

WORKERS OF THE WORLD, UNITE!

Declaration on the Dissolution Of the Communist International

Adopted May 27, 1943



**Published Online by
Socialist Labor Party of America**

www.slp.org

October 2006

THE SO-CALLED THIRD, OR “COMMUNIST,” INTERNATIONAL has come to an end. The action to dissolve as a formal would-be international proletarian body was initiated at Moscow on May 22, 1943, by “The Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International.” “The Presidium” proposed, as the official statement phrased it, “to dissolve the Communist International as the guiding center of the international labor movement.” The “proposal” is, in fact and in effect, equivalent to consummation. The Stalinist bureaucracy decreed the death of the “Third International” (or “Comintern,” for short) and then and there executed the death sentence. Thus came to an inglorious end the inglorious career of a body which (whatever may have been the intentions of its original founders) more than any other single factor or agency brought disruption, discord and confusion into the movement of world labor during one of the greatest crises in history, and which in unparalleled manner heaped disgrace upon Marxism, and deliberately or stupidly distorted and corrupted its essential principles in the service of the present ruling class of Soviet Russia, the Stalinist bureaucracy, and the Stalinist puppets in the various countries throughout the world.

Despite the pretentious claims, expressed in the familiar Stalinist jargon, the decision of the “Presidium” is in fact a declaration of bankruptcy—a bankruptcy that is twofold in character: It is an acknowledgment of bankruptcy as regards the claims of Stalinism that it represents Marxism. It is a declaration of bankruptcy, even viewing the “Comintern” as a Stalinist “international” tool, a bankruptcy brought about primarily by the inability of the Stalinist bureaucracy to maintain itself without the aid of the chief western capitalist democracies, not so long ago reviled by the Stalinists as the chief “warmongers” and enemies of the then Nazi-Soviet partnership.¹ The dissolution of the “Third International” is a complete,

¹ In his 1934 report of the work of the Central Committee of the Communist party, Stalin among other things stated (chiding particularly the Western Powers as anti-Soviet plotters, etc.)

“Still others, again, think that war should be organized against the U.S.S.R. Their plan is to smash the U.S.S.R., divide its territory and profit at its expense. It would be a mistake to believe that it is only certain military circles in Japan who think in this way. We know that similar plans are being hatched in the circles of political leaders of certain states of Europe.” (Italics ours.)

Believing himself to be a super-realist, that as a smart real-politiker he could play one capitalist power against the other, and profit thereby, Stalin added:

“There can hardly be any doubt that such a war would be a very dangerous war for the bourgeoisie. It would be a very dangerous war, not only because the peoples of the U.S.S.R. would fight to the very death to preserve the gains of the revolution; it would be a very dangerous war for the bourgeoisie also because such a war will be waged not only at the fronts but also in the rear of the enemy. The bourgeoisie need have no doubt that the numerous friends of the working class [!] of the U.S.S.R., in Europe and in Asia will be sure to strike a blow in the rear at their oppressors who

ignominious surrender to anti-Axis capitalism (world capitalism), and in practice marks the final step by Stalinism in the abandonment of international Marxism. And, finally, the dissolution of the “Third International” is a certificate of vindication of the genuine Marxists, specifically of the Socialist Labor Party of America and its sister parties in other English-speaking countries, which from the very beginning exposed and denounced the “Third International” as an anti-Marxist conspiracy against genuine international Marxism.

“First” International Was Marxist.

