

IN *The Communist* of February 1, there is an article in which appears the following paragraph:

"To our great sorrow and regret our delegates, Fraina and Stocklitsky, did not and could not represent our position in the Second Congress of the Communist International as they defended in our name a policy which the Communist Party of America had repudiated at its second convention, and upon which the Communist International declared war—the policy of splitting the A. F. of L. and kindred organizations. In this respect our delegates met with the well-merited rebuke of Comrade Radek, who accused them of hypocrisy. That our party was to some extent discredited at the Second World Congress of the Communist International is not altogether our fault; our delegates were out of touch with the latest developments in our party and were elected by the September First Convention; our program, which was adopted at our second convention, before the position taken by Fraina and Stocklitsky on the question of participation in the reactionary trade unions, was not the position of the C. P. A. which was misrepresented by our delegates. The Communist International, judging us by our delegates, who misrepresented us, saw no difference between the views of our delegates and the delegates of the U. C. P. and this doubtless influenced the Communist International's decision to force immediate unity."

If these charges were true, they would seriously compromise Stocklitsky and myself. But they are not true, as the stenographic report of the Congress discussion on unionism will prove

It is a simple question of facts. And the facts are these, on each particular point:

1. That, on the question of participation in the reactionary trade unions, I misrepresented our party (I say "I" because Stocklitsky took no part whatever in the public discussion on unionism).

The implication is that I opposed participation in the trade unions. When I left the United States, this was partly true, a relic of my S. L. P. training. But my observations in England and particularly in Germany prepared me to accept the views of the Russian comrades in favor of participation, which I did within a week of my arrival in Moscow. In the Commission on Trades Unionism I consistently spoke in favor of participation. At the Congress, in my two speeches on unionism, I emphasized, on the basis of American experience and requirements, the necessity of participation in the trade unions.

These are the facts.

There were some differences concerning the character of participation, concerned with extra-union organizations, such as Shop Committees, Shop Stewards, etc. In Radek's original theses, based upon the German and Russian experience, there

was no provision for such organizations in pre-revolutionary periods. Comrade Radek saw the point and accepted our amendments.

2. That I favored the policy of splitting the A. F. of L. and kindred organizations.

This is not true. At one of the sessions of the Trade Union Commission, Flynn, of the U. C. P., favored this policy. I made a ten-minute speech against Flynn, severely criticizing him and maintaining that his policy would ruin our movement. In one of my speeches in the Congress I said: "To adopt the slogan, 'Break the A. F. of L.' is to break, not the A. F. of L. but the American Communist movement."

I did argue in the Commission for broadening the conditions under which splits may be permitted, and also new unions organized; and at the end Radek and I were in agreement. Moreover, Radek in the Congress declared that considering the majority of the workers in the United States are not in the unions, special problems were created for the American comrades not covered in his theses.

3. That I was rebuked by Radek and accused of hypocrisy.

Comrade Radek never did anything of the sort. This rebuke was given to some of the other delegates. In fact, in the Congress Radek, while reporting for the Trades Union Commission, admitted that Murphy and Fraina did make some constructive proposals. (J. T. Murphy and I worked together on the union question and independently of the industrialist group, being Communists and not Syndicalists.)

4. That "to some extent" I discredited our party by my attitude on unionism.

Consider the facts: In discrediting the party I would necessarily discredit myself. But I was appointed on a Council of Three to organize the whole trades union work in America; and I wrote the instructions to this Council, which were accepted with one very slight change by the Provisional Executive of the Red Labor International.

I did discredit myself with the U. C. P. delegates. Flynn, MacAlpine and Reed went around saying that I knew nothing about American conditions, and that my accepting the theses would ruin the American movement. Does the editor of *The Communist* agree with the U. C. P. delegates?

5. That there was no difference (or it appeared so to the Russian comrades) between my views on unionism and those of the U. C. P. delegates.

The facts I have cited should amply prove the contrary. When I got the program of the U. C. P. I immediately and particularly criticized its trades union clause. In the credentials commission, when I defended our party against exclusion, I pointed out that this clause showed the U. C. P. was not fundamental in its understanding of Communist tactics, and that the C. P. A. if for no other reason should be recognized by the International. Comrade Zinoviev asked me personally if I agreed with the clause on unionism in the U. C. P. program. I naturally and immediately answered no. Zinoviev said that acceptance of the trades union decisions of the Congress must be made a fundamental condition of unity. I agreed.

6. That my attitude on unionism "doubtless influenced the Communist International's decision to force immediate unity."

Nothing of the sort. When I arrived in Moscow I found that the Executive Committee was absolutely convinced that there must be unity in the American Communist movement, and that nothing would change this conviction. Comrade Andrew tried, slightly, and no attention was paid to his arguments. The decision of the Communist International for unity comes out of the general policy of the International and out of the conviction that the struggle between the two parties is demoralizing our movement. I am on this matter in complete agreement with the International.

I do not know on what evidence the editor of *The Communist* wrote as he did, but surely it was not after knowing the facts as contained in the stenographic report of the Congress. Early in October I mailed my two speeches to the party from Moscow, but while they arrived in New York, for some reason the manuscript never reached the C. E. C. But for this I am not responsible.

Superficially, I was identified with the Industrialist group, but the report will show that my arguments were sharply different from theirs. There was some confusion on this matter; for example, the report states "that the American delegation abstained from voting on the trades union theses," whereas in fact this means the U. C. P. alone, and not Stocklitsky and myself.

The theses on unionism, in my opinion, are fundamentally sound; and their insistence on participation in the trade unions absolutely unassailable. I do have some criticisms; I did propose ideas not incorporated in the theses; but these have absolutely nothing to do with the criticism in *The Communist* (which is one of facts and not ideas) and I shall if granted the