

# Lovestone Dissects U.S. Empire

The following speech was delivered by Comrade Jay Lovestone at the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International.

Comrades: I believe the American Party owes an explanation to the Congress for the impermissible performance of some comrades of the delegation that has come here. Allow me to assure you comrades that I do not intend to air the inner questions in detail as has been done. I merely propose to analyze the economic situation prevailing in the United States, not only from an American angle but particularly insofar as it involves the present status of international capitalism.

The comrades in the opposition of the Workers (Communist) Party are confusing the immediate economic situation with the fundamental trend of economic developments of American imperialism. We reject any schematic concept as utterly un-Leninist.

The American Party's opposition say that they accept the main line of Comrade Bukharin's theses but they have seven reservations; one, they want an elaboration of some sections; second, an emphasis on other sections; third, they say that the rate of decline in the growth of production is already clear. Then they say that the rate of increase of exports is already declining. Fourth, our opposition demands a "new emphasis" on America. Fifth, according to our opposition the thesis of Comrade Bukharin fails to show clearly the interdependence of the class struggle within the imperialist countries and the contradictions between the capitalist countries. Sixth "it is necessary that the Congress should work out a more concrete perspective or America," says Comrade Foster. Seventh, all in all, our opposition, in accepting the theses of Comrade Bukharin, say that they want "a new word" on America. Otherwise our self-styled left wing which the Comintern has repeatedly criticized for its right errors, accepts the theses of Comrade Bukharin.

Comrade Bukharin says that American imperialism is still on the ascent; that the very prowess of American imperialism is the basis of rationalization in Europe. The Central Executive Committee maintains that American imperialism is still on the ascendant. Our comrades of the opposition charge that we advertise American imperialism because we recognize as an objective, though objectionable fact, the existing prowess of American imperialism. For instance, the other day in our July 4 demonstrations, when our comrades were arrested for anti-imperialist acts, we were "salemens" of Wall Street. And look at this piece of advertising that has been put into the theses of Comrade Bukharin—advertising American imperialism—in the language of our opposition:

"The general social and economic basis of this fact is the slow rate of development of the crisis of capitalism in the course of which one of its principal component parts is on the upgrade while others are undergoing a process of relatively slow decline. This includes the growing consolidation of the positions of the United States as the world exploiter, creditor and usurer (the 'prosperity' of the United States...)"

Now, what does the opposition say? I quote from their documents as follows:

"An analysis of the degree of ripeness of these contradictions will show that American capitalism is about to reach the apex of its growth."

This is taken from the Bittelman-Foster thesis. Secondly, "The present economic depression must inevitably become the forerunner of a deep-going crisis." Third, before the Presidium of the Comintern, Comrade Dunne declared:

"Furthermore, our Party and in this all of us are involved, but of

## Defends Bukharin's Thesis at Sixth Communist World Congress

course most of the responsibility rests on the majority of the C. E. C.—have under-estimated the rapidity of the development of the class struggle in America, underestimated the tempo both of the decline of American national economy and the will and the desire of the masses to struggle."

A few words about the present economic situation in the United States. Yes, there is an acute depression in the United States today. Basic features of this depression are shown in mass unemployment, arising first of all from the depression itself and secondly from the tremendous rationalization process which is producing an army of virtually permanently "disemployed" workers. Secondly—the mass production which has been the very boast and pride of the development of American imperialism is bringing on sharp contradictions in its course. Thirdly: the credit situation—with America as the leading world creditor—is in a crisis, because of the terrific plethora of capital. There are also crises in different industries. But these crises are not elements of decay, elements of decline, but on the other hand are symptoms of growth of rationalization in these industries. For examples, I mention coal, oil, textiles.