The “Communist” International (founded in Moscow in 1919) was generally referred to as the “Third International” for the reason that it was supposed to be the successor to the so-called Second International, founded in Paris in 1889, and itself hailed as the heir of, or successor to, the “First” International, or The International Workingmen’s Association, organized through the initiative (chiefly) of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, in London, in 1864. But the “Third International” was as distinct from the “Second International” as both were distinct from the “First.” For however heterogeneous were the elements that composed the “First International,” and short-lived though it was, it was based solidly on Marxism, and constituted a tremendous force in the world during the period of its existence. It was essentially an organ of Socialist action, while the “Second International” was chiefly, and eventually became essentially, a bourgeois debating society, while the “Third International” never became more than an agency for the Soviet government, later justly earning the designation of agency for the Stalinist bureaucracy.

commenced a criminal war against the fatherland of the working class of all countries [!]. And let not Messieurs the bourgeois blame us if on the morrow of the outbreak of such a war they will miss certain of the governments that are near and dear to them and who are happily ruling ‘by the grace of god.’ One such war against the U.S.S.R. has been waged already, if you remember. fifteen years ago. As is well known, the universally esteemed Churchill [!] clothed this war in a poetic formula—‘the invasion of fourteen states.’”

This braggadocio, this swaggering, is a characteristic acknowledgment by Stalin that the Stalinist stooges in the various countries were expected (which is to say instructed) to start “revolutionary insurrections” in cases of countries at war with Russia. How miserably the German Nazi Stalinist robots (shortly before that time collaborating with Hitler) failed is a matter of history. But that they failed Stalin is not to say that they did not have the desire to carry out orders. But just as their Machiavellian master and hero thought he was able to outsmart the capitalist powers elsewhere, so the German Stalinist Machiavellians thought they could outsmart the Nazi gangsters. The workers of the world (regarded as mere pawns in the Stalinist game of power politics) are paying a heavy price in blood for the “mistakes” of the super-smart realist, Joseph Stalin, and for the anti-working class policies of the Stalinist “Comintern.”

Thus, despite its imperfections, the “First International” was, and historically remains, the only true Marxist, or Socialist, International. The “First International” rallied the workers of the world around the banner of working class revolution against world capitalism. It was based uncompromisingly on the principle of the class struggle, and performed accordingly.

Social Democratic “Socialism.”

The “Second International,” though theoretically committed to the class struggle, and nominally accepting Marxism, became in fact an instrument for the attempted bridging of the class struggle, and for the hatching of collaborators with capitalism, terminating finally as the last-trench defense of capitalism when dangerously threatened following World War I. And it might be added that it became also the incubator of the ideas which subsequently gained notoriety as Social-Democratic “Socialism,” a “Socialism” which (whatever its original design) was a deliberate and carefully nurtured flank movement against Marxian Socialism, a movement which offered as “Socialism” the Stateism which first, universally, for a long time found expression in the various “Municipal Socialism” administrations, later expanding as national Social-Democratic “Socialist” governments in a number of European countries and which, as stated, ultimately became out-and-out bulwarks of capitalism. The same Stateism subsequently found expression, on the one hand, in the Fascist and Nazi gangster regimes, and, on the other hand, in what may be termed the Stalinist “benevolent despotism.”

To Defend the Stalin Bureaucracy.

The “Third International,” departing fundamentally from the Marxian internationalist principles of the “First International,” sought to rally the workers of the world to the defense, primarily, of the national existence of backward Soviet Russia, in effect, of the Stalinist bureaucratic State. While the various Communist parties were enjoined to participate in the struggles of their respective working classes, and to build “mass parties,” the primary consideration was to be promotion of the interests of the Soviet Republic, which in practice meant the protection and strengthening of the Stalinist bureaucratic State—a fact obvious to any intelligent observer, and reflected in the ever changing and contradictory tactics and policies of

the Communist parties (generally brazenly anti-working class), as they desperately attempted (meeting with chameleon-like success in the attempts) to follow the line laid down in Moscow. This is not a matter of opinion—it is a matter of palpable fact and historic truth.

But the very circumstances which made of the “Third International” a useful agency of Stalinist Stateism eventually rendered the Stalinist agencies in the various countries largely unnecessary, even reducing these to the nuisances that Stalin and his associates in recent years have been frequently reported to regard them. Having abandoned all but the pretense of Marxism, having embraced more and more the idea of State ownership and control of the industries as the principle of government, having moved ever closer to the great capitalist nations, becoming more and more like these in all essentials, such questions as international working class solidarity and all that hangs thereby faded further and further into the background, until the consummation of the Soviet-Nazi pact, and later the war with Nazi Germany, practically caused them to disappear altogether.

