

COMMUNIST LINE

October 1, 1975



No. 2, \$ 1.25

LIQUIDATION OF THE C.P.U.S.A.

MARXISM-LENINISM vs. CLASS COLLABORATION

To reconstitute a genuine vanguard communist party, Marxist-Leninists must unite on the basis of the correct ideological and political line. *Forging unity on the basis of political line is the immediate task at hand.*

Our political line must mark out the steps to proletarian revolution in the United States. The foundation for laying out this course, the basis for drawing clear lines of demarcation between the true revolutionary path and the path of counter-revolution and reaction, is Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought as our theoretical guide to action.

We seek to build a party that is *"bold enough to lead the proletarians in the struggle for power, experienced enough to find its bearings amidst the complex conditions of a revolutionary situation, and flexible enough to steer clear of all submerged rocks in the path of its goal"*, (Stalin, FOUNDATIONS OF LENINISM. FLP, 1970, pp. 102-103). Without the most advanced theory as a reliable guide to action, there can be no revolutionary party, nor a revolutionary movement. In order to oppose opportunism, the ideology of the bourgeoisie within the revolutionary movement, and overthrow the bourgeoisie itself, communists must be armed with the most advanced theory.

Theoretical clarity, which comes out of a scientific study of the objective processes in their development and decline, is the only basis upon which the aim of the movement can be defined, the general route and direction of the movement laid out, and the ways of concentrating forces on the side of the revolution in their correct fighting positions determined.

In order to concentrate a superior force to defeat our enemies- both imperialism and opportunism- we must concentrate a substantial fighting force on the theoretical front. Unity amongst Marxist-Leninists requires that we mobilize our forces and wage a protracted, national campaign to defeat opportunism on the theoretical front. In this context, as Chairman Mao has pointed out, *"historical experience merits attention"*.

To wage a vigorous struggle on the theoretical front we must examine the underlying historical connection between imperialism and opportunism, between the present day chieftains of opportunism and their historical predecessors. *"Present day struggles are a continuation and development of those in the past. All anti-Marxist trends of thought that appear in society today have their historical origins. To discern them, it is necessary to link present day struggles with those in the past and trace the 'stream' to its 'fountain head', so as to study how they go back to their 'predecessors' and how they inherit those viewpoints that have already been overcome and put on a new farce of counter revolutionary restoration by invoking the dead souls of history!"* (PEKING REVIEW, 2/28/75, p. 18).

History has proven, and life today confirms, that new demons and monsters will inevitably appear to block the road to revolution. These current day dead souls must be opposed. At the same time, Marxist-Leninists realize that those who fail to struggle against opportunism, themselves easily degenerate into opportunists. There is no middle ground.

Our road is clear. We must smash opportunism on all fronts, lest we ourselves, as the revolution takes an unexpected turn, wind up on the side of imperialism, rather than revolution.

As a contribution to laying a granite theoretical foundation, to building unity on the basis of political line- so that Marxist-Leninists may reconstitute a vanguard communist party in order to lead the proletariat in its conquest of state power and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the MLOC is publishing COMMUNIST LINE.

The theory of proletarian revolution in the United States must be based upon an honest, scientific summation of historical practice, and our revolutionary practice, on honest, scientific theory. This is the dialectical, historical materialist approach to revolution, the unity of

theory and practice. *"Marxism-Leninism is a science and science means honest, solid knowledge; there is no room for playing tricks. Let us then, be honest."*

Today it is time to grasp firmly the best efforts that the most advanced proletarians and revolutionary fighters have historically put forward to defeat opportunism within our midst. COMMUNIST LINE is, therefore, publishing materials which will assist comrades in grasping the underlying historical connection between present day opportunism and its historical predecessors. This is important in order to 1) develop the correct strategy and tactics for defeating the bourgeois forces within our ranks, and 2) rally genuine Marxist-Leninists into a unified fighting force for the battle ahead.

Historical experience merits attention, and it is an integral aspect of correct practice. It is the ground upon which the correct viewpoint and method are built. From this historical analysis we must derive a clear understanding of the relationship of forces in the revolution, and determine who are our friends and who are our enemies.

For this purpose, in order to launch a protracted campaign to build up a superior theoretical force and defeat opportunism on the theoretical front, we must study the history of this struggle in the past which for so long has been suppressed by the opportunists.

COMMUNIST LINE will be published on the basis of the concrete needs of our struggle. The first two issues, which appear together for study, include:

Issue No. 1 of COMMUNIST LINE:

(A) a brief preliminary analysis of the historical experience and lessons of the international communist movement and the communist movement in the United States;

(B) a preliminary chronology of the workers' and communist movement from the early 1800's to the present, as reference in guiding the study and investigation of the historical experience of the proletariat; (Cont. p. 31)

"The Communist

The following selections are from various articles and documents of the Communist Political Association, formed in 1944 with the dissolution of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. We are reprinting these selections so that comrades can evaluate the revisionist political line put forward by the first modern revisionists. The dissolution of the C.P.U.S.A. was accomplished in under twelve minutes. Earl Browder, general secretary of the C.P., stepped to the podium stating, "I hereby move that the Communist Party of America be and hereby is dissolved," the motion carried without discussion and the C.P. convention adjourned. Ten years of opportunist theory and practice had finally bore their poisonous fruit.

PREAMBLE TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMUNIST POLITICAL ASSOCIATION

(Adopted by the National Convention, May 21, 1944)

THE Communist Political Association is a non-party organization of Americans which, basing itself upon the working class, carries forward the traditions of Washington, Jefferson, Paine, Jackson and Lincoln, under the changed conditions of modern industrial society.

It seeks effective application of democratic principles to the solution of the problems of today, as an advanced sector of the democratic majority of the American people.

It upholds the Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution and its Bill of Rights, and the achievements of American democracy, against all the enemies of popular liberties.

It is shaped by the needs of the nation at war, being formed in the midst of the greatest struggle of all history; it recognizes that victory for the free peoples over fascism will open up new and more favorable conditions for progress; it looks to the family of free nations, led by the great coalition of democratic capitalist and socialist states,

to inaugurate an era of world peace, expanding production and economic well-being, and the liberation and equality of all peoples regardless of race, creed or color.

It adheres to the principles of scientific socialism, Marxism, the heritage of the best thought of humanity and of a hundred years experience of the labor movement, principles which have proved to be indispensable to the national existence and independence of every nation; it looks forward to a future in which, by democratic choice of the American people, our own country will solve the problems arising out of the contradiction between the social character of production and its private ownership, incorporating the lessons of the most fruitful achievements of all mankind in a form and manner consistent with American tradition and character.

For the advancement of these aims, the Communist Political Association establishes the basic laws of its organization in the following Constitution.

THAT AMERICANS MAY THINK TOGETHER, ACT TOGETHER

(Concluding Remarks at the Closing Session of the National Convention of the Communist Political Association, May 22, 1944)

BY EARL BROWDER

FELLOW Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen:

We have had a fruitful Convention. We have met in one of the most critical moments in the history of our country and of the world. We have faced unprecedented problems. We have avoided every temptation to fall into the pattern of copying the answers from the past; we have worked out new policies to meet an entirely new and unprecedented moment in our history.

The only people we are really concerned with and profoundly anxious to satisfy, are those we want to convince that, though our ideas may differ somewhat from theirs, we have the same interests. They are the people we want to convince that they and we have to fight shoulder to shoulder together for these interests. We want to convince them that the very fact that we think in certain respects differently from them may make our cooperation with them even more

valuable than if we were simple yes-men cooperating. The people that we really want to convince are the great mass of the American people, the alert and intelligent workers, as well as the farmers, of America, the business and professional people who are honestly trying to think through the problems of today and who are earnestly attached to the welfare of their country as their first consideration. Yes, we want even to convince that large number and great body of professors and doctors of philosophy who are badly represented by Dr. Counts and Dr. Childs. We want to convince the capitalists of America that we are serious and earnest in our proposals for a national unity broad enough to include capital and labor. We want to convince every honest man and woman who understands the great crisis through which our country and the world is now living, the greatest crisis of all history.

[This issue of The Communist is in its major part devoted to the proceedings of the plenary meeting of the National Committee, Communist Party U.S.A., held in New York on January 7, 8 and 9, 1944. Included are the National Committee Statement issued to the press; the summation speech of the General Secretary, Earl Browder; excerpts from the speeches of Comrades Dennis, Minor, Williamson, Hudson, and Green; and the unanimously adopted decisions of the National Committee. The report given by Comrade Browder, in behalf of the Political Committee, was published in full in the Worker of January 16, 1944, and is now also available in pamphlet form, under the title Teheran and America, published by Workers Library Publishers, New

York. This report reviews, in the light of the Moscow-Cairo-Teheran Agreements, the role and obligation of our nation and its working class, in the winning of the war and in the establishment of an orderly and peaceful post-war world. Close study, full understanding and wide popularization of the report, and the National Committee Plenum discussion and decisions, based thereon, are essential for the strengthening of national unity, for a win-the-war victory in the 1944 elections, and in meeting the many complex wartime and post-war problems of the U.S.A. The March issue will contain further speeches by Communist leaders at the National Committee meeting, including the addresses of Comrades James W. Ford and Rose Wortis.—The Editors.]

STATEMENT TO THE PRESS BY THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY *

AN UNPRECEDENTED situation in the world and within our country has been created by the favorable course of the military action and by the international agreements of the United Nations coalition which assure victory in the war and the outlook for a long period of world peace and orderly post-war reconstruction.

It is beyond question that the post-war reconstruction, like production for the war at present, will be carried out under the system of free enterprise.

The Communist Party commits itself in full good faith to work with the overwhelming majority of our nation for the most successful realization of our enormous national task of war and post-war construction on this basis.

It is equally evident that the political issues of this time will be decided within the form of the two-party system traditional in our country. In this framework can be fought out and won the necessary struggle of the American people to safeguard our country's victory and the preservation of its institutions through such measures as the restoration of universal suffrage to the Southern people, the elimination of anti-Negro and all other undemocratic restrictions in the primary elections, and a total removal of all anti-labor laws and racial discrimination.

The Communist Party's contribution in the election will be to aid the struggle for the unity of the

people in support of the nation's war policies, without partisan or class advantages.

The win-the-war policies of the nation are under challenge in this election. A rejection by the people of all defeatist attacks on the President's and the nation's war policy is an inseparable part of the successful and speedy victorious conclusion of the war. The national election of 1944 is as much a test of the people's support of the war as was the election of 1864.

The war is not yet won. The really decisive fighting lies ahead. The Communist Party places ahead of all other considerations the consolidation of our national unity to guarantee the speediest victorious conclusion of the war in Europe and Asia, uninterrupted and full war production, and the consolidation of the peace and collaboration between nations which the agreements have made possible.

The National Committee calls a National Convention of the Communist Party to meet in May, the day and place to be fixed by the Political Committee by February 1. Before this Convention the National Committee will place a number of proposals, among which will be that the Communist organization cease to carry the word "Party" in its name, and, instead, adopt a name more exactly representing its role as a part of a larger unity in the nation, not seeking any partisan advancement—a name, for example, like "American Communist Political Association."

Political Association"



Earl Browder

COMMUNISTS AND NATIONAL UNITY

An Interview of PM with Earl Browder

This contains the text of an interview given by Earl Browder to Harold Lavine, assistant to the managing editor of the New York newspaper PM, March 15, 1944.



William Z. Foster

QUESTION: *We have been following your speeches and Robert Minor's "Questions and Answers" and various editorials in the Daily Worker the past month or two and we have several questions that arose in our minds. We wanted to find the answers.*

The first question we wondered about was: What do you feel now distinguishes Communists from other elements in our society which in your own mind are progressive, pro-war, pro-world cooperation and the general progressive New Deal elements? Or, another way of stating that: Why does the Communist Party still feel it necessary to have a separate organization within other New Deal groups?

ANSWER: It is quite true that, as far as the current issues of the day are concerned, we have more points of similarity than of difference with other progressive groups, and it is our policy to stress the points of agreement rather than the points of difference. We think, however, that the very existence of our organization helps to bolster up the other progressive groups. We feel we have a distinct contribution to make in the fields of political orientation, theory and organization which would be lost if we were to dissolve ourselves. We do not, of course, exist as a separate organization within other progressive groups.

We find that progressive elements in America are very badly organized, although America generally has a reputation of being first-class in the field of organization. On the other hand, we pride ourselves as having some mastery of the art of organization and we think we have in this field a distinct contribution to make to the general progressive camp, a contribution which would immediately be lost if we were to dissolve. We would not be strengthening the progressive movement by that act but would be weakening it.

That seems to us sufficient reason, rather than to disperse our organization, to attempt to make it even stronger while making all necessary organizational adjustments to enable us to contribute to the maximum to the common tasks.

QUESTION: *Another thing we wondered about is this: You state you are cooperating with other elements in our society to achieve relative prosperity after the war under the present free enterprise system. On the other hand, you resist liberal criticism of monopolies and cartels, and in fact denounce liberals for attempting to prevent the growth of monopolies and cartels. To us that seems something like a contradiction because, by their very definition, monopolies and cartels are combinations in restraint of trade; they are organized for the specific purpose of regulating production, keeping up prices, regulating technological development; in short, organized almost to produce scarcity. To us it does seem that while on the one hand you talk about prosperity under free enterprise, on the other hand, you are fighting or deriding the liberals who are attempting to achieve just that.*

ANSWER: I think that in the liberal circles there is a certain misconception of this whole problem, a dangerous misconception, because, unless it is clarified, the progressive program will be weakened. The liberals look at monopolies and cartels and see only their negative and parasitic manifestations; but that is only one side of the picture. Monopolies and cartels are inevitable forms of capitalist economy in its higher stage of development. It is impossible for an economy like America's to go back to the pre-monopoly stage. If you are going to try to make the present system work, you can only do it on the basis of its main features; the only alternative would be a new social system.

what does a Communist do?

(From "THE COMMUNIST POLITICAL ASSOCIATION," a CPA handbook by David Goldway, 1945.)



On the job, preferably a war job, works for all-out production for Victory.

Takes part in union meetings, working for labor unity and against discrimination.

Goes to CPA Club meeting, usually twice a month—takes part in its activities.



Goes to the movies. Liked Dragon Seed, Tomorrow the World, Fighting Lady.

Reads The Daily Worker, The Worker, and occasional CPA pamphlets.

Writes to his Congressman frequently, for or against bills on vital issues.

Buys War Bonds and gives to War Relief Funds. Gives blood to the Red Cross, too.

When shopping, checks points and ceiling prices. Supports price control.

Dinner at home. Romps with the kids. Listen to news broadcasts on the radio.

ON THE DISSOLUTION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A.

By JACQUES DUCLOS

(Slightly Edited)

Many readers of *Cahiers du Communisme* have asked us for clarification on the dissolution of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. and the creation of the Communist Political Association.

We have received some information on this very important political event, and thus we can in full freedom give our opinion on the political considerations which were advanced to justify the dissolution of the Communist Party.

The reasons for dissolution of the Communist Party in the U.S.A. and for the "new course" in the activity of American Communists are set forth in official documents of the Party and in a certain number of speeches of its former secretary, Earl Browder.

In his speech devoted to the results of the Teheran Conference and the political situation in the United States, delivered December 12, 1943, in Bridgeport and published in the Communist magazine in January, 1944, Earl Browder for the first time discussed the necessity of changing the course of the C.P.U.S.A.

The Teheran Conference served as Browder's point of departure from which to develop his conceptions favorable to a change of course of the American C.P. However, while justly stressing the importance of the Teheran Conference for victory in the war against fascist Germany, Earl Browder drew from the Conference decisions erroneous conclusions in no wise flowing from a Marxist analysis of the situation. Earl Browder made himself the protagonist of a false concept of the ways of social evolution in general, and in the first place, the social evolution of the United States.

Earl Browder declared, in effect, that at Teheran capitalism and socialism had begun to find the means of peaceful co-existence and collaboration in the framework of one and the same world; he added that the Teheran accords regarding common policy similarly presupposed common efforts with a view to reducing to a minimum or completely suppressing methods of struggle and opposition of force to force in the solution of internal problems of each country.

That (the Teheran Declaration) is the only hope of a continuance of civilization in our time. That is why I can accept and support and believe in the Declaration at Teheran and make it the starting point for all my thinking about the problems of our country and the world. (Address at Bridgeport, Conn., Dec. 12, 1943.)

Starting from the decisions of the Teheran Conference, Earl Browder drew political conclusions regarding the problems of the world, and above all the internal situation in the United States. Some of these conclusions claim that the principal problems of internal politics of the United States must in the future be solved exclusively by means of reforms, for the "expectation of unlimited inner conflict threatens also the perspective of international unity held forth at Teheran." (*Teheran and America*, pp. 16-17.)

The Teheran agreements mean to Earl Browder that the greatest part of Europe, west of the Soviet Union, will probably be reconstituted on a bourgeois-democratic basis and not on a fascist-capitalist or Soviet basis.

But it will be a capitalist basis which is conditioned by the principle of complete democratic self-determination for each nation, allowing full expression within each nation of all progressive and constructive forces and setting up no obstacles to the development of democracy and social progress in accordance with the varying desires of the peoples. It means a perspective for Europe minimizing, and to a great extent eliminating altogether, the threat of civil war after the international war. (Bridgeport speech, *The Communist*, January, 1944, p. 7.)

Reprinted from the April, 1945, issue of *CAHIERS DU COMMUNISME*,
theoretical organ of the Communist Party of France.

And Earl Browder adds:

Whatever may be the situation in other lands, in the United States this means a perspective in the immediate postwar period of expanded production and employment and the strengthening of democracy within the framework of the present system—and not a perspective of the transition to socialism.

We can set our goal as the realization of the Teheran policy, or we can set ourselves the task of pushing the United States immediately into socialism. Clearly, however, we cannot choose both.

The first policy, with all its difficulties, is definitely within the realm of possible achievement. The second would be dubious, indeed, especially when we remember that even the most progressive section of the labor movement is committed to capitalism, is not even as vaguely socialistic as the British Labor Party.

Therefore, the policy for Marxists in the United States is to face with all its consequences the perspective of a capitalist postwar reconstruction in the United States, to evaluate all plans on that basis, and to collaborate actively with the most democratic and progressive majority in the country in a national unity sufficiently broad and effective to realize the policies of Teheran. (*Teheran and America*, p. 20.)

To put the Teheran policy into practice, Earl Browder considers that it is necessary to reconstruct the entire political and social life of the United States.

Every class, every group, every individual, every political party in America will have to readjust itself to this great issue embodied in the policy given to us by Roosevelt, Stalin and Churchill. The country is only beginning to face it so far. Everyone must begin to draw the conclusion from it and adjust himself to the new world that is created by it. Old formulas and old prejudices are going to be of no use whatever to us as guides to find our way in this new world. We are going to have

to draw together all men and all groups with the intelligence enough to see the overwhelming importance of this issue, to understand that upon its correct solution depends the fate of our country and the fate of civilization throughout the world.

We shall have to be prepared to break with anyone that refuses to support and fight for the realization of the Teheran Agreement and the Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition. We must be prepared to give the hand of cooperation and fellowship to everyone who fights for the realization of this coalition. If J. P. Morgan supports this coalition and goes down the line for it, I as a Communist am prepared to clasp his hand on that and join with him to realize it. Class divisions or political groupings have no significance now except as they reflect one side or the other of this issue. (Bridgeport speech, January, 1944, *The Communist*, p. 8.)

Browder's remark regarding Morgan provoked quite violent objections from members of the American C. P. Explaining this idea to the plenary session of the central committee, Browder said:

... I was not making a verbal abolition of class differences, but that I was rejecting the political slogan of class against class" as our guide to political alignments in the next period. I spoke of Mr. Morgan symbolically as the representative of a class, and not as an individual—in which capacity I know him not at all. (*Teheran and America*, p. 24.)

As Browder indicates, creation of a vast national unity in the U. S. presupposes that the Communists would

be a part of this. Thus, the Communist organization must conclude a long-term alliance with far more important forces. From these considerations, Browder drew the conclusion that the Communist organization in the U. S. should change its name, reject the word "party" and take another name more exactly reflecting its role, a name more in conformity, according to him, with the political traditions of America.

Earl Browder proposed to name the new organization "Communist Political Association," which, in the traditional American two-party system, will not intervene as a "party," that is, it will not propose candidates in the elections, will neither enter the Democratic or Republican Party, but will work to assemble a broad progressive and democratic movement within all parties.

In his report to the plenary session of the central committee of the C.P., U.S.A., Browder spoke in detail of the economic problems of U. S. postwar national economy, and their solution on the basis of collaboration and unity of different classes. Browder indicated that American business men, industrialists, financiers and even reactionary organizations do not admit the possibility of a new economic crisis in the U. S. after the war. On the contrary, all think that U. S. national economy after the war can preserve and maintain the same level of production as during the war.

However, the problem is in the difficulties of transition from wartime economic activity to peacetime production, and in the absorption by home and foreign markets of \$90 billions in supplementary merchandise which the American government is now buying for war needs. In this regard, Earl Browder claims that the Teheran Conference decisions make possible the overcoming of Anglo-American rivalry in the struggle for foreign outlets, and that the government of the United States, in agreement with its great Allies, and with the participation of governments of interested states, can create a series of giant economic associations for development of backward regions and war-devastated regions in Europe, Africa, Asia and Latin America.

As to extension of the home market, to permit absorption of a part of the \$90,000,000,000 worth of merchandise, Browder suggests doubling the purchasing power of the average consumer, notably by wage increases.

Marxists will not help the reactionaries, by opposing the slogan of "Free Enterprise" with any form of counter-slogan. If anyone wishes to describe the existing system of capitalism in the United States as "free enterprise," that is all right with us, and we frankly declare that we are ready to cooperate in making this capitalism work effectively in the postwar period with the least possible burdens upon the people. (*Ibid.*, p. 21.)

Further, Browder claims that national unity could no more be obtained by following a policy based on slogans aimed at the monopolies and big capital.

Today, to speak seriously of drastic curbs on monopoly capital, leading toward the breaking of its power, and imposed upon monopoly capital against its will, is merely another form of proposing the immediate transition to socialism. (*Ibid.*, p. 23.)

In his closing speech to the plenary session of the C.P. Central Committee in January, 1944, Browder tried to base himself on "theoretical" arguments to justify the change of course of the American C.P. Also he expressed his concept of Marxism and its application under present conditions. Browder thinks that by pronounc-

ing the dissolution of the C. P. and creating the C.P.A., the American Communists are following a correct path, resolving problems which have no parallel in history and demonstrating how Marxist theory should be applied in practice.

Marxism never was a series of dogmas and formulas; it never was a catalogue of prohibitions listing the things we must not do irrespective of new developments and new situations; it does not tell us that things cannot be done; it tells us how to do the things that have to be done, the things that history has posed as necessary and indispensable tasks. Marxism is a theory of deeds, not of don't's. Marxism is therefore a positive, dynamic, creative force, and it is such a great social power precisely because, as a scientific outlook and method, it takes living realities as its starting point. It has always regarded the scientific knowledge of the past as a basis for meeting the new and unprecedented problems of the present and the future. And the largest problems today are new in a very basic sense.

We have more than ever the task to refresh ourselves in the great tradition of Marxism, completely freeing ourselves from the last remnants of the dogmatic and schematic approach. . . .

True, according to all of the textbooks of the past, we are departing from orthodoxy, because none of our textbooks foresaw or predicted a long period of peaceful relations in the world before the general advent of socialism. (*Ibid.*, pp. 43-45.)