Are there contradictions in American imperialism? I refer you to the fact that at the February Plenum of our Central Committee the thesis presented to the Central Committee and voted for by the opposition pointed out very sharply a number of contradictions in American imperialism. Merely to enumerate these are: 1. The large excess productive capacities as indicated in the "over-development" of certain industries. 2. The deepening fundamentally critical condition of agriculture. 3. The superabundance of credit. 4. Intensive installment buying which really should be called over-buying or over-selling. To a large extent American prosperity is based on installment buying. This mortgage on the future purchasing power of the workers and farmers which may for a time defer an economic depression, will become an aggravating force of an economic crisis, once it sets in. 5. Derangement of certain basic industries. This is due for the time to insufficient rationalization and being appendage industries, like coal to steel and rails, and like coal and oil being more subject to distributing conditions of the world market than other industries. 6. The rapid development of great international cartels in Europe indicates a growing capacity of other imperialist powers not only to challenge but also to undermine the supremacy of American imperialism. 7. American imperialism is dependent on other imperialist powers for certain basic raw materials, as rubber, nitrates, oil, tin, nickel, etc. 8. The increasing export of capital creates for American imperialism a problem in the final repayment of commodities.

We have elaborated and emphasized the contradictions developing in American imperialism and the opportunities for work for our Party growing out of the conditions arising from these very contradictions. Are there already visible elements of decay? Yes! And we have pointed out very emphatically such elements of decay in American imperialism as the development of a rentier class, the narrowing domestic market hitherto largely the very base of American prosperity.

But we must not overlook its certain strength and special reserve powers.

However, when we look at this reserve power we do not become pessimistic. We say that in this very aggression of American imperialism we find the basis for the increased militarization as well as the certainty of America being involved in the coming imperialist war. In appraising the role of American imperialism we must not over-estimate the strength of American capitalism. There are forces gnawing at its very vitals despite the outward substantial signs of prosperity. Above all, we must keep in mind the fact that international capitalism is now in its last stage—the decadent stage of imperialism.

Comrades, our opposition sees only either the contradictions or strength. They cannot see, at the same time, that the very strength of American imperialism brings about contradictions and hence increasing opportunities for our Party's working.

Now I want to examine some of the criticisms made of Comrade Bukharin's these by our opposition.

The vitality of American imperialism is not to be measured by mere figures of the value of commodities produced in certain years, but by the whole system of rationalization, particularly by the productivity status of the individual productive unit, that is, by the productivity per man per hour.

The number of persons engaged in industry for the product of one hundred men in 1914 is as follows:

Year	Number of Men (approximately)
1919	102.2
1921	99.6
1923	80.5
1925	71.0
1927	64.0

Up to 1919 employment and productivity had increased simultaneously. Now the trend indicates continued increase in productivity but, particularly in the last three years, a marked decrease in the number of men employed in the manufacturing industries. The average work of men employed in the manufacturing industries increased about 45 per cent in 1927 above 1914.

The second point. Comrade Bittelman says that there is a decline in the rate of increase of exports. It is silly to compare the present years with the war years, as Comrade Bittelman has done. First of

all, the war and immediate post-war years are an unusual period. Secondly we must examine the values in pre-war dollars and not stop at mere superficial dollar value. In order to have correctness in this respect, we should not take the years of 1919-21 for they are not the proper base to take. The United States is not living in a vacuum. We must look at it in relation to other imperialist powers. The question is: is the United States still beating in the world market all other imperialist powers? We say yes. It is this that indicates the present strength and prowess of American imperialism. On this basis American exports are still expanding despite Bittelman's figures.

But why does Comrade Bittelman leave out the question of the trend in the export of capital which is the very key to the present international situation? These facts show that American imperialism is still on the upgrade. We herewith produce the following table:

American Export of Capital.	
Year	Amount
1923	\$ 414,000,000
1924	878,000,000
1925	1,031,000,000
1926	1,135,000,000
1927	1,377,000,000

These figures are exclusive of re-funding loans and are the net amount of additional new capital exported within these years.