Stalin Accepts Stateism.

The definite acceptance of Stateism was clearly indicated in Stalin’s speech before the 18th Congress of the Russian Communist party in which, with much vehemence and forced argumentation, he defended the retention of the political State in Soviet Russia.² The line subsequently followed by the Stalinists has led them straight to where they stand today, i.e., as collaborators of capitalism, and as ardent advocates of Stateism, or “benevolent” industrial feudalism—not as a makeshift, not as a temporary expediency, but as a matter of governmental principle. However much they played with Marxian phrases, Socialism became more and more an abstraction, more and more an academic question, something to be realized some day, perhaps, but in a future so distant as to rob it of all actuality as far as the Stalinist bureaucrats were concerned.

Thus the “Third International,” reflecting the anti-Marxian Stalinist Stateism, finally came to express the complete negation, the direct opposite, of the Marxian industrial administration concept expressed by Marx in the celebrated declaration: “Where its organizing activity begins, where its proper aim, its soul emerges, there

² See *Soviet Russia: Promise or Menace*, New York Labor News Co., 1939.

Socialism casts away the political hull”; to which may be counterposed the alternative, expressed by Marx in these words: “The existence of the state is inseparable from the existence of slavery.”

Having become the direct opposite of Marxism, and yet persisting in its Marxist pretenses and claims, the Third, or Stalinist, “International” was bound to sink deeper and deeper into moral and political corruption, deeper and deeper into the mire of international capitalist power politics, both in the land of its origin, as well as in the various countries, with the Stalinist puppets burlesquing, or still more corrupting, the already corrupted or perverted Marxian principles. Under the terrific pressure of the global war, in which the realities inevitably force their way through frauds and fictions, the dissolution or collapse of the “Third International” became merely a question of time, even as the collapse of the various national Stalinist groups becomes a mere question of time.

Lenin’s Intentions and the “21 Points.”

And yet the launching of the “Third International” was undoubtedly done for the purpose of promoting working class revolution, and with no thought that it was to serve merely Russian national interests. For Lenin was quite clear on the point that Russia could not lead the world in revolution, and unreservedly so stated repeatedly. In 1919 he said:

“For the present—NATURALLY ONLY FOR A SHORT PERIOD—the leadership of the revolutionary proletariat AND THE INTERNATIONAL has passed to the Russians, just as it was held during the nineteenth century now by the English, now by the French, and finally by the German.” (Capitals ours.)

With this clear understanding of the nature and problems of Soviet Russia, it was logical on the part of Lenin and his associates to organize a new International to take the place of the old, defunct and, by now, thoroughly anti-Marxist “Second International.” But whatever may have been Lenin’s intentions, in the heat of the Russian revolution he either abandoned the Marxian premise or yielded to pressure. For the “Third International” was no more a Marxist International than was Bakunin’s ill-famed “International Alliance of Social-Democracy.” The proof of this contention lies in the “21 Points” imposed as conditions for admission to the “Third

International,” which were adopted by the Second Congress of the “Communist International” held in Moscow, July-August, 1920. The following extracts are quoted to show, not only the anti-Marxist and idiotic nature of most of these conditions, but also to establish that parties affiliated with the “Third International” were expected to be completely subservient to the Moscow headquarters of the “International,” which in fact meant, of course, complete submission to the Soviet government. From Point No. 1 we cite:

“The entire propaganda and agitation must bear a genuinely Communistic character and agree with the program and the decisions of the Third International. All the press organs of the party must be managed by responsible Communists who have proved their devotion to the cause of the proletariat.

“The dictatorship of the proletariat must not be talked about as if it were an ordinary formula learned by heart, but it must be propagated for in such a way as to make its necessity apparent to every plain worker, soldier and peasant through the facts of daily life, which must be systematically watched by our press and fully utilized from day to day.”

Point No. 3 provided:

“In nearly every country of Europe and America the class struggle is entering upon the phase of civil war. Under such circumstances the Communists can have no confidence in bourgeois legality.