The new political course outlined by Browder found but few adversaries among the leading militants of the C.P.U.S.A. At the enlarged session of the political bureau of the Party, those who spoke up violently against Browder were William Foster, president of the C.P.U.S.A., and Darcy, member of the central committee and secretary of the Eastern Pennsylvania district.

Foster expounded his differences with Browder in two documents—in a letter to the national committee of the C.P.U.S.A. and in his introductory speech to the extraordinary session of the National Committee, Feb. 8, 1944.

In these two documents, Foster criticizes Browder's theoretical theses regarding the change in the character of monopoly capital in the U.S.A., the perspectives of postwar economic development as well as Browder's position on the question of the Presidential elections.

In his Feb. 8 speech Foster also attacks those who, on the basis of Browder's theses, suggested that strikes be renounced in the postwar period.

But in neither one of these documents did Foster openly take a stand against the dissolution of the Communist Party.

In his report Comrade Browder, in attempting to apply the Teheran decisions to the United States, drew a perspective of a smoothly working national unity, including the decisive sections of American finance capital, not only during the war but also in the postwar; a unity which (with him quoting approvingly from *Victory and After*), would lead to "a rapid healing of the terrible wounds of the war" and would extend on indefinitely, in an all-class peaceful collaboration, for a "long term of years." In this picture, American imperialism virtually disappears, there remains hardly a trace of the class struggle, and Socialism plays practically no role whatever. (*Foster Letter to Members of N. C.*)

Foster violently criticized Browder because the latter, while outlining a new course in the activity of the American C.P., had lost sight of several of the most fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism.

It seems to me that Comrade Browder's rather rosy outlook for capitalism is based upon two errors. The first of these is an underestimation of the deepening of the crisis of world capitalism caused by the war.

(Cont. p. 5)

When questioned directly in Political Bureau discussion, Comrade Browder agreed that capitalism has been seriously weakened by the war, but his report would tend to give the opposite implication. The impression is left that capitalism has somehow been rejuvenated and is now entering into a new period of expansion and growth. (*Ibid.*)

According to Foster, world capitalism can surely count on a certain postwar boom, but it would be wrong to think that capitalism, even American capitalism, could maintain itself at the production level attained in wartime, and resolve, in a measure more or less satisfactory to the working class, the complex problems arising after the war.

Without diminishing the importance of the Teheran conference, Foster considered, nevertheless, that it would be an extremely dangerous illusion to think that Teheran had in any way changed the class nature of capitalism, that the Teheran conference had liquidated the class struggle, as it appears from Browder's speech. The fact that capitalism has learned to live in peace and in alliance with socialism is far from meaning that American monopoly capitalism has become progressive and that it can henceforth be unreservedly included in national unity in the struggle for the realization of the Teheran conference decisions.

The class nature of imperialistic capitalism, Foster asserted, is reactionary. That is why national unity with it is impossible. The furious attack of these circles against the democratic Roosevelt government—does this not supply a convincing proof? Can one doubt, after that, that the monopolist sections in the U. S. are enemies and not friends of the Teheran decisions as Earl Browder thinks?

The danger in this whole point of view is that, in our eagerness to secure support for Teheran, we may walk into the trap of trying to cooperate with the enemies of Teheran, or even of falling under their influence. Trailing after the big bourgeoisie is the historic error of social-democracy, and we must be vigilantly on guard against it. (*Ibid.*)

Foster also criticized Browder for his attitude toward the National Association of Manufacturers, which is, in his opinion, one of the most reactionary organizations of monopoly capital in the U. S. However, Browder thought he had to approve a certain number of the economic measures of this association. He accepts its central slogan, that

of "free private enterprise," which is in reality basically reactionary and contrary to the Roosevelt policy. What is more, Browder, counting on seeing workers' wages increased 100 per cent after the war, invites U. S. monopolists to share his good intentions and says to them: "[You] must find the solution in order to keep their plants in operation."

Citing these words of Browder's, Foster declared:

In my opinion, it would be a catastrophe for the labor movement if it accepted such a plan or such an idea, even if only provisionally. Starting from a notoriously erroneous conception, that U. S. monopoly capitalism can play a progressive role Comrade Browder looks askance at all suggestions tending to subdue the monopolies, whereas the C.P. can accept only one policy, that of tending to master these big capitalists now and after the war. In calling for the collaboration of classes, Browder sows wrong illusions of tailism in the minds of trade union members. Whereas the job of the trade unions is to elaborate their policy and dictate it to the big employers.

As to the problems of postwar organizations, Foster repudiated all illusions regarding the self-styled progressive role of monopoly capital. America, Foster declared, will emerge from the war as a powerful state in the world, the industrial magnates will be rather inclined to dictatorial acts than to compromises, and it is hardly likely, he added, that we can expect a progressive program from them.

So far as the bulk of finance capi-

tal is concerned, starting out with a prewar record of appeasement, it has,

all through the war, followed a course of rank profiteering and often outright sabotage of both the domestic and foreign phases of the nation's war program, especially the former. While these elements obviously do not want the United States to lose the war, they are certainly very poor defenders of the policy of unconditional surrender. In the main, their idea of a satisfactory outcome of the war would be some sort of a negotiated peace with German reactionary forces, and generally to achieve a situation that would put a wet blanket on all democratic governments in Europe. (*Ibid.*)

Foster thinks that Browder is right when he says that the question of socialism is not the issue of the present war and that to pose this question would only result in restricting the framework of national unity. But considering the fact that the successes of the U.S.S.R. will increase the interest of the masses in socialism, the Communists must explain to the workers the importance of the socialist development of our epoch and the way in which it concerns the U. S., for otherwise the Social Democrats could represent themselves as a part of socialism.

The enforcement of the Teheran decisions, both in their national and international aspects, demands the broadest possible national unity, and in this national unity there must be workers, farmers, professionals, small businessmen and all of the capitalist elements who will loyally support the program. (*Ibid.*)

Foster's letter to the National Committee and his speech at the extraordinary session of the National Committee on Feb. 8, 1944, against Browder's line, provoked violent criticism from those in attendance. Most speakers rejected Foster's arguments and supported the "new course" of the C.P.U.S.A. outlined by Browder.

Speaking during the meeting against Browder, Darcy said that in his opinion Foster's speech was not aimed at diminishing Browder's authority. Like Forster, Darcy violently criticized the interpretation given by Browder of the Teheran decisions and asserted that the political agreement of the big three powers who constitute the Teheran conference should not be considered as an agreement on the principal post-war economic problems.

Afterwards Darcy was expelled from the Party by the Congress on the proposal of a commission named by the Central Committee and headed by Foster, because, as the decision says, by sending to Party members a letter containing slanderous declarations on Party leaders, he attempted to create a faction within the Party, and because he submitted the letter in question to the bourgeois press.

After the extraordinary session of the National Committee, a discussion on Browder's report to the plenary assembly of the Central Committee was opened in the basic organizations of the Party, in regional congresses and the Party press.

According to information published in the *Daily Worker*, after the discussion the organizations and regional congresses of the Party unanimously accepted Browder's proposals. As to Foster, he declared at the extraordinary session of the National Committee that he did not intend to make known his differences with Browder outside the Party Central Committee.

The Congress of the C.P.U.S.A. (held May 20, 1944) heard Browder's report in which he expressed his opinions regarding the political situation in the U. S. and he proposed adoption of a new course in the policy of Communists of the U. S.

Proposing a resolution on the dissolution of the C.P.U.S.A., Browder declared:

On Jan. 11 the National Committee of the Communist Party in the interest of national unity and to enable the Communists to function most effectively in the changed political conditions and to make still greater contributions toward winning the war and securing a durable

peace, recommended that the American Communists should renounce the aim of partisan advantage and the party form of organization. . . .

With that purpose I propose in the name of the National Committee and in consultation with the most important delegations in this Convention, the adoption of the following motion:

I hereby move that the Communist Party of America be and hereby is dissolved. . . . (*Proceedings*, p. 11.)

After having accepted the resolution on dissolution of the C.P., the Congress of the C.P.U.S.A. proclaimed itself the Constituent Congress of the Communist Political Association of the United States and adopted a programmatic introduction to the Association's statutes. In this introduction it is said:

The Communist Political Association is a non-party organization of Americans which, basing itself upon the working class, carries forward the traditions of Washington, Jefferson, Paine, Jackson and Lincoln, under the changed conditions of modern industrial society.

It seeks effective application of democratic principles to the solution of the problems of today, as an advanced sector of the democratic majority of the American people.

It upholds the Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution and its Bill of Rights, and the achievements of American democracy against all the enemies of popular liberties.

It is shaped by the needs of the nation at war, being formed in the midst of the greatest struggle of all history; it recognizes that victory for the free peoples over fascism will open up new and more favorable conditions for progress; it looks to the family of free nations, led by the great coalition of democratic capitalist and socialist states, to inaugurate an era of world peace, expanding production and economic well-being, and the liberation and equality of all peoples regardless of race, creed or color.

It adheres to the principles of scientific socialism, Marxism, the heritage of the best thought of humanity and of a hundred years' experience of the labor movement, principles which have proved to be indispensable to the national existence and independence of every nation: it looks forward to a future in which, by democratic choice of the American people, our own country will solve the problems arising out of the contradiction between the social character of production and its private ownership, incorporating the lessons of the most fruitful achievements of all mankind in a form and manner

consistent with American traditions and character. . . . (*Preamble, Proceedings*, pp. 47-48.)

The Constituent Congress of the C.P.A. adopted a main political resolution, "National Unity for Victory, Security and a Durable Peace."

The resolution points out the exceptional importance of the Teheran conference decisions for victory over the aggressor and establishment of a lasting peace. It calls for reinforcement of national unity as the necessary conditions for their application.

By national unity is meant union of all patriotic forces from Communists, Laborites to adherents of the Democratic and Republican parties. All ideological, religious and political differences must be subordinated to this unity. The resolution stresses the exceptional importance of the 1944 elections on whose results depend the country's unity and destiny. It recognizes the increasingly important role of the working class in national unity, its growing activity and its political influence.

* * * * *

The resolution then says that the majority of the American people are not yet convinced of the need for a radical solution to social and economic problems with the aid of nationalization of big industry or by

means of establishing socialism.

That is why, the immediate task consists in obtaining a higher level of production in the framework of the existing capitalist regime. With this, private employers must receive all possibilities to solve the problem of production and employment of labor. Solution of these problems is likewise, in the first place, linked to the maximum increase in the American people's purchasing power and extension of foreign commerce. If private industry cannot solve these tasks, the government must assume the responsibility.

The resolution expresses itself against anti-Semitism, anti-Negro discrimination, calls for the outlawing of the "fifth column" and for the banning of calls by the latter for a negotiated peace with the aggressor.

The resolution concludes:

For the camp of national unity, which is composed of the patriotic forces of all classes, from the working people to the capitalists, rests and depends upon the working class, the backbone and driving force of the nation and its win-the-war coalition. . . . It requires the extension of labor's united action of the A. F. of L., the C.I.O. and Railroad Brotherhoods. It requires the most resolute development of labor's political initiative and influence, with labor's full and adequate participation in the government. . . .

. . . we Communists, as patriotic Americans, renew our sacred pledge to the nation to subordinate everything to win the war and to destroy fascism. . . . (*Resolutions*, p. 7.)

In addition to the resolution on "National Unity," the C.P.A. Congress passed a series of other decisions: on transition from war to peacetime production; on international trade union unity; on the C.P.A.'s wage policy; on political life as it regards demobilized veterans; on work among women; on farmers; on the situation in the southern states; on suppressing the poll tax; on the fight against anti-Semitism; on unity among countries of the western hemisphere and on the 25th anniversary of the Communist movement in the U. S.

The congress unanimously elected Browder president of the C.P.A.

The C.P.A. Congress addressed a message to Comrade Stalin and the Red Army saying especially:

In every American city and village, every factory and farm of our great land, men and women and children of all classes speak with wonder and deep gratitude of the heroic achievements of the Soviet Union and its valiant Red Army. Every day since the brutal and treacherous common Fascist enemy violated your borders on June 22, 1941, more of the American people have come to know and love your leaders and your people.

The political and military leadership of the U.S.S.R. and its mighty Red Army is applauded not only by our great political and military leaders, but by our workers, farmers, businessmen, professional people, artists, scientists and youth. The appeasers of the Hitlerites and the enemies of our common victory, who have been trying to frighten us with Hitler's "Soviet bogey," have not succeeded in blinding our people to the realities. Your deeds daily speak with an authority that drowns their poisonous words.

As the relentless offensives of your mighty forces drive the Nazis from your soil, bringing nearer the day of your common and final victory over the Fascist enemy, we grow ever more conscious of our enormous debt

to you, the leaders and fighters and peoples of the great Soviet land. The names of your liberated towns and villages are daily on our lips, the name of Stalin and the names of your countless heroes enshrined in our hearts.

Daily more and more of our people understand why it is that yours, the world's first Socialist state, has given the world such an unparalleled example of unity, heroism, individual initiative and a new discipline in the art and science of warfare.

All patriotic Americans are determined to strengthen still further the concerted action of the United Nations, and its leading coalition of our country, the Soviet Union and England on which our assurance of victory rests. They are determined to continue and deepen this coalition in the peace to come and to extend the friendship among our peoples which will cement the alliance of our two powerful nations as the mainstay of victory, national freedom and an enduring peace." (Message to Stalin, *Proceedings*, pp. 13-14.)

After the Constituent Congress, the leadership of the C.P.A. waged a campaign of explanation on the aims and tasks of the Association.

In one of his speeches Browder said:

... That is why we dissolved the Communist Party, renounced all aims of partisan advancement, and regrouped ourselves into the non-partisan Communist Political Association. That is why we are ready and willing to work with any and all Americans who place victory in the war as the first law, and who move toward such a minimum program as we have outlined for the solution of our postwar problems. This is why we do not associate ourselves with any other political party, but rather with the most forward-looking men in all parties. ("The War and the Elections," *Daily Worker*, June 18, 1944.)

Explaining the functions of the C.P.A., its organizational secretary, Williamson, declared:

As regards the functioning of the Association, we emphasize that this means manifold increase and improvement in every aspect of political-educational activity, on a national, state and local club basis. We must become known as an organization whose grasp of Marxism provides us with correct answers to the complex political problems confronting the people. While the members belong to, and are active in, every type of mass organization—political, economic, cultural, fraternal, etc.—the Association in its own name will speak out boldly and with authority on all issues and policies." (Williamson, *Proceedings*, pp. 55-56.)

The practical activity of the C.P.A. since the Congress was subordinated to the principal task of the hour: active participation of the C.P.A. in the 1944 election campaign.

The national C.P.A. Congress unanimously backed Mr. Roosevelt's Presidential candidacy. In their speeches, Browder and the other leaders of the C.P.A. in the name of the C.P.A. supported Mr. Roosevelt's election to a fourth term. The regional-state organizations of the C.P.A. and local clubs carried on an active propaganda campaign in favor of Mr. Roosevelt and congressional candidates favorable to Mr. Roosevelt.

On Sept. 25, 1944, during a meeting called by the New York C.P.A. on the 25th anniversary of the Communist movement in the U. S., Browder said:

... every group, however small, just as every individual has the same supreme duty to make its complete and unconditional contribution to victory. We must give not only our lives, but we must be ready also to sacrifice our prejudices, our ideologies, and our special interests. We American Communists have applied this rule first of all to ourselves.

We know that Hitler and the Mikado calculated to split the United Nations on the issue of Communism and anti-Communism; we know that the enemy calculated to split America on this issue in the current elections, and thus prepare our country for withdrawal from the war and a compromise peace. We therefore set ourselves, as our special supreme task, to remove the Communists and Communism from this election campaign as in any way an issue, directly or indirectly.

To this end we unhesitatingly sacrificed our electoral rights in this campaign, by refraining from putting

forward our own candidates; we went to the length of dissolving the Communist Party itself for an indefinite period in the future; we declared our readiness to loyally support the existing system of private enterprise which is accepted by the overwhelming majority of Americans, and to raise no proposals for any fundamental changes which could in any way endanger the national unity; we went out into the trade unions and the masses of the people, straightforwardly and frankly using all our influence to firmly establish this policy of national unity; we helped with all our strength to restrain all impulses toward strike movements among the workers, and to prepare the workers for a continuation of national unity after the war. . . .

As spokesman for American Communists I can say for our small group that we completely identify ourselves with our nation, its interests and the majority of its people, in this support for Roosevelt and Truman for President and Vice-President.

We know quite well that the America that Roosevelt leads is a capitalist America, and that it is the mission of Roosevelt, among other things, to keep it so. We know that only great disasters for our country could change this perspective of our country from that of capitalism to that of socialism, in the foreseeable future. Only failure to carry through the war to victory or a botching of the peace and failure to organize it, or the plunging of our country into another economic catastrophe like that of the Hoover era, could turn the American people to socialism.

We do not want disaster for America, even though it results in socialism. If we did, we would support Dewey and Hoover and Bricker and their company. We want victory in the war, with the Axis powers and all their friends eliminated from the world. We want a world organized for generations of peace.

We want our country's economy fully at work, supplying a greatly multiplied world market to heal the wounds of the world, a greatly expanded home market reflecting rising standards of living here, and an orderly, cooperative and democratic working out of our domestic and class relationships, within a continuing national unity that will reduce and eventually eliminate large domestic struggles. . . .

That is why American Communists, even as our great Communist forebears in 1860 and 1864 supported Abraham Lincoln, will in 1944 support Franklin Delano Roosevelt for President of the United States. . . .

As to Browder's attitude toward the Soviet Union, he highly appreciates the U.S.S.R.'s role in the United Nations system and in the work of finally crushing Hitlerite Germany and establishing a lasting peace after the war. Browder stressed more than once that the Soviet state built by Lenin and Stalin constitutes the irreplaceable force which saved the world from fascist slavery and he called for it to be made known to all Americans all the wisdom of Leninist-Stalinist theory that made the Soviet Union great and powerful.

From an organizational point of view, the C.P.A. structure is as follows: the basic organizational cell is the territorial club whose general meeting is called once a month. Between general membership meetings all the work planned by the club is carried out by its committee, made up of the most active members. The clubs are subordinated to regional C.P.A. councils. The leading organization of the C.P.A. is the National Committee elected for two years at the Association Congress. The Association's president and 11 vice-presidents elected by the Congress comprise the permanent leading organization of the Association.

The C.P.A. Congress set forth maintenance of the principle of democratic centralism as the structural basis of the Association. Williamson, C.P.A. organizational secretary, explained to the Congress in these terms the application of the democratic centralism principle of the C.P.A.:

... While maintaining a structure

and minimum organizational requirements compatible with the character of a Marxist political educational association, we must grant greater autonomy to the lower organizations, emphasize that democracy is a two-way street from top to bottom and bottom to top, and eliminate all rigidity of organization. (Williamson, *Proceedings*, p. 58.)

The National Congress of the Political Association adopted the C.P.A. constitution in which it said that everyone who wishes to belong to the C.P.A. accepts its program and its line.

Explaining who can belong to the Association, the *Daily Worker* wrote:

We can ask of new applicants to membership in the Party only loyalty to the principles that are already comprehensive to all workers, devotion to the most basic duties of action today; plus a willingness and eagerness to study the program and history and the theory which will make them thorough Communists. And above all a willingness to fight, to sacrifice in the war of mankind against Nazi enslavement is the first requirement for entering the Communist Party. (Minor, *Daily Worker*, Feb., 1944.)

At the time of its dissolution the Communist Party of the United States, according to Browder's declaration, had 20,000 members without counting the 10,000 Party members in the army. According to the Congress decisions all

members of the C.P.U.S.A. are members of the C.P.A. and must register before July 4, 1944. As the *Daily Worker* announced up to July 16, 1944, hardly 45,000 persons had been registered.

Without analyzing in detail Browder's full position on the dissolution of the C.P.U.S.A. and creation of the Communist Political Association, and without making a developed critique of this position, one can nevertheless deduce from it the following conclusions:

1. The course applied under Browder's leadership ended in practice in liquidation of the independent political party of the working class in the U. S.

2. Despite declarations regarding recognition of the principles of Marxism, one is witnessing a notorious revision of Marxism on the part of Browder and his supporters, a revision which is expressed in the concept of a long-term class peace in the United States, of the possibility of the suppression of the class struggle in the postwar period and of establishment of harmony between labor and capital.

3. By transforming the Teheran declaration of the Allied governments, which is a document of a diplomatic character, into a political platform of class peace in the United States in the postwar period, the American Communists are deforming in a radical way the meaning of the Teheran declaration and are sowing dangerous opportunist illusions which will exercise a negative influence on the American labor movement if they are not met with the necessary reply.

4. According to what is known up to now, the Communist Parties of most countries have not approved Browder's position and several Communist Parties (for example that of the Union of South Africa and that of Australia) have come out openly against this position, while the Communist Parties of several South American countries (Cuba, Colombia) regarded the position of the American Communists as correct and in general followed the same path.

Such are the facts. Such are the elements of understanding which permit passing judgment on the dissolution of the American Communist Party. French Communists will not fail to examine in the light of Marxist-Leninist critique the arguments developed to justify the dissolution of the American Communist Party. One can be sure that, like the Communists of the Union of South Africa and of Australia, the French Communists will not approve the policy followed by Browder for it has swerved dangerously from the victorious Marxist-Leninist doctrine whose rigorously scientific application could lead to but one conclusion, not to dissolve the American Communist Party but to work to strengthen it under the banner of stubborn struggle to defeat Hitler Germany and destroy everywhere

the extensions of fascism.

The fact that all the members of the Communist Party of the United States did not sign up automatically in the Communist Political Association shows that the dissolution of the Party provoked anxieties, perfectly legitimate.

* * * * *

In truth, nothing justifies the dissolution of the American Communist Party, in our opinion. Browder's analysis of capitalism in the United States is not distinguished by a judicious application of Marxism-Leninism. The predictions regarding a sort of disappearance of class contradictions in the U. S. correspond in no wise to a Marxist-Leninist understanding of the situation.

As to the argument consisting of a justification of the Party's dissolution by the necessity of not taking direct part in the presidential elections, this does not withstand a serious examination. Nothing prevents a Communist Party from adapting its electoral tactics to the requirements of a given political situation. It is clear that American

Communists were right in supporting the candidacy of President Roosevelt in the last elections, but it was not at all necessary for this to dissolve the Communist Party.

It is beyond doubt that if, instead of dissolving the Communist Party of the United States all had been done to intensify its activity in the sense of developing an ardent national and anti-fascist policy, it could very greatly have consolidated its position and considerably extended its political influence. On the contrary, formation of the Communist Political Association could not but trouble the minds and obscure the perspectives in the eyes of the working masses.

In France, under cover of Resistance unity, certain suggestions for the liquidation of the party have been circulated, with more or less discretion, during the last months, but none among us has ever thought of taking such suggestions seriously. It is not by liquidating the Party that we would have served national unity. On the contrary we are serving it by strengthening our Party. And as far as the American Communists are concerned, it is clear that their desire to serve the unity of their country and the cause of human progress places before them tasks which pre-suppose the existence of a powerful Communist Party.

After the Teheran decisions came the Yalta decisions which expressed the will of the Big Three to liquidate fascism in Germany and to help the liberated peoples to liquidate the remnants of fascism in the different countries.

It is scarcely necessary to recall that the material bases for fascism reside in the trusts, and the great objective of this war, the annihilation of fascism, can only be obtained to the extent in

which the forces of democracy and progress do not shut their eyes to the economic and political circumstances which engender fascism.

The American Communists have an especially important role to play in the struggle taking place between the progressive forces of the earth and fascist barbarism.