For the last six months of 1928 America has exported \$1,053,164,000. This compared with \$794,277,000 in the first half of 1927. It is a fact that American capitalism is investing in foreign securities and in domestic securities for export and at home, a thousand dollar per business second.

Now Comrade Bittelman's main argument to prove his fallacious theory of the decline of American imperialism is that the percentage of national income received by the workers is decreasing. Comrade Bittelman cites this in order to show the increasing misery of the American workers. He forgets that though it is absolutely true that the rate of exploitation of the American workers is increasing, this fact in itself does not mean that their condition is getting worse. A smaller share of a bigger national income is bigger than a larger share of a smaller national income. To prove our point we herewith indicate the constant rate of increase in the growth of the national income of the United States:

Year	Amount of Income
1921	\$62,736,000,000
1922	65,567,000,000
1923	76,769,000,000
1924	79,365,000,000
1925	86,461,000,000
1926	89,682,000,000

Here we have an increase of \$28,000,000,000 in seven years—a pretty rapid decline!

Comrade Varga is correct when he states that the American standard of living is not going down. The fact of the matter is that the real income has been increasing 7 per cent every year. What the opposition confuses is real wages with the rate of exploitation.

Now from this fallacious income analysis Comrade Bittelman comes to his most "damaging" conclusion against the theses proposed by Bukharin. He says: "The theses do not bring out sufficiently the dependence between the outer and inner conflicts of imperialism." Comrade Bittelman wants to create the impression that Bukharin's theses tried to explain the conflict among the imperialist powers without a class basis, without linking them up with the relations of the classes in the various countries.

It goes without saying that this is a ridiculous charge which, if it were true, would challenge the whole Marxian basis of the theses proposed by Comrade Bukharin in behalf of the Russian delegation.

(To Be Continued.)

## Congratulates Moore on Expose of Randolph

From Seattle, Wash., has come a letter congratulating Richard B. Moore, national organizer of the American Negro Labor Congress and Communist candidate for Congress for his expose of the misleaders of the Pullman Porters Union. The letter, written by John W. Carr, follows:

"Dear Comrade Moore: 'I have read with genuine gratefulness your 'Open Letter to Mr. Philip Randolph' on page 11 of the 'Negro Champion' of Aug. 8. I am

a member of the Communist Party and International Labor Defense, and moreover, being a member of the Negro race, I am watching every advance movement.

"Please send me full information regarding the American Negro Labor Congress. How may I become a member? And how may a branch be established in Seattle?"

"Also permit me to bid you success in your race for Congress.

"Earnestly yours, my dear comrade, "JOHN W. CARR."



# Lovestone Dissects U.S. Empire

This is the second instalment of Comrade Jay Lovestone's speech at the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International.

(Continued.)

A few words about the role of American imperialism. The Central Committee declares that the growing aggressiveness of American imperialism today is based on its growing strength. This is the special feature of the present world situation. Our opposition says that the growing aggressiveness is based —on "the diminishing reserve power of American imperialism." This is false and is a wrong "elaboration" of the theses. The opposition cannot see that the growth and aggressiveness of American imperialism can go together. Here is where they get their criticism of the Party in certain fields. They believe so firmly in their false conclusions that American imperialism is about to decline, that they charge that the C. E. C. policies towards Anglo-American and Japanese-American conflicts are based on a supposed notion attributed to the C. E. C. of America being the tail to British and Japanese imperialism on China.

Let us examine some facts. I read from the estimate of the Anglo-American relations made by one of the "theoreticians" of our opposition. Comrade Dunne in estimating the Anglo-American relations has declared:

"If American imperialism really desires peace for herself and the imperialist world (we consider in this article only the inner imperialist conflicts and not the general struggle of imperialism against the Soviet Union), the requisite procedure seems quite simple. It would be sufficient for immediate purposes for the two most powerful imperialist nations—America and Great Britain—to sign a treaty against war and agree to move jointly against any other imperialist nation or nations, which disturbed the peace. The combination of forces would be too powerful for any possible grouping of capitalist nations to challenge."

