

This picket line demonstration is a protest against the arrest of 13 revolutionary socialists (Trotskyists) in Greece.

Arrested for exercising the democratic right to political activity, several face the death sentence after trial by court martial.

The Trotskyists in Greece are a section of the Fourth International who fought the Nazis during the German occupation and have continued the struggle for a free Socialist Greece against the reactionary governments supported by British imperialism and by the Truman doctrine.

These arrests are part of a reign of terror carried on by the corrupt Royalist government against all opponents.

The Greek government has filled the jails and concentration camps with trade unionists, liberal democrats - with all those who have dared to criticize one of the most reactionary dictatorships in the world.

This Royalist mob ruling Greece today was persecuting its opponents under the German occupation for the benefit of the Nazis.

The Truman Doctrine now gives moral aid and financial assistance to this murderous dictatorship in Greece. Under the guise of stopping

"totalitarianism" the Truman government is upholding a vicious dictatorship. Encouraged by this support, the Greek government has scorned all demands for a general amnesty of political prisoners.

This picket line demands:

Release the arrested Trotskyists!
Free all political prisoners in Greece!
End the reign of terror!
Stop loans and grants to the Greek dictatorship!

SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY
WORKERS PARTY

#

COPY OF LETTER SENT BY WP TO SWP
ON LEAFLET

June 6, 1947

George Clarke, Organizer
Local New York
Socialist Workers Party

Dear Comrade Clarke:

Appended please find the substitute paragraph we are proposing for the leaflet.

Permit me to reiterate the reasons which, in our opinion, require this formulation:

1. Since everyone understands that the internal situation in Greece is closely related to and directly reflects the struggle between American and Russian aims in Eastern Europe, a leaflet dealing with the Greek government issued by a political organization -- not to speak of one issued by two Trotskyist parties -- will be read with this larger struggle in mind. It is, consequently, necessary to indicate the attitude of the undersigned parties to this larger struggle. This requires that we do not remain silent about our attitude to Stalinism, at least to that bare minimum where we agree.

2. We do not look upon this picket line as a broad united front but as an action by two Trotskyist parties collaborating on the basis of a perspective for unity. The leaflet is, therefore, not limited to a mere protest on the specific issue. We are, consequently, in agreement with the political content of the leaflet insofar as it deals with American imperialism. That the latter is the main enemy and should therefore be the object of the main political attack in the leaflet goes without saying. But we consider the political references incomplete without the inclusion of at least a sentence or even a phrase that indicates our attitude toward Stalinism. The reference to the latter in our formulation is a bare minimum statement and we are sure that it in no way conflicts with the political views of your party.

Fraternally yours,
Ernest Erber

1679

Proposed substitute for third paragraph:

The Trotskyists in Greece are a section of the Fourth International with the political aim of a free Socialist Greece. They have struggled for this aim against the Nazis during the German occupation, have continued this struggle against the reactionary governments supported by British imperialism and by the Truman doctrine and are opposed to the armed imposition upon Greece of a Russian puppet government.

#

A NOTE ON CONTENT WITH A LETTER ON TONE

By Irving Howe

* * *

Comrade Charles Morgan's reply to my question to Comrade Forest on "inevitability of socialism" shows that he has been studying Marxism very diligently. He knows about the stages of society, how one has supplanted the other and why capitalism is in crisis. Good. But he does not satisfactorily answer the question I addressed to Forest. I will try again, commit still another "journalistic putsch" and perhaps we will get a more satisfactory answer.

(1) The Origin of the Problem : What Forest Wrote. I took objection to the following crucial sentence by Forest:

"It is because Marx based himself on the inevitability of socialism that he could discern the law of motion of capitalist society, the inevitability of its collapse."

Gates, the notorious exponent of American pragmatism, charged that Forest's statement was idealism. Why? The reasoning is simple:

The "inevitability of socialism" is not a fact, not at least as yet; it is an hypothesis. On what is that hypothesis based? I insist, and I believe quite in the Marxist tradition, that the hypothesis is based on an analysis of capitalist society. But Forest turns the matter around. She denies this; she insists that in order to analyze capitalist society you must first believe in the "inevitability of socialism." In other words, that the theory of "inevitability" exists prior to an analysis of the inevitability of capitalist collapse. If you give the English language half a break, that is the only possible meaning that can be assigned to her statement.

So the question arises: if the theory of "inevitability" is held prior to your concrete analysis of capitalist society, where is it derived from? If "inevitability" is not derived from an analysis of capitalist society, that is, if it is not derived from an examination of the material conditions of existence - then it can be derived only conceptually, a procedure which would be, as Gates charged, idealism.

(2) Johnson contra Forest. This contention is fully borne out by the statement from an article by Johnson which Gates so conveniently dug up - as if in anticipation of Morgan. This statement of Johnson reads:

"Engels and Lenin insisted that Marx deduced the inevitability of socialism not from the negation of the negation, but by an observation of socio-economic phenomena." (that is, of capitalist society.)

Good for Johnson; he is absolutely right; It is a pleasure to be able to say so! But his statement is in direct contradiction to that of Forest. I stand with Johnson against Forest; that, Comrade Morgan, is all I tried to establish in my question to Forest.

(3) Morgan the Marxologist. Comrade Morgan, evidently not too familiar with the works of his ideological leader, Johnson, enters a defense for Forest. He insists that Marx's economic categories are social categories. I vote for that. He insists that capitalism is in irreversible decline, that its demise is inevitable. I vote for that too. He speaks of inevitable social revolt. Count me in on that too.

But all of this has nothing, nothing to do with the inevitability of socialism. I shall not here discuss what Marx meant; that is another question. But in modern scientific usage, the word "inevitability" means an event having a probability of one. That means the event, on the basis of our previous experience, is judged as being objectively certain to take place, without human intervention, in the future. Probably Marx didn't mean this by his use of the word inevitability; since the word has at least six assignable meanings, it is a matter of some dispute.

But whatever Marx meant, Morgan's views are clearly irrelevant. Morgan proves that capitalism must inevitably enter its demise and that social revolutions must inevitably take place. But this does not yet mean that socialism is inevitable.

For, as we have discovered in the past few decades, the inevitable demise of capitalism and the inevitable appearance of social revolution -- do not as inevitably lead to a socialist victory.

Hence, Morgan's "proof" is no proof at all. But it is revealing. For never in his learned demonstration does he once mention one little detail -- THE PARTY.

He has been so taken in by Johnson's "instincts" and "self-mobilizations" that in a discussion of inevitability of socialism he does not mention one of the main -- and in current historical situation, the main -- problem in relation to it: will and how can the revolutionary party gain the leadership of the masses?

If Morgan's version is Marxism, I choose the Marx Brothers.

Let me repeat one thing: my discussion has not been on the validity of the theory of "inevitability of socialism" -- and despite Morgan's ferocious accusations against me of nihilism and MacDonaldism, I reapt "whatever that may mean," because the term has been assigned so many meanings. Nor was my article on which of those meanings Marx intended. I merely tried to show that Forest's use of the phrase was idealist. As the quotation from Johnson so amply demonstrates.

(4) Pragmatism and Idealism. Comrade Morgan, who is a very serious Marxian scholar, ends his polemic by stripping my Marxian "fig leaf" and exposing me as a petty bourgeois revisionist. All right. But I must say a word about a gross misunderstanding from which he suffers. He charges that I ended my piece by insisting upon a choice between pragmatism and idealism, without taking into account dialectical materialism.

What I did say was this. (Really, our ferocious polemist could have understood it, had he wished to. I may be a nihilist and a

MacDonaldite and even naive, though that last hurst a little, but I fancy I write fairly clearly.) I said that if, as Forest charged, Gates' attack on her was pragmatism (Gates was merely repeating what Johnson had said) then there was left to us only the choice between pragmatism and her idealism -- for what Gates said was perfectly correct. By that, my dear Comrade Morgan, I did not wish to suggest that pragmatism is the only alternative to idealism; generally speaking, my thought doesn't run in the direction of setting up "only alternatives." In fact, I had and have no desire to say anything in a brief note on either pragmatism or dialectical materialism. I don't know enough about either; I leave that to scholars like Comrade Morgan.