Without any doubt they would have been in a better position to play this role in the interests of their country and human progress if, instead of proceeding to dissolve their Party, they had done everything to strengthen it and make of it one of the elements of the assembling of the broad democratic masses of the United States for the final crushing of fascism, that shame of the 20th century. It would be useless to hide the fact that fascism has more or less concealed sympathizers in the U. S., as it has in France and other countries.

* * * * *

And it is clear that if Comrade Earl Browder had seen, as a Marxist-Leninist, this important aspect of the problems facing liberty-loving peoples in this moment in their history, he would have arrived at a conclusion quite other than the dissolution of the Communist Party of the United States.

END ITEM

The Struggle Against Opportunism In The Labor Movement - For A Socialist United States

By William F. Dunne

Table of Contents

1. Preface

2. The Economic, Social and Political Basis for a Socialist United States

We base our program for the political preparation of the workingclass of the United States for the abolition of the system of monopoly capitalism (imperialism) and the establishment of a socialist system of production and government as the main, immediate and central task of Marxists (Communists and Marxist Socialists) and the unification of these forces for this high purpose, on the following facts and conclusions:

1). All the material resources for a socialist economy are present in our country in abundance—raw materials, industrial plants, power-producing enterprises, transportation, highly developed agricultural resources.

2). All the productive social forces are present to administer socialist government.

3). The workingclass of the United States (wage earning population and its families and dependents) is the great majority of our total population. With its close natural allies—the 14 million doubly oppressed Negro people, landless and debt-ridden farmers and city middle class of the lower economic brackets, it is the overwhelming majority of our population.

4). The monopoly capitalists (Wall Street banks and insurance companies, the 60 imperial families) now own and control the largest production system in the world. During World War II, all sections of this already huge network of industry expanded enormously. It produced far in excess of the needs of the armed forces of some 12 million without undue strain. It supplied much of the needs of the allies. It established bases all over the world whose respective productive capacity was greater than that of many of the smaller capitalist countries.

This enormous tonnage of raw and finished goods—whose sum total has never been even approached before—was produced without the normal influx of young labor reserves into the mass production industries but also when this section of the productive population as well as several million older trained workers, engineers, and technicians, were withdrawn for the armed forces. Their places were filled by inexperienced women workers and men of advanced age.

Labor Power and Production

There is little or no exaggeration in saying that if this same tonnage of raw and finished commodities had been used for production instead of destruction—in terms of industrial plants, mining machinery, light and power plants, railways, etc.—it would have been sufficient to industrialize (and modernize agriculture) the more thickly populated regions of the earth at least up to the technical standard of 1914-18 France.

5). The vast majority of our population live by, or are dependent on, the sale of labor power to industries and businesses owned or dominated by monopoly capital. They own no tools of production. They own no capitalist property by ownership of which others must

work for them. This vast army of scientists, engineers of all categories, chemists, technicians, mechanics and laborers in all trades and occupations, and their dependents, make up the great majority of population.

Due to highly developed industrial organization and standardized techniques, the universality of motorized transport, the mechanization of agriculture, the transformation into industrial workers of huge sections of the agrarian and white collar workers by war demand for labor power, this majority of the population is the most technically capable and efficient in the world.

But its share of the "vast accumulation of commodities" it produces (wages, salaries) decreases. The huge surplus is the property of a small minority.

6). There is no other capitalist nation or combination of capitalist nations capable of seriously crippling or hampering the development of a social system in our country by armed intervention and invasion as was and still is the case with the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

7). With all this vast wealth of natural resources, unmatched industrial development and huge army of highly trained productive workers of all categories, peace time prosperity has been achieved for brief periods in our country in the last 23 years only as the result of markets expanded by preparations for two world wars and the demand created by military destruction on a world-wide scale. Five and one-half years of this period were devoted to two world wars.

The depression of 1913-14 was replaced by industrial activity resulting from the war demand previous to and after our entry into World War I. The United States became a creditor nation only during and after that war. Monopoly capitalist expansion in the U. S. after that war was the result of demand for goods and capital created by destruction of life and property unparalleled up to that time.

But the boom period was short-lived, 1924-29. The subsequent crisis, depression, brief partial recovery, renewed depression, lasting ten years, was replaced by industrial activity again resulting only from preparations for the outbreak of and our entry into World War II.

There has been bloodstained

boom and war prosperity now since 1940-41.

The truth cannot be hidden. In this fearful truth is to be found the reason why our country, undamaged by the war which wrecked the economy of the rest of the capitalist world, and severely damaged the socialist economy of the Soviet Union, emerging from the holocaust which consumed the material wealth and millions of mankind of other warring nations, with its industrial and agricultural capacity greatly increased, presents a paradox to the eyes and ears of the world's peoples.

The Great Fear

The spokesmen of monopoly capitalism and its government in our country, their press and radio, their analysts and commentators, present to the world a picture of the highest monopoly capitalist and government circles in the richest country in the world in the grip of a great fear. Their worldwide offensive in behalf of "free enterprise" is in fact a not too brilliant defense. No one knows the weakness of the case for "free enterprise" better than the highest circles of its beneficiaries.

Two things they know very well indeed and their fear is justified because it is based not on danger from foreign attack—imperialist or Communist—but on fear of the great majority of our people, workingmen and women, Negro and white:

The monopoly capitalists and their advisers know better than anyone else that their "free enterprise" is not free at all. They know better than anyone else that its objective is to destroy the last vestiges of free enterprise remaining from the pre-monopolist, pre-imperialist era. They know also that to the liberty loving peoples of the rest of the world they appear as the main support of feudal, fascist and imperialist reaction.

The monopoly capitalists know, and their fear of the workingclass is based, and rightly, on the fact that more of our class are reaching the correct conclusion about the economic, political and military history of the last 30 years—in the lifetime of men and women still young.

That correct conclusion is: The system of monopoly capitalism in our country has been able to achieve a precarious stability in the last three decades by one method and one method alone. That method is war on a world scale.

Twice in 27 years the gigantic accumulation of goods—"mountains of commodities" have been destroyed by wars which replace these mountains of commodities, for which there were no buyers, with mountains of corpses.

The men and women whose bodies made the mountains of corpses were the men and women who had produced the mountains of commodities. There were such great mountains of commodities for which there were no profitable markets that it was necessary to slaughter millions of human beings so there would be fewer buyers.

This is the mass homicidal lunatic logic of free enterprise (capitalist imperialism and its defenders) in our country—the richest country in the world, the most blessed by nature.

The bloody mud of the worldwide battlefields is not yet dry. But mountains of commodities are beginning to accumulate in our country again. Once more the defenders of free enterprise are preparing the minds of workers, who produce the "mountains of commodities" to permit again the conversion of their bodies into mountains of corpses.

This is our case for a program for a socialist United States—the only victorious, sane and final way to end monopoly capitalism and the effects of its lunatic economic logic—mass destruction to maintain prosperity.

Pre-monopolist capitalism produced small wars. Monopoly capitalism produces world wars. World wars can be postponed but they cannot be prevented under the system of monopoly capitalism. War, and the preparations for war, is an inevitable product of this system and has now become the normal market outlet for the "vast accumulations of commodities."

But it is not inevitable that the system of monopoly capitalism continues to exist. The grip of the monopolists by means of their ownership and control of the means of life, their domination of government to maintain their power to rob and rule can, must, and will be broken.

Take Power from Them

The natural resources and the means of production now in their

hands, and which are the source of their economic and political power, must be taken from them—and become public (social) property. Socialist government will plan and administer social production. Government power now in the interests of the monopoly capitalist minority becomes government in the interest of the vast majority—workingmen and women.

This is the program of socialism and this is the only way out of the murderous maze into which monopoly capitalism has plunged our country and the world twice in 27 years.

It will do it again unless it is abolished and a socialist system established by a politically conscious workingclass, aroused and made resolute by full knowledge of the truth—that history has made it possible for the workingmen and women of the United States, by freeing themselves, to end the horror of fascism and war forever—and liberate the working people of the whole world.

No such glorious destiny and decisive role has ever been given to the workingclass of any other country—and to its most advanced detachments—Communist and Marxist Socialists.—WFD.

(Cont. p. 8)

3. The Present Situation— The Perspective— The Tasks

By William F. Dunne

The American workingclass is in a militant mood. The preparations for new and more powerful attacks on the workingclass and the organized labor movement are well advanced in Wall Street and government circles. Gigantic class battles are in prospect. Labor and its allies, the fourteen million Negro people, the working farmers, sections of the professional and liberal middle class, will fight to repel the attacks of monopoly capital, and the fascist shock troop detachments it is mobilizing. Every Communist will work for unity and fight "above and beyond the call of duty" in these struggles.

Capitalism's Merciless Logic

The fact that such great and continuous defensive struggles must be engaged in by the workingclass, in the richest country in the world, must be utilized by the Communists to show the merciless anti-labor logic of the capitalist system and the necessity for abolishing it.

The main, immediate and central task of Communists today in the United States is to win our class, the mighty, militant and well-organized workingclass, which is an absolute majority of the population, for a socialist program. This central task is to prepare our class for the abolition of the capitalist-imperialist system. Without socialism as its goal, the workingclass—in spite of its resolute economic struggles, will fight heroic but losing battles. This is the lesson of all labor history.

Our main and immediate task is to unite our class—not only for militant struggle for living standards and against "the daily encroachments" of the capitalist class and its government upon hard won rights—but to unite it for victorious struggle for a socialist system of production in the United States. The sixty imperial families and their mercenaries of press and radio have no solution except more work for lower real wages, unemployment, and war.

Our central task as Communists is to prepare the workingclass for the inevitable break with their imperialist rulers and their satellite fascist and neo-fascist prophets. We must convince the working class of our country that it is a choice between fascism and freedom, that it is its historical duty, and that it has the power, to put an end for all time to the exploitation of man by man in this, the richest country in the world—the last remaining really decisive base of world capitalism.

U. S. Workers Decisive

The workingclass in the United States is in a decisive position. Victory for a program of socialism in our country will end forever the constant threat of a new world holocaust. The American workingclass has the power to dissipate the danger of a new imperialist world war in which the bodies of tens of millions of people would again be tendered as bloody burnt offerings on the dual altar of Mammon and Mars—the only method by which the monopolists and their imperialist system now maintain and restore "prosperity" in these United States. Only the workingclass, headed by its advanced detachments, who have freed themselves of all defeatist illusions implanted by the propagandists of their exploiters, can rally round itself and lead all other anti-capitalist forces in this decisive and inevitable struggle.

The creation of a conscious workingclass committed to a program for the abolition of capitalism and establishment of revolutionary socialism is the main, immediate and central task of Communists in the United States.

Millions of militant workingmen and women in the decisive industries and occupations in this most richly endowed by nature of all capitalist countries, are waiting to hear and welcome a program to release the wealth of the country to supply the needs of its population—instead of using it to increase the wealth and power of a ruthless ruling minority.

If we Communists make Marxism-Leninism and its treasury of knowledge of the laws of motion of capitalist society in this "period of wars and revolutions", the property of these millions by releasing it from opportunist classrooms and the clutch of sectarian pedagogues, these millions of our class can be trusted to make it their guide to thought and action. They will take the hard but sure road toward socialism once they are shown the way because there is no other choice except more intensive exploitation, increasing social degradation, and war.

Only those who know little and care less about the workingclass of the United States believe it will make the latter choice. Only those who in this way rationalize their fear of what seems to them an impregnable system of robbing and ruling by greedy and bloody-minded men; only those who fear the anger of an aroused and determined conscious workingclass as much or even more than they fear the monopolists and their mercenaries can make themselves believe such defeatist slander of the mighty workingclass of the United States.

Great Responsibility

To prepare the working class for the responsibility of leading the struggle for its own liberation and that of all other exploited groups of the population is the central task of Communists. There is no other reason for their existence.

History has placed this heavy responsibility upon the Communists of the United States and upon the workingclass of which they are the most politically advanced section. To understand the necessity of this task—now made more than ever urgent by the decline and decay of the capitalist-imperialist system and the geometrically increasing intensity of the evils it inflicts upon the peoples of the world—is to accept it.

We shall not falter and we shall not fail provided all defeatist revision of Marxist-Leninist theory and perversion of its strategy and tactics are eliminated from our ranks.

4. Tactics, Alliances, Immediate Demands in Struggle for Socialist Program

Since the only reason for the existence of Marxist-Leninist political parties (Communist parties, irrespective of designation) and of the science of Marxism is to guide and coordinate the struggle to replace capitalism by a socialist system—the transition period out of which develops the classless Communist society,—it follows that tactical compromises in the field of the class struggle by Communists must advance the interest of the workingclass as the only class capable of leading other exploited classes in this direction—or they are ipso facto defeatist.

This is the key to the question of tactics — and compromises. These questions arise every day because of the immensely complex nature of class relationships in capitalist society—a complexity it is hard to resolve into its component parts because of the domination of the channels of information by the capitalist class and their agencies—press, radio, etc.

Delusion of "Practicality"

Tactical compromises are necessary and must be made on the basis of the concrete situation in all its aspects—but with no compromise on principle. Compromises which in their practical results substitute a program of reforms within capitalist society for the

program of abolition of capitalism and the establishment of socialism are neither compromises nor practical. They are surrender, political and moral suicide.

Such are the results of opportunism. Since all Marxists agree that socialism is the only victorious way out for the workingclass from the continual round of crises, depressions, unemployment and world wars of ever increasing mass destruction, the substitution of other goals as the central, main

and immediate task of the most advanced party of its class constitutes rejection of its reason for existence and surrender to enemies of socialism—including those who profess belief in socialism but deny the decisive role of the workingclass and its Marxist party.

The opportunist wreckers in the leadership of the CP have made this substitution—and defend it against all criticism to the point of expelling and denouncing as enemies of the workingclass all Communists who characterize this substitution as surrender of all principles—putting this leadership in the camp of opportunism which aids in deceiving the workingclass.

Business Boosters

"This projected foreign-economic program of the GOP, a logical counterpart of the Hoover-Vandenberg-Byrnes 'get tough with Russia' policy, is bound even more grievously to impair friendly and cooperative relations among the Big Three and the other United Nations. Its effect will be to promote further distrust and enmity toward the USA abroad; to lose for us allies and good neighbors, including opportunities for expanding peaceful commerce and exchange. (Our emphasis).

"... It . . . hampers the development of world trade and restricts the opportunities of American commerce in the world markets. (Our emphasis). These factors are hastening and accelerating the maturing of the next cyclical economic crisis. And the likelihood is that this crisis may break out—unless retarded by a great economic and political counter-offensive of the masses of the people—in 1948, or maybe even during the last half of 1947." (Page 17—Dennis Report, Dec. 3-5, '46—Emphasis in original).

The above categorical statements show clearly that this leadership is in the reformist camp. It is trying to save monopoly capitalism from its contradictions.

This leadership has abandoned the work Communists are supposed to do. This leadership is not made up of Communists who are agitators, propagandists, organizers for the workingclass, preparing it politically for acceptance of and struggle for socialism as the only victorious way out of crises, unemployment, poverty, and imperialist war.

This leadership is functioning openly as "statesmen" of a "liberal" capitalist system. It is even calling upon the merciless laws of monopoly capitalism to cease working—and thereby halt "the next cyclical economic crisis!" It is competing with the most expert demagogues of the capitalist parties in maintaining and even extending the illusions concerning the capitalist system and its government.

Opportunist Cycle

The opportunist cycle is completed. To Marxists it is clear that the revisionists of the European Social-democracy have at last had their opportunist record broken to smithereens by these "practical" American advocates of "unity" without principle.

The cold truth is that this leadership shrinks from the struggle to win the workingclass for Marxist socialism. Marxist socialism is the goal mainly of the poor, the propertyless, the dispossessed, for working people in city and countryside who do the hard, dirty, unpleasant jobs, and whose lives know little glamor but are filled with constant worry and insecurity. Marxist socialism can never be respectable in capitalist and upper bracket middle class circles. Both fear the workingclass because one robs it directly in production and the other assists in the process.

Alliances—Why and How?

Are alliances and compromises with the middle class and their parties and other organizations permissible? Of course. But sections of the middle class enter into alliance with the workingclass, with Communists, only when their own economic, political and social interests are threatened by monopoly capital and its government to the extent that it must have allies to strengthen its defensive actions.

Is it necessary in the present period for Communists and the workingclass and its organized labor movement to enter into alliances with the middle class? Of course it is, provided it is an alliance and not a surrender to their program and leadership; provided the program and points of agreement allow full freedom for special demands of the workingclass—and for the campaign for socialism as the only victorious way out for the workingclass—the great majority of the population.

This is not the kind of tactical compromise into which this opportunist leadership is trying to deceive and drive the CP membership and non-party workers and intellectuals it hopes to influence.

Opportunist Chicanery

This is surrender of the socialist objective. It is justified (Bittelman articles in the Daily Worker) by the vulgar opportunist conception, harking back to the Second International, that there is and must be an indefinite period in which the workingclass does not try to assume independent political leadership but accepts middle class demands and leadership. For itself it makes only limited economic demands so as not to "alienate" the middle class.

According to this theory, which also has syndicalist roots, open advocacy of and continuous campaigning to win the workingclass for a socialist program hampers the struggle for immediate demands.

The exact contrary is true since the greater the socialist understanding in the ranks of the workingclass, the more resolute and effective are all struggle for immediate economic and social gains, the greater the unity in these struggles as a result of the knowledge of the class nature of the capitalist system and distrust and hatred of the robber class, its mercenaries, its methods and its class objectives.

Deception is multiplied by the deliberate effort to create confusion in regard to "the political preparation of the workingclass for the struggle for socialism" and "the immediate struggle for socialism."

It is a demonstrable fact, a matter of common knowledge, that the workingclass in our country is not now prepared to challenge capitalist-imperialism as a system; that it does not, as class, or even decisive sections of it, accept the program of abolition of capitalism and the establishment of a socialist order as the only way out of the multiplying evils monopoly capitalism heaps upon it.

Crime of Confusion

It is this creation of confusion instead of clarity which constitutes one of the major crimes of this opportunist leadership. The limited extent of socialist consciousness in the ranks of the workingclass—the entire absence of it for that matter—(although this is by no means the case)—should make it all the more urgent that Communists in the most advanced capitalist country in the world, where the workingclass is an absolute majority of the population, should be dedicated to "the political preparation of the workingclass for socialism."

This is incontrovertible. The more intensive that preparation is, the larger the number of workers who accept the program for a socialist United States, the easier and more effective will be such tactical compromises with other parties and other social classes, and therefore temporary alliances with them against the attacks of monopoly capital.

It should be clear to even backward children that winning a million workers for a Marxist socialist program, by placing this as the central and immediate task in all Communist activity (an entirely feasible task in a year or two) would pretty much settle the question of Communist participation in united fronts for a program of immediate demands together with middle class groups and workers still under middle class leadership.

If not exactly welcomed with open arms, Communists would then obviously be necessary to such united front struggles in our country.

Enemies of Communism and socialism would then be compelled to discuss all such issues on a political basis—not on the basis of slander, innuendo and outright ignorance because there would then be no doubts as to the Communist objective—a Socialist United States.

In the political struggle of the workingclass for its emancipation opportunist intrigue as a substitute for class power leads only to denial of the struggle to win the workingclass for Marxist socialism, leads only to defeat and disgrace. This leadership in its surrender to reformist capitalism and adoption of demagogic deception of the CP membership and the workingclass as a policy, replacing political preparation of the workingclass for the abolition of capitalism as the present source of the major ills of mankind, succumbs to the worst forms of capitalist parliamentary corruption.

Leninist Goal and Method

It rejects—and slanders and expels—Communists who insist on the adoption of Marxist-Leninist methods and objectives:

"The Communists in . . . America must learn to create a new, unusual, non-opportunist, non-careerist parliamentarism; the Communist parties must issue their slogans; real proletarians, with the help of the unorganized and very poorest people, should scatter and distribute leaflets, canvass the workers' houses and the . . . rural proletarians . . .; they should go into the most common taverns, penetrate into the unions, societies and casual meetings where the common people gather, and talk to the people, not in scientific (and not very parliamentary) language, not in the least strive to get seats in parliament, but everywhere to rouse the thoughts of the masses and draw them into the struggle, to take the bourgeoisie at their word, to utilize the apparatus they have set up, the elections they have called for, the appeal to the country they have made, and to tell the people what Communism is in a way that has not been possible (under bourgeois rule) outside of election times (not counting of course times of big strikes . . .) It is very difficult to do this in . . . America, very, very difficult; but it can and must be done." . . . the tasks of Communists cannot be fulfilled without effort . . ." (Lenin—Selected Works—Vol. 10—Page 142. (Our emphasis))

This was written in 1920—when the CP, then only a year old, was under heavier attack than any it has experienced since. Thousands of its members had been arrested on a nationwide scale in the Palmer raids; the CP had been compelled to go underground. Its press was illegal. But Lenin did not suggest that even under such difficult conditions the CP abandon its central and immediate task and program for winning the workingclass and poorer sections of the population for socialism.

But this is exactly what this notorious revisionist leadership has done—and in a period of the greatest political freedom and opportunity for agitation, propaganda and mass distribution of Marxist literature—in a period of gigantic strikes in basic industries on a scale never seen before in our country—involving some 4,000,000 workers.

Clarity vs. Confusion

The most urgent need in the

labor movement today—deluged as it is with pro-capitalist propaganda, from the founts of the outright supporters of monopoly capitalism and all points of its program, through the deception technique of Wallace—New Republic middle class grouping with its "free enterprise without monopolies or cartels" to the even more obsolete slogan of the opportunist leadership of the Communist Party: "Resurrect the Roosevelt program"—is a clear understanding of the objectives, strategy and tactics of the socialist class struggle.

The opportunist leadership of the CP for years has acted and continues to act as though the principles of Marxist-Leninism were a collection of mystic rubrics for which they have been selected as sole guardians. The science of Marxism is the most precious and practical heritage of the workingclass of all countries. To sequester this heritage in sectarian cloisters from which it is doled out in adulterated doses is one of those revisionist crimes against the workingclass (especially in the United States, the most highly developed and dominant imperialist country) which, in classical religious terms would be called a sin against the Holy Ghost.

In Old Testament terms (and Marxist terms as well) it is the crime of scribes, pharisees and philistines.

Utmost clarity on these questions is imperative. We are including therefore what we are convinced is one of the most concise summations of the best Marxist thought on these questions. It combines the history of the development and application of theory and practice from the earlier period of capitalism into this period of imperialism—"the final stage of capitalism": Study of this brilliant exposition will do much to clear up questions concerning the main reasons for the situation today in which the leadership and program of the CP have placed it: Namely, trailing behind and cheering on the demagogic politicians of the two capitalist parties and their pro-capitalist programs instead of being the leading force in the preparation of the workingclass for the political struggle for a socialist United States.

Serious study of these basic rules which govern and make possible the correct application of Marxist-Leninist theory, strategy and tactics, in the light of the present stage of the class struggle in our country, leads inescapably to but one conclusion: The program of the CP, essentially the same as that of middle class reformists and pro-capitalist trade union bureaucrats, makes ineffective, in terms of real wages and living and working conditions, the trade union struggle against the "daily encroachments" of monopoly capitalism on these economic and social standards.

Defeatism In All Fields

The program is based first of all on the appeal to the monopoly capitalists to the effect that the granting of its economic demands will stabilize their system and avert a crisis.

Second, the demands are not based on the needs of the workingclass but on the ability of the monopolists and their government to make even greater profits.

Third, this program is put forward in the name of "unity"—but in the CIO and in the A.F. of L. the "unity" for joint struggle for such demands is achieved by eliminating the elementary trade union and democratic political rights of the membership—including Communists. (This is dealt with in another section).

Fourth, This non-existent "unity" is used to justify the jettisoning of the main, major and immediate task of Communists—winning the workingclass for a socialist program.