The Central Committee rejects this opportunist non-Leninist estimate of the Anglo-American conflict, and maintains that the Anglo-American conflict has displaced the Anglo-German conflict of pre-war days.

Now let us see about the Japanese question. Our Central Committee maintains that the Japanese-American imperialist conflicts are developing and are bound to sharpen. But particularly because of the strong persistent anti-Japanese propaganda of American imperialism and the propaganda of Wall Street that the United States is a friend of China—it is necessary for us to expose this propaganda by making clear the concrete, aggressive role of American imperialism. American imperialism is today temporarily giving Japan, to a certain extent, some freedom because of the greater common danger of a revolutionary China. Do we deny the sources of conflict between Japanese and American imperialism? We do not deny any of this. What we do deny is that it is our work to hide the role of American imperialism in this connection as an active co-operator with Japan in crushing China. The basic line of the policy of the Party must be founded not on the differences among the imperialist powers, but on the concrete role of the so-called home government, the

## Defends Bukharin's Thesis at Sixth Communist World Congress

United States government, which oppresses the American workers.

Is there a radicalization process going on in the United States? The Central Committee says: yes. The volume of radicalization today is greater than at any time since the LaFollette movement was at its height. We say, furthermore, it is increasing, but if it were of a national and deep-going character there would be some mass political expression of it. There would be many economic struggles of the workers. There would be a wave of strikes. But Green, Woll and the reactionary trade union fakers and the capitalist politicians still have the overwhelming majority of the working class following their policy.

The error of the opposition on the question of radicalization is that they maintain that radicalization in the United States today is already national and involves the bulk of the working class. This is due to the fact that they think radicalization can come only when capitalism goes down and that American imperialism is already going down. They fail to see that the developing strength of American imperialism itself develops contradictions which are a source of radicalization.

Briefly about unemployment:

America with its mass unemployment and with its consequent developing unrest affords increasing opportunities for our Party. Our Party has responded well.

Much has been said here by our opposition about the fight against the Right danger. The American Party has consistently fought the Right danger for a number of years. Our opposition is making a caricature of the fight against the Right danger.

Comrades, I want to give you a brief survey of the development of our Party.—In the first stage we made errors mainly of an ultra-Left character. For instance, Comrade Cannon, now parading here as one of the Left, had a shortcut method of fighting the ultra-Lefts by proposing to expel 5,000 workers from our Party. We fortunately rejected that method.

In the second period of our Party our orientation was largely a Right Wing orientation, that was in 1924 and 1925 with Lore-Foster-Bittelman constituting the heart and head of our then Party leadership. Let us briefly look at the line of our Central Committee at that time.

1. Labor banking, which everyone denounces today, was officially endorsed in the Labor Herald, edited by Foster, the official organ of the Trade Union Educational League.

2. The convention in which the Foster-Bittelman-Lore-Cannon group were the majority, was greeted by Lore in the "Volkszeitung," his paper, as the victory of a majority for Trotskyism. And when we tried to repudiate this, we were defeated in all our efforts.

3. The convention sent a request to the Comintern that the E. C. C. I. decision to reorganize the Party on the basis of shop nuclei should not be applied to America.

4. Our efforts to secure a repudiation of Trotskyism as soon as it raised its head, were defeated. It was not until instructions came from the Party representative in Moscow at the Fifth Congress that Trotsky-

ism was first renounced by the then majority of our Central Committee led by Foster and Lore.

5. The whole of the trade union work was then based upon the skilled workers, the labor aristocracy. The sole attention was paid to the amalgamation of the existing trade unions. All our efforts to push the organization of the unorganized (1923 Convention) were rejected.

6. Lore, who was then the real ideological leader of the Foster majority, has since been expelled. At the Fifth Congress, special instructions were given to our Party to have the then majority of Foster break with the Lore forces, now outside the Party, and unite with the followers of Ruthenberg.