- - -

June 20, 1947.

Dear Comrade Morgan:

I have written a brief reply to your polemic against me in the Party BULLETIN, which you will see when it appears. Here permit me, in the spirit of utmost sincerity, to address a word to you.

Your article was your first venture into party print on a polemical question. I hope you make many more ventures, since there is nothing as desirable in a revolutionary party as an articulate membership, even when it is wrong. But I hope, too, that you don't write quite the same sort of articles again; not that the party won't print them, but that you should learn better.

You see, Comrade Morgan, we have established in the WP a certain tradition in polemics; it is one of the most precious aspects, I think, of that tradition. We try to polemicize as well and, if you wish, as sharply as we can; we destroy our opponents arguments, we prove if necessary his ignorance, his misuse or misunderstanding of Marxism. But that is all -- we try to keep it objective and impersonal. Perhaps we don't always succeed, but we try. Let me give you an instance of which I was perhaps the victim. The article I wrote on "The New Course" in the NI met with general disapproval in the party. Good. Comrade Erber wrote a reply; a very sharp reply in which he proved to the satisfaction of a great many comrades that I was completely wrong. Good. But Erber's polemic is a model of objectivity, of sticking to the political-intellectual issues and leaving irrelevant personal or demagogic remarks aside. I tried to answer in the same way. I am notoriously hot-headed and impatient, but I at least tried honestly to answer in the same way.

Now in our party, it is not a general procedure to refer comrades to psychoanalysts when we disagree with them, as you did in your polemic. For one thing, it is a dangerous precedent: suppose I replied by referring you to a psychoanalyst? Where would we be then? It is difficult enough to decide political questions these days, without confronting the party with the problem of deciding which of us should visit a psychoanalyst because our writings are, as you put it, "of clinical interest." And then again, many psychoanalysts claim that everybody needs analysis -- a conclusion which takes on more weight when one remembers that it was made without even having read the WP BULLETIN... You see what a mess you get into when you bring in such irrelevant nonsense. So henceforth when you go out to

slay anti-Marxian dragons, you may remain as humorless as you wish -- but don't suggest psychoanalysis. It's a two-edged weapon.

And again don't you think it's rather presumptuous to accuse a comrade of MacDonaldism when that comrade has been the only member of the party who has written a sustained attack on MacDonald, good, bad or indifferent? Isn't it, shall we say, a little rash? And again the accusation of nihilism which you couple with MacDonaldism? You see, you are so impatient to make your polemical splash that you forget that whatever else he is, MacDonald is certainly not a nihilist; nobody who believes in Capitalized Eternal Values is a nihilist.

And similarly with the accusation of anti-Marxism, with or without fig-leaves. Do you think that sort of thing makes for a healthy internal life? You may prove to your heart's content my misuse or ignorance of Marxism; in the face of your obvious scholarship I am ready to be extremely humble on that score; but those of us who have spent a good part of the last few years in writing polemics against MacDonald, Burnham, the editors of PR, and a number of other opponents of revolutionary Marxism, tend to get a little annoyed when we are accused of anti-Marxism. Perhaps it is a sign of our petty-bourgeois sensitivity; if so, forgive me.

You see, Comrade Morgan, our party is different on this matter from most others; we have established a tradition of free and tolerant and impersonal discussion where even fools like myself may reply to scholars like you. Of this tradition we are supremely proud.

I can see you reading this letter - oh, so impatiently. "Tone," you are no doubt mumbling to yourself, "tone, all those petty bourgeois Shachtmanites talk about tone. What about the content?" Well, I've tried to take care of the content elsewhere. But one of the things we've learned about from sad experience - a pity you couldn't have had it with us, though perhaps you will get a repeat version for yourself soon - is that these matters of tone, of party procedure and comradely attitudes sometimes supersede in importance the issue in dispute.

With comradely greetings,

Irving Howe

###

CAUTION AND WHAT IT MEANS

By Ben Lawton

* * *

The theory that caution against using revolutionary arguments, such as the maritime fraction advocates is not only wrong but it is dangerous insofar as it puts the revolutionary and general Marxist ideology into the background. When limitations of what can be attained are argued for, without also showing the discrepancies therein and capitalism, itself, then the line becomes reformist.

In the maritime fraction there are continual bickerings about what stand is to be taken in either of the two unions represented, but it all leads to caution. There is not only fear of the union bureaucrats but the Stalinists as well.

Those who take this attitude will lead into what direction?

There is also the attitude which I will take up briefly, because it all stems from the same root of parlor Bolshevism, of those who are not interested in party functions if they have something "better" to do. Does Comrade R. remember just a short while ago that he did not attend a fraction meeting because a date with a girl comrade (who would have understood) was more important? Comrades J. and L. sneaked out of a housing parade to shop, and if it weren't for the persuasion of X they wouldn't have marched at all. I myself am not simply pure nor do I believe I have the right to lay down any laws but these concrete cases are to prove my point. Ten years I've stayed away from the movement for these same reasons.

Comrade N. also jibes me about my leftist position but I think truly 19-1/2 centuries have made a vast difference in the ambitions and, if I may be brazen, the sincerity within the revolutionary movements. The Christian martyrs have fought even into the well-known catacombs. Although Christianity in itself is wrong, we must not forget and admire the stand these fighters took for what they believed in.

Today there seems to be a different story and I'm called an ultra-leftist because I believe in carrying not only our immediate party aims but also Marxism and its slogans to the working class. Where else but in our working class organizations, trade unions especially, can we bring these slogans and, if I may steal a word from the church, the gospel.

To those who interpret my argument as meaning that in a union like the NMU, which is still Stalinist controlled, we should wear a Trotskyist sign so all can see and read, should know that even I have more sense than that. The point is not in shouting Trotsky or the "ism" but let the working class know of Marx and socialism. Pound your line and immediate aims, then after those 5-10% of the workers follow, tell them you are a believer in the socialization of industry. When a correct line is constantly and continually put forward combined with Marxism, watch another 50-60% rally toward you.

Is it sectarian to say, "Workers of the world unite, you have nothing to lose but your chains and a world to gain?" Wasn't it Marx who broke with the British right wing trade unionists and everything

in between to the anarchists, so he could better use socialist ideology and in trade unions at that during the upsweep of capitalism?

The false line of caution that is the baby of the SWP and the seaman's fraction in the WP who follow it is really sectarian. How can workers be attracted to the socialist revolution without a revolutionary line given to them? "Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary practice," so said Lenin. Nor am I urging for socialist unions as the TUUL and SLP varieties for they are just other forms of sectarianism. Stalinism is corrupt today because among other trends they went from this latter type of sectarianism to caution. These seeds of corruption were planted way back when. I remember how my former comrades had more important dates than party functions. This I found all along in the revolutionary movements (pseudo, quasi-or real). There are things like this that breed the fruits of corruption and as long as I believe in the cause of true socialism I shall not stand idly by while others help these rotten eggs to explode in their own and our faces.

To be afraid now to call yourselves politicals in your unions smacks of fear and, this time Comrade N. notwithstanding. Most of us hope to live to see barricades in our time; when the guns face us, must we still be cautious? It is stuff like this that helped to create our Budenzes, Joe Sullivans, Max Eastmans, Tom Stammers and numerous other renegades, including the entire leadership of the CI.

For heaven's sake, we don't have to tell each other of the need for socialism and to give each other revolutionary slogans. Give it to your unions and workers organizations.

Besides unions there are many unorganized workers who would probably listen to what we have to say. Why not have comrades living in various parts of the U.S. take one night a week to form workers' clubs? Has anyone ever thought of that? They may not have socialism as their slogan for that is the party's job, but they can urge for workers' needs. I don't mean to imply this as an all time necessity. A tenants' club in a working class neighborhood is just as well and I know the party is active there but this is not all over the U.S. I, for one, am not for a labor party, but since the party officially is; these clubs can act as a basis or nucleus for such a party. To the workers in these clubs who are militant and prove to be class conscious - to them too we bring the Marxian doctrine to them.

It is important to remember that in the words of Marx, "Communists never hide who they are."