Opportunist "Unity"

A study of Marxist-Leninist strategy and tactics is especially necessary at this time because of the intensity and scope of the offensive of monopoly capitalism and its government; it is especially necessary because the opportunist

leadership of the CP separates mass resistance to this powerful drive on union rights, living standards, social and political gains, from the main, immediate and central task of using the lessons of these class conflicts and the righteous anger of workers, Negro and white, for the systematic political preparation of the workingclass for the struggle for socialism.

The socialist interests of the workingclass are treated by this leadership as if they were a menace to labor unity, as if they endangered electoral and other alliances with sections of the middle class.

It is in the light of the above facts that we ask serious study of the following summation of Marxist strategy and tactics and consideration of their application in our country where the workingclass constitutes the great majority of the population:

We here refer to the speech of Comrade Manuilsky delivered to the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, July-August 1935.

Opportunist Distortion

It was this Congress which prepared the way for the organization of the Popular Front against Fascism—the democratic front against fascism and imperialist war. Since the congenital opportunist leaders of the C.P. of the United States (Browder simply being the most influential) took the tactical line agreed on at the 7th Congress (1935) as a license to peddle the independence of the C.P. and step by step accomplish its dissolution (1944), make it an agent of bourgeois and petty bourgeois policy in the labor movement, it is very useful to note where Manuilsky found the main danger in carrying through this campaign for workingclass unity for that pre-war period marked by Hitler's conquest of power two years before.

Read and Digest

We give here extended quotations, which we do not do elsewhere in this document, (wanting rather that readers should look up the context for themselves) because of the decisive importance of this theoretical and tactical material in relation to the entire question of notorious revisionism, leading to defeatism and dissolution, over a whole ten year period in the life (and living death, under revisionism) of the CPUSA.

Comrade Manuilsky, speaking on the 40th anniversary of the death of Frederick Engels and the lessons of his life, work and battles in connection with the tasks and tactical line that the rise of Fascism placed before the international working class and its Communist parties, began by calling attention to vital tactical questions and the basic principles which must govern Communists in their decisions upon these matters, i.e. how action is determined in specific situations:

" . . . Engels said: 'We want the destruction of classes. What are the means of securing this? The political domination of the proletariat . . . The policy which should be followed is a workers' policy. A party must be formed not as an appendage to some bourgeois parties, but as an independent party with its own aim, its own policy.' (From Engels' speech at the London Conference of the First International).

"And it was to these aims that Engels devoted his half century of struggle.

"Engels' distinguishing traits as a politician of the working class were distinctly formulated by Lenin as follows: ' . . . A most profound understanding of the fundamental revolutionary aims of the proletariat, and an unusually flexible definition of a given problem of tactics, from the point of view of these revolutionary aims, and without the slightest concession to opportunism and revolutionary phraseology.' (Lenin: Marx, Engels, Marxism)"

"I now want to deal in detail with Engels as the master of proletarian tactics. . . . the leaders of our Section, can learn something from the brilliant examples of the art of tactics given by the great proletarian captain."

"Of the rich treasury of tactical

propositions which Engels worked out and applied in the course of his practical activities I will deal with only a few which directly concern the central task of the Seventh Congress, viz., the task of preparing and organizing the workingclass and all the toilers for the decisive battles."

"There were not a few people in Engels' time, and there are not a few today, who conceive of the proletarian revolution not dialectically but mechanically. They argued that the class conscious, consistent, 'pure' revolutionaries were in one camp, while the other camp was one reactionary mass: that there can be no changes in the relations of class forces, for all classes have once and for all adopted their prescribed positions in the revolutionary scheme: there are no vacillating intermediate strata, for all have been entered beforehand in the category of reaction: there is no vanguard and reserves, for all represent one revolutionary mass; there are no masses who are only just approaching revolution, for all have been beforehand, included in the camp of the revolutionary vanguard; there are no stages in the development of the revolutionary struggle, for in some enigmatic way, the masses have been transferred to the supreme class 'of the last and decisive battle'; the revolutionary party need not carry on everyday work to enlighten and prepare the masses for the struggle, for the masses are only waiting for the signal to rush into battle under the leadership of the arch-revolutionary leaders; organizational preparation for the purpose of accelerating growth of the movement is superfluous, they say, because the spontaneity of the movement itself is working in our favor. This is the type of people Engels had in mind when he ridiculed the following scheme of development of the revolution:

"All the official parties united in one lump here, all the Socialists in one column there—great decisive battle. Victory all along the line at one blow. In real life things do not happen so simply. In real life . . . the revolution begins the other way round, by the great majority of the people and also of the official parties massing themselves together against the government, which is thereby isolated, and overthrowing it; and it is only after those of the official parties whose existence is still possible have mutually and successfully accomplished one another's destruction that the great division takes place and with it the prospect of our rule. If . . . we wanted to start straight off with the final act of the revolution, we should be in a miserably bad way.' (The Correspondence of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.)

"This brilliant proposition of Engels on the progress and development of the revolution was still more strikingly and fully developed by Lenin more than thirty years later. He wrote:

"To imagine that social revolution is conceivable without revolts by small nations in the colonies and in Europe, without the revolutionary outburst of a section of the petty bourgeoisie with all its prejudices, without the movement of non-class-conscious proletarian and semi-proletarian masses against the oppression of the landlords, the church, the monarchy, the foreign nations, etc.—to imagine that means repudiating social-revolution. Only those who imagine that in one place an army will live up and say, 'We are for socialism,' and in another place another army will say 'we are for imperialism,' and that this will be the social revolution . . .

"Whoever expects a 'pure' social revolution will never live to see it. Such a person pays lip service to revolution without understanding what revolution is.' (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. V, Page 303.)

"Further on he says: 'The socialist revolution in Europe cannot be anything else

(Cont. p. 10)

than an outburst of mass struggle on the part of all and sundry of the oppressed and discontented elements. Sections of the petty bourgeoisie and of the backward workers will inevitably participate in it—without such participation, mass struggle is impossible, without it no revolution is possible—and just as inevitably will they bring into the movement their prejudices, their reactionary fantasies, their weaknesses and errors. But objectively they will attack capital, and the class-conscious vanguard of the revolution, the advanced proletariat expressing this objective truth of a heterogeneous and discordant, motley and outwardly incohesive, mass struggle, will be able to unite and direct it.' (Lenin: Selected Works, Vol. V, Page 304)

"These remarkably profound words of Engels and Lenin contain the fundamental elements of the reply to the question of how we today can successfully fight against the offensive of capital, of fascism, and the menace of war. (Our emphasis) They indicate the necessity of the proletarian party having a correct policy towards the masses of its own class and towards its allies and they indicate the task of creating a broad people's front of struggle, the need for and the ability to take advantage of international antagonisms for the purpose of strengthening the position of the proletariat. All our experiences have more than once confirmed the fact that the party which starts out with vulgarized and naive conceptions of revolution is incapable of playing the part of organizer and leader of the revolution. There is nothing more dangerous for a live and fighting party than a ready-made, invented and lifeless formula, for it conceals all the living and motley variety of the conditions and forms of struggle.

Preserve Class Character

"It is wrong to think that the revolution will develop along a straight line like the flight of an arrow, that no hitches or interruptions, and retreats for the purpose of leaping further forward will occur in the maturing revolutionary process. It is wrong to think that the tactics of the revolutionary party should be based not on the relation of class forces that exist, but on relations as we would like them to be. It is wrong to think that in the process of preparing for revolution as well as in the process of its development it is sufficient for the proletarian party to rely entirely upon the forces of the vanguard and that there is not need to rely on the majority of the working class. It is wrong to think that by ignoring other class forces and by refraining from trying to win over the vacillating classes to the side of the revolution, at least temporarily, the proletarian party can create the clear situation of 'class against class.' It is wrong to think that it is possible to prepare for the revolution and to bring it about without taking advantage of the antagonisms within the camp of the enemy, without temporary, partial compromises with other classes and groups which are becoming revolutionary, and their political organizations. (Our emphasis)

Basic Premise

"In 1889, in a letter to the Danish Socialist Trier, Engels recommends that other parties be utilized in the interests of the working class, that,

'... Other parties and measures should be temporarily supported which are either of direct advantage to the proletariat, or which represent a step forward in the direction of economic development or of political liberty ...'

'But,' Engels adds, 'I am in favor of this only if the advantage accruing directly for us, or for the historical development of the country along the path of economic and political revolution, is unquestionable and is worthy-while striving after. Another obligatory condition is

that the proletarian class character of the Party shall not thereby be brought into question. That for me is the absolute limit.'

"Strengthening the class character of the party, raising the class-consciousness of the proletariat, raising its fighting capacity, strengthening its positions, weakening the position of the class enemy—such are the criteria which Engels regarded as essential in deciding the question of whether this or that compromise was permissible. (Our emphasis)

"These tactics are profoundly hostile to the policy of class cooperation between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie pursued by international Social Democracy, for that policy robbed the party of its class character, it strengthened the position of the bourgeoisie and weakened and demoralized the proletariat. These revolutionary tactics have nothing in common with the policy of the "lesser evil," with voting for Hindenburg, with forming a bloc with Bruening; for, in pursuing the policy of the "lesser evil," Social-Democracy surrendered to the bourgeoisie one proletarian position after the other, it paved the way for fascism, and prepared for the defeat of the proletariat. (Our emphasis).

"Thirty years later, Lenin enlarged on this idea of Engels on the basis of the experience of the three Russian revolutions, and taught the young Communist Parties flexible and mobile tactics that would enable them to overcome their "left-wing" sickness and to take up the struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie in a really Bolshevik manner. He wrote:

'To carry on a war for the overthrow of the international bourgeoisie, which is a hundred times more difficult, prolonged and complicated than the most stubborn of ordinary wars between states, and to refuse beforehand to maneuver, to utilize the conflict of interests (even though temporary) among one's enemies, to refuse to temporize and compromise with possible (even though transient, unstable, vacillating and conditional) allies—is not this ridiculous in the extreme? ... It is possible to conquer this most powerful enemy only by exerting our efforts to the utmost and by necessarily thoroughly, carefully, attentively and skillfully taking advantage of every 'fissure,' however small, in the ranks of our enemies, of every antagonism of interests among the bourgeoisie of the various countries, among the various groups or types of bourgeoisie in the various countries; by taking advantage of every opportunity, however small, of gaining an ally among the masses, even though this ally be temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable, and conditional. Those who do not understand this do not understand even a grain of Marxism and of scientific modern socialism in general.' (Lenin, 'Left Wing' Communism, an Infantile Disorder).

Tested Tactics

"Comrades, if you ponder over these words of Engels and Lenin as applied to our epoch, to the policy which our Congress is now indicating for the ensuing period, you will understand that these tactics, tested by the experience of the whole of the world labor movement during many decades, now create * * * great opportunities for emerging out of the agitational-propaganda period of our development and for becoming mighty factors in the whole of contemporary political life in the various countries and throughout the world. But it is precisely because we are now entering the broad road of great mass policy, because we are preparing to count, not in hundreds of thousands, but in millions, because we are beginning to bring under our influence those strata which only yesterday were in the ranks of Social-Democracy, or else were outside of politics altogether, because of this, (we) must be particularly alert to possible Right and opportunist distortions of our mass policy, distortions which will retard the

growth of our influence among the masses and the growth of the fighting capacity of the proletariat, and thereby retard the maturing of the conditions for the proletarian revolution. (Our emphasis) And here we must once again turn to our teacher Engels and recall the struggle he waged against opportunism, the ruthless, untameable struggle to which he devoted half a century of his life as a political fighter.

"Engels saw right through the petty bourgeois who in scores of different disguises tried to entrench himself in the labor movement, weakening it and disorganizing it. With unerring aim and inimitable sarcasm, Marx and Engels tore the mask from the face of this philistine; they exposed the philistine grimaces beneath the mask of free and easy geniality. This philistine has the right to commit any despicable act because he considers himself to be 'honestly' despicable. Engels wrote:

'Even stupidity becomes a virtue because it is the irrefutable evidence of firmness of conviction. Every hidden motive is supported by the conviction of intrinsic honesty, and the more determinedly he plots some kind of deception or petty meanness, the more simple and frank does he appear to be.'

"This philistine is a

'... drainpipe in which all the contradictions of philosophy, democracy and every description of phrasemongering are mixed up in a monstrous manner.' (Marx and Engels Archive, Book V).

"While upholding revolutionary Marxism, Engels fiercely attacked German reformists, the French Possibilists, the British Fabians and the Ultra-Lefts. At the same time, with exceptional firmness and patience, he criticized and corrected the opportunist mistakes of the leaders of the proletarian parties such as Wilhelm Liebknecht and Bebel, Lafargue and Guesde.

This tireless struggle against opportunism, and particularly against conciliation with opportunism, caused some of the leaders whom he attacked to dub Engels 'the rudest man in Europe.' All of us should learn from Engels how to be passionately 'rude' in the interests of the party, in the interests of the revolution. (Our emphasis).

"No one was so eager to unite the vanguard of the working class in the ranks of a united workers' party as Engels was. He wanted to do that as much as we want to do it today. But he knew and saw that unity not based on principles would weaken the working class. Of what use would a mass party be for the proletariat if it served as a lasso, dragging it into cooperation with the bourgeoisie? (Our emphasis). In 1882 he welcomed 'the split in the workers' party in France from Mallone and Bruse who had abandoned the class struggle, had sacrificed the proletarian class character of the movement and had made a rupture inevitable.

'All the better,' he said, 'Unity is an excellent thing as long as it is possible, but there are things that are more important than unity.' (Original emphasis).

"I think it is necessary to recall these words of Engels precisely at the present time when here at this Congress we are holding aloft the banner of the political unity of the international working class. (Our emphasis.)

"Through the medium of Comrade Dimitroff's report, the Congress has very strongly emphasized its will to fight for a united workers' party in every country, for a united workers' world unity of principles and not on the basis of a putrid bloc between petty bourgeois and proletarian elements after the model of the Second International. We would remind the thousands, tens and hundreds of thousands of Social Democratic workers who regard themselves as followers and disciples of Marx and Engels that we and they would be committing a crime against our class if we recreated that fictitious 'unity' which led to the catastrophe of August 4, 1914, to the bloc between a section of the

working class and the bourgeoisie. (Our emphasis) and which, in the last analysis, facilitated the victory of fascism. The working class does not need unity of this kind! We want the unity for which our teacher Friedrich Engels fought all his life; we shall exert every effort to achieve this unity and we shall achieve it.

The "Historical Moment"

"But this unity can be achieved only by a party which by its increasing activities wins the confidence of the masses, by a party which overcomes schematism and vulgarization in its approach to the mass movement. It is for such a party that Engels fought. He ruthlessly scourged passivity and inactivity as among the most pernicious forms of opportunism. In his correspondence with the workers' leaders he tirelessly repeated: the Party must act under all circumstances. It must participate in the whole of the political life of the country and take advantage of every event in home and foreign politics for active intervention; it must be with the masses everywhere and always, at the opportune moment it must issue real fighting slogans that shall emanate from the masses themselves, and it must issue new ones as the movement grows. This is the main tactical rule for the proletarian party upon which Engels insisted.

"Engels was particularly sharp in his attacks upon those parties who failed to be on the spot at decisive moments of the mass struggle. In this connection Engels quite openly said that the party which misses such a decisive moment, which fails to intervene, will be dead and buried for some time." (Our emphasis) Manuilsky: Engels In the Struggle for Revolutionary Marxism.

5. "Notorious Revisionism of Marxist-Leninist Theory, Strategy and Tactics — Desertion to Capitalism's Camp"

On the eve of the postwar conflicts (1944-45), the C.P. leadership, not only missed "such a decisive moment" to "intervene" [Engels — See previous Section] and do its best to rally and guide the workingclass and its organizations in struggle against the capitalist offensive but its intervention was in behalf of the interests of the imperialist rulers.

To these established facts—the denial of the class struggle; the acceptance of the "peace" program of monopoly capitalism and its government; the dissolution of the Communist Party by this leadership and its continued rejection of the struggle for a socialist program in the labor movement, can be attributed the present low political level and obscene opportunist exhibitions which are paraded as Communist strategy and tactics.

This revisionist leadership can continue to rend the heavens with cries of "left sectarianism," "semi-Trotskyism" (whatever that means) and expel Communists who insist that winning the working-class of the United States for a Socialist program is and must be the main and immediate task of Communists. Such acts and utterances solve no problems for Communists and the workingclass. It is not these expelled comrades who are responsible for the opportunist isolation of the Communist Party from the workingclass today.

That responsibility rests upon a leadership which deserted Marxist-Leninism, the Communist Party, and the workingclass, of which it was supposed to be the vanguard, by accepting the following statement of policy by Browder and others (and many other statements of similar import and political content):

"Marxists will not help the reactionaries by opposing the slogan of 'Free Enterprise' with any form of counterslogan. If any one wishes to describe the existing system of capitalism in the United States as 'free enterprise' that is all right with

(Cont. p. 11)

us, and we frankly declare that we are ready to cooperate in making this capitalism work effectively in the postwar period with the least possible burdens upon the people." (Teheran and America, Page 21).

On the basis of the defeatist analysis and policy stated above, the dissolution of the Communist Party was "theoretically" justified and the program of class collaboration and a no-strike policy in the "peacetime" postwar period urged upon the organized labor movement and in some industries and unions its endorsement was secured.

But the majority of the unions in spite of defeatist efforts to persuade them to adopt a policy that could have led only to their liquidation as fighting organizations of the working class (as it did in the case of the C.P.) rejected this policy, although it did immense damage by hampering preparations to meet and counter the capitalist offensive on the economic front.

Disgraceful Decisive Fact

For the first time in history a Communist Party, the C.P. of the United States, had an official program and tactical line which met with the approval of the monopoly capitalists. The C.P. was no longer in danger of being accused of "sectarianism" or "advocating revolution." It was no longer isolated—except from the workingclass.

It is still isolated in its "reconstituted" form. It has no program of its own because its revisionist leadership refuses to make it the proletarian party of Socialism and conduct its work in a Marxist-Leninist manner. The lack of faith of this leadership in the ability of the workingclass in the United States to understand, accept and fight for a socialist program if the necessity for it is explained to them in the course of all their conflicts with monopoly capital and its government, is the main reason for isolation and lack of Marxist socialist influence.

Defeatist Opinion

Behind all this is the belief, current in the C.P., that Socialism is neither necessary nor possible in the United States because of "special" features of capitalist development in this country. This accounts for the ease with which this leadership was able to turn upside down the united front tactic developed by Lenin and applied at the Seventh Congress for the program of pre-war anti-fascist struggle, and thereby lead the Party to dissolution and disaster.

This explains the ease with which Browder, becoming holder in 1936-37, was able to hand over the C.P. to John L. Lewis, with its press and its cadres of organizers—without a single guarantee as to program or the political rights of Communists, and rank and file members in the unions. On the contrary, all the guarantees were given by the C.P. The Party groups were abolished. The opportunist leadership agreed to make no fight even in Lewis' United Mine Workers for removal of the constitutional clause which lumps Communists with Ku Klux Klanners and Fascists and prohibits them from holding membership.

Step by Step Betrayal

Communists were doing most of the agitational, propaganda and organization work for the CIO unions but they were no longer Party workers. The opportunist program and leadership made them into "pure and simple" trade unionists.

The first steel workers organization meeting called by Murray in Pittsburgh had to be organized by Communists because no one else had any standing among militant steel workers. (75,000 had been organized in the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers by Communists and rank and file committees. They had been expelled by President Green of the A.F. of L.)

That first CIO steel workers meeting was held in the Sons of Italy hall and Vito Marcantonio

was the main speaker. At that time there was not a single basic industry where the broad foundations of the present CIO unions had not been laid by Communist organizers rank and file committees when the Party machinery was handed over lock, stock and barrel to John L. Lewis in 1935-36. After that, to hint that Lewis was less than God was to face expulsion from the C.P. But it had been the Communists who had kept the spirit of struggle alive in the coal fields after Lewis had abandoned it from 1924 to 1933.

High and Low Spots

These are a few of the high, or low, spots of the process by which the C.P. was finally led to its dissolution. The Party had lost its independence to such an extent that this leadership was both unwilling and unable to organize a mass campaign in the organized labor movement and other workingclass organizations to lift the embargo on shipments of munitions to the Spanish Republican forces by the Roosevelt administration.

No attempt was made to get unions to charter ships to run the blockade while members of the ill-equipped Abraham Lincoln Battalion and the International Brigade and the Spanish people died by the thousands trying to stop the Franco-Hitler and Mussolini divisions equipped with the most modern arms in the world. The campaign for aid to the Spanish Republicans was allowed to wax and wane according to how Roosevelt was reported to be feeling. "We must not embarrass the President," said Browder.

Blame for Franco

The Roosevelt administration in alliance with the Roman Catholic hierarchy was far more responsible for the fascist victory in Spain which set the stage for World War II than was the British Tory government, but one will not discover this in the C.P. literature of the time. With the United States' government enforcing the embargo while the fascist governments had a free hand, the defeat of the Spanish republic was only a matter of time.

This refusal to place such major issues of the class struggle clearly before the workingclass—always a hallmark of revisionism at its worst—was carried into the war period. This resulted in the acceptance of the "soft underbelly of the Axis" theory which took such a deadly toll of American troops and left the Red Army to bear the main might of Hitler's hordes.

Facts of Record

The opportunist leadership choked off protest against the Pétain and Darlan treachery. It raised no outcry against the deal with Bonomi and the 40 days of grace given the Nazis in Italy to reorganize their forces and launch a sweeping offensive against the Partisans. Both Browder and Sumner Welles assured the Chinese Red Armies and the 90,000,000 people back of them that the United States government was on their side and that they had nothing to fear—but they continued to be slaughtered and blockaded by United States-equipped Kuomintang troops.

No inkling was ever given the Party membership or the working class of the two-sided character of the war—a war of liberation for the popular forces in the capitalist and colonial countries, and an imperialist war for the interests of the ruling class and their governments—a war waged by American and British imperialists with the hope and belief that the Soviet Union and the revolutionary forces of the workingclass and its allies in the occupied countries would suffer such losses as would make impossible an effective struggle against both imperialisms for a long time to come—perhaps forever.

Out of this foul but fertile swamp, the seeds of opportunist appeasement sown before and during the war sprouted, grew and burgeoned into the poisonous plant whose miasma poisoned the Party and such sections of the workingclass as came under its influence.

New Low Record

Browder's appeals, published in the New York Times and the Herald-Tribune and other organs of monopoly capitalism, soliciting their aid in "laying the specter of Communism," assuring them that Communists were willing to discuss the dissolution of their Party; his books "Victory and After"; "Teheran and America"; his Madison Square Garden speech in January 1944; his open efforts to secure the submission of Communist Parties in other countries; to Wall Street's postwar program; his incentive wage plan; and finally the dissolution of the CP and the open call to the workingclass to accept the program of monopoly capital; support the imperialist adventures of its government and abandon strike struggles for economic demands in the postwar period, were all one pattern—rejection of the Marxist-Leninist concept of the historical liberating role of the workingclass headed by its Communist vanguard.

"Promotion and Pay"

It is useless for this present revisionist leadership, now that Browder has been removed and expelled, to say that they were bemused by this monstrosity of opportunist mediocrity they had created in their own images, and by his defeatist program. Only people who are petty bourgeois reformists in method of thinking, manner of living and social background, and who set up no safeguards in the way of imperialist corruption, could have accepted such a program.

Browder "showed them the way to promotion and pay" in middle class and capitalist circles and they poured out on him and his revisionist maunderings a constant stream of adulation that would have sickened an Oriental potentate of the Arabian Nights period. There was literature written during that period by many persons still in the revisionist leadership in which Browder is compared to Lenin and Stalin.