7. The C. I. further declared at its Fifth World Congress that: "The comrades gathered around Comrade Cannon have made a number of declarations which have shown that in their efforts to secure influence on the petty-bourgeoisie they have failed to maintain the Communist position."

8. What was the policy of these self-styled Left Wingers of today on the Negro work at that time? I read from a speech delivered at the Third Comintern Congress by Comrade Dunne of the opposition:

"That the black workers are not organized is not to be explained by race antagonism, but by the fact that the American workers in general are not organized. In those branches of industry in which Negroes work, they are accepted in the trade unions as members on a basis of equality. If we are against dual unions in general, we cannot be for dual Negro unions. Race prejudice exists, it is true, but the best means of struggle against it will be the acceptance of white and black workers in one organization, and for the mobilization of the Negroes on one side of the barrier and the whites on the other."

"If Comrade Losovsky insists upon the organization of separate Negro unions in America, then we invite him to come to America and try to occupy himself with this question for at least a year. I am convinced that at the next Congress he would demand the head of that comrade who might propose such a solution of the Negro problem."

Our Central Committee has put forth a totally different policy, without Comrade Losovsky's assistance on this question.

Then let us come to the present period of our Party, beginning with the close of 1925.

We now see the beginning of the development towards a Bolshevik Party, with the present Central Committee leading the Party.

1. We organized the Party on a Bolshevik basis of shop nuclei.

2. We raised the ideological level of the Party.

3. We have driven the Party into mass work. Today 47 per cent of our members are in the trade unions, as against only 32 per cent when we took over the Party leadership.

4. We began the campaign to organize the unorganized. When we raised it concretely on the Passaic question, the organization of the unorganized textile workers and famous Passaic strike, the opposition resisted it and branded it as dual unionism. (December, 1925, C. E. C. Plenum.)

5. We have made considerable headway in the unification of the Party, ideologically as well as organizationally.

6. We have laid the beginning of mass work among the Negroes.

7. We have conducted the fight against opportunism, continuing the fight against Lore, and the fight against the ideologically damaging effects of American imperialism on the working class and even on certain sections of our Party—the present opposition.

Comrade Swabeck, one of the leaders of the opposition, declared there was pessimism in the Party because the Russian Revolution is no longer a source of inspiration to the American workers.

This comrade saw a conflict between the ideals of the proletarian revolution in Russia and the objectives of the Party in active participation in the every-day struggles of the working class. We rejected this theory vigorously as an example of the most dangerous opportunism.

And when Comrade Foster developed the theory that the trade union bureaucracy is invincible, and that the savings of the workers in America have "dynamic possibilities," we rejected it as another evidence of the dangerous effects of the strength of imperialism on the ideology of our Party.

Our Party is engaged primarily in the work of organizing the unorganized. The Trade Union Educational League has been so organized as to provide place for the unorganized workers in its structure. In mining, textile, needle trades, boot and shoe, and rubber, we are engaged in organizing new unions. In textile, mining and the needle trades we already have new unions organized. The Party is in the center of every strike in the country. The Passaic strike and many others, the Sacco and Vanzetti movement, the fight against the American imperialist war in Nicaragua, the struggle against the oppression of the colonial masses—in all these our Party has been the leader. Today our Party has the complete hegemony over the Left Wing.

Comrade Cannon spoke here critically about our election campaign. I can only refer to an article of his in the "Daily Worker" (June 5, 1928) before he came to Moscow, in which he wrote the highest praise of our election campaign.

With reference to the Negro work, we have made many errors, but we have made a definite beginning in this work.

In the organization work, our Party apparatus is centralized. We have brought in more than 1,000 new members in the mining campaign: we have more than 15,000 members in the Party today, with an average monthly increase of 600 members for 1928. We now have 28 factory nuclei papers with a circulation of over 60,000.

(To Be Continued.)