When as a party our members do not emphasize the limitations of our gains to the workers under capitalism, then his line must be reformist and his actions no better than his line.

#

APPROACH

By Ben Lawton

. * * *

According to some Johnsonites my article on the foregoing topic is irrelevant, immaterial and sounds like words from the mouth of a naive person. The proof of the pudding is in the tasting and I have got results. To prove that the issue of the correct approach to the American worker is important, let local NY tell us how many recruits we have gained since the city convention; and if the Johnsonites want to build that mass party they talk so much about then let them lend an eye to this article, for I have much influence in the NNJU and at the same I am bucking the obstacle of being a known Trotzkyite. Therefore in view of the fact that recruitment and contacts are a necessary factor in building a mass party, then the tactical question of approach is necessary.

Much talk and discussion has taken place through the years of building a revolutionary party, but so little has been said about approach. It seems that this is left solely to the discretion of the approacher. That is all very well, but a line is sorely needed, for the American worker is not as reactionary as some people would like to believe.

There is something that we must tackle because, unfortunately there is a true science to contend with, and that is psychology of the individual as well as the masses. When talking to and conversing or discussing with an individual the approach may have to be less general and more specific than when talking from a platform.

This individual, we must learn, has had what kind of background? Were his parents religious or not? This seems quite complicated and you may say "How do we get at finding out all these things?" That is why it is unfortunate, but important that though one person may be sympathetic another may be antipathetic. By learning the reasons for all degrees between the two we then know what to argue. We must break down background. Never become excited in a political argument or discussion.

Although this may sound absurd, but when you realize the fact, then you'll understand that the American working class is revolutionary but in too many cases it lies dormant because he believes government can solve everything. Only the advanced worker has been indoctrinated with "State and Revolution". Further, he has a yea team attitude and does not know the practical reasons for the existence and origins of national boundary lines. Therefore we must teach him and explain to him what we hold to be true.

During the periods of the last depression, like a bone to a whining dog, the American worker was given concessions or there would have been a social revolution in the US. In spite of these concessions we still had some of our greatest strikes in history in that period, after Roosevelt took over. The exact numbers of unrest agains

the president of those that could not be fooled will never be known because a large section of the poverty-stricken population either couldn't or wouldn't vote. Yet the growth and existence of fascist organizations (vigilantes, bundists, black shirts, silver shirts, KKK etc.) were perpetrated to keep a restless militant proletariat in check. It is too bad that no organization with a correct approach existed at that time. The Stalinists sold out the workers, first with their theory of social fascism, then their class collaborationist line and thirdly with their cooperation with Hitler. The Trotskites gave the working class a blow by fusing with social democracy and therefore lost their independence to deal correctly with the working class. In 1937 the task of building, once more an independent organization gave them no time to get to the masses and then the war made things more difficult and ended the depression.

What are the solutions and how to approach is a task for us and means work and fast work at that. The coming depression is being prepared for by the bourgeoisie by anti-labor measures and if we are caught napping it will be another sell out.

The approach to the masses must be purely and simply on anti-capitalist lines. At no time retreat. As monopoly capital is concentrated into fewer and fewer hands the greater the sufferings and privations of the "underprivileged", it is then that retreat is impossible. With a correct approach the working class will go further and further into the offensive. It is these anti-labor bills or laws that prove to me that the bourgeoisie are on the defensive or else our bosses would not have to resort to legalities. They would not in that case have to prepare prisons and concentrations camps for the more honest labor leaders. It is now that a break in discipline in some unions and a lack of fear in Stalinist controlled unions that we expose our betrayers when and where possible. There is only one Marxist argument as far as I can see and that is a dogmatic anti-capitalist argument and the expose of labor fakers, Hall, Lundberg, Murray, Lewis, King et al.

The IKD believes that the working class has failed and that the work in trade unions has been too concentrated in that direction. However, where else do they think that we can get a larger nucleus in the circles of the working class to begin to get a larger base in order to build the movement. As one of their leading comrades told me that it is impossible to build a mass revolutionary movement and that if such a thing were possible a revolution would not be needed as the masses would become socialized because they would be in the majority. To them I want to say that the working class has not failed as such but the misleaders have been the direct cause of that. Where else but in your unions, coops (sometimes) and other working class organizations do you think you can do revolutionary work? As Lenin once so aptly put it, unions and other proletarian organizations should be schools for communism. This is all part of the psychology of approach. Also their theory of who will start the revolutionary as no organization can set a date for the upheaval, as they imply. Nor will the middle classes have to follow, for even the Bolsheviks had to liquidate some of the upper class members. The Russian revolutionary masses proved that the workers can, with the correct guidance will not fail.

To go back to the individual, whether you have or have not convinced him, be his friend. No one is hopeless. Many past red baiters have felt the class struggle and then realized where they belong. I've had comrades tell me people were hopeless by having a short conversation with them; whereas I found out that only a little patience was needed. At all times be friends with the person in question. Make appointments and at party socials the comrades mix and make the contact or friend feel at home. Talk politics but don't make it seem as though it was the order of the evening.

There is always one important thing to remember; we are not a sect of the working class nor its clergy who preaches theory and forgets to practice. We are part of the said class and must act as such. Where leadership is needed, go in and pitch.

There is one thing to be made clear, that Stalinist or Social democratic workers are not hopeless either. When a reactionary worker with an anti-socialist ideology joins one of these organizations in his mind it stands for socialism; he has taken a progressive step. To prove my belief, I'll bet a good percentage of the WP and SWP have been recruited from these parties. Therefore, work on them as well as other workers. They will sometimes talk and listen to you. I have been successful with the most dogmatic of them. Their dogmatism is based mainly on hero worship and not on intelligent logical political thought.

With the average worker the approach should start from the premise that the Soviet Union is not a "Workers State". It is unfortunate that so many workers believe that it is, and give it as an example. Then follow up your argument from there, after you have convinced him on that score.

What happened to the slogans of Marx, Lenin and Luxemburg which preferred the cry of "All power to the workers"? You cry that the Americal proletariat is not ready for socialism or state power. That is just what Scheideman and Kautsky said of their respective countries. As everyone is entitled to his opinion, and you believe that the recession is on in the revolutionary movements then why give slogans that are retrogressive. "The union 'rank and file' to take power in all industries". If the continuance agitation for proletarian power is ultra leftist and sectarian then Marx and Trotzky must have been also, in expounding the Permanent Revolution. The true dialectic of revolutions, however, stands this wisdom of parliamentary moles on its head: not through a majority to revolutionary tactics but through revolutionary tactics to a majority--that is the way the road runs. Thus it is clear that in every revolution only that party is capable of seizing the leadership and powers which has the courage to issue the appropriate watchwords for driving the revolution ahead and the courage to draw all the necessary conclusions from the situation.

Take this into considerations of future development that as the coming capitalist chaos approaches, the revolutionary party must be prepared with slogans, approach in the right directions and a correct trade union policy. And to reiterate myself, trade unions are a school for communism and if we are caught napping then the betrayal is on.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN WORKERS PARTY
AND CIC

* * *

May 26, 1947.

TO THE SECRETARIAT

Dear Comrades:

Our Committee has received your communication of April 28, including the resolutions of the Plenum of the CIC of March 1947. We note with satisfaction the decision of the Plenum making possible the full participation of our party in the preparations for the coming EPC and in its deliberations. This decision is a welcome step in the direction of the consolidation of our movement.

So far as your justification of the conditions set down for the participation in the EPC of organizations not affiliated with the Movement is concerned, we do not consider it fruitful to engage in a discussion on the subject at the present time. We have made our views on this sufficiently clear to you and we shall continue to make them clear to all the sections and to the EPC itself. Our views have in no way been altered by your communication. We still consider the procedure recommended by the CIC on this matter to be entirely false.

Our Committee has also discussed the resolution of the March Plenum of the CIC on the scope of the coming EPC and on the basis of representation.