The Nonpareil

This was only the beginning because superlatives were soon exhausted. It was then decided that Browder could be compared only with Browder. Any other comparison ran the risk of underestimating the peculiar quality of his genius.

A careful reading of the purposely lengthy quotation from Manuisky's report on Engels to the 7th World Congress will show clearly how Browder and his revisionist colleagues arrived at this stage by exploiting all the opportunist possibilities in the correct anti-fascist democratic front program and ignoring and concealing from the CP membership the grave dangers facing it. Cooperation with the powerful American capitalist class replaced Communist independence and vigilance. Opportunism of a type never before accepted by Communist leadership poisoned the C.P.

Some repetition will do no harm here:

"Unity is an excellent thing as long as it is possible, but there are things more important than unity." (Engels—original emphasis).

"I think it is necessary to recall these words of Engels precisely at the present time when here we are holding aloft the banner of the political unity of the international workingclass." Report on Engels in Struggle for Revolutionary Marxism.—See previous Section.

The prostitution of the Leninist tactic of the united front and the constant utter perversion of the concept of workingclass unity as in the recent elections (especially in New York State where at least three-fourths of the CP membership is located and where its headquarters are) is proof that the leadership which calls itself Communist is engaged more actively than ever before in revisionist attempts to deceive the membership and the workingclass. Never were these attempts exceeded in their fraudulent character by anything in the same field under the Browder regime.

Recent Revisionist Record

Browder rejected the program for winning the workingclass for socialism and admitted frankly that he was against any fight in the postwar period against monopoly capital. The present leadership has merged the CP with the demagogues of "free enterprise" and rejects as its main and immediate task the struggle for a Socialist program under the guise of fighting the monopolies.

Their opportunist acts and utterances prove the contention made in other sections of this document, sections which were written before the elections, some of the analysis and conclusions having been written even before the "campaign" began:

First: By withdrawing the CP candidate for governor—the key office—this revisionist leadership disfranchised everyone who did not want to vote either for Dewey or Mead, all who did not want to vote for gubernatorial candidates of either of the two capitalist parties.

Second: By withdrawing CP candidates for governor and senator, by having no candidates for these offices, they betrayed the interests of the Party and the workingclass. The CP, with the slogan of "resurrect the Roosevelt program," exerted all its efforts to influence the workingclass to support the major candidates of the Democratic Party, the party of Truman and Byrnes, one of the two parties of Wall Street imperialism.

Elaborate Deception

It makes not the slightest difference, except that the deception is more elaborate, that the American Labor Party was one of the instruments used to achieve this result and assist in the betrayal. Perversion of the struggle to win the workingclass for a Socialist program can go no further when workers and intellectuals are asked to join the CP, to join the ALP, to vote for outright and acknowledged representatives of one of the two parties of the capitalist class and that party the one carrying federal authority in the drive for world domination.

Third: By withdrawing its candidate for governor, this leadership prevented the CP from becoming a legal electoral party in New York—the key state in the 1948 elections—for another four long years except by the arduous and uncertain method of petition. (Parties go on the official ballot automatically in New York only by polling the required percentage for the office of governor.)

Fourth: The election returns proved that "unity" like charity was used to cover this multitude of sins. Withdrawing its candidate for governor was explained to the CP membership as necessary to preserve the "democratic coalition"; nothing must be done to jeopardize Mead's chances of election. Two months before November 5th, it was clear that Dewey would carry New York by at least 350,000 votes. Truman and Byrnes had made sure of it. Dewey beat Mead by 680,000 votes. How could a CP gubernatorial candidate have endangered Mead's election chances? Not only was the "broadest possible democratic coalition" defeated but the CP section of it was discredited and disgraced before the eyes of class conscious workers of the state and nation. The combination of opportunism and contempt for the intelligence of working people took a cruel toll.

Fifth: This "reconverted" leadership, in an effort to quell the anger of the membership and non-party supporters is using the same type of political forgery used at the "special" convention to convince the membership that its revisionist treacheries were no worse than alleged "mistakes" made by Stalin and the entire leadership of the CP of the Soviet Union, i.e., the method of political forgery. (see later section.)

The election statement of the National Board of the CP signed by Foster and Dennis makes the

claim that the campaign "made clear the issues, promoted the unity of labor and the people and doubled our Party vote."

None of these statements is true but here we deal only with the third and last: Ben Davis, Negro, Communist Party candidate for Attorney General, polled 95,000 votes out of a total of some 5,000,000 ballots. In the last elections to the New York City Council, to which he was elected, he and Cacchione, Communist Councilman, polled 123,000 first choice votes (proportional representation) in only two boroughs of Manhattan and Brooklyn.

Fraud as a Policy

In 1938 the Communist candidate for Congressman-at-Large polled 105,000 votes. The "doubled vote" is a plain fraud. It is given some plausibility only by taking the CP vote for governor in 1942, a war year, when the CP could muster only 42,000 votes and failed to qualify for an official place on the ballot.

Sixth: Nothing is more certain than the final Socialist victory of the workingclass, that had the CP in this campaign ran a candidate for governor like Ben Davis and thrown its full resources into such a campaign with a program of Socialism as the final way out of the cumulative horrors of capitalism, and the only way to end war forever, as its central propaganda slogan, that it could have secured a minimum of 250,000 votes. Communist influence would have been increased decisively; the workingclass and the Negro people would now have another popular political leader of national calibre.

But this kind of campaign would have laid the basis for the CP becoming a mass party with decisive influence in future popular election coalitions. This is exactly what this revisionist leadership does not want. This would have necessitated the organization of the struggle to win the workingclass for a socialist program. To this, these opportunists are opposed because they do not believe in the advisability of such a struggle. They try to conceal this defeatist conviction by saying that the workingclass is not "ready"

for it and that it would "isolate" the Communists.

What does this revisionist leadership have to say now following the disgraceful defeat to which it led the CP and those workers who followed it?

It does not indict clearly and mercilessly the Democratic Party as one of the two parties of finance-capital, although Mead, and Lehman, Democrat candidates for governor and senator, pledged full support "to the forthright foreign policy" of President Truman. These spokesmen of the capitalist class were also the Communist Party candidates. They were also the American Labor Party candidates. This is what Foster and Dennis and the National Board of the CP describe in the official statement in *The Worker*, November 10, 1946, as "welding an all-inclusive unity from FDR Democrats to Communists."

Defeatist Demagogy

This is the way these defeatist demagogues of revision describe the maneuver by which they put the CP in the camp of the class enemies of the workingclass, gave aid and comfort to reaction and by this demagogic creation of confusion and demoralization in the ranks of the workingclass contributed to the victory of the Republican Party—another wing of the imperialist war forces.

Does this revisionist leadership make any attempt to explain the election results in terms of class forces and class alignments? It does not. It "puts the blame on Mame." Truman is the villain. In the best style of the petty bourgeois apologists of the capitalist two-party system, Dennis and Foster avoid any reference to the Democrat Party as an imperialist party (to which the CP has been nothing but an appendage for a decade), and accuse Truman of surrendering "to the GOP instead of meeting its attack."

False Assumption

Such a statement is based on the assumption that Truman as Democrat Party President of the United States owes allegiance to the workingclass and the "common people" generally. This of course is not the case and if Marxist theory had not been discarded long ago by this revisionist leadership it would not even be necessary to labor the point. Truman has not betrayed anyone—least of all the monopoly capitalist masters of the Democrat Party. Truman simply carried out the instructions given him by the spokesmen of the monopoly capitalists who own and run the Democrat party, and who feel that middle class New Dealers and trade union officialdom can do a better job of maintaining illusions concerning the two-party system as spokesmen for the opposition.

Deception of the workingclass and its allies, and more especially of the doubly oppressed Negro people who, from bitter experience, understand the class character of the Democrat Party and the Truman administration far better than do Foster and Dennis, consists in uttering the following falsehood, designed to conceal from CP members and the workingclass the outright imperialist character of the Democrat Party:

"Instead of defending the FDR policy of American Soviet friendship, the rock of Roosevelt foreign policy, Truman betrayed this by letting Senator Vandenberg, Roosevelt's chief enemy in foreign policy, impose the monopolies' 'tough line' on the country. Instead of fighting for price controls and orderly return to peace time production, Truman turned the country over to Taft inflationary profiteering after a few futile gestures."

"Thus, Truman broke the FDR-labor-progressive coalition which had defeated Hooverism for more than a decade. He opened the gates to it by his appeasement of and surrender to it. This is the first major reason for the present GOP electoral victory which could have been avoided by a bold struggle against the Hooverites along the lines of the FDR platform and on the basis of the FDR-labor-progressive coalition." (Our emphasis).

This statement is a lie from start to finish. It is opportunist demagogy at its worst because it does not give CP members and non-party workers the true reasons for the political situation in the United States. It does, however, give (inadvertently) the true reason for the ease with which the government circles of the 60 families were able to change their domestic and foreign tactical line since the end of major military operations: The reason is that the Communist Party revisionist leadership and those reformist middle class intellectuals and trade union bureaucrats who welcome and applaud this demagogy have been poisoning the labor movement and the entire working class with this and similar social-democratic distillations for over ten years—seven of these years being the period of blood-stained war prosperity with blurring of class lines and destruction of political and moral standards.

Not "Errors" but Policy

This is the "main major" reason why the CP has become a party of reformist capitalism and this is the "main major" reason the organized labor movement politically is still in the camp of its exploiters—this is the "main major" reason why so many of the 14,000,000 Negro people are still in the camp of their oppressors.

Elsewhere in this document we explain in some detail the mechanics of the treachery to Marxist-Leninism—and the class struggle without which no socialist victory is possible. It is enough to say here, to avoid repetition, that the "Roosevelt program" was a program to salvage, strengthen and advance the interests of the 60 imperialist families—the rulers of the United States.

Purpose of Concessions

It was necessary to engage in

an elaborate program of concessions to the workingclass and its allies, to divert the rising socialist consciousness during the crisis and depression of 1929-39 and keep the rapidly growing organized labor movement on the side of "free enterprise" and the capitalist imperialist system. In most of this, the program was successful.

Roosevelt himself may or may not have been more farsighted than other capitalist party leaders. But in one thing he was indisputably more clever than any of his predecessors—and probably more than any of his successors. He saw that the most skillful and unscrupulous apologists for and defenders of capitalist imperialist interests are the social democrats of one variety or another, the careerist middle class intelligentsia and trade union bureaucrats.

With their aid he was able to enlist even the services of the leadership of the Communist Party—an unexpected but welcome addition to the reformist-capitalist forces. He understood and acted on the basic fact, with an almost cynical pragmatism, that capitalism in the U.S. could afford reform—that reforms are cheaper than revolution, if you can afford them.

The Real Rulers

The political specialists who speak for the National City Bank, the Chase National Bank, General Motors, the Duponts, the Association of American Railroads, General Electric, Ford, Big Steel and Little Steel, American Telephone and Telegraph, the giant light and power holding companies, Standard Oil and the House of Morgan, etc. are convinced by reason of the dominant position the monopolists and their government of the U.S. have secured through the crushing of the Axis powers, that they no longer need the Roosevelt program.

What they want and will try to secure by every means, including another world war, is expansion. Without vast new markets, conquest of gigantic new fields for profitable capital investment, new sources of cheap raw materials, monopoly capital in the United States is doomed, in spite of its apparent stability and power. There is not the slightest possibility of monopoly capitalism in this country solving for any long period its major contradiction—astronomical postwar productive capacity and the shrinking domestic and world market—by any program which will leave the system intact.

These are the forces whose efforts to maintain their domination over the workingclass produce a Hoover, a Roosevelt, a Truman or a Dewey—and the conditions which leave no way out for the workingclass except Socialism or submission and slavery.

What does this opportunist leadership of the CP propose? Does it at all times tell the CP membership and the workingclass that Socialism is the only final and victorious way out of the bloody military shambles into which the 60 families and their government are trying to drive them? That is the "main major" task of Communists. Do they make the political preparation of the workingclass for socialist struggle their main task?

Political Perfidy

They do not. They give the workingclass no inspiring goal beyond the ceaseless, bitter and exhausting struggle for economic reforms whose benefits are cancelled out by the system of commodity production. Consequently they do not tell the workingclass of the life and death necessity for a socialist system—how to achieve Socialism.

Neither do they indict the Democrat Party of monopoly capital by so much as one word in the statement signed by Foster and Dennis for the CP National Board. Truman is the traitor, they say. He is not a traitor except in the minds of disappointed middle class careerists, professional office holders, revisionists—and workingmen and women who have been deceived by these demagogues. But this does not excuse the continuation of such vicious deception. Truman has tried to follow the

advice given him by the advisors of the capitalist class who bought him and their Democrat Party. He is an enemy of the workingclass. We must look elsewhere for the evidence of political treason.

It is to be found in unmistakable form in almost every paragraph of the Foster-Dennis-programmatic election statement, but one or two quotations are enough to show that the "main major" task of this revisionist leadership is to keep the CP and the American labor movement in tow to appeasers of monopoly capitalism. This does not involve any contradiction between such purposely vague formulations as "a new political alignment leading to a new peoples' mass party." "This," they say, "will require labor's leadership." This is chicanery. It is like the well-known riddle about the elephant and the canary—it is stuck into this election statement to make it harder for the workingclass to understand. As they say themselves:

"The political forces which emerged in the last stages of the elections—the Wallace forces, the Chicago Conference of Progressives, the LaGuardia-

Newbold Morris Republicans, and particularly the CIO, PAC, and other independent groups—have the platform on which to begin the organization work that will guarantee the running of a progressive pro-Roosevelt candidate for President in 1948." (Our emphasis).

Where is "labor's leadership" in this reformist-capitalist set-up? Where is the independent program of the CP? Where is the program for winning the workingclass for the socialist way out?

One More Low Record

The concluding sentence of the CP National Board statement undoubtedly establishes a new low record for nostalgic revisionism by persons posing as Marxist-Leninists:

"The forces and program exist now which, if united and applied, can restore the political life of America to the Roosevelt path."

The political and organizational essence of this last sentence and all that goes before it can be condensed into one slogan which expresses it concisely: "Turn your face toward the past and your pratt toward the enemy."

The Foster-Dennis statement puts the CP at the tail of footloose middle class and disgruntled bourgeois politicians, mainly Democrats with a scattering of Republicans. It accepts their program. It discards the independent role of the CP. The Dennis-Foster statement does not even call on workingmen and women to join the Communist Party.

There is little more to be said except to fix responsibility and draw a final conclusion:

Dennis and other close associates in the conspiracy to wreck the CP did their best to spread political corruption in the CP and prepare the way for its dissolution.

During the whole period under consideration, concrete instances of political corruption multiplied: Out of this and as part of it, came the most notorious informer and provocateur in the history of the workingclass movement in our country—J. B. MATTHEWS, former chief investigator of the Dies Committee.

He was brought into the center of the CP work by this leadership. He was the white-haired boy of Browder and his clique. To cast doubt on him was to be branded as a disrupter. The assets he had to sell to the Dies Committee and its labor-baiting backers were acquired as a privileged comrade and co-worker of the opportunist Political Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Louis Budenz was another prized acquisition of this wrecking crew. In partibus infidelium, inter spem et metum, Christo et Ecclesiae ten years for the hounds of God, while keeping his Trotskyite connections. Elevated to the managing editorship of the *Daily Worker*, he was part of the parade of

shady figures which marched through the editorial staff during a whole decade. To express doubt of Budenz's devotion was to court expulsion. There was Casey, (Glazier) of odoriferous memory, another Daily Worker Managing Editor, recruited from the lower social-democratic depths of the New York Times; Rushmore and Honig from the anti-labor incubators of the Hearst Press—and others.

These persons, living symbols of moral and political corruption, were brought in, built-up and promoted for one main purpose, i.e., to combat the Communist forces in the Party who would not accept opportunism, step by step revision of Marxist-Leninism, and the political dissolution of the CP into an appendage of the John L. Lewis bureaucracy and demagogic careerist politicians of the two capitalist parties.

6. Opportunism and Defeatism in Excelsis — Denial of Class Struggle — Political Dissolution of "Re-Constituted" CP

A New Reformist Party

But the expulsion of Communists for "leftism" continues—it appears to be the only answer of these confirmed opportunists to the growing demand for a socialist program and placing the work of winning the working-class for that program in its proper place—as the main, major and immediate task of Communists in our country.

The report of Eugene Dennis, General Secretary of the U.S. Communist Party to the July 16-18, 1946 meeting of the CPUSA National Committee, furnished the best basis for a picture of the development of the devastating effects of the opportunist policy within the U.S. Communist Party itself and in the organized labor movement and working class generally so far as CPUSA influence extends.

This report—unanimously adopted by the National Committee—furnished a basis for such an estimate because the analysis and program that are developed in it are in turn developed from the program adopted unanimously by the so-called special convention of July, 1945, at which the opportunist leadership of CPUSA "reconstituted" itself.

The step by step—but nevertheless rapid—political dissolution of the Communist Party of the United States by its defeatist leadership and program of appeasement which we have dealt with in material prepared earlier, is now shown with unmistakable clarity.

The following quotation from official statements of its general secretary at the recent meeting of the National Committee should remove any remaining doubts in the minds of the membership as to where the CP has landed. It is now nothing but a caricature of a Communist Party. Its political independence is a myth.

"What is required is the organization, in every ward and township, in every city and on a Congressional district basis, of some form of independent, political, legislative membership organization, as well as united front committees. Local coordinating centers comparable to and allied with the Conference of Progressives are important, but they are not enough. Independent united progressive committees for the city elections are extremely important also and must be promoted. But something else is needed, something which will result in building down below, everywhere, a grass roots mass membership political action organization." (Dennis, Political Affairs, Special Plenum Issue, January 1947, page 11. Our emphasis—last lines.)

The "united front" pretense has been dropped. The CP membership is now ordered to organize another political party.

Now we are witnessing the political dissolution of the "reconstituted" Communist Party. This is a matter of the utmost seriousness for the workingclass, all anti-imperialist forces of the United States, and of all countries.

Far more serious is the fact that this is the sign manual of surrender to enemy class forces who are trying to extinguish Marxist thinking in the labor movement. These anti-social forces are trying to deprive the workingclass of Marxist theory and leadership and prevent the creation of a workingclass committed to a socialist program.

It is part of a deliberate and well-organized attempt to compel the majority of the population of our country, the workingclass and its allies, to foreswear their socialist destiny—in a country where the natural resources, the productive capacity and the social forces needed to reach this goal of liberation are present in the greatest abundance.

Continuous Process

Dennis' reports are also the best basis for an estimate of the defeatist role played by these revisionists in the organized trade union movement and in the broader activities of the labor movement on the electoral and legislative fronts. It will be seen that the attempt in the recent elections to herd the CPUSA membership, class-conscious workers and anti-capitalist forces into the Democratic Party in support of the candidates of one of the two parties of U.S. monopoly capitalism; the shameful unity with a block of Trotskyites, right wing Social Democrats, Association of Catholic Trade Union leaders and Christian Fronters at the recent CIO convention against the democratic trade union and political rights of the Communists and the CIO membership generally was already planned, prepared, and justified in the programmatic report of the "notorious revisionist" National Committee, July 16-18, 1946.

I.

The programmatic report by Eugene Dennis to the meeting of the National Committee of the U.S. Communist Party and unanimously adopted July 16-18, 1946, setting forth the policy, program and tactical line of this leadership, is anti-Marxist-Leninist.

There is only apology for crass revisionism and rejection of the independent role of the C.P. The central slogan is "resurrection of the Roosevelt program."

This justification of the surrender of the independent role of the CPUSA to capitalist party demagogues and reformist trade union leaders has become the central task of Communist Party leadership today.

This leadership not only does not desire any "unfriendly criticism" of these, our allies, but will "declare war" on such "left wingers", as do indulge in such criticism.

This CPUSA leadership has rejected the revolutionary essence of Marxism by postponing it to the distant future where, for all practical purposes, it is out of sight. It proposes only such measures as meet the approval of the supporters of "free enterprise." These CPUSA leaders attempt to "convince and influence" the representatives of the capitalist class when, by straining credulity to the breaking point, sympathy with and support of even their most reactionary efforts for so-called "uplifting the working class" can be justified. (In this connection, the defeatist meaning of CPUSA's "resurrection" of Roosevelt policy will be analyzed below.)

Marx on "Postponement"

The political position of the present party program and leadership in relation to the genuine struggle

for a socialist program, is best expressed by Marx:

"The programme is not to be given up but only postponed—to an indefinite period. One accepts it, though not really for oneself and one's own lifetime but posthumously as an heirloom to be handed down to one's children and grandchildren. In the meantime one devotes one's 'whole strength and energy' to all sorts of petty rubbish and the patching up of the capitalist order of society in order at least to produce the appearance of something happening without at the same time scaring the bourgeoisie . . . Instead of decided political opposition, general compromise; instead of the struggle against the government and the bourgeoisie, an attempt to win and to persuade . . ." (Karl Marx, SELECTED WORKS, Vol. II, Pg. 629-31—our emphasis.)

This vulgar revisionist political method is illustrated by the general secretary of the CPUSA, who declares:

"Furthermore . . . the militant workers must enlist the aid of certain political figures and groups who also happen to support various features of the administration's imperialist foreign policy." (Dennis Report, Political Affairs, Sept., 1946, Pg. 796;—our emphasis.)

Communists are thus put in the position of soliciting aid of imperialist demagogues who mouth deceptive "democratic" phrases in order to maintain in the working class illusions as to the classless nature of this government of the Monopoly Capitalists. This leadership has surrendered the major weapon of Communists—the revolutionary struggle to win the working class for a socialist program—as its main, central and immediate task and, by demagogic perversion of the united front tactic, is trying to lead the party membership into the reformist capitalist camp.

This was the program of unity with and support (with no guarantees for the party and for the working class) of the candidates of the Democratic Party in New York (the government party of U.S. Imperialism). These reports blasted the last hopes of many Communists — hopes that notorious revisionism and appeasement of the capitalist class and its middle class apologists were being rooted out of the CP. This is not the case. It has now appeared in a more dangerous form.

The reports attempt to conceal the abject desertion by this leadership of the revolutionary struggle to win the working class for a socialist program. It tries to do this by sprinkling pseudo-Marxist phrases over a program for continuing the U.S. Communist Party as a tail to the kite of capitalist and middle-class parties, mainly in the current government party (Democratic), but also in any other party where these incurable appeasers can make a "deal."

The program therefore is merely the continuation of the dissolution of the CPUSA as the revolutionary political party of the working class, under the guise of "re-constitution" and "unity."

The Dennis reports, wordy with that irrelevant detail typical of the worst type of eclecticism, center around the proposal for "the return to the Roosevelt policies." This is the heart of the new revisionism. It has not even the crudely false factual and theoretical justification with which the older Browder revisionism tried to justify its betrayal, i.e. that U.S. capitalism had ceased to be imperialistic; that it had become a benevolent patron and protector of the exploited and oppressed throughout the world; that it stood ready to extend a helping hand to the working class and colonial peoples, provided the Communists and the labor movement of our country dropped their economic demands and rejected political struggle for a socialist program.

II.

The outbreak of the class struggle involving millions of workers in the greatest strike wave in the history of our country (coinciding with the surrender of Japan) in answer to the new capitalist offensive against the working class, marked the beginning of the post-war crisis. It was no longer possible for the revisionist leadership to continue its deception with a program which openly had called for surrender of the strike weapon, class collaboration and submission to the imperialist ruling class.