## Rivers Continue to Mount in South

ATLANTA, Sept. 7.—The overflowing of rivers in Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina today was causing great destruction to highways and crops. Hundreds of square miles of farmland were reported inundated in North Carolina. The Cape Fear River rose 13 feet above its banks at Fayetteville.



# Lovestone Dissects U.S. Empire

This is the third instalment of Comrade Jay Lovestone's speech at the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International.

(Continued.)

Are we fighting the right danger? No one can charge the Central Committee with being guilty of over-caution and conservatism in leading the Party work. The Central Committee has provided for the immediate expulsion of any Party member who refuses to violate an injunction. In the fight against the injunction, particularly in the coal strike, many scores of our members have been jailed. The same has occurred in the national picketing and street demonstrations in which our Party has participated vigorously and which have very often been led by our Party.

Only the other day our Central Committee was compelled to repudiate a proposal by one of the opposition leaders in America, Comrade Swabek, to refuse to build a new union in the textile industry because the reactionary United Textile Workers—the blackest type of reactionary union we have—has issued a statement that it wants to organize the unorganized. We have been fighting against the Right danger in Minnesota, where supporters of the opposition said that the discipline of the labor party is as high as the discipline of the Communist Party, and where these comrades insisted on supporting the bourgeois politician, Shipstead, for the U. S. Senate.

In the anti-imperialist work, we fought the pacifist errors of Comrade Gomez, an opposition delegate.

In the mining campaign, we have fought the Right errors committed in the anthracite by the opposition spokesman, Papcun.

And in the question of the progressives, it was the Central Committee which saw to it that where we made unity with the progressives we did not give them the leadership.

Our Central Committee very properly sharpened its position towards the socialist party. Much has been made here of the so-called opportunist attitude of our Party towards the socialist party.

The minutes of our Political Committee, December 14, 1927, show that this outrageous opportunistic crime (of sending under special circumstances for special confidential purposes some very reliable comrades into the socialist party) charged against the majority of the C. E. C. if it is at all to be considered an error, was participated in wholeheartedly by our opposition leaders in an even more aggressive and aggravating manner than that proposed by the majority.

Much noise has been made by our oppositionists here in reference to the Panken matter as another opportunistic crime of the Central Committee. Not only did the supporters of the opposition of the New York District Executive Committee unanimously vote for the policy in the Panken election, but in the Polcom meeting of October 27, 1927, Comrade Foster made a motion which was typical of the worst of opportunistic errors our Party has committed in its relations to the socialist party. The motion thus pro-

## Defends Bukharin's Thesis at Sixth Communist World Congress

posed by Foster was rejected. It reads as follows:

"That the policy of the New York D. E. C. in giving qualified support to Panken the S. P. candidate for judge) was incorrect. The Party should have approached the S. P. with general proposals for the establishment of a united front labor ticket in the New York elections, based on a minimum program."

The C. E. C. of our Party has been charged with opportunism by the opposition because of the wrong step it took in sending an open letter to the S. P.

It is clear from the minutes of Polcom, Nov. 7, Nov. 25 and Dec. 7, 1927, that though the Central Committee as a whole was responsible for this mistake, yet the opposition did more than its share in having the Party commit this error. The Party has repeatedly pointed out the anti-proletarian and pro-capitalist policies of the S. P.

On April 9, before we received the last letter from the Presidium of the Comintern, we find the following motion in the Polcom:

Motion by Mr. Lovestone:

"That the Party issue a statement not addressed to the S. P., but an official statement to the workers on the S. P. convention."

In the May Plenum Resolution, our Party elaborated in detail its sharpened policy against the S. P. Comrade Bittelman has said here that he and the opposition as a whole admit and correct their errors. What he should have said was that the entire opposition repeat its errors.