“It is their duty to create everywhere a parallel illegal organization machine which at the decisive moment will be helpful to the party in fulfilling its duty to the revolution.

“In all countries where the Communists, because of a state of siege and because of exceptional laws directed, against them, are unable to carry on their whole work legally, it is absolutely necessary to combine legal with illegal activities.”

Point No. 4 imposed this insane obligation:

“The duty of spreading Communist ideas includes the special obligation to carry on a vigorous and systematic propaganda in the army. Where this agitation is forbidden by laws of exception it is to be carried on illegally. Renunciation of such activities would be the same as treason to revolutionary duty and would be incompatible with membership in the Third International.”

The remaining points covered varying obligations, more or less rational and realistic, but nearly all certifying to the complete, abject submission of all affiliated parties to the Moscow headquarters, which is to say to the Soviet Government—and, in later years, to the Stalinist bureaucracy.

Comments on what has been cited are superfluous. There is no Stalinist so rabid that he would now dare defend the “21 points.” Yet, as late as 1935 these conditions were observed by the Stalinists everywhere, including the United States Communist party. It was in 1935 that the Stalinist bureaucracy ordered the “line” changed, and (through the ignorant puppet, George Dimitroff, heading the “Third International”) decreed that the time had come to save “the remnants of bourgeois democracy,” and directed the Stalinist robots everywhere (but especially in the western capitalist democracies) to make common cause with the enemies of working class emancipation, the petty bourgeoisie and allied interests.

S.L.P. Declaration on Internationalism—1919.

When informally, and chiefly through hearsay and unsupported rumors published in the capitalist press, the Socialist Labor Party in 1919 learned that plans were afoot for the launching of a new International, cognizance was taken by the Party of these rumors to the extent of the N.E.C. of the Socialist Labor Party broadly outlining the conditions under which the S.L.P. could join a new International. This was done at the N.E.C. Session held in New York in May, 1919. At the same session the N.E.C. formally severed all relations with the now thoroughly moribund “Second International.” From the declaration of the N.E.C. we quote the following:

“(1) That we favor the formation of a new International based upon clear-cut revolutionary principles, the unqualified recognition of the antagonism of interests of the capitalist and wage-working class, and of the inevitable class struggle resulting therefrom, terminable only by the complete overthrow of the capitalist system of production by the revolutionary classconscious action of the working class.

“(2) That we favor the organization of the working class into integral, revolutionary, industrial unions, both as a means to conduct the class struggle as well as provide, by the planful organization of industrial units, the framework of the future form of society and the shaping of its constituent parts, and we hold, in the light of past and present events, that the recognition, endorsement, and active support of this revolutionary,

industrial unionism should be made a condition for admission into the new International.

“(3) That, since the means and methods to carry on the struggle against capitalism must of necessity differ in each country according to the prevailing conditions—social, political, and economic—the choice of these methods must therefore be left to each country. In the United States, for instance, where the Constitution of the land provides a method for its own amendment, the working class will not and should not voluntarily deprive itself of the political weapon, to utilize the working class ballot to proclaim and to propagate the working class RIGHT and to shield the gathering forces of the working class MIGHT on the industrial field. In accordance therewith we hold

“(4) That, while there should be no room in the new International for the social patriot with his bourgeois connections, ever ready to carry confusion into the ranks of the workers, care must also be taken to guard with equal vigilance against the entrance, under cover of the revolutionary phrase, of an anarcho-syndicalist-direct-action element whose capacity for creating confusion in the ranks of the working class is even greater than that of the social patriot bourgeois for the reason that, playing upon the impatience of revolutionary masses, and, in the nature of things honeycombed with the agent provocateur, it carries the heedless into premature action and up to the machine-guns of the capitalist foe.”

S.L.P. Observers at the Third Congress.