Since revisionism is deception of the working class and since it attempts to deliver its Marxist-Leninist Party to the petty-bourgeois appeasers of capitalism, new methods to carry out such a program had to be devised. They were:

"When Marxism is adulterated to become opportunism, the substitution of eclecticism for dialectics is the best method of deceiving the masses; it gives an illusory satisfaction; it seems to take into account all sides of the process, all the tendencies of development, all the contradictory factors and so forth, whereas in reality it offers no consistent and revolutionary view of the process of social development at all." (Lenin, State and Revolution, Pg. 19)

Both the substance and the number of urgent calls for the "restoration of the Roosevelt policy" make this the core of the revisionist program and the key to the understanding of the revisionist method of deception. This is the major proposal of the "leadership" of the CPUSA a year after the end of the war which crushed the fascist Axis powers and changed the relationship of class forces throughout the world in favor of the working class and its allies.

We are in a new historical period. But these revisionists would reverse history.

Change In Relationship True For United States

This estimate of the change in the relationship of class forces holds true for the United States in spite of the fact that a revisionist leadership for some 15 years has carried on no mass campaigns to explain in a Marxist-Leninist manner the basic economic causes inherent in capitalism and multiplied in this post-war imperialist period—of skyrocketing cost of living, appalling lack of housing, the rapid deterioration of public health, shrinking educational facilities and especially the horrors of the new wave of terror against the Negro people, crises, war and sharpening class struggle. This estimate holds true in spite of the fact that for twenty years there has been no systematic and patient effort made to win the working class for a Marxist program of socialism.

This petty-bourgeois revisionist leadership claims that "now" they have a Marxist-Leninist program. But even this claim is made in the hushed, conciliatory tone used by a borrower asking a banker to extend an overdue note. The claim is made only to quell the qualms of sincere Communist Party members and class conscious non-Party workers.

Page 784 of the printed Dennis report is devoted mainly to repeating a series of demands that the Roosevelt policy "be restored"; that it "be resurrected"; that "labor and the progressives must fight not only resolutely but flexibly (?) for the restoration of the FDR policy." In fourteen other counted instances (and this by no means exhausts the list) this revisionist programmatic report calls for the "revival", the "restoration" and/or the "resurrection" of the "Roosevelt policy" in both domestic and foreign affairs.

(Cont. p. 14)

An Attempt To Reshuffle History

This is an attempt to reshuffle history as a mountebank does a deck of cards, to call for another new deal from a marked deck, to "resurrect" (unwittingly an apt word is used) a program of the government party of the ruling class adopted as a result of great mass struggles in a clearly defined historical period of crisis and depression and which was designed to:

(1) Protect the interests of monopoly capital and restore and extend its power after the crash, crisis and acute and chronic depression beginning in 1929, and lasting a whole decade up to the beginning of war prosperity based on the outbreak of war in Europe and the continuation of it in Asia in 1939.

This program was designed to overcome the effects of the unprecedented industrial and financial crisis in the USA which, occurring in the period of the chronic world crisis following World War I, had shaken world capitalism to its foundations; had reduced American monopoly capitalism's prestige to shreds and tatters; had ended the dream of millions in the United States and of middle class, feudal and monopolist circles throughout the world, that American monopoly capitalism had solved the basic problem of its system (the problem of markets deriving out of the system of social production of goods on a vast scale and private ownership)—had at last produced the miracle of "permanent prosperity."

(2) To shunt off the torrent of working-class militancy, the rising class consciousness and the great mass struggles of unemployed and employed which were overflowing the narrow limitations of capitalist-democratic legality, into channels least harmful to the economic interests of the monopoly capitalists and least dangerous to their political power.

(a) To prevent the rise of a powerful Communist Party in the U.S.—to sidetrack the struggle for socialism—to keep the rapidly growing and increasingly militant labor movement in the basic industries in the camp of monopoly capitalism and its two-party system of bourgeois-democracy.

(3) To prepare and perfect the alignments necessary to protect the fundamental interests of U.S. imperialism in a world in which war was already on the order of the day, at a time when the fascist Axis Powers seemed to be well on the road to world equality with or supremacy over U.S. imperialism.

(a) To accomplish the above tasks in such a way as to put the main burden of the war upon the socialist Soviet ally with the consequent maximum damage to its socialist economy; also, to conduct the war against the Axis powers in such a way as to reduce, after the war, the British imperialist rival to a subordinate level compatible with its survival as a satellite instrument and useful weapon against the Soviet Union, the working class population of the liberated countries, the colonial and semi-colonial peoples.

Program of Deception

In the light of Marxist-Leninist method, this revisionist program submitted by Dennis commits the worst of all deception: It substitutes formal "democratic" pronouncements of the "Roosevelt program" for the dynamics of the class struggle—the clash of opposing social forces.

The Roosevelt program was designed solely to pull capitalism out of the worst economic crisis in its history with the least possible damage to its system. This program was applied by the current Democratic Party government of monopoly capital headed by Roosevelt. It was never a program for the working class; the working class received in various forms

those immediate demands which its level of class consciousness and its organized power forced monopoly capital to concede—and only through the medium of nationwide mass battles.

Bureaucratic trade union officials, middle class intellectuals and other supporters of capitalism, now give Roosevelt and the Democratic Party—and the two-party system of monopoly capitalism—all the credit for the reform measures of that period. The facts are otherwise. That these dangerous illusions still persist in the labor movement proves nothing except that a CPUSA leadership already succumbing to revisionism did nothing to explain what had happened in terms of class relationships and the dire needs of U.S. monopoly capital, originating in its crisis-weakened domestic and world position; did not point out patiently and effectively that concessions made to the working class, to the Negro people, to the middle class "brain trusters", during that critical period preceding World War II, were tactical necessities for attaining a major strategic ruling class goal: restoration of its prestige and revival of confidence in its economic system and bourgeois-democratic form of government.

Major Objectives of Roosevelt Program

This had to be done before U.S. monopoly capital could resume its drive for world domination—for which it had high hopes before the crash in 1929—and which it has now resumed and intensified.

Wall Street imperialism has taken this course not because Roosevelt died and the Democratic Party has changed its allegiance from the "people" to "Wall Street." The Democratic Party has been the operative war party of finance-capital in two world wars. It is still one of the two capitalist war parties—and it still has the executive branch of the government machinery. The Roosevelt program made it possible for U.S. imperialism to secure its present premier position in the postwar capitalist world.

These were the major objectives of the "Roosevelt program." The concessions and reforms were of a minimum character. Most of them, such as old age pensions, unemployment insurance, collective bargaining, etc., had been in force in England and Germany before the first World War. Those concrete aspects of the program which coincided in some respects to the immediate needs of the working class were forced into the program by the nationwide campaign of and for the unemployed; by the hunger marches; by the mass struggle for unemployment insurance; the drive for industrial unionism and the growing union strength in the basic industries (1929-38), for the legalization of collective bargaining. Recognition of and, later in the war period, material aid to the Soviet Union were in preparation for and conduct of a world war in which U.S. imperialist need for powerful military allies determined policy. Wall Street imperialism and its government now feel they no longer need such a program.

III.

On Page 783 of "Political Affairs" for September, 1946—as if nothing had happened since 1936—Dennis appears as a champion of "American national interests"! However, Vandenberg, Earle, Bullitt, Byrnes and Dulles, "must be condemned for what they are—enemies of the United Nations cooperation, enemies of America's national interests." (our emphasis.)

Now, what are these politicians of the Republican and Democratic Parties? They are the more outspoken representatives and propagandists for the program of the government of the Sixty Families who are the class enemies of the working class. They are not enemies of the United Nations "cooperation." They are the organizers of reaction in the United Nations under the domination of U. S. imperialists.

They try to use U.N. as an instrument of U.S. imperialist policy to force the "cooperation" of weaker states; to mobilize the full forces of world reaction represented in the United Nations against the great majority of the population of such strategically located nations as Greece and Spain—against the Soviet Union.

This is the reality. The Dennis conception is typically anti-Marxist-Leninist. It tries to substitute for the class struggle inside each capitalist nation, and struggle for national ruling class interests between nations, the formal expression of this struggle—the echoes of the wide upsurge of anti-imperialist battles on various levels in debates of diplomats in the assembly of the United Nations.

The main enemy of the U.S. working class, the enemy of whose determination to cling to economic and political power, the organized labor movement and the fourteen million people of the Negro national minority have had irrefutable evidence in this postwar period is not a foreign power as the fascist Axis was. The enemy of the U.S. working class is a part of the nation. It is the ruling class. In the U.N. its spokesmen voice its imperialist interests. The defeat of its program in our country means, not national, but class struggle. Petty-bourgeois prattle about the United Nations as an instrument of peace is a crime against the working class as long as UN is dominated by U.S. imperialism and its British minions.

Ruling Class Is The Enemy

The enemy of the U.S. working class is that class which by "chicanery and fraud" and by force has secured control of the banks, the natural resources and raw materials, transportation, the decisive industries, bringing into its orbit all production. It owns or controls the press, moving pictures, the radio. Its government is the national government. For Marxists, this is elementary—A B C. But continued emphasis on this fact is a fundamental need of the CP membership and the working class of the U.S., where defeatist, opportunist deception has concealed the class role of capitalist government for more than 12 years in this imperialist epoch.

More than ever is this continued emphasis indispensable when the capitalist class of the U.S. tries by the mobilization of all its powerful forces, and with an intensity never before seen, to enlist the working class in its drive for destruction by corruption and war of all governments and peoples who oppose its imperialist aggressions.

This programmatic, revisionist report consequently is based on the most misleading and dangerous conceptions in the whole arsenal of rotten liberalism! It is the false conception that this government—the capitalist-democratic form of imperialist government—a government operating solely in the interests of finance capital, has somehow betrayed the American people—"us."

But this is not a government of or in the interests of the people of the U.S., if by "people" we mean the working population as against the minority of monopolist exploiters and oppressors. The government of monopoly does not "betray" the people; it deceives, robs, and suppresses in the interests of the capitalist class. It could not exist without these methods. It is the instrument by which the capitalist class and its allies preserve and try to extend their class rule for profit at home and super-profit abroad. Its "main function" is to maintain its class rule at home.

"Betrayal" is rather the crime that is committed by the leaders of working class parties who try to conceal this all-important fact from their class—by covering it up with reformist phrases and deceptive description of the ever cruder reality.

Non-Marxist Conception

On Page 784 of the Dennis re-

port appears this same habitual, non-Marxist conception of the class relationships in the U.S. and throughout the world; the same attempt is made to replace the class objectives of the labor movement and its allies—the economic gains, the strengthening of the organizations of labor against their class enemy, the end to imperialist aggression, and support for the struggles of the working class and all peoples oppressed or threatened by U.S. imperialism and its puppets—by the phrase, "our national security."

The report says: "American-Soviet friendship—the key to Big Three unity and peace—must be fought for in a new and more forceful way, as the most vital prerequisite for protecting our national security and for ensuring the peaceful collaboration of the United Nations." (our emphasis.)

This is exactly what the chief spokesmen of U.S. imperialism say they are doing. This is the way they describe their objectives. They are all for "peace"—on the basis of the program of U.S. monopoly capital. Few people will disagree with the statement that Lippman voices the policy of the two-party government of monopoly capital, called by the uninformed and the unduly courteous, "the Truman Administration."

In the Herald Tribune of September 7, 1946, Lippman wrote:

"That point is manifestly in the Eastern Mediterranean in the direction of the Black Sea. For at that point American sea and air power can be brought within reach of the vital center of Russia, and can, therefore, most surely counteract the striking power of the Red Army. There it would be feasible for the United States, employing the kind of force for which we are best equipped, to redress the balance of power which has been radically upset by the demobilization of the western land armies, by the enfeeblement of Europe, by the disunity of China, and by the reorganization of the British empire . . . For it will take a long time to restore Europe, unify China and reorganize the British Empire.

"Our object in checking the expansion of the Soviet power is to give Europe, China, and the British Empire the time, the freedom from interference, and the opportunity, to solve their enormously complicated problems. . . . The real need, however, is to check the Soviet expansion in order that their problems which invite expansion may be settled peaceably.

" . . . We must not, however, confuse our interest in cooperating with free men to construct a free world with the immediate and urgent problem of world politics which is to halt the expansion of the Soviet empire and to bring about a negotiated settlement of the conflict of power." (Our emphasis.)

What are the "enormously complicated problems" of the countries Lippman lists?

They are the problems of new class relationships, the problems of the class struggle, of the social revolution at varying stages of development, which have arisen since the crushing of the main menace, the Fascist powers.

Lippman is calling for the restoration of class relationships throughout the world as nearly as possible on the basis existing before the defeat of the Fascist powers changed that relationship in favor of the working class and its allies. He, like Dennis, tries to set the clock back. But he bases his program on the relationship of class forces, not on chatter about the petty-bourgeois delusion that "peace" can be achieved on some other basis than that of class power, i.e. the "Pax Romana"—the "peace" of living death—or a new life for the world's toilers, peace enforced by the power of the popular forces.

World Situation Has Changed

Lippman is also, it will be noted, in favor of the "revival" of the "Roosevelt policy" of "direct

diplomatic relations" and "negotiated settlement" with the Soviet Union.

But the world situation has changed in terms of class power. The fascist Axis has been destroyed, and so Lippman, instead of the veiled threat of withholding munitions and military support (the Second Front) implicit at all times in the Roosevelt policy but meaningless in the light of the world situation, calls for U.S. occupation of the Eastern Mediterranean—and for war, waged not by a fascist Axis but by the "democracy" of the U.S., if a "negotiated settlement" is not achieved.

It is not necessary any longer to argue as to whether Lippman speaks from first-hand knowledge. The sinister and ironical answer to the unreserved endorsement of the Roosevelt program for saving and strengthening monopoly capitalism, was the presence in the Eastern Mediterranean, "in the direction of the Black Sea," of the giant aircraft carrier, the Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and numerous other units of U. S. Naval power, sent there by Truman, Roosevelt's choice as his successor, to preserve "peace."

U. S. Imperialism Threatens World's Peoples—Domination of Capitalist World by One Power

U.S. imperialism stands at the crossroads of the ancient sea highway of the Old World. (Standard Oil of New Jersey, Standard Socony—Vacuum in Middle East, Persian and Arabian tribal-feudalism in the service of petroleum democracy.) On the one hand, it threatens the Soviet Union with war, with atomic attack. On the other hand, it threatens with boycott, blockade, and war the working class and peasantry of the European countries who have declared in all the elections and violent class conflicts their intention to free themselves from the monopoly capitalist, feudal landlord systems which forced fascism, subjugation and slavery upon them.

Freed from U.S. imperialist pressure, bribes and bombs in support of the surviving imperialist powers, militarists, fascist and feudal-clerical forces, the working class of Europe will continue to liberate itself with a minimum of violence and bloodshed.

This also holds true for the workers and peasants of China, India and Indonesia and Africa.

The main enemy of the progress of the millions of the world's peoples toward economic, political and social liberation and higher cultural achievements is the imperialist rulers of the U.S., their government, and its program for world domination by all methods, including war.

This fact sets for Communists in our country and the working class and its allies, its historic task: to organize to defeat, by the use of every possible exercise of mass power, the program of their own imperialist rulers, and, by their struggle at home to win the working class for a Marxist program of socialism and fraternal fighting relations with the working class and oppressed peoples of all countries, to consolidate and lead these anti-imperialist forces to victory, which Marxist-Leninist theory, strategy, and tactics will make certain.

IV.

This is what Communist leadership must tell the U.S. working class day in and day out. But Dennis and his fellow revisionists, bent on appeasing both the middle class and the monopolists and with that lack of confidence in the working class that is the hallmark of defeatist liberalism, do not and will not tell them!

The alternative is submission of the working class and its main allies (the doubly oppressed Negro people, the exploited farmers) to the imperialists and their militar-

ists. These are hard truths, but they must be stated and explained without stuttering and without weasel phrases in terms every working man and woman can understand.

No one in his right mind, certainly no Communist, believes that the Sixty Families and that section of the population living on their bounty—both the upper and lower depths, the parasite middle-class debaters, openly and covertly in the service of monopoly capital and its government, and the de-classed slum and gangster elements (i.e. the suborners and the shock troops of fascist forces) will ever order their relationships with the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics on the basis of "friendship."

The indisputable evidence of this is the 7,000,000 Russian war dead; the 25 million homeless, and the devastated cities, towns, and villages from Leningrad to Stalin-grad, from the Polish-Rumanian frontiers to the Volga and the Caucasus. This was the price paid for resisting and defeating four-fifths of Hitler's armed forces, while the Second Front was promised and postponed but never organized for three long years—when formal "friendship" between the Soviet government and the U.S. government, headed by Roosevelt, was at its zenith. The united front of the working class of the U.S. and its allies is the force that will decide this issue of "friendship."

Once more the revisionist fashion which sets the pattern for the program deliberately confuses diplomatic agreements made by the Soviet government with imperialist governments—and confuses attempts to reach such agreements with the actual political situation created by the continued existence and growth of the Socialist Soviet state and the rapid rise of powerful anti-feudal, anti-imperialist mass movements in the liberated countries and in great nations and among great peoples, as in China, India, and Indonesia.

The Dennis report talks in terms framed to spread and perpetuate in this critical period the most dangerous illusions, i.e., that appeasement of the middle class and outright representatives of monopoly capital in the Republican Party and in the Democratic Party now in control of the federal government machinery, will result in the formation of some kind of as yet undefined "progressive" electoral bloc based on the "resurrection of the Roosevelt program" and that this appeasement is the main task of the CP.

Deception of Working Class

This "progressive" electoral bloc—or, as another phrase in the report has it, "the broadest possible democratic coalition"—is supposed to exert enough parliamentary pressure to force monopoly capital, its state and war departments, to abandon its drive for world domination.

The campaign for and the election of "progressive" candidates of the two parties of monopoly capital on a program of "resurrection" of "the Roosevelt program" or the Wilkie program as an effective method of stopping war is deceptive of the working class. It would be no more deceptive—and infinitely less dangerous—to tell the labor movement that the only way out of the system of monopolistic robbery is a return to handicraft industry and the horse-and-buggy era.

War on the Soviet Union, on the people of China and the Mediterranean, the open use of armed forces, backed financially and diplomatically by Wall Street and its government (Standard Oil in the Middle East, China and Indonesia) against other peoples, will be prevented only by the united mass action of the working class of our country and its allies in every field of struggle of which electoral struggle is but one and that mainly of a preparatory character. To hand the leadership of this decisive struggle over to petty-bourgeois politicians is a crime against our class.

The Dennis report never mentions once that, with their dependents the "wage-earning population" makes up the great majority of the inhabitants of our country. This fact has a specially decisive meaning in the U.S., with its "democratic" traditions, and is worth repeating over and over again to a party membership which has been steeped in revisionist illusions for so long.

Many, if not most, of them believe that "isolation" and "sectarianism" mean failure to win middle-class and even capitalist class approval. Here we discover the touchstone which opens the secret vault, from whose hoard of revisionist gems selected specimens were displayed at the July, 1946 meeting of the National Committee of the CPUSA!

Major Task Distorted and Dismissed

Nowhere in the entire report is the struggle to win the U.S. working class for a socialist program cited as an immediate major task.

On Page 707, this central task is described as "... to bring forward its fundamental program for the eventual socialist reorganization of society." It would indeed have to be a rabid red-baiter who would object to this fine bit of Fabianism.

The second reference is on Page 800. It says the CPUSA must "infuse all its work with its long range perspective of socialism." This will surely make the tyrants tremble! It is our considered belief that even Harold Laski, the social-democratic leader of the British Labor Party, would gag at such a formulation.

The only other reference to winning the workingclass for socialism is on page 807, at the end of a passage where confusion is the only perceptible policy. It refers, in passing, to "our ultimate socialist program."

Here we have again in our party that phenomenon inseparable from "notorious revisionism," the method called, when the Marxist-Leninist opposition was fighting to save the party from the Pepper-Lovestone wreckers, "tipping your hat to socialism."

"Eventual socialist reorganization of society," "long range perspective of socialism," "ultimate socialist program"—here is the new revisionism in excelsis. These are the only references to a socialist program in the entire eclectic, vulgarly opportunist report accepted unanimously as the party line by this revisionist leadership—operating in a country where the workingclass is the majority of the population.

Bourgeois-Democratic Deception

What the entire leadership of the CPUSA has adopted in this report is a revival, in a new guise, of the whole program of bourgeois-democratic deception of the U.S. working class. It is the program which made it possible for "our own" monopolists and their government in the immediate post-war period, (San Francisco UN meetings) without organized political opposition from the CPUSA and the labor movement, to become both the bankers and the military backers of imperialist, fascist and feudal reaction and/or combinations of all three in conscript service in its drive for the rulership of the world by one imperialist government—"our own"—without effective working class resistance.

"... in order to relieve the bourgeoisie of the last trace of anxiety it must be clearly and convincingly proved to them that the Red bogey is really only a bogey, and does not exist. But what is the secret of the Red bogey if it is not the bourgeoisie's dread of the inevitable life and death struggle between it and the proletariat? Dread of the inevitable decision of the modern class struggle? Do away with the class struggle and the bourgeoisie and 'all dependent people' will 'not be afraid to go hand in hand with the proletariat.' And the ones to be cheated will be precisely the proletariat." (Karl Marx, SELECTED WORKS, Vol. II, p. 620.)

Dennis does precisely this.

The timorous redundancy by which he tries to avoid such fundamental issues as methods of struggle against imperialist war; the character of the present world crisis; the relationship of class forces in the U.S.; the central, socialist task of a Communist Party; his vague and contradictory references to "independent political action," "third party," "important, though limited, forms of independent political action," "pro-Roosevelt peace forces," "a new people's party," "a new progressive party," "a new third, a people's party," "a new progressive party alignment," "multiply their independent pro-Roosevelt activity," etc., etc., ad nauseam—all these prove, without the wealth of additional evidence, that this is clearly another treacherous, revisionist program.

United Struggle Imperative

The monopoly capitalists and their government have made our country (and it is our country, although it is in the hands of the class enemy) into the financial center and arsenal of world counter-revolution; Imperialist reaction at home, imperialist intervention and war abroad. Only in a united mass struggle of the working class to smash this program of slaughter and slavery does a popular peace and working class freedom lie: And only a program for the abolition of capitalism can rally the decisive working class detachments who alone can organize and lead such a struggle.

This is what Communists must tell American workers, and convince them of it in the course of our activity in all the day-to-day struggles for immediate needs.

There is no other alternative except to aid the petty bourgeois and bourgeois apologists; to perpetuate the false and defeatist illusions by which they try to keep the working class attached to the capitalist parties and programs—to keep working class struggles within the narrow limits set by them and by which the working class is fooled year after year into placing government power in the hands of henchmen of the class which openly advocates throttling the labor movement, more production but a smaller share in wages—and war as the way out of ever more frequent economic crisis.

V.

Both contempt for and lack of Marxist theory and method show in almost every sentence and paragraph of the Dennis reports.

In every section in which he attempts to go beyond certain factual material, revisionist wording rather than exact Marxist terms are used; instead of sharply attacking the capitalist system, he complains and appeals, regrets and deplores. He never goes beyond workers' present understanding of the class struggle. It is the duty of Communists to develop that understanding to a higher level, by using union militancy and experience as the starting point for further Marxist agitation, propaganda, education and organization. The vast knowledge and experience that the working class has acquired through its economic struggles must be explained in terms of Marxist-Leninist theory.

Frederick Engels, in his preface to the first English edition of Marx's "Capital," wrote:

"... It is, however, self-evident that a theory which views modern capitalist production as a mere passing stage in the economic history of mankind, must make use of terms different from those habitual to writers who look upon that form as imperishable and final." (Our emphasis.)