Up to the May Plenum the differences in the Party were not brought up in any sharp way. The differences that existed were chiefly between Comrade Bittelman on the one hand on the trade union question, and the majority of the Central Committee, inclusive of Foster, on the other hand. A similar relationship occurred on the proposal of Comrade Bittelman on political strikes in our every-day agitation.

On the very day before the last Plenum was opened, all comrades were agreed that no political resolution was required for the session. Comrade Cannon and Bittelman even made motions to this effect. These motions were unanimously agreed to. Obviously until very recently the present opposition in our Party did not see any Right menace.

I want to say a few words on Comrade Losovsky. He says we rejected the Profintern resolution. He says we have made a united front with the Right wing of the German Party in opposition to the Profintern. Comrade Losovsky's imagination is working overtime.

What are the facts regarding the so-called rejection of the Profintern resolution? First of all, Comrade Foster presented the resolution on trade union work at the May C. E. C. Plenum which we voted for. Secondly, Johnstone presented an ultra-factional document as the report of the Profintern Congress delegation which we rejected and which not even Comrade Losovsky

would have us accept. Thirdly, we carried a motion endorsing the Profintern resolution. Fourthly, the charge made by Comrade Losovsky yesterday that the cable to the Trade Union Educational League Conference, the Left Wing Conference, caused discontent in the Central Committee, is unfounded. Although Comrade Foster put his opposition to the contents of this wire—yet we published it and long before we received this advice for the organization of the unorganized we adopted the following motion:

Political Committee, November 2, 1927:

"The T. U. E. L. in order to establish working relations with the unorganized masses, shall build up a special connection with the workers' clubs, shop committees and other groups in the organized plants and cities. Into all groups and leading committees of the T. U. E. L. there shall be included representative elements from the unorganized plants and in the respective industries and localities."

As to the ridiculous charge of Losovsky that we have made unity with the Right Wing in the German Party, Comrade Losovsky—"people who live in glass houses should throw no stones." Is your criticism of the German Right Wing correct? We endorse it 100 per cent. Why do you make these charges without quoting us as you quoted your case against the Germans?

Was there no criticism of the Profintern resolution by us? Of course there was! By whom? Especially by Comrade Foster about whom you are so silent—in the May Plenum Trade Union resolution. Foster criticized it also in an 18-page letter to Comrade Losovsky. In July Comrade Foster wrote an article against the criticism made by Comrade Losovsky against us.

Comrade Losovsky, without the slightest basis of fact, has been attacking our Party in a most shameful manner and charging it with not doing any work in organizing the unorganized. Our Party has done considerable work in this field, despite the slanderous campaign of Comrade Losovsky.

I myself have some disagreements with certain features of the Profintern resolution. In this matter I also want to register a sharp disagreement with Comrade Pepper, who said he agrees with this resolution of the Profintern 99 per cent.

The comrades might ask, why is it that Comrade Losovsky is so bitter and prejudiced against our Party? The answer is the following: For years we have conducted a vigorous fight against him to compel him to revise the program of the T. U. E. L. (the American Left Wing) which provided for a long time the exclusion from its ranks of any worker who did not accept first of all the proletarian dictatorship.

When we consider the effort it took from us to defeat Comrade Losovsky on this point, there comes forcefully to our attention the fact

that Comrade Losovsky has no right whatsoever to talk of another comrade as a "muddler of two continents." The weakness of the Profintern is the leadership of Comrade Losovsky, who has been making a muddle of nearly everything he has touched.

At the IX Plenum Comrade Losovsky introduced a resolution on the American trade union question in which there was not a single word about the need for Communists working with the existing A. F. of L. unions. The American delegation to the IX Plenum introduced a counter-resolution in which it laid the greatest emphasis on the organization of the unorganized, but at the same time said it is necessary to continue and increase the work of the Communists in the A. F. of L. Comrade Losovsky fought against this amendment bitterly, but was overwhelmingly defeated—in fact, Comrade Foster refused to vote for the position of Comrade Losovsky on the policy to be followed by our Party in the mining campaign.