The subsequent arrival of the “21 points” all but completely disillusioned the Socialist Labor Party as far as affiliation with the “Third International” was concerned. Yet, among a considerable number of members there was a lingering doubt as to the complete authenticity of the “21 points,” and at the N.E.C. Session held in 1921 it was decided to send two observers to Moscow to “sit in” at the congress of the “Third International” to be held there in that year. The report brought back by the two observers completed the disillusionment. At the 15th National Convention of the S.L.P. held in New York in 1924, a resolution was adopted, reviewing the entire question. From this resolution these passages are quoted:

“They [the two S.L.P. observers] went, saw what was to be seen and came back reporting in substance that there was not a chance in the world squarely to place the position of the S.L.P. before such a gathering, for one thing, the most important, that the Russians had not the slightest comprehension of American conditions and had neither time, patience nor opportunity at this time to post themselves; and, for another, because the

‘American delegation’ to the congress, composed of muddleheads, freaks, fakers and I.W.W. ejects, would have blocked the chance if there had been one.”

The resolution also declared:

“The Third International, . . . its initial policies governed by the imperative need to start armed uprisings everywhere in order to relieve pressure of bourgeois governments upon Russia and thus to safeguard the revolution, and possibly prompted also by the mistaken belief held at one time that revolution was everywhere imminent, developed lines of action that aimed at the creation of an international organization so centralized as utterly to ignore the conditions, social, political and industrial, that prevailed in other countries, an endeavor that was bound to produce rather quaint results and did so in America, and the whole performance was capped, so to speak, when these policies culminated in the formulation of the so-called 21 points, theses by means of which the movements in all lands were to be uniformly governed, and acceptance of which was made a condition of affiliation. These 21 points, among other things, decreed secret political organization side by side with above-ground ‘legal’ parties, the former to guide and control the latter; a periodical ‘cleansing’ of the parties by throwing out members not coming up to the 21-point standard; propaganda among troops and a lot of other prescriptions which, however fitting they might be for some European countries, are utterly absurd in the light of the situation prevailing in America. Indeed, they are more than absurd, for they must be regarded as downright vicious and as placing weapons into the hands of the capitalist foe with which to smite the working class—to say nothing of their effect upon the American working class itself.”

S.L.P. Attitude Toward Soviet Regime.

The Socialist Labor Party consistently adhered to this position, continuing sharply critical of the “Third International” and its national affiliates, yet for a while remaining hopeful of changes in the “Third International,” and maintaining a sympathetically expectant attitude toward the Soviet regime, *apart* from the “Third International.” The course and logic of events justified neither the hope of change in the “Third International,” nor the sympathetic expectancy as regards the Soviet regime itself. As already pointed out, quite to the contrary.

And when, finally, the Stalinist bureaucracy in 1939 signed the “blood-pact” with the Nazi bandits which precipitated the World War, and when Stalin

subsequently brought disgrace on the supposed Marxism of Soviet Russia, and dishonor on the brave Soviet army, by invading the, at that time, peaceful and defenseless Finnish Republic, it became impossible to view the Stalinist bureaucracy as other than an accomplice of the blackest and bloodiest reaction, and as perpetrators of deliberate treason to Marxism and the international working class. Branding the Stalinists as traitors, exposing them, and their allies, as unprincipled Machiavellians, furnishing incontestable proof of every charge made against the unscrupulous betrayers of Marxism, the Socialist Labor Party unequivocally placed the Stalinist bureaucrats with the other class enemies of the workers—with the Nazi bandits, the Fascist scoundrels, and the international capitalist plunderbund generally.

Events since then have added new proofs of the crimes of Stalinism, and completely revealed the fact that official Soviet Russia (once honored as the first Socialist Republic, and eagerly looked upon as the hope and inspiration of the international proletariat) henceforth is not to be considered as anything but one of the many forces consciously striving to save and perpetuate the capitalist robber system, and therefore no longer to be differentiated from the rest of the capitalist world, nor to be regarded as a group that has any interest whatever in common with Marxist organizations, dedicated, as these latter must be, to the unconditional surrender of capitalism, to the waging of the class struggle until its hoped-for peaceful termination (in this country at least), and pledged to unceasing propagation of uncompromising Marxian principles as extended and applied in this country by the great American Marxist, Daniel De Leon.