We regard the decision adopted by the majority of the CIC on the proposal to extend an invitation to such groups as the POUM, the Bordigists and the like, as erroneous. The decision is entirely negative. It deprives the Movement of the initiative with regard to such organizations, it deprives our movement of a valuable means for approaching not only the leadership but above all the ranks of these organizations, it is impregnated with an utterly sectarian spirit which evidently considers the Movement as it exists today a more or less finished product, and it is therefore harmful to the best interests of the movement. We wish to emphasize our view on this matter precisely because our party has even less in common politically with such groups as, for example, the Bordigists than other tendencies now in existence in the Movement. Other decisions taken by the Plenum of the CIC seem to be based upon precedents from the history of the Communist International which, in our opinion, are misunderstood or misapplied precedents. The CIC, however, failed to note or to learn from the fact that the Comintern, in its formative period, took the energetic initiative to invite to its Congresses, with deliberative or consultative vote, such divergent organizations as the syndicalist or anarcho-syndicalist IWW and CNT, the Jewish Bund of Poland and a considerable number of other ultra-leftist or centrist organizations. There is no good reason why the Movement, with all due regard for difference in proportions, should not proceed in a similar way today. We are therefore addressing ourselves to all the sections with the request that they take the measures necessary to reverse the decision of the March Plenum of the CIC on this point.

Our Committee also discussed the decision of the CIC on the basis of

representation to the EPC. We reject this decision in its entirety. The decision of the CIC seems to have been adopted upon the basis of apparently similar bases of representation that prevailed in the early years of the Communist International. The similarity in decisions is, however, only apparent, in our opinion, and therefore superficial. The Comintern did indeed divide the countries of the world into several categories, allotting more votes to countries in one category than in another. Whatever may be one's opinion of the procedure followed at that time, its purpose and effect were radically different from the purpose and effect of the decision of the CIC. In the first place, the physical and political conditions under which the Comintern and its sections operated in the early twenties are in no way comparable with our own conditions today. In the second place, the division of countries into various categories employed by the Comintern had as its obvious purpose the reduction of the disproportionate weight that certain sections would have in the Congresses if the mere number of members in a section was the only basis of representation. The difference in numerical strength between the larger sections, especially the Russian party, and the smaller and smallest sections was immense, in many cases a relationship of 100 to 1 and in some cases even 1,000 to 1. Furthermore, many of the sections in the larger countries were not yet in any sense stabilized but were rather constantly in a state of flux, both politically and organizationally. To have based representation at Comintern Congresses merely on numbers would have signified the complete formal domination of the sessions by the Russian party and would have committed a gross injustice by reducing the representation of most of the other sections to nil or nearly nil. The basis of representation adopted was, therefore, calculated to give greater formal weight to the numerically smaller sections.

The decision of the March CIC has neither this merit nor any other. The difference in numerical strength between the largest section of the Movement and the smallest is for all practical purposes inconsequential as a justification for the decision of the CIC. The difference between the largest section, which has no more than 1000 members, and the small sections in the "countries of medium" or "lesser importance," does not begin to be comparable to the difference in numerical strength between the largest and the smaller sections of the old Comintern. It is the difference between a larger sect and one that is not so large, and in most cases this difference is compensated by other considerations, such as influence of a section in the working class of a country, strength of the section in relation to the population as a whole, etc. Under these circumstances, to allot to a section with 150 members only 1 delegate because it operates in a country of "lesser importance" and to give another section which has no larger membership 3 delegates because it operates in a country of "great importance," is a crying absurdity. It is a decision which not only has no authorization in the statutes of the Movement (1938) but it violates the spirit of democratic representation and true internationalism, and can only arouse repugnance if not in the sections of the countries placed in the first category than at the very least in the countries placed in the second and third.

Under the concrete circumstances of the life of the Movement, of the actual numerical strength of its sections, and of their relations to each other, no other basis of representation can be considered just and democratic and appropriate to the needs of the movement than

that of allotting delegates in strict accordance with proportional numerical strength, with the necessary provisions made for exceptions to this otherwise rigid rule in those individual cases where its literal application would deprive an organization of its full right of representation. For these reasons, we categorically oppose the decision adopted by the CIC at its March Plenum, and urge it to replace the basis of representation recommended by it with the one proposed by us. We are addressing ourselves to all sections on this matter too with a request that they immediately take the measures necessary to achieve a reversal of the decision of the CIC and the adoption of a decision which will help assure the democratic character of the EPC.

We have been informed by the representative of the Spanish group in Mexico that you have rejected its proposal that the first place on the agenda of the EPC shall be a special point dealing with the attitude of the sections toward the war and the national resistance movements. This is the only information we have on this point at this time since we have not received any formal notification that such a proposal was rejected. If, however, the information given us by the representative of the Spanish group proves to be correct, we would consider the refusal to place such a point prominently on the agenda of the EPC to be astonishing and unacceptable. We have been under the impression that the agenda of the EPC, as published officially, included in its first point a full report of the political line and conduct of the sections and of the Movement as a whole during the war, and that special time would be allotted for the discussion of this report. It is unacceptable to us that this should be omitted from the deliberations of the EPC. A report and discussion on this point must unconditionally constitute one of the central axes of the EPC, for without it the EPC is doomed in advance to the loss of much of its value and significance. If the information we have received on this matter should be wrong or inexact, we have nothing further to say on it. But if the agenda of the EPC does in fact exclude such a report and discussion, we propose formally that it be given prominent and adequate place on the agenda.

We take this opportunity of informing you that the unity negotiations between our party and the SWP, reinitiated by your representative in February, have reached a complete stalemate. This is perfectly clear from the speeches delivered by the two leaders of the SWP at the meeting of its Political Committee of May 6. We have reproduced these speeches in our own BULLETIN for the information of our members and of all the sections. This BULLETIN, which contains additional material on the unity question, is being sent to you. We shall presently send you the results of the discussion of the unity question which our Committee will hold in the next days. For the time being it is quite plain to us that the leadership of the SWP has seized upon a few ridiculously trivial episodes as a pretext for abandoning the idea of unity with the WP and as the basis for a systematic incitement of the SWP membership against the unification. Obviously, it is impossible to take seriously the argument of the SWP leaders that their February position in favor of unity was taken on the "basis of a misunderstanding," in view of the fact that the position of our party at no time lent itself to misunderstanding by anyone. Our position was not only repeatedly set forth in a series of documents available to all, but was set forth once more with the fullest frankness and in the most ample and unmistakable detail at those sessions of our leading committees which were held in the presence

of your representative whose report of our deliberations to the SWP formed the basis of its Plenum decision for unity. The "misunderstanding" of the SWP could only be based upon the belief that we had in some incomprehensible way pledged ourselves to abandon the vigorous presentation and defense of our political views, either in the present period of the discussion in which we were invited to participate or in the normal and proper course of the life of the united party. Since we never encouraged any such belief, or gave the slightest ground for holding it, we cannot bear any responsibility for the existence of such a "misunderstanding." For our own part, since our position in favor of unity was at no time based upon a misunderstanding of any of the factors or problems involved, we have no reason for altering our position. It remains today the same as it was when adopted in agreement with your representative. It is hardly necessary to add, however, that we have neither the ability nor the desire to impose unity arbitrarily upon the SWP. We can only adhere to our position and seek to influence the development accordingly. We look for you to proceed in the same way.

With best Party greetings,

Max Shachtman
National Chairman, Workers Party

#

June 21, 1947.

National Committee of the
Workers Party

Dear Comrades:

We acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 26, 1947, addressed to the Secretariat. This letter raises a series of points on which it is necessary to dwell.

(a) With regard to your remarks concerning the proposal made at the last Plenum of the CIC to invite the POUM and Bordigists to the EPC, we point out to you that far from proceeding in all these questions by mechanically imitating the conduct of the Communist International, we seek to place ourselves upon the concrete grounds and to resolve each problem in accordance with the specific circumstances. None of these organizations at the present time manifests a tendency toward our program and still less toward the organization of the Movement. On the contrary, their hostile position toward us has only been reinforced in recent times, coincident, moreover, with their increasingly marked ideological separation from the revolutionary Marxist program.