Obviously, Comrade Losovsky acts in a factional, prejudiced manner against our C. E. C. I am of the opinion that Comrade Losovsky has for some time functioned as one of the primary forces instigating factionalism.

In recent months the Party has done much work in organizing the unorganized. Several thousands of our Party members have been expelled from the trade unions. Our Party has developed a vigorous, energetic strike leadership policy. What we need is advice and criticism, and not vilification from Comrade Losovsky.

Comrades, I want to say that despite the very sharp criticism made by . . . (Interruption, the chairman announcing the end of Comrade Lovestone's time. One minute granted to finish).

The Congress should not misjudge the situation. Our Party will not be thrown into a faction fight despite the vigorous efforts of our opposition to camouflage, develop poisonous smoke screens and to stampede our membership into a suicidal faction war. Our Party has fought the Right danger. We have made a proposal here for a special amendment to the theses proposed by Comrade Bukharin on behalf of the Russian delegation, to instruct the American C. E. C. to continue and intensify its fight against the Right danger.

The Party needs peace. We are in the midst of big campaigns—the mining campaign, the election campaign and the campaign to organize the unorganized in a number of industries. There is a possibility of peace because despite all the errors, all the hesitation, all the slowness of our opposition, they are more and more coming closer to the correct line of the Comintern, to the policy followed by the C. E. C. Therefore we insist that the opposition should dissolve its bloc (Foster-Cannon). We request that the C. I. should reject the unfounded charge of Right Wing levelled against the C. E. C. We insist that the C. I. should once and for all put an end to the factional opposition to the C. E. C. The American Party realizes the gravity of the situation. We are prepared to do everything in our power to maintain the unity

YOU can always depend on a labor faker to pick on a fake issue to fight against with his mouth. A cur barking at the moon is an example of useful endeavor compared to the antics of a trade union body bleating against new developments in the cinema. To expect the New Jersey State Federation of Labor to tackle the organization of the unorganized industrial workers in that state would be like expecting the House of Morgan to come out for the Communist ticket. The labor movement in New Jersey is about the most graft-ridden and spy-ridden in the United States and its official leaders have as much in common with the exploited workers as a fox has with a chicken coop.

THE regular and irregular members of the Daily Worker editorial staff are not in the habit of passing taffy to each other, but I must hand a bouquet to my next column neighbor Fred Ellis for his cartoon showing Mrs. Knapp going to "jail." It appeared in last Friday's issue. It says half a dozen columns on capitalist miscarriages of justice.

MRS. KNAPP stole tens of thousands of dollars, yet she is treated with the consideration given to Harry Sinclair and Edward L. Doheny who were able to get away with a couple of states. Mrs. Knapp may feel bored before her thirty day term in her boudoir has expired, unless big-hearted Al pardons her in the meantime. But as we said before had she swiped a bottle of milk for her thirsty poodle dog she would now be defending herself from savage cockroaches in a filthy jail. The moral of this story is, that robbers who know their onions should join either the Democratic or Republican party before starting out to get rich quick, and then take care not to be caught at petty larceny.

SCARCELY had Mrs. Florence Knapp parked herself comfortably in her flowered suite in the sheriff's home, at Albany, than the candidate for attorney-general of Massachusetts addressed an open letter to Governor Smith demanding that he take steps to end the notorious "Albany baseball pool" which is reported to have flourished in the shadow of the capitol. The political thieves are certainly rattling each other's skeletons. As a matter of fact the pool operated in Hudson and not in Albany and only the blind in New York's officialdom were unaware of its location. Those who did not profit by it were too busy, getting theirs from some other source of graft.

*Tom O'Flaherty*

of our Party and to carry on the tasks such as are confronting us in developing our work amongst the Negroes, fighting against imperialist war on Nicaragua, organization of the unorganized. With the help of the Comintern and under the leadership of the Comintern, we will move forward to a united mass Communist Party in America.