Capitalist Reaction.

The reaction of the world of capitalism to the dissolution of the “Third International” was as might have been expected. The formal rejection of the Socialist principle of internationalism, the implied pledges of solidarity with the world of capitalism by the Stalinists, raised a shout of joy in the plutocratic camp. The plutocratic jubilation was due primarily to the expected favorable effect on the war effort of the Allies, and hardly so much because world capitalism feared any “revolutionary” activities by the “Comintern.” For while obviously the “Comintern” had proved itself a nuisance to capitalist governments (even as it had so become to the Stalinist bureaucracy itself), it had also been found useful as a bogeyman to the

blackest reaction (including the Ultramontane machine) against recalcitrant capitalists and (particularly to the Nazi bandits) as a club to be held over timid or wavering rulers and capitalists when Hitler found it expedient to use it to bring such rulers and capitalists in line. But, on the whole, the plutocratic joy was unconfined.

Triumphantly the spokesmen of the international plutocracy welcomed Soviet Russia “home,” gleefully the plutogogues dilated upon the fact that what was regarded as revolutionary Marxism in Russia had been abandoned, with the Soviet Union returning to the capitalist fold, while plutocrats everywhere indicated readiness to slaughter countless fatted calves in honor of the prodigal son. The plutocratic New York *Herald Tribune*, in an editorial appearing in its issue of May 23, 1943, hailed the dissolution of the “Third International” as “Russia’s contribution.” Undoubtedly expressing the sentiments of the plutocracy generally, the paper added:

“So far as the present Russian government is concerned, there is no reason to suspect that the dissolution of the Comintern is merely a gesture. Instead, it appears far more probable that it is the climax of the process that began when Stalin won his duel with Trotsky for leadership in Russia—the organization of that country into a national state run on Communist lines, rather than a center of world revolution.

“Probably the Third International was retained when much of the policy that inspired it was abandoned because of its intimate connection with Lenin, to say nothing of the fact that it appeared to furnish support for Russian national aims. But the intellectual bankruptcy of Communist parties outside Russia, operating under this system, became so obvious that Stalin found the connection embarrassing to Russia rather than helpful. This is quite apparent in the words of the resolution of the Presidium. Nevertheless, Stalin did not dissolve the Comintern in the early stages of the war, when such a move would have been a confession of weakness. He waited until Russia had won great victories, until the Allies were reaching the climax of their power. Unquestionably the step takes on added sincerity thereby.”

Yet, the organ of plutocratic capitalism is realistic enough to acknowledge that the Stalinist treason against the international working class does not mean the end of Marxian internationalism. “It must be recognized,” said the paper, “that revolutionary Socialism on an international basis will not die. It represents an idea that will always find adherents when the world is troubled by wars or economic

disaster—a movement that will wax or wane no matter what Joseph Stalin or any other national leader may decide.” The paper might have put it more succinctly and accurately if it had merely stated that Marxian Socialism “represents an idea that will always find adherents while, the robber system of capitalism persists.” Yes, and in ever increasing number with ever increasing clarity and understanding among the exploited workers as regards the nature of capitalism, the nature of the Marxist goal, and the nature of the tactics needed to reach that goal. And, until then, those remaining faithful to the principles of Marxian Socialism will persist in promoting the cause of working class emancipation athwart all obstacles created by capitalism and its traitorous allies, whether pledging fake loyalty to the workers as Social Democrats or as would-be Russian “Marxists.” And treason will find its reward no less than loyalty. “History is the judge; its executioner, the proletariat.” (Marx.)

How Stalin’s Robots Took the News.

The reaction of the Stalinist stooges (here and elsewhere) was also as might have been expected. Having long ago ceased to think and reason independently, whatever the Stalinist bureaucracy in Moscow decided was accepted by the mindless Browders without question, even though one decision might flatly contradict the other within twenty-four hours. In their abysmal ignorance, incredible stupidity, unlimited servility to Moscow, and brazen and corrupt through and through, they have unquestioningly accepted the dissolution of the thing that for so long was their proudest boast, pretending that, though stunned, they expected the decision, and greeted it with satisfaction, if not with glee!