This is particularly the case with the POUM whose leadership in Spain has just issued a manifesto breaking formally with revolutionary Marxism and advocating a policy of trailing behind the "great Western democracies." To invite organizations other than those which proclaim themselves of the Movement has meaning only if it is a question of organizations showing a certain tendency to approach us. On the other hand, the resolution of the March Plenum specifies that if such an organization expresses the wish to attend our Congress,

the CIC will examine the concrete case of such a request.

(b) With regard to your remarks on the question of the decision of the CIC relative to representation at the EPC, we are astonished to note that you have completely misunderstood its real sense.

In this question too we were guided not by the concern to imitate the procedure of the Communist International of Lenin but to arrive at as democratic as possible a representation of our movement at the EPC, taking into account both the political importance of the country and the numerical strength, and by giving particular attention to seeing to it that the numerically large sections do not overwhelm the weaker ones.

In the first place, it is wrong to say that the division of the countries into different categories by the Comintern "had as its obvious purpose the reduction of the disproportionate weight that certain sections would have in the conference if the mere number of members in a section was the only basis of representation."

The organizations which, at the First Congress of the Communist International, had the largest number of votes (5) regardless of their numerical strength, all belonged in the category of countries of great importance: Russia, United States (SLP), Germany, France (Zimmerwald Left). Then came a second category of organizations, some of which far exceeded the membership of the organizations belonging to the first category but which had the right to only three representatives; and finally there was a category of organizations belonging to countries of minor importance (Estonia, Lithuania, Armenia, German Volga, etc...) which in spite of their numerical strength had the right to only one representative. Later on, the resolution "on the reorganization of the Executive" of the Fourth Congress specified that "the number of votes that each section has at its disposal is determined by each Congress in accordance with the memberships of the parties and the political situation of the corresponding countries." The basis of representation established by the CIC is manifestly more democratic with regard to the real state of our movement. The first and second categories in reality encompass the overwhelming majority of our important sections, and the difference between them, for the same number of members, is only one (1) representative. On the other hand, by raising to 150 members the basis for the right of representation we favor those organizations which are far from having this membership, all the small groups having from 20 to 100 members and which would otherwise be completely overwhelmed by the large sections. The same effect was sought by the inclusion of the clause which stipulates "from 150 to 500 members and for a minimum of 300 members, one additional delegate. From 500 to 1000 members and for a minimum of about 750 members, one more delegate. From 1,000 to 1,500 and for a minimum of about 1,250, one more delegate, and so on." This clause operates entirely to the disadvantage of the large sections.

If, on the other hand, what you suggest in your letter were adopted, that is to say, "allotting delegates in strict accordance with proportional numerical strength," if, for example, the basis of one delegate for 50 members were allowed, in order for the small groups to profit by this representation, the result would be an enormous disproportion between the very large, the large and the small sections, running from one to 32, whereas with our representation it remains

from one to six, even in the case of the largest section of the first category and the smallest section of the third category.

(c) With regard to the information that was transmitted to you by the representative of the Spanish group in Mexico, we are curious to know from what source this comrade who is always so well informed on the machinations of the CIC and the Secretariat gets his information. You know that the resolution of the October 1946 Plenum specifies "that a report on the activity of the Movement during the war shall be presented and placed in discussion before the EPC," in which shall be included the point relating to the attitude of the sections toward the war and the resistance movements, and that since this resolution no other document of the Movement has appeared to eliminate or to modify this point.

It would therefore be preferable in the future that you be more prudent with regard to rumors launched by different tendencies and isolated comrades who seek to discredit in advance the EPC in order subsequently to evade its decisions and its discipline. It is not without point to remind you, comrades, that the ideological and organizational preparation of the EPC has been discussed up to now on three occasions at plenums of the CIC, in which participated on the average the qualified representatives of ten sections, including the most important of those who belong to different tendencies, and that the decisions concerning the EPC were adopted, after long discussions, unanimously.

None of these representatives placed in doubt, so much as for a single moment, the sincere desire of the CIC to arrive at as democratic as possible a representation of our movement, and the efforts of the Secretariat to facilitate to the highest degree compatible with the restricted material means at our disposal the discussion.

We are consequently very disagreeably surprised to note that your letter, the first to be received by us after the resolution of the last CIC which decided your participation in the Movement discussion and at the EPC with full rights, should be couched in such a tone, placing in doubt the democratic preparation of the EPC and preparing in our opinion indirectly a position of retreat with relation to your commitment to respect the decisions and discipline of this EPC.

Concerning your remarks on the question of the development of the negotiations between your organization and the SWP, we note with regret that their present state does not presume a rapid and favorable conclusion, such as we wished and hoped for.

The stiffening which is presently manifesting itself in the attitude of the SWP is in large part the consequence of the repeated attacks which your leadership believed it necessary to launch, immediately after the departure of Comrade Smith, against the SWP, its leadership and the Johnson tendency.

These attacks contained no unitary spirit and in no wise prepare a climate of better entente in the united party.

The letter of Comrade X which was written before the plenum of the SWP which decided in principle the question of unification and before the "Joint Statement," served you as a basis for launching a camp-

aign which awakened all over again, in the SWP and among those of its members most opposed to the unity, as well as in the Movement, all the fears, the distrust and the doubts concerning the possibility and the usefulness of this unity. Nobody demands of your organization an ideological capitulation, that is, the abandonment of your political opinions which you will have the right to defend under the normal conditions of the regime of democratic centralism which characterizes our Movement.

But we all believed, and on this point there is room for speaking of a "misunderstanding," that you sincerely adopted the position of returning to the SWP and the Movement as a disciplined tendency which accepts the fact of its position as a minority with regard to the majority of the SWP and of the Movement, which shows by deeds that its principal concern is not to discredit and to combat this majority, but to give weight and under its leadership to build a revolutionary party in the United States.... That is, either you are convinced that our movement is a healthy revolutionary movement in whose ranks a tendency like yours can have its place in order to influence it along your own ideas in the long run, or else our movement appears to you of such secondary importance and so corrupt that you prefer to act independently and with full freedom. In this case, let us state frankly that the question of unity is not posed, and let us stop presenting the spectacle of people who are maneuvering without any genuine desire and without any faith in the possibility and usefulness of this unity.

In no case have we understood your return to our movement as being part of an "entrism" tactic similar to that which we practiced in the past in reformist and centrist organizations and which had as its aim to provoke a split after a certain period of time.

We take note of the fact that both you and the SWP declare yourselves still supporters of unity in the terms discussed during the visit of our representative. In that case, let us leave it to the EPC to settle this question finally, given the fact that we now see with difficulty the possibility of a unification prior to the EPC.

The recommendation that we can make both to your organization and to the SWP is to pursue from now until then the political discussion, to expand the practical joint action in all fields and in all questions where an agreement proves possible, and to restrict to the minimum the discussions around personal incidents by making the coordination committee of the two organizations function regularly.

We believe that the method which consists in inflating beyond measure the remarks made or written in internal discussions and documents of this or that comrade, is not the one most indicated to bring the unity negotiations to a successful conclusion. What is important are the written agreements which defend the official position of each organization on the question of unification and not the manner in which each one, inside his organization, had endeavored to explain and justify his attitude toward this question.

You are expending, comrades, a great energy in making yourselves believe that everything in this affair of unification is a function of shady machinations and calculations which have as their aim to draw you into some trap or other and to eliminate you as an ideological tendency.

As for ourselves, comrades, we believe that by accepting the unification in the terms proposed during the visit of our representative, you accept the return to our organized movement with a full knowledge of our ideological positions, of our organizational principles, of your rights, but also of your duties as a minority tendency in the SWP and the Movement.

If you are resolved to build up sincerely with us the revolutionary party in the United States, the Movement fully guarantees you your rights, as we have already done by publishing your documents in our organs and by bringing them to the attention of all the members of the Movement by our own means.

But if you judge that your political conceptions differ so much from ours that the discipline of the present majority of our movement is unacceptable to you and coexistence in our organization impossible, it is necessary to say so frankly and to conclude that unification at the present stage is impossible not for organizational reasons of "bureaucratic" regime or of "cliques" etc... but for political reasons.

The choice is still in your hands.

With our fraternal greetings,

For the Secretariat

#

August 30, 1947.