Reformism and Monopolies

The continued, deceptive, reformist emphasis in the Dennis report on the possibility of "curbing" and "restricting" the power of the gigantic monopolist corporations by bourgeois-democratic

"In spite of enormous difficulties, the Workers (Communist) Party of America has achieved considerable successes in the sphere of mass work. It has led a number of strikes, has made first attempts to organize the unorganized. It has penetrated into the Miners' Union. The weak sides of the Party still remain its inadequate influence among the real American workers and its organizational defects. The work of the Party in various spheres - for example, work among the Negroes, among women, etc. is still not well organized and the carrying out of the decisions of previous enlarged Plenums with regard to the establishment of a broad left wing in the trade unions has also been inadequate" ("Thesis on the International Situation and the Tasks of the Communist International," cited in THE COMMUNIST, May 1927, p. 148).

"It has become evident during the course of the discussion that both groups [the majority or Lovestone-Gitlow-Pepper faction and the minority or Foster-Bittelman-Cannon faction - ed.] are guilty of the fundamental error of exaggerating the specific features of American capitalism. You know that this exaggeration lies at the root of every opportunist error committed by both the majority and the minority group. It would be wrong to ignore the specific peculiarities of American capitalism. The Communist Party in its work must take them into account. But it would be still more wrong to base the activities of the Communist Party on these specific features, since the foundation of the activities of every Communist Party, on which it must base itself, must be the general features of capitalism, which are the same for all countries, and not its specific features in any given country. It is on this that the internationalism of the Communist Party is founded ... The error of both groups is that they exaggerate the significance of the specific features of American capitalism and thereby overlook the basic features of American capitalism which are characteristic of world capitalism as a whole. Therefore, when the leaders of the majority and the minority accuse each other of elements of a Right deviation, it is obviously not without some measure of truth" (Speech delivered in the American Commission of the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International by Joseph Stalin on May 6, 1929).

"What did Comrade Foster talk to me about? He complained of the factionalism and unprincipledness of Comrade Lovestone's group. What did I answer him? I admitted these sins on the part of the Lovestone group, but at the same time added that the same sins were characteristic of the Foster group. On the basis of this Comrade Foster arrives at the singular conclusion that I sympathize with the minority group. Where is the foundation, one asks? On what grounds is Foster pleased to think that I fail to see the defects of the minority group and even sympathize with that group? Is it not obvious that with Comrade Foster the wish is father to the thought? What did Comrade Lovestone talk about? Of the worthlessness of the Foster-Bittelman group. What did I answer? I answered that both groups were suffering from serious defects and advised him to take measures to liquidate factionalism. That was all ... I think the Commission of the Presidium of the E.C.C.I. should in its

International Commu

draft dissociate itself both from the errors of the majority and from the errors of the minority. And for the very reason that it must dissociate itself from both, it must not propose to turn over the leadership to the minority. Hence the proposal of Comrade Foster with all its implications, automatically falls to the ground" (Ibid.). "Did not Comrade Foster know that he should have held aloof from the concealed Trotskyites that were in his group? Why, in spite of repeated warnings, did he not repudiate them at the time? Because he behaved first and foremost as a factionalist. Because in the factional fight against the Lovestone group even concealed Trotskyites might be useful to him. Because the blindness of factionalism dulls the Party sense in people and makes them indiscriminating as to the means they employ" (First Speech delivered in the Presidium of the E.C.C.I. on the American Question, by Joseph Stalin, May 14, 1929).

"...both factions of the American Communist Party and particularly the majority faction, have, beginning with 1925, systematically violated the fundamental decisions of the Congresses of the Comintern regarding the liquidation of factionalism and the establishment of unity" (Ibid.).

"Finally, a few words as to the fate of the American Communist Party in connection with the decision adopted by the Presidium of the E.C.C.I. The comrades of the American delegation regard the matter too tragically. They declare that with the adoption of the draft of the Commission the American Communist Party will either perish, or in any case, will totter on the brink of a precipice. That is not so, comrades. More than that, it is absolutely ludicrous. The American Communist Party lives and will continue to live in spite of the prophecies of the comrades of the American delegation" (Second Speech delivered at the Presidium of the E.C.C.I. on the American Question, May 14, 1929).

"The small Communist Party of America is faced today with the very responsible task of giving leadership to a mass movement that is growing by leaps and bounds ... The party as yet has not properly estimated the magnitude of the new problems and is not as yet clear on the methods of solving them. It has found one of those important methods, the recruiting into the Party of thousands of workers, and along this line it has already achieved notable success. But the Party is not ready as yet to lead the rising revolutionary upsurge in the country. There cannot be any illusions on this point. And the Party cannot accomplish the task without a determined break, a sharp turn about in the methods of work, of developing and consolidating the revolutionary trade unions. The March 6 demonstrations that are an expression of a mighty spontaneous upheaval of the masses should not deceive the Party as to its own organizational weakness and absence of much firmer contacts with the wide masses. Only basing itself on the revolutionary trade unions, on the Trade Union Unity League, will the Party

be able to accomplish successfully the task of assuming leadership in the struggles of the working class. But the situation in the TUUL is as yet exceedingly tragic. In every way, organizationally, politically and from the point of view of cadres the TUUL is particularly weak and wholly unprepared to cope with its tasks" ("The Crisis in the United States and the Problems of the Communist Party", by S. Mingulin of the Communist International, reprinted in THE COMMUNIST, June 1930, p. 510). "The things which hindered the English and American sections most of all in obtaining the leadership of mass activity was their sectarian approach to the masses, their over-estimation of the influence of the Social-Fascists and trade union bureaucrats among the workers, and hence their efforts to remain only in the opposition. Then there is the completely insufficient initiative of the lower Party organizations and the Red Trade Unions, and also the R.T.U.O., and finally, the weakness of our cadres ... Sectarianism is explained here by the fact that, up to the present, the majority of the members, and especially the leading cadres of the Party, have not been native-born American workers, and a considerable proportion of the cadres



THE AMERICAN COMMUNIST
COMMUNIST PARTIES IN THE
HAS LAID TASKS OF A DECI
POINT OF VIEW OF THE WOR
J. V. Stalin, May 6, 192

come from small industry, while a considerable number of them are of petty bourgeois origin. The real nature of this sectarianism consists in a right opportunist lagging behind the mass movement. In distinction to the British Communist Party, the Communist Party of the U.S.A. had several big strikes to its credit, which it led independently. This experience shows that our Parties and Red Trade Unions have wide possibilities of leading independent economic fights. But this possibility is used without any definite and consistently applied plan, in a partisan manner, from time to time, and case to case. Therefore, it is not surprising that the strikes which are successfully led by us do not leave any trace on our Parties and our trade unions. Remember the famous strike of the textile workers in Gastonia, which obtained the sympathy of the workers of the South for us, and which gave us the possibility of building up our Party organization there. And what have we now in Gastonia? Not a single Party member. Take last year's strike in Pennsylvania and Ohio. After the strike, our union did not grow stronger there, but weakened" ("The End of Capitalist Stabilization and the Basic Tasks of the British and American Sections of the Communist International", by T. Gusev (Speech at the Twelfth Plenum of the E.C.C.I.) in THE COMMUNIST, January 1933, pp. 40-41).

"The American comrades are afraid of political discussion; they have not organized any discussion for the study

nts On The C.P.U.S.A.

of the decisions of the 13th Plenum, and are not organizing any discussions for the study of the decisions of the 14th Plenum now. In the cells only organizational and technical questions are discussed, and the collection of money is the chief work" (Ibid., p. 46).

"Over 70 per cent of the population of Pittsburgh consists of steel smelters and metal workers. Our organization had 66 members, of whom only two were workers in the steel industry" (Ibid., p. 46).

"Is it possible for a Party which suffers from big defects in the sphere of inner-Party democracy, such as the absence of political life in the cells, a formal and bureaucratic attitude to the question of securing new members for the Party, absolutely insufficient collective work in the leading organs, an impermissible attitude to mass organizations, an anti-democratic financial policy - is it possible for a Party with such defects to cope with the tasks which face it at the present time - the task of firmly attaching to itself those broad masses who are being aroused to the struggle by the crisis, and securing them for the Communist Party? No, it is impossible" (Ibid., p. 47).

RTY IS ONE OF THOSE FEW
WORLD UPON WHICH HISTORY
VE CHARACTER FROM THE
D REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT.



"It must be remembered that the basic cadres of the English and American Communist Parties have not changed for several years. These cadres grew up in the sectarian period of the existence of the Parties. Many of these comrades cannot get rid of their sectarian tendencies. It is precisely this part of the cadres which forms the chief hindrance to eliminating sectarianism. With regard to the U.S.A., I should add that a certain part of the cadres grew up in conditions of unprincipled factional struggle, in other words, that this part of the cadres did not come forward because they were completely suitable for responsible political and organizational work" (Ibid., p. 48).

"Comrade Stachel states in the July Party Organizer that the turnover of the Party membership for the year remains about 100% (Also cites a unit with a 300% turnover - ed.)" ("A Review of the American 'Party Organizer'" in THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL, vol. xi, No. 24, December 20, 1934, p. 891).

"As to how weakly the Party is still rooted among the American proletariat, the national composition of the Party membership offers striking evidence. According to the report on the organizational situation in the Party, 70 percent of the party members are still foreign-born. The proportion, of course, should be the opposite. Figures presented to the Conference show that the Party increased its membership during the year 1932. Several thousand new members were also recruited during the first six months of 1933. But the actual membership of

the Party was, at the time of the Conference, not bigger, but rather slightly less, than at the end of 1932. It shows that the fluctuation of the membership is still tremendous. The Party easily gets new members, but cannot keep them. The great majority of the Party members are unemployed, which again shows that the Party has not determinedly adhered to the fixed course of getting new members from the big factories - and building factory cells" (Ibid., p. 656).

"The tasks indicated, and the methods of work put forward in the Open Letter do not differ essentially from those of the Fourteenth Plenum Resolution. In the Open Letter there is, however, a very important additional point; this is the warning given the Party of the possibility of going off its proletarian base if it does not strengthen it among the decisive strata of the American workers (especially in the big factories of the most important industries) much more rapidly than hitherto." (Ibid., p. 653).

"One of the weakest points of the work of the revolutionary unions is the insufficient work among Negroes, which in such industries as steel means the penetration of the biggest and most important plants" ("The Eighth Congress of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. and some conclusions", B. Sherman, in THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL, vol. xi, No. 12, June 20, 1934, p. 393).

"Although there has been some improvement in the shop work of the Party and increased attention to the Central Committee and District and section leadership to give concrete guidance to the concentration points, we cannot be at all satisfied with the present situation ... on the whole and particularly in the concentration districts (Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Detroit and Chicago) there is as yet no decisive improvement in the Party's work in the factories ... The majority of our shop units are in small shops and light industries and 80% of our units are still street units. The shop units have a poor political life, often functioning only as a trade union fraction, they react very slowly to shop issues and political questions. Only 47 shop units out of 338 issue shop papers.

(Ibid., pp. 393-394).

"The building up and consolidation of the Communist Party in the United States took place amidst great difficulties. Born out of heterogeneous, theoretically weakly developed groups and having its main organizational strength in the small enterprises of light industry, with their narrow craft ideology, and a big percentage of the immigrant elements isolated from the masses, the Party became, from its very beginning, the centre for protracted factional fights which hampered the development of the revolutionary mass work and the rooting of the Party among the decisive strata of the American working class. Only in 1929 was the Party able, with the direct help of the Communist International, to purge itself of the Lovestone renegades and this put an end to

the factional struggle" ("The Extraordinary Conference of the C.P. of the U.S.A." in THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL, vol. x, No. 19, October 1, 1933, p. 652).

"It should be particularly noted that the mass language organizations under the influence of the Party, to which a mass of workers from the basic branches of industry belong, are not mobilized for trade union work. This is the case also with the press of these organizations. For example, in the Cleveland district, in one steel center, the International Workers Order has 600-700 members, the overwhelming majority of whom work in steel enterprises. However, this organization does nothing to draw these workers into trade union work. In several localities there is not a single worker in this or any other mass organization who belongs to a trade union" ("The Current Problems of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.," I. Mingulin, in THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL, vol. xii, No. 14, July 20, 1935, p. 884).

"The fact that the trade union work of the Party has not been sufficiently reorganized is particularly clearly revealed on the question of the approach to work in the reformist trade unions, in the tendency to limit this work, to reduce it to a narrow opposition movement, as noted in the resolutions of the Plenum. This is, without doubt, the decisive question in the trade union policy of the Party" (Ibid., p. 885).

"The fact that certain leaders of the CPUSA are so eager to prettify U.S. imperialism and so eager to affirm their loyalty to the ruling class of the United States recalls to mind Browder's revisionism, which existed in the CPUSA for some time. This renegade from the working class, Browder, denied Lenin's basic thesis that imperialism is parasitic, decaying and moribund capitalism, and denied that U.S. capitalism is imperialist in its nature, maintaining that it "retains some of the characteristics of a young capitalism" and would play a progressive role and be a force for world peace for a long time. Why don't these leaders of the CPUSA stop and consider: What is the difference between your present embellishment of U.S. imperialism and Browder's revisionism?"

"It is no accident that certain leaders of the CPUSA have attacked the Chinese Communist Party on the question of the Caribbean crisis. This action is a reflection of their completely wrong understanding of U.S. imperialism and their completely incorrect class stand. In their reports and statements over a considerable period, certain leaders of the CPUSA have been doing their utmost to prettify U.S. imperialism, to prettify Kennedy, the U.S. imperialist chieftain, and to affirm their loyalty to the U.S. ruling class" ("A Comment on the Statement of the Communist Party of the U.S.A." in "Renmin Ribao" (People's Daily) Editorial, March 8, 1963, in WHENCE THE DIFFERENCES

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES FROM THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL, JOURNAL OF THE COMINTERN, ON THE C.P.U.S.A. AVAILABLE FOR 50¢, POSTAGE INCLUDED.

END ITEM

cratic parliamentary methods, strengthens the monopolies by developing and maintaining crippling illusions within the working class as to the classlessness of capitalist government; as to government above classes, rather than the reality, which is government by a class.

The working class and its organizations is the only class force capable of initiating, organizing and conducting united mass campaigns and sustained struggles to resist and at times administer severe defeats to the program of special extortions and tyrannies of monopoly capital. The middle class leaders while at high prices and call for prosecution of monopolists by a government of monopolists, but the working class strikes.

Middle Class and Monopolists

The middle class leaders then turn on the working class. They blame higher prices on the higher wages won by the unions. They join in the demand of the propagandists of the giant corporations for more production and cheaper production.

"In the long run, workers can earn more only by lowering costs of production." Footnote to the Labor Crisis, PM, Nov. 24, '46.)

They, politely, of course, threaten the working class with suppression:

"In many industries, especially those with small and marginal operators, to press far-reaching changes in wages and working conditions without some program for enabling industry to meet the bill is merely to push many businesses into bankruptcy and the middle class toward fascism." (Ibid.)

What lovely leaders of the working class! They blame, not the monopolists and their government, for their financial (and political) bankruptcy, but the working class they help to exploit.

Communists Should Expose These Facts

These are the facts available to everyone who can read U.S. history. It is the Communist task to:

"... expose the utter falsity of its promises... unmasking, instead of admitting, the illusion-breeding demand that this government, a government of capitalists, cease being imperialistic." Lenin, THE TASK OF THE PROLETARIAT, Page 33.)

But Dennis encourages these bourgeois illusions within the CPUSA and the working class by his lack of and opposition to a class-conscious ideology. He speaks of "people," of "democracy," of "the nation," without making class distinctions. This is vicious nonsense from the Marxist-Leninist point of view. This form of government operates for the benefit of the capitalists. It, and the illusions created on this subject by purveyors of deception—ranging from revisionists of Marxism-Leninism to the chief spokesmen of the two big capitalist parties—are what keep capitalism in the saddle. This has to be made clear by Communists at all times.

"... we must do the work of criticism... and free the proletariat from the spell of the 'common' petty bourgeois delusions." (Lenin, TASK OF THE PROLETARIAT, Page 8.)

VI.

As a state form, modern parliamentary government grew out of the necessity which forced the rising capitalist class to break through the restrictions of the feudal system based on agriculture and serfdom, with its hereditary landed nobility, clerical-monarchist state form, hampering its own development as the ruling class.

This new state form, with its wider popular base, enabled the developing capitalist class to enlist the aid of the new property-

less wage-earning class in this struggle. At the same time, the increasing technical ability needed for manufacture and commerce, especially in factory production and the operation of power-driven machinery, compelled an increase in literacy and in the general educational, technical and cultural level among the working class. With the aid of the working class the rising capitalist class became the ruling class. These, in the main, are the economic and political factors on which the tradition of bourgeois democracy is based.

In the U. S., the absence of an aboriginal population that could be conquered and turned into chattel slaves or wage-earners, compelled the ruling class to resort to the importation of the one commodity lacking in this otherwise rich country for the creation of an independent capitalist economy—labor power. The abolition of Negro chattel slavery did not solve this problem for the victorious capitalist class. Mass immigration was encouraged and even organized.

The relative shortage of labor power and, at times, an absolute shortage, has been a major factor in the development of capitalist democracy in our country, not the "benevolence" of the capitalist class. Yet property qualification for manhood suffrage was not abolished until some 50 years after the Revolution—and then only by great struggles of the young labor movement. Free elementary education was won the same way. Woman suffrage was secured only by the most strenuous and sustained conflict.

The disfranchisement and terroristic suppression of Negroes in the South continues to this day, with but minor improvement. Great numbers of the working class and agrarian population are also disfranchised throughout the U.S. by arbitrary and complicated regulations; the widespread illusion that the "primary" system makes it possible for the "common people" to "capture" one or the other of the two parties of imperialism, makes even the exercise of the full rights of franchise for the working class and its allies more difficult in the U.S. than in any other country where the ruling class governs through its bourgeois democracy in its classic form.

To speak of "democracy" in the U.S. as this revisionist leadership does—without regard to these decisive facts—is to aid in the deception of the working class.

Dangerous Illusions Must Be Corrected

The fact that all Marxist-Leninists know that the capitalist-democratic form of government affords the most favorable setting for the working class in its defensive battles and for the development of its revolutionary struggle for socialism, does not mitigate the deception practiced by these revisionists. On the contrary, precisely because Communists are the most vigilant and vigorous defenders of bourgeois-democratic rights of the working class and all exploited and oppressed sections of the population, and fight resolutely for their extension, it is all the more necessary, clearly and patiently, to convince our class of the danger in the illusion spread by capitalist propagandists, petty-bourgeois careerists and corruptionists, to the effect that capitalist democracy by itself affords the opportunity and the machinery to end the exploitation and oppression of a working class in the majority by capitalists in the minority.

This illusion is one of the most effective weapons in the arsenal of capitalism.

It has been strengthened among CPUSA membership and, to the extent of its influence in the labor movement, by the vulgar "Americanization" of the CPUSA begun by Browder in the early '30s, and now continued by this revisionist leadership.

This method consists, in the main, of glamorizing petty-bourgeois politicians, urban and agrarian, of the pre-imperialist epoch and present period, and of play-

ing down the labor movement and its militant and revolutionary leaders. The false theoretical values of this method have been exploited to the limit, and great harm has been done to the revolutionary struggle to convince the working class of its own irresistible strength and historical liberating role—and the need to be conscious of it.

Is This Sectarianism?

The revisionist leadership which, by unanimous vote, foisted the Dennis reports and their anti-Marxist-Leninist program on the Party membership, will say that the views expressed above are "sectarian" or "leftist-sectarian," that they represent "cancerous leftism," that "isolation" of the Communists from the labor movement and the working class would result from such forthright Marxist definition of the central issues of the class struggle in the United States at this time.

As for isolation—although this is not the place to go into the matter in great detail—it must be said here that one must go back 20 years to find a time when the CPUSA had less influence, less membership, and when its press had less circulation; one must go back to the Lovestone-Pepper period of the late '20s, when a similar defeatist program and a politically pretentious but bankrupt opportunist leadership was as destructive of working class and Party morale as it is today.

We are Marxist-Leninists. We are revolutionists. We are Communists.

Duty to Workingclass

We are trying to raise the level of understanding of our class of the decisive, revolutionary role of liberation which capitalism, by creating the working class, has placed upon it. "The proletariat is the gravedigger of capitalism." We appeal to its strength, not to its weakness.

It is seemly, therefore, to conclude this exposure of the anti-working class and anti-Marxist-Leninist deception in the Dennis programmatic report, adopted unanimously by this revisionist "leadership" of the CPUSA, with a statement on this practice as it affects the movement toward liberation of the working class; an estimate of the origin and result of this criminal deception of the working class written by one who rates with Marx, Engels and Lenin, as one of the greatest teachers and strategists of the liberation struggle of the international working class and its allies, the doubly oppressed national minorities; the colonial and semi-colonial peoples:

"The chief endeavor of the bourgeoisie of all countries and its revisionist hangers-on is to kill in the working class faith in its own strength, faith in the possibility and inevitability of its victory, and thus to perpetuate capitalist slavery. For the bourgeoisie knows that if capitalism has not yet been overthrown and still continues to exist, it owes it not to its own merits but to the fact that the proletariat has still not faith enough in the possibility of its victory. It cannot be said that the efforts of the bourgeoisie in this respect have been altogether unsuccessful. It must be confessed that the bourgeoisie and its agents among the working class have to some extent succeeded in poisoning the minds of the working class with the venom of doubt and skepticism. If the successes of the working class of our country, if its fight and victory serve to rouse the spirit of the working class in the capitalist countries and to strengthen its faith in its own power and in its victory, then our party may say that its work has not been in vain. And there need be no doubt that this will be the case." (Stalin, LENINISM, Page 478.)

Decisive Change

The change in class relationships throughout the world in favor of the working class and its allies has developed as a result of the crushing of the Fascist Axis, the victory of the Soviet Union

and the rise of powerful democratic revolutionary forces. These facts, coupled with the brazenly aggressive role of the imperialists of the U. S. as the bankers, munitions makers and militarists for reaction and counter-revolution everywhere, puts on the first order of the day for Communists the revolutionary task of dispelling the bourgeois illusions of which Stalin speaks; of destroying the defeatist influence of the "reformist hangers-on."

Our main and immediate task is the winning of the working class for a socialist program as the only victorious way out for the working class and all exploited sections of the population; of organizing and conducting Communist work in the daily struggles in full accord with our immediate major objective and Marxist-Leninist theory, strategy and tactics—the speediest possible political preparation of our class for its historic task, at the head of all other exploited classes, of establishing a socialist system in our country.

? Opportunist "Practically" in Unions — Surrender to Suppression of Democratic Rights of Workers

The united front of labor against the blackmail and banditry program and anti-union drive of monopoly capital was broken at the CIO Convention, November, 1946.

The first battle in the campaign against wages, living standards and the freedom of unions and political rights in the U. S. was won by the monopoly capitalists who used infiltration tactics at the Atlantic City convention of the CIO—won by the Wall Street banks, industrial corporations, and their two-party, anti labor government.

The Declaration of Policy on Communism, jointly drafted and unanimously adopted by the bloc of CIO officials—led by right-wing social democrats, Trotskyites, Christian Fronters and Coughlinites, titular leaders of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists and opportunist leaders of the Communist Party—unites all this motley bureaucracy for suppression of the political trade union democratic rights of the militant, rank-and-file membership. Honest delegates were confused by the deluge of demagoguery and the failure of CP leaders to expose and oppose this representative policy. "Unity" at the expense of class-conscious workers and Communists, "unity" at the expense of the democratic rights of all workers as the way out of crises and war—this "unity" is the way to disaster.