With customary effrontery and mental dishonesty, the grotesque Browder declared that the dissolution of the “Third International” did not affect “organizationally the status of the Communist Party of the United States, because since 1940 the Communist Party of the United States of America has maintained no affiliation outside the borders of our country.” And with matchless mendacity this somewhat blurred carbon copy of the unscrupulous Stalin added: “It is my opinion, however, that the Communist Party of the United States will express its agreement with the proposal *and its motivation, since its own experience had already pointed in the same direction.*” (Italics ours.) This dishonest and hypocritical statement implies, of course, that the Communist party of the United States withdrew from

the “Third International” two years ago for the same reasons that prompted Stalin in 1943 to disband the “Third International”! And, incidentally, the Browder statement slyly suggests that he and his fellow-robots were so much smarter than even their adored and “all wise” Moscow “fuehrer,” since they understood two years ago what only now dawned upon the Moscow Stalinists

Browder Betrayed by the Record.

Unhappily for the little American Stalin, the record betrays and convicts him. For the Communist party of the United States severed formal affiliation with the “Third International” in 1940 with the utmost reluctance, and to the accompaniment of weeping and gnashing of teeth. The reason for the 1940 action of the Communist party of the United States was *exclusively* the enactment of the reactionary Voorhis law, prohibiting affiliation with a foreign group except on certain ruinous conditions. In a speech, or “report,” on the “Voorhis Registration Act,” delivered before a special national convention held in New York City on November 16, 1940, Browder declared, and proposed:

“That the Communist Party of the U.S.A. in convention assembled, does hereby cancel and dissolve its organizational affiliation to the Communist International, as well as any and all other bodies of any kind outside the boundaries of the United States of America, FOR THE SPECIFIC PURPOSE OF REMOVING ITSELF FROM THE TERMS OF THE SO-CALLED VOORHIS ACT, which originated in the House of Representatives as H.R. 10094, which has been enacted and goes into effect in January 1941, which law would otherwise tend to destroy, and would destroy, the position of the Communist Party *as a legal and open political party*. . . .

“That the convention denounces the Voorhis Act as harmful and destructive of the democratic rights of the people, AS DESIGNED TO COERCE THE PEOPLE INTO SUBMISSION TO THE ENTRY OF THE UNITED STATES INTO THE IMPERIALIST WAR. . . .” (Capitals and italics ours.)

Comments on Browder’s corrupt falsification of facts and history are scarcely necessary. They are in line with similar falsifications in the past, and altogether in keeping with the precepts and example of his unprincipled masters in Moscow. It is not to be expected, however, that the United States Stalinists will obey the logic of the situation, and disband. Racketeers never willingly give up a lucrative racket,

nor is it to be expected of poseurs and sob-sisters that they will voluntarily abandon the instrument which affords them the opportunity to pose and glorify themselves as the saviors of humanity.

Browder Enunciates the “New” Party Line.

It will be profitable here to note one more instance of the reactionary servility to Moscow by the American Stalinist robots. When Stalin shouts violent insurrection and defiance to capitalist powers, the Browders likewise shout violent insurrection, etc. When Stalin proposes and practises collaboration with capitalism, the Browders propose and practise capitalist collaboration, etc. Stalin having clearly indicated his acceptance of capitalism as a future going concern, as a partner of Soviet Russia in maintaining the capitalist robber system after the war, what could be more natural than for the Stalinist robots to accept this “new” line from Moscow? The little Stalinist fuehrer from Union Square recently debated with the notorious plutogogue, George Sokolsky. In the course of this debate, Browder brazenly declared:

“I can promise for those who are fearful of the powers of survival of American capitalism that all policies of the interests of the people which will make the people more ready to accept the continuation of this present system will be policies that receive the support of the Communist party because we are fighting for the interests of the people at all times, and if gaining those interests of the people under capitalism wed the people to capitalism, we accept that without question.