TO THE CIC

Dear Comrades:

Our Committee has carefully studied your letter of June 21, 1947 in reply to our communication of May 28, 1947. We have given the arguments that you present on the various points all consideration. In return, we take this occasion to set forth once more our own views on every one of these points, so that you and all the sections may have a clearer and more exact picture of our position, not as it is presented by others but as it really is.

1. We find it necessary to make a general observation about your reaction to the disagreements and proposals expressed by us with regard to the preparation and organization of the EPC. In the discussions between your representative and our Committee early this year, he made it plain that the commitment we made in connection with our attendance at the EPC would guarantee our Party the fullest and freest participation in the preparation and work of the EPC on the same basis as all other sections. It should be obvious that participation in the EPC necessarily involves participation in all of the decisions taken by the CIC in preparing the EPC, for short of that our effective participation would be reduced to little more than a formality. We note, however, that the Secretariat communicated the decisions of the last Plenum of the CIC, after they had been adopted, without informing us in advance either of the date and place or the agenda of that Plenum so that our Party might be able to express its

views in time. We note the same failure of the Secretariat with regard to the September Plenum of the CIC. In spite of this, our Party expressed itself on some of the decisions of the March Plenum of the CIC in its letter of May 25, 1947. The criticisms it expressed on two points dealing with the preparation of the EPC and the question it raised with regard to another point were not only in accordance with its right to full participation in the work of preparing the EPC but were stated with all the desirable restraint. The views expressed by us are, moreover, not unique with our Party but are evidently shared by other sections.

Your reply, however, deals with our views in a tone of irritation and officiousness. It would appear that our Party, whose participation in the EPC was decided by the March Plenum "with full rights" (as you write), has committed some sort of offense by presuming to question those of your decisions which we consider prejudicial to the best interests of the Movement and which were communicated to us without either the CIC or the Secretariat taking the trouble to explain, motivate or justify them.

If you are "very disagreeably surprised" by our letter and can see in it nothing but an attack upon your authority and upon the validity of what you call the "democratic preparation of the EPC," we can only call such a reaction lamentable. It signifies that you not only do not understand the role of the Movement today but likewise do not understand your own role in the Movement and the norms you should seek to maintain in your relations with our Party.

You find it useful to remind us that the decisions of the Plenum were adopted unanimously by the qualified representatives of ten sections - a statement which the records of the Plenum do not seem to bear out. We are obliged to reply that while we consider this important, we do not consider it decisive. We, for our part, find it necessary to remind you that the decisions were taken without consulting our Party and without its participation. This fact does not, it is true, nullify the formal standing of the decisions. It does mean, however, that our Party is not obliged to support them or to refrain from calling them into question or from making counter-propositions. The commitment of our Party to abide by the decisions of the EPC under the condition that unity is achieved between our Party and the SWP is one thing. The idea that we are in any way committed to agree with and support decisions made by you in advance of the EPC and before the EPC has had a chance to discuss and decide upon them is an entirely different thing. Our Party reserves the full right to appear before the EPC not only in order to defend its views against the political line of the CIC and the Secretariat but, where necessary, also against the decisions taken by these two bodies on the preparation of the EPC.

We hope that however disagreeable this may appear to some comrades, it will come to none of them as a surprise. In other words, we interpret what you call our "full rights" to mean rights which are not inferior to those of anyone else and which we may exercise to the full.

2. Your explanation of the reasons for the refusal of the Plenum to invite to the EPC organizations of the type of the POUM or the Bordigists, shows a failure to grasp the task that should preoccupy the Movement as a whole. Furthermore, it is tantamount to a declaration that the ideas which should be at the foundation of our Movement have

failed to reach beyond the narrow confines of the official sections and have no attractive power.

The justification for your decision, which you offer in the form of the fact that the leadership of the POUM has recently taken another big step to the right, is no justification at all, in our view. We are prepared to assume that there are militants in the POUM who have profound disagreements with the political direction of their leadership. A proposal to the POUM to attend the EPC would give our Movement an additional avenue of approach to the dissident militants of that Party and help to fortify and direct their disagreements toward an effective goal. The same applies with even greater force in the case of the Bordigists, who are a far stronger force in Italy than the official section, and in the case of numerous other revolutionary groups which, while not as strong as the Bordigists, are not so insignificant that our Movement can afford to ignore them so disdainfully.

If there is not now a "certain tendency of approachment" toward us in these groups and organizations, the responsibility lies at least in part with the Movement. The task is not to wait until such a tendency manifests itself "spontaneously," but to stimulate such a tendency, to nurture its growth by every means at our disposal. It is precisely one of these means, and not the least significant, that you failed to employ by your refusal to extend an invitation to such groups.

This refusal could be understood, to be sure, if the idea is allowed to prevail that the Movement should be composed only of the Trotskyist tendency. We know that such an idea, expressed and unexpressed, does exist in sections of the Movement today. With the SWP leadership, in fact, as shown by the statement of its Political Committee of August, 1946, the idea exists that the Movement should be composed only of one faction of the Trotskyist tendency. If such an idea should actually dominate the Movement, then in our opinion it can only guarantee the continued sectarian isolation of the Movement and its complete disintegration. We do not believe that this fate is inevitable, it goes without saying. But your decision to narrow the scope of the EPC is permeated with this false conception of the real position of the Movement today and therefore also of its real tasks.

In other words, what is involved in this matter, for us, is not some organizational or administrative detail, but a political question of great importance.

3. The best that we can say about your explanation of the decision with regard to representation at the EPC is that it should have accompanied the decision at the time it was made and communicated to the sections. This would have given more sections the opportunity to reject it at an earlier date.

In our criticism of the basis of representation decided upon by the CIC Plenum, we offered the example of the early days of the Comintern. The comparison which you make with the Comintern empties it of all realistic sense.

The prestige and authority enjoyed in the Comintern by its leading section - the Russian - has no parallel and can have none in our Movement as it is today. Nevertheless, we reiterate, the basis of

representation in the early Comintern period (the division of countries into different categories included) had as its primary real aim the reduction of the disproportionate weight which the Russian party in particular would have had if representation were based strictly upon membership. The Russian Party at one time had many times more members than all the other sections of the International put together. When such numerically insignificant sections as existed in the U.S.A., Germany and France were placed in the same category as Russia and given the same delegation vote, it should be perfectly obvious to any informed comrade that this was done to reduce the otherwise certain overwhelming preponderance of the huge Russian section. If more numerous sections belonging to countries of the "lowest" category were given less representation than less numerous sections belonging to countries of the "highest" category, this decision had the same significance and purpose. In most cases, the sections in these countries (like Lithuania, Armenia, Volga Germans, etc.) were, practically speaking, only affiliates of the Russian party. To give these countries representation strictly on the basis of the number of members would, again, only have added to the preponderance of the Russian party. This the leadership of the International wisely insisted on avoiding to the greatest extent possible under the circumstances of the time.

In our Movement today, however, there is no comparable situation. The numerical difference between the larger and the smaller sections, even if we accept the grossly inflated membership figures announced by the largest of the sections, is relatively insignificant, as insignificant as it must be when it is a difference between a few hundred in the larger countries and a few dozen in the smaller countries. (We refrain from speaking of the political difference between the sections unless someone finds it possible to argue that any section has shown such political eminence as to merit placement in a superior category.) Under these circumstances, the basis of representation which seems to us indicated is one that is uniform for all and therefore not subject, or least subject, to objection or suspicion on the part of any section or member of the Movement.

For discussion purposes, we have suggested the figure of one delegate for every 100 members or less. The example you give of the results that would presumably follow from a basis of representation of one delegate for every 50 members appears to us as an example of how a reasonable proposal can be reduced to absurdity by exaggeration and also of how you permitted yourselves to accept as authentic the ridiculously exaggerated membership figure claimed by the largest section.

On the basis of what we have set forth above, it should be apparent that we are interested in a certain basis of representation for the EPC not because it is to the advantage of large sections or small sections, large countries or small ones, this faction or that one, but because it is the one that most closely and practically corresponds to democratic norms.

4. Your remarks on the need of prudence on our part with respect to the information furnished us by the Spanish Group in Mexico or other tendencies "which aim to discredit the EPC in advance," have been given the consideration they merit. We have always sought to act with prudence about all information and all rumors disseminated on all sides. That is why our letter to you requested that you con-

firm or deny the report made to us by the comrades of the Spanish Group. We are glad to learn of your denial and we are communicating it to the comrades who provided us with the information originally. We are encouraged now to believe that you will recommend to all others the same prudence with regard to the rumors and information, or rather misinformation, which has been disseminated so energetically about our Party in all corners of the Movement.

5. You are quite right in concluding that the development of the negotiations between our Party and the SWP does not allow for the hope that a rapid and favorable unification - or any unification at all - is in sight.

You are quite wrong in stating that the "stiffening" of the attitude of the SWP is "in large part the consequence of the repeated attacks" which we allegedly directed against the SWP, its leadership and the Johnson tendency "immediately after the departure of Comrade Smith."

In fact, all the remarks made in your letter on the question of unity between the two parties and of the reasons for the present situation, convince us that the Secretariat, or its leadership, has utterly failed of its clear responsibility in this question and has disqualified itself completely from consideration as an objective participant in the unity situation. We are sure you will prefer this plain statement of our opinion to any attempt to state it in terms of out-of-place diplomacy.

Let us remind you of some facts, which unfortunately are not to be found in your letter.

As is known to you from your representative, Comrade Smith, our leading Party committees had long and thorough discussions with him during his visit here and finally adopted a resolution on the question of unity and our relations to the EPC which he found satisfactory. In spite of our highly unfavorable preceding experiences with the SWP in the unity question, our Party leadership and membership were firmly and sincerely prepared to consummate the unification on the most solid possible foundation and at the earliest possible time.

The resolution which the SWP Plenum adopted subsequently in favor of unity gave no serious reason whatsoever for the complete turn-about-face of that leadership from the drastic anti-unity position which it had gotten the SWP convention to adopt only a few weeks earlier. We took the SWP unity resolution at face value, however, and proceeded to the practical negotiations with the other comrades for an early achievement of unity. All our efforts to elicit the reasons for the complete change of position by the SWP were in vain. Both Smith and your other representative here refused to give us any explanation except vague and diplomatic assurances. The explanation was finally made apparent by our accidental receipt of the circular letter sent to the SWP militants by Comrade X.

The attempt to present the letter of X as the expression of opinion of just another "individual" member of the SWP will impress only the very youngest member of the Movement. Everyone else knows perfectly well that X is not only the acknowledged leader of the SWP but that his letters and statements have at least as much weight and validity as any official declaration of the SWP leadership.

The only statement in the X letter which bore the earmarks of truth was the one in which he explained that unity with the WP, impossible up to then, was possible now only because Smith had assured the SWP leadership that the Cannonite faction was guaranteed a majority at the coming EPC and that at the end of the EPC the Workers Party comrades would be compelled to abide by the decisions and otherwise remain silent in the united party. For the rest, the X letter, reiterating the most vicious slanders hurled at us in the past years, was filled with a running series of distortions, misrepresentations and outright falsehoods about our Party and about the proposed unity.

We would like to hear anyone deny this today! We would like to hear anyone forthrightly defend this letter! Nobody has yet ventured to do so. Even Smith found it necessary to refute one of the more outrageous falsehoods in the letter, even though he confined the refutation to a personal letter to Shachtman. Even Johnson, whom you have now taken under your patronage, found it necessary to refute the falsehoods in the X letter, even though he confined his refutation to the membership of the Workers Party. In the ranks of the SWP, the letter has not been refuted or corrected to this day, either by its author or by the "official" SWP leadership.

You suggest that the X letter was written "before the Plenum of the SWP which decided in principle the question of unification." What impression do you seek to create by this? That a different view of the unity and of the Workers Party was presented to the SWP membership after the Plenum? But nothing of the sort is true. If you do not know this, you should. The fact is that the X letter received its widest circulation in the SWP membership after the SWP Plenum had adopted the pro-unity resolution. And it is also a fact that for every informed person in the Movement, the X letter has a thousand times more importance as a presentation of the views of the SWP leadership on unity than any formal "Joint Statement" which it agreed to sign with us.

We suggest that you make a test, comrades. Reprint the X letter for every comrade to read. Then let every comrade judge for himself whether this letter, a model of duplicity and falsification, was a contribution to unity, to what you call "a climate of better entente" between the two groups, and just what kind of contribution it was. Every comrade will then see whether it was just an innocent expression of opinion of an "individual," or the indefensible but true position of the SWP on the unity question. Every comrade will then see the real basis of the "stiffening" of the attitude of the SWP. We do not think that you will reprint the letter. That is regrettable.

Our Party, however, which believes in the principle of providing its membership with all relevant material and at the right time, did reprint the X letter for our own comrades. Our Committee accompanied it with a circular in which, with the utmost restraint in tone and with an insistence that our fundamental position in favor of unity must nevertheless be maintained, the distortions were corrected and the facts restated. That circular would also be worth while reprinting for all the comrades, everywhere, to read. In this way, they could judge the real attitude not only of the SWP but also of the Workers Party. When they read our circular letter in comment on the X letter, they will see that in the case of this "incident," as in the case of all that followed, it was not our Party that "attacked" the SWP or its leadership or the poor Johnson tendency.

In every case, it was our Party which defended itself from an attack launched by the SWP leadership or protected itself from behind-the-scenes maneuvers by Johnson. This can be demonstrated to the hilt by us, before any body of comrades interested in the details which we do not need to dwell upon in this letter - demonstrated by irrefutable facts and documents.

In your letter to us, you say that what is important is not the internal speeches and documents of "this or that comrade" but the written agreements which define the official position of the organizations. As a rule, this is, of course, correct. In the concrete case, it is a bureaucratic absurdity, hollow formalism. In the "written agreement," the SWP is very solemnly for unity with the Workers Party. But in the "speeches and documents" - not of "this or that comrade" but of the acknowledged leader of the SWP, whose words carry more weight and authority than a thousand "written agreements" as everyone knows or should know - the very opposite is true. Read the letter of X. Read the recent speeches of Cannon and Stein in the SWP Committee ("this or that comrade!") in which they say that the SWP is now back to the position of its 1946 convention on unity - that is, opposed to unity; that unity is possible only if the Workers Party capitulates to the SWP; and that there can henceforth be collaboration between the two parties only in those cases where the Workers Party accepts without question the decisions of the SWP. Only a formalist one thousand miles removed from reality would say, in the face of this, that the speeches and documents are not important - that only the "written agreements" are important.

The latest development in the situation only underlines what we have said about the value that can be attached to the "written agreements" signed by the SWP leadership. We refer to the split from our Party of the Johnson faction, its decision to join the SWP and the decision of the SWP in favor of admitting the Johnsonites. As you know from the resolution of our Party's National Committee, we have not presented and do not intend to present any objections to the application of the Johnsonites for membership in the SWP. We do not believe in the idea of trying to use organizational or formal devices for the purpose of keeping members in our Party against their expressed will, or of preventing them from joining the party of their choice.

But it should be obvious that the decision of Johnson and the SWP was taken because they both considered that regardless of the "written agreements," any real prospect of unity between the two parties was ended. To us it is clear that if Johnson envisaged the prospect of unity between the two parties, he would not even have contemplated a split from the Workers Party and affiliation to the SWP. It is equally clear to us that if the SWP leadership envisaged the prospect of unity and was serious about it, it would not have encouraged the Johnson split and recommended his admittance into the SWP today. A party "unites" with a section of another party only if it is convinced that unity with the party as a whole is either impossible or undesirable. In the present case, the SWP leadership believes, as it has so clearly stated in the speeches of Cannon and Stein, that if unity with the Workers Party is desirable at all, then only on the basis of a capitulation by the Workers Party. It goes without saying that on such a basis, there can be no unity and there will be no unity.

Your comments on the unity question do not carry any independent

weight with us. For the situation that now exists between the two parties, you comrades of the Secretariat, or those who are the authors of the policy of the Secretary, bear your full share of the responsibility. There has been a steady accumulation of reasons for this conclusion.