“We are perfectly willing to support a capitalism in the United States after the war which is compatible with the interests of the people and which takes into account the necessary problems of the people. We are content to see this debate worked out in the field of life as to which is the more conducive to the welfare of the masses of the peoples—capitalism or socialism—by the experiences which the world will present to us, because surely, after this war the most powerful capitalism in America, having won the joint victory against Fascism, will continue to operate. The great Socialist system [!] will continue to operate, and if these two countries—the Soviet Union and America—can exist peacefully, in collaboration to preserve world order, which is a policy which we press with full vigor and with full conviction, then the possibility will exist that the great debate between socialism and capitalism can be decided, on the whole, peacefully.”
(Italics ours.)

And the *Daily Worker* (May 19, 1943) calls this “a rational exposition of the Communist position in the U.S.”!

Vindication of S.L.P.

There we have it. And that this represents “his master’s voice,” that this is the “new” line laid down by the Stalinist bureaucracy, admits of no doubt. It is thoroughly in keeping with Stalin’s pro-capitalist policies, entirely in harmony with his announced postwar collaboration with world-capitalism, and altogether in accord with the “motivation” underlying the dissolving of the “Third International.” The wheel has come full circle. The logic of events has told. And let this serve as the final proof of Stalinist treason to Marxism, as the complete vindication of the principles and policies of the Socialist Labor Party.

The National Executive Committee of the Socialist Labor Party hails the formal dissolution of the so-called Communist International with the satisfaction justified by a complete vindication of all that the Socialist Labor Party has maintained regarding the “Third International” and related questions. We declare that our analysis and forecasts as a Marxian organization, as the genuine political party of the working class in this country, made more than twenty years ago, and amplified again and again during the twenty years, have received overwhelming and final confirmation. And we assert that, as we were right then, so we are right now.

The Marxist Way to Freedom!

There is but one road to working class emancipation, the course charted by Marx and De Leon: Uncompromising political working class action, and thoroughly integrated Socialist Industrial Unionism. Compromises and half-measures are fatal to the bona fide working class movement, reforms are deadly to it, and secrecy, deceit and double-dealing must inevitably doom it. Society cannot be revolutionized behind its back, nor can the working class be emancipated through the administration of opiates. “The proletarian army of emancipation cannot consist of a dumb driven herd,” said Daniel De Leon. “The emancipation of the working class can only be the result of the classconscious act of the working class itself,” said Marx and Engels. And the guiding international principle is, and must remain, that the working class of each country must settle its accounts with its own capitalist

Workers of the World, Unite!

class, without dictation from abroad, and in keeping with traditions and developments peculiar to each country, while nevertheless maintaining the greatest possible degree of international working class solidarity. And in the firm conviction that the Socialist Labor Party alone possesses the program that will insure working class emancipation from capitalist slavery, we further declare that—

The struggle today, as it has been for many years, is between capitalism and Socialism; that—

De Leon was absolutely right when he declared that there are today but two nations, the international exploiting class, and the internationally exploited toilers; that—

Not reforms and palliatives, not amelioration of wrong, but complete emancipation of the wronged, and the unconditional surrender of the perpetrators of the wrong, will alone settle the social problem, and bring peace and order to a world reduced to chaos, and threatened with complete destruction; that—

There can be no truce between the exploiters and the exploited, and that the struggle must go on until final victory.

Finally, we pledge that—

The Socialist Labor Party hereafter, as in the past, will support any bona fide effort made to establish and maintain on the basis of Marxian principles a true International dedicated to the ultimate unification and complete emancipation of the workers of the world, re-echoing the immortal battle-cry of the founders of Revolutionary Socialism:

*Workers of the World, Unite!
You have nothing to lose but your chains!
And you have a world to gain!*

National Executive Committee,
Socialist Labor Party of America,
ARNOLD PETERSEN,
National Secretary.

New York, N.Y.,

May 27, 1943.