Speaking in your name in his February discussions with our Party, Comrade Smith declared that while you agreed with the SWP politically as against us - in the question of unity between the two parties you were a "third party." Smith insistently repeated this and assured us over and over again that any doubts we might have about your being a "third party" - that is, an objective and impartial factor in the unity question, not tied to either faction - would be rapidly dispelled in the ensuing period.

In the ensuing period, there has been absolutely no evidence of the claim that you are a "third party." There has been sufficient evidence to justify fully the conviction that you have acted throughout the unity question as the factional colleagues and representatives of the SWP leadership. You have as much right to do so as you have to be the colleagues of the SWP in the disputed political questions. But you do not have the right to make a contrary and misleading claim. And you do not have the right to claim that you are discharging objectively the function that is incumbent upon a responsible Secretariat.

You are no less familiar with the evidence to which we refer than we are.

At the March, 1947, Plenum of the CIC, you proposed and had adopted a resolution on unity between the two parties which was not dictated by the objective considerations which would mark a "third party," but dictated exclusively by the factional interests of the SWP leadership. You intransigently opposed the resolution of a minority of the CIC which, with great restraint, sought to express some critical remarks about the SWP on the unity question. Yet, Smith informed our Party here that your Secretariat, prior to his visit here, had adopted a resolution criticizing the SWP for adopting an anti-unity position at its convention without even giving the Secretariat or the CIC an opportunity to express itself on the question. Where is this resolution? Why has its text never been communicated to us, even though we have repeatedly asked for it? Why has it not been made available to the membership? Why was it not even entered into the records of the March Plenum of the CIC?

At the same Plenum, you proposed and had adopted a resolution on the outrageous, bureaucratic expulsion of H. and J. from the SWP. Again, your resolution showed not the slightest sign that you were acting as a "third party," but ample signs that the resolution was cut to the factional taste of the SWP leadership. Your opposition to the resolution on the same question which was offered by a minority of the CIC, was further evidence of the same kind. Yet, again, Smith informed our Party that prior to the Plenum, your Secretariat had adopted a resolution criticizing the SWP's expulsion of H. and J. We ask the same questions about this resolution as we ask above about the other. There is no living sign of it.

In your letter to us you write that it is we who must decide whether or not we believe that the political differences are such that the

Workers Party tendency and the SWP tendency can coexist in one organization. You say that the choice is still in our hands. You are saying a good deal! For two years and more, since the SWP Minority and our Party initiated the movement for unity, we have said a hundred times over that we believe that, however deep the political differences between us are, the two tendencies can coexist in one party. For the same two years and more, it was impossible for our Party or for the SWP Minority to get the same or a similar declaration from the lips of the SWP leadership. For the same two years and more, we repeatedly demanded from you a clear statement as to whether or not the two tendencies can coexist in one organization. But we never did get such a statement from you, for reasons which are not at all obscure. What your position is in this question you have never stated in any document, clearly and explicitly, any more than has the SWP. Now, however, at this late hour, it is you who call upon us to take a position on whether the two tendencies can coexist! In reply, we tell you to read any one of a dozen documents written by us in the past two years, where you will see our position stated word for word. Perhaps you will now tell us in what document we can find your position on this question stated word for word?

In the period since the negotiations for unity were resumed, from February, 1947, onward, you have not had one single word of criticism to make of the course followed by the SWP in the unity - not one. In exchange, in your letter, you repeat all the criticisms made of us by the SWP, without finding it necessary to be specific or to offer proof of your charges. Whatever criticisms you do have of the SWP course and conduct - and who among even the closest supporters of the SWP can fail to be embarrassed by and critical of that indefensible course? - you evidently confine to confidential communications between factional colleagues. Your criticisms and attacks upon us, you circulate throughout the Movement.

Finally, your attitude toward Johnson. In the resolution of his national faction conference, Johnson declares formally that immediately before Smith appeared at our Committee to propose a solid unification of the Workers Party and the SWP, the representative of the Secretariat proposed to Johnson (in January, 1947!) that his faction should split from the Workers Party and join the SWP. At that time (says Johnson's resolution) Johnson rejected the proposal. Now he has accepted it. The representative of the Secretariat to whom he refers has reason to congratulate himself on his achievement in behalf of unity between the two parties.

Like the SWP leadership, you, in your letter, take Johnson under your protection from the "attacks" we have directed against him. It is possible that for a time this may impress some comrades in the Movement. It is even possible that such comrades will be impressed by the latest series of attacks he has made upon our Party. But as you know, no experienced party militant pays any serious attention or attaches any serious weight to Johnson, either politically or organizationally. As you know, also, this is true of the experienced and informed militants both of the Workers Party and of the SWP. The same militants know that Johnson's capitulation to the SWP does not begin to be a substitute for the unity between the two parties - the unity which the SWP leadership and Johnson have done what they could to wipe out as a realistic possibility.

It is for these reasons, comrades, that we say that we do not and

cannot attach any independent weight to your comments on the unity question. That weight they do have is identical with the weight we attach to the views of the SWP leadership - not less, but also not more.

You have proved yourselves to be the unfailing factional representatives of that leadership. You have not found it possible or necessary to intervene against that leadership - not by organizational measures, which we have never proposed and which we would not support, but by the moral political intervention which was incumbent upon you - when it was guilty of the most patent and intolerable violation of the clear interests of the Movement as a whole. Now, when the two most authoritative leaders of the SWP clearly state in their speeches that the only time there can be practical collaboration in the class struggle between the two parties is when we accept the position of the SWP, and the only time there can be unity between the two parties is when we capitulate to the SWP, your only reaction is to condemn our party and to remain silent about the SWP - which allows us to infer only that you share the views of the SWP leaders on these questions.

In the same period, however, you have found it possible and necessary to intervene organizationally and administratively in the life of other sections, not only small ones but large ones, acting as though you already enjoyed an authority which you have yet to acquire. In those interventions, too, you have acted not in accordance with the objectivity and restraint which should be your responsible function, but as the factional representatives of the SWP leadership. As a Secretariat, that is not your right. As a faction, it is your right, although even then within limits.

But it is also our right to intervene wherever we can against your policies and your stewardship. This right we shall continue to exercise actively up to and including the sessions of the EPC.

We are obliged to add concluding remarks about our Party and the EPC. You write in your letter to us that in your opinion our Party is "indirectly preparing a position of retreat with regard to your (that is, our party's) commitment to respect the decisions and discipline of the EPC." It is difficult for us to believe that this can possibly be meant by you the way it reads. Our Party does not require, and has at no time considered the question of, a "position of retreat" with regard to our commitment. This cannot be the subject of misunderstanding in the Secretariat, inasmuch as our position has been communicated to you in official documents and in the oral report that Smith must have made to you.

We committed ourselves, in resolutions adopted last February by our leading Committees and supported generally by our membership, to abide by the decisions and the discipline of the EPC, but only on one condition. That condition was that unity shall have been achieved between the Workers Party and the SWP. In the case of unity, inasmuch as the SWP would be bound by the EPC decisions, we, as a minority in the united party, would also be bound by them. But in that case and only in that case! If, however, unity between the two parties was not achieved before the EPC, our Party and its leadership reserved the full right to establish their position toward the EPC decisions at a regular national party convention to be held after the EPC. That was the position taken by our Party Committees in the

presence of Smith and with a clear understanding by him that this was our position. It is still our position today. There is no possibility of ambiguity or misunderstanding on this score.

With Party greetings,

Max Shachtman

For the P.C. of the Workers Party.

#

1707

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE MEXICAN SECTION ON
THE METHOD OF REPRESENTATION

1. The Mexican Section solidarizes itself with the propositions of the document "The Fourth International in Danger," of Comrades Natalia Sedova, Peret and Munis.

2. The Mexican Section considers it totally improper to demand acceptance of discipline prior to the world congress. What it shows is that our movement needs to permit the tendencies to manifest and define themselves in the congress and that the latter discuss and decide the conditions under which the diverse factions can coexist in the International, united by the rule of subjection of the minorities to the majorities.

(This resolution was adopted in the meeting of July 19, 1947.)

#

1708