Under the guise of "unity", these reformist defenders of the capitalist system and the outright agents of the corporations within the CIO have succeeded in initiating the typical splitting tactic: organization of the leadership against the membership.

The leadership has become "respectable." The next step that is inevitable in this backward direction is for this union leadership to guarantee a new high level of production per manhour, and this is already in force in many CIO shops and plants.

The last section of the resolution embodying the surrender to the most rabid exponents of the policy of monopoly capital (Hearst, the Chicago Tribune, the Daily News, Scripps-Howard papers, etc.) reads as follows:

"In pursuit of the principles set forth herein and adopted by the CIO Executive Board, we, the delegates to the Eighth Constitutional Convention of the Congress of Industrial Organizations RESENT AND REJECT EFFORTS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OR OTHER POLITICAL PARTIES AND THEIR ADHERENTS TO INTERFERE IN THE AFFAIRS OF THE CIO. THIS CONVENTION SERVES NOTICE THAT WE

WILL NOT TOLERATE SUCH INTERFERENCE." (PM—Nov. 18—our emphasis)

Politically, this declaration puts the CIO back to where the American Federation of Labor was in 1923.

Forbids Independent Action

It prohibits, by the phrase, "political parties and their adherents," any activity in the CIO in behalf of independent political action by the membership.

The only political action mentioned in the declaration (in the second paragraph) is the "non-partisan," ineffective kind of activity—ineffective and consequently inoffensive to the monopolist overlords—described as:

"... encouraged its membership to exercise its rights and obligations as citizens of the community by supporting progressive legislation affecting their economic and social well being."

This, in connection with the repudiation of all independent political action, is a reversion to complete acceptance of the two capitalist parties, Democrat and Republican, as the only vehicles of political action for workers and their unions. This is what is meant by the phrase "within the framework of American political democracy."

But the political slogan raised in this declaration of CIO policy is "social justice." (Second line of fourth paragraph of text as printed in PM, Nov. 18, 1946.)

"Social justice" is the slogan of the Coughlinites (it is the name of the official Coughlinite organ) and Christian Fronters. It is the meaningless, demagogic slogan of all these anti-Semites, Negro-baiters and clerical-fascists—enemies of socialism and of the Soviet Union. It is the sign manual of reaction throughout the world; it is the shouted shibboleth with which they try to conceal their belief in the corporative, fascist state form of working-class suppression and their support of counter-revolution.

No CP Opposition!

The revisionist leaders of the U. S. Communist Party, the National Board, in agreement with the revisionist leaders of CP who are also officials of CIO unions, accepted this slogan unanimously! Not a single Communist leader spoke in opposition! Not a single CP delegate spoke against this open expression of reaction or opposed the obvious preparations to destroy what trade-union democracy still survives in CIO!

Not a single CP member—or anyone else—rose to tell the convention, to tell the U. S. working class, or to tell the millions of working men and women throughout the world who are fighting reaction backed by Wall Street imperialism, that this declaration was not one of independence from, but rather one of surrender to, labor's most vicious enemies.

What can the millions of seasoned workingclass, anti-fascist fighters—united with millions of Communist workers in the Soviet Union, China, Spain and the liberated countries of Western Europe (the front that saved us from fascist invasion)—think of this particular sentence in the CIO declaration?

"The CIO, as an American institution, has no interest apart from the interest of our people and our country." (Tenth line, fifth paragraph, in PM text cited earlier.)

But in this one sentence this "league of frightened men" categorically repudiated the international ties and obligations of labor organizations heretofore universally acknowledged, the ties called by Abraham Lincoln "the strongest bond uniting mankind..."

In this one sentence these betrayers of the most sacred of all labor's traditions insulted and deserted in the face of the class enemy attack those millions of members of the World Federation of Trades Unions to which it is affiliated.

Strikes at Basic Right of All Workers

By so doing, they sabotaged the efforts of the WFTU to secure the right to speak for world labor in the name of its 70,000,000 members before the UNO and at the very time when this struggle was at a crucial stage!

The content of this CIO declaration is of a character no Communist, class-conscious working man or militant trade unionist can accept.

It strikes, in the weasel language of enemy propagandists, at the democratic rights and consequently at the morale of the rank-and-file membership. It is intended to justify a tighter, bureaucratic clamp on the rights of workers in the basic and heavy industries, where the majority of CIO membership works and which are the main preserves of monopoly capital. This move can work only in favor of the corporations. This is the key to this whole appeasement policy. And those officials who accepted this policy cannot be trusted to organize and lead the struggle against the anti-labor offensive.

It is the policy of the bent knee and bowed head to capitalism and its mercenaries; ridicule, slander, abuse and the gag for the exploited, dues-paying membership. What have the CP leaders who are also CIO officials been doing during the ten years and more that they have held these influential positions?

It is the duty of every Communist to expose and oppose such a policy when directed against any section of union membership except fascist spies and spokesmen. To fail to do so is cowardice. To justify support of this demagogic reaction in the name of an organizational "unity" that is not and was not threatened, in the name of political "unity" that can only aid monopoly capital, is treachery.

This is what these revisionist CP leaders have done and are doing. By so doing, these refugees from the social revolution that is yet in the womb of time here in the U.S. have dragged the Communists—and their goal, socialism—and the class struggle on the political plane which is their method, in the mire of class collaboration for the second time in two years.

What A Contrast!

There was a Communist named Dimitroff who stood manacled in a Nazi court while the Hitlerite mobs howled for his blood. He used that Nazi court as a forum from which to warn the working class and the whole world of the true meaning of fascism, of what fascism meant for working men and women, for the Jews, for colonial peoples, small nations and national minorities.

But the CIO declaration of policy on communism has the sole purpose of appeasing these same anti-labor forces in the U. S., forces that appeased the fascist rulers, and kept them in power until they thought all popular resistance had been crushed. The world labor movement waited in vain for even one Communist Party voice raised in warning at the CIO Convention in Atlantic City.

These revisionist CP leaders not only failed to oppose but actually supported this appeasement—and not only at the CIO Convention but in the Daily Worker. They call it "unity"—but it is this kind of "unity" that brings fascism into power. These revisionist demagogues probably will even have the gall to quote Dimitroff in an attempt to justify their own opportunistic cowardice.

History repeats itself, said Marx—once as a tragedy, and then as a farce!

The performance by these refugees from the class struggle is farce-tragedy, if one can use such a term: tragedy, because it marks the open and absolute desertion of a great and militant tradition in the organized labor movement; farce, because in spite of the demagoguery, and the red herring of "interference" by political parties, the sickly cowardice and politically backward character of the "resolu-

tion on Communist policy" is apparent. The CIO leadership (Murray-Carey) is solidly in the official ranks of the Democrat party. Only faint vestiges are left of the so-called independent groupings which never got beyond the stage of appendages of the Democrat party.

Twenty-three years ago, in Portland, Oregon, one lone Communist delegate told Philip Murray, William Green, John L. Lewis and Matthew Woll, at the 43rd Annual A.F. of L. Convention, where their anti-Communist policy, their "efficiency" unionism, and their appeasement of the employers, would lead the unions, including the United Mine Workers.

By 1929-30, the wreckage of the UMWA—i.e., what was left of a once powerful union—was being rescued by Communists in a dozen hard-fought battles from Illinois and western Pennsylvania through Ohio and West Virginia to Harlan and Pine counties in Kentucky.

It Happened Before

The defeatist policy of appeasing the mine operators at the expense of the mine workers had reduced the mighty UMWA to a skeleton and resultant impotence. The AFL itself had likewise been reduced to a skeleton—perhaps 2,000,000 dues-paying members in all its unions—by the same policy.

By reorganizing old unions, by organizing industrially in so-called federal labor unions, by organizing independent industrial unions, by organizing the unemployed and by eliminating strike-breaking during the worst period of the crisis and depression, the Communists by 1935 had built new broad foundations for industrial unionism in all the heavy industries. The Communists brought militant industrial unionism to the South.

And it was to Lewis and Murray, in 1935-36, that was presented a nationwide network of growing industrial unions, unions built by the Communists and by thousands of other unpaid, volunteer organizers, speakers and tacticians—and the most courageous and competent staff of organizers this or any other country ever developed in the industrial union field.

It was after this that Earl Browder and his corps of revisionists began to liquidate CP groups in the unions, dropped the fight for democratic union rights, and made Lewis a gift of the CP, its press, and its organizers.

Murray's first meeting in Pittsburgh as head of the Steel Workers' Organizing Committee was organized by Communists. They were the only ones who could combat effectively the tight control exercised by Mussolini's consulates over Italian steel workers and that exercised by clerical-fascists among both the Italians and the Poles.

A Lesson From 1923

History repeats itself: It was Philip Murray who, in 1923, at the Portland, Ore., A.F. of L. Convention, made the motion to unseat the lone Communist delegate mentioned above. The delegate was unseated—and the press from coast to coast hailed this as a great victory for "democracy."

But before this delegate was unseated he said (there was more democracy then in the AFL than there is now in the CIO):

"Speaking as a Communist, since the issue has been raised, although I came here as a trade unionist and not as a Communist, I understand the real reasons for the effort you are now making.

"YOU WANT TO PROVE TO THE EMPLOYERS THAT YOU ARE MORE CONSERVATIVE THAN THEY ARE, THAT YOU LOVE THE WAGE SYSTEM EVEN MORE ARDENTLY THAN THEY DO. You have succeeded in gaining a great deal of immunity for yourselves, BUT THIS IMMUNITY DOES NOT EXTEND TO THE ORGANIZATIONS YOU ARE SUPPOSED TO REPRESENT. In that the employers and we Communists think alike. They, too, make a distinction between a high-salaried official and the working class.

"... THESE SAME PAPERS THAT ARE NOW LAUDING YOU FOR YOUR DETERMINED EFFORTS TO CAST THE COMMUNISTS INTO THE OUTER DARKNESS WILL BE DENOUNCING YOUR ORGANIZATIONS JUST AS BITTERLY AS YOU NOW DENOUNCE ME. Seeking to placate the employers, you have bored within their organizations, but you have captured nothing but jewel-studded lodge charms. YOU MAY SAVE YOURSELVES, BUT YOU CANNOT SAVE THE UNIONS UNLESS YOU CHANGE YOUR POLICIES..."

"It is here we see the divergence of interest between the membership and officialdom... of the pleasure and profit of peddling your influence for the benefit of one or the other of the parties of the employers.

"You seem to believe that capitalism is in its heyday; we do not; we say that this is the twilight of capitalism and that unless the labor movement changes its policies and tactics it is going to be caught and dragged down in the general chaos that capitalism is bringing in the train of its collapse... WE ARE ABOUT TO ENTER ANOTHER PERIOD OF DEPRESSION... WHAT OF THE LABOR MOVEMENT? HAS IT RECOVERED THE LOSSES IT SUSTAINED? YOU KNOW IT HAS NOT. IT WILL FACE ANOTHER OPEN SHOP DRIVE WITH LESS CONFIDENCE... WHAT IS YOUR ANSWER TO THIS? A WAR UPON THE 'RADICALS' IN COOPERATION WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, AN APPEAL FOR AID FROM THE EMPLOYERS IN THIS HOLY CAUSE..."

(From speech by William F. Dunne on motion by Philip Murray to unseat Dunne.)

Appeasers Never Learn

The same creeping paralysis which set in among the unions as a result of the anti-Communist crusade and policy of cooperation with the corporations will not now overtake the labor movement as a whole in spite of this surrender by sections of CIO leadership to the propaganda campaign of the monopolists and the efforts of the leaders to turn back the clock. For hypocrisy does not turn the trick quite the way it used to in the old days! The working class has learned much in the last 16 years—but appeasers never learn!

Millions of workers have learned now to look behind such fervent expressions of devotion to the "four freedoms" as occur in the CIO Declaration of Policy on Communism—which includes "freedom of speech for everyone-everywhere." This is advertised as a very "subtle" slap at the Soviet Union and at the alleged "iron curtain." But it can be seen that "everywhere" obviously does not include the CIO itself; otherwise there would be no excuse for the main Policy declaration. This is the sort of cheap chicanery with which an officialdom engaged in "emancipating the working class one at a time" (beginning with themselves of course) tries to evade issues which under slightly changed conditions can mean life or death to the labor movement.

They have made the same kind of mistake made in 1923.

They thought then they were dealing with just one Communist, not with living issues affecting the lives of millions.

They think now that the class struggle policy will disappear from the discussions and struggles in and of the CIO unions, just because these leaders have abandoned the task of winning the working class for a socialist program.

The bureaucracy is welcome to these CP leaders. They belong in that camp—and the sooner the working class membership of the

CP understands this, exposes these leaders and the National Board and National Committee that placed its imprimatur upon their desertion of Marxist-Leninist theory, their rejection of the struggle for the socialist goal of the working class—defeats and ousts them, then the sooner can the grave injury done to the CIO and the struggle for a united front against the capitalist offensive be overcome.

Betrayal By Leaders

It was betrayal when working class CP members and class conscious workers, who did not want to aid either Dewey and the war-mongering anti-labor Republican Party or Mead and the war-mongering anti-labor Democratic Party of Truman and Byrnes, were herded into the latter party against their will by Machiavellian intrigues. By withdrawing the CP candidate for governor the CP is left off the ballot for four more years. This piece of skulduggery has now been followed by a denunciation of the Communist Party itself (communism and socialism) arranged and agreed to in the highest official circles of the CP and of the CIO—by these same revisionist Communist Party leaders.

If the policy expressed in this CIO declaration is allowed to stand, if these revisionist deserters of the social revolution and apostles of appeasement are allowed to continue to pose as Communists and militant leaders of

unions, then the results might well be disastrous in this present period of the gathering offensive by monopoly capital and its government. This shall not happen.

Proletarian members of the CP will now begin open political struggle against these defeatists.

Communists who have been driven out of the CPUSA for exposing the anti-Marxist and anti-working class nature of the program of these CP and union wreckers will close ranks and rally workers around a program of class struggle and the immediate organization of the campaign to win the support of the mighty working class of the U.S. for a socialist program.

Struggle Is Necessary

The struggle against revisionist program and against defeatist leadership in the CP; the work of rallying the rank-and-file Marxist-Leninist forces in the organized labor movement and among all sections of the working class, among the Negro people and working farmers, can and will be integrated.

The left wing of the labor movement will now reject opportunism and appeasement as a policy and will reorganize and strengthen its lines.

By making the theory and practice of Marxist-Leninism—the laws of motion of capitalist society in this imperialist period and how to use them to advance the cause of the working class—available to and the weapon of the entire labor movement and the working class, we will meet and defeat the offensive of monopoly capital and its shock-troops against our living

standards, political rights, our unions and political parties. Nothing said here is intended to prove that the CIO leadership is to the right of the A.F. of L.

The main difference consists in the fact that the greater part of the membership of the major CIO unions work in giant mass production industries and marine transport which are the domain of the magnates who rule the union of bank and industrial capital, the particular form of monopoly capitalism—namely capital—the last imperialist era.

Here, in these industrial networks, hundreds of thousands of workers have learned the utter futility of isolated protest and combat against the economic and political might of these corporations and government agencies.

Membership Makes Difference

The great struggles which brought many of these CIO unions into being are still fresh in the memories of great sections of these workingmen and women. They are more conscious of their class power and of their relations with workers in other industries and other countries. This, in the main, accounts for the more advanced political views and class solidarity of the CIO membership.

It is all the more regrettable that this great bloc of organized workers should have had the anti-democratic and defeatist resolution of "Declaration of Policy on Communism" foisted upon them by the action of bureaucrats animated by fear of monopolists, their propagandists and government—and hatred and fear of independent political workingclass anti-capitalist struggle.

Political Rights

It is now more than ever necessary to open and continue a campaign among the rank and file of both the CIO and A.F. of L. unions, to restore, defend and extend basic trade union political rights. This resolution is an unmistakable signal for the need of such a campaign—to show to them that entrenched and high salaried officials can and do have economic and social interests which are not those of the on-the-job membership.

Under no circumstances must such a campaign, essential as it is to the question of class relationships in the struggle to win the main body of the working class for the socialist solution, be allowed to become merely an anti-leadership movement. This would defeat its purpose. "It is the anarchist method," Lenin wrote, "to work always from below and never from above."

The necessary distinctions must always be made between those leaders and officials of various categories who merely make mistakes—and those who are, as the clerical phrase goes—"confirmed in sin." Class loyalty is the decisive test. Which class do their programs, policies, acts and utterances serve in the long run—the workingclass or the exploiting, employing class? This is decisive.



8. Fascist Imperialism and "Democratic" Imperialism — Opportunist, Sectarian Deception Aids Main Enemy — Monopoly Capitalism

cism and war as their only solution?

The answer that Communists are loyal citizens of the U.S.A.; that they are militant trade unionists; that they are friends of the Soviet Union; that they are for housing, lower prices, higher wages; against anti-Negro terror; for peace and against imperialist war, against Franco and fascism, anti-Semitism, etc. is no answer at all.

A Searching Question

It is no answer at all because millions of workingmen and women will ask logically: "Why do you need a Communist Party to believe in and work and fight for or against these demands and issues? We believe in all or most

of these things but we do not see why that makes you a Communist."

That is a correct question and a basic and unanswerable criticism. The bald and unpleasing truth is that by rejecting struggle for a socialist program in the labor movement CP leaders appear as opportunists anxious merely for official positions and power. Red-baiting cannot be exposed and defeated by this opportunist appeasement.

Communists in our country must rid themselves of the opportunist poison and corruption which has been accumulating for years as a result of the failure to realize its always present danger in this dominant imperialist country, with its relatively high economic and technical standards, with the con-

tinual infiltration of bourgeois influence and elements into their ranks; if Communists are able to say to the workingclass that they are of its flesh and blood; that they are members of a Marxist-Leninist political party because their class must have such a party (just as other classes must have their parties for their class purposes) to teach, organize and lead it in the inevitable struggle to liberate itself by abolishing capitalism and classes and thereby liberate mankind; if Communists in our country are able to do this soon—and without opportunist equivocation—the way will be opened for the speedy entry of the American workingclass into the world arena as the decisive force for the socialist victory of the democratic workingclass forces throughout the world.

9. The Theory and Practice of Deception of CP Membership and Workingclass

1. The program and leadership of the Communist Party of the United States make of it today a Communist Party in name only. The program with its central slogan: "Resurrect the Roosevelt policy" in various versions, has no basis in reality and does not express the immediate needs of the labor movement and the working class in this period of the offensive of monopoly capital, its 100 Wall Street corporations and their government against the working class and their living and social standards, wages, working conditions, political liberties. Such a slogan by focusing attention on the past instead of the present and future, minimizes the deepening economic and social contradictions of this post war period and hampers the organization of the basic working class forces against the vast military program and the militarist and fascist menace inseparable from American imperialism's drive for expansion and world domination.

In no way does this central homesick opportunist slogan ex-

press the world change in class relationships in favor of the democratic working class and socialist forces in general resulting from the crushing of the fascist Axis powers in Europe and Africa in World War II.

This slogan in its various guises is therefore the key to a policy and program which is intended to and does hand over the leadership of the struggles of the workingclass to the demagogic middle class leaders and capitalist class politicians and their "main peace time social props"—bureaucratic union officialdom. Their class role is to sugarcoat and thereby make palatable the bitter pills of speedup, poverty and militarist rule for domestic and foreign plunder and war which the monopoly capitalists and their government are trying to force upon American workingmen and women, Negro and white. This slogan places the Communist Party in the camp of "liberal" imperialism and objectively aids monopoly capital, militarism, labor repression and imperialist war.

2. This program and the leadership, which has forced it upon the Communist Party, are anti-Marxist-Leninist and therefore anti-workingclass. In adopting this program of surrender to "liberal" imperialism, this leadership has betrayed the basic interests

of the workingclass. Both the program of the "special" convention, July 1945, and that of the enlarged meeting of the so-called "National Committee", July 1946, categorically reject the revolutionary task of winning the American workingclass for a socialist program as a major and immediate task of the Communist Party. These are acts of connected and continuous desertion of the theory and practice of Marxist-Leninism, and thus constitute betrayal of the revolutionary class struggle and its major objective—Socialism.

3. The leadership which sponsors this crass opportunist program differs in no fundamental way from that which cheered and followed Browder into open acceptance of the domestic and foreign program of our imperialist rulers in 1944-45. They differ in no essential because in both periods the Communist Party has been wrecked by a policy of "notorious revisionism" which puts the party in the capitalist camp, makes of it a reformist party which joins with parties having similar aims—to save capitalist imperialism, instead of politically preparing the workingclass to abolish it and establish the socialist system of production for common use instead of for profit and power of a small minority.

4. We declare that the "reconstitution" of the Communist Par-

ty in July 1945 was carried out following the impact of the Duclos letter in such a way as to nullify the purposes of that document, i. e. by the same leadership which had peddled the Communist Party to the capitalist parties and dissolved it to please them. They first expelled Sam Darcy, (the only member of the National Committee at the time who had fought consistently the Browder surrender policy) to prevent as far as possible the exposure of their opportunist anti-C. P. and appeasement conspiracy at the coming rump convention and before the outraged membership. They continue this war on all members who reject opportunism and fight it.

Their campaign of slander and expulsion on a nationwide scale is the expression of the policy of appeasement of the capitalist and middle class enemies of socialism

a). A rump convention of 94 delegates (all with minor exceptions guilty of betrayal of Marxist-Leninism and dissolution of the C. P. to appease the class enemies), then elected some 71 of their number to national leadership after fundamental discussion in the party press and state convention had been deliberately confused, censored and suppressed.

Not Workingclass

The rank and file C.P. membership in unions is a mere handful. The C.P. was never more isolated from the workingclass than it is today. Never has it had less influence, in spite of the glorious achievements of the Soviet Union and the tremendous growth in membership and great increase in influence of Communist parties in practically every country in the world; in spite of the change of class relationships throughout the world in favor of the workingclass and its allies as a result of the crushing of the fascist Axis powers; in spite of the great national liberation struggles in India, China and Indonesia; in spite of the militant mood and nation-wide strikes in the U.S. of millions of workers in basic industry.

Its "coalitions" are merely the surrender of and by revisionist careerists to the demagogues of the middle class and capitalist class. Class conscious workers do not and will not join the C.P. to be reconverted into reformists. "Opportunism drives the masses away from the Party. Sectarianism takes the Party away from the masses." These "notorious revisionist" leaders have made a synthesis of the two which has wrecked the C.P. and discredited Communist theory and practice in our country more than have the enemy attacks.

Not Communist Party

The Communist Party is submerged in the parties and movements of the middle class and sections of the capitalist class. It has been drowned by surrender of its independent revolutionary role and denial of its central task—winning the working class of the United States for the Marxist proletarian way out of exploitation and imperialist war—Socialism administered by a workingclass government in the interests of the entire working population.

9.) What of the immediate issues? When and where has this "reconstituted National Committee" called upon the working class of the U.S. to exert its mighty organized economic power in a political manner to stop the preparation for a third World War? Where and when has it told the workingclass that it has the power to upset the war plans of the imperialists?

10.) The parasitic monopolies and their government are plundering and impoverishing the working class and lower sections of the middle class mercilessly—by inflation, speculation, taxation and militarism. Their instruments are the Democratic Party (in power) and the Republican Party—two-party sharing of capitalist government. What did this "reconstituted" leadership propose in 1946? "Wire your Congressman or Senator (Democrat or Republican)!" "Resurrect the New Deal!" "Elect the candidates of the Democratic Party (Mead and Lehman) etc.—the imperialist party of Byrnes and Truman."

4,000,000 families, veterans, workers of all categories, Negro and white, need housing—in the richest country in the world—a country where no single building was damaged by enemy action. What is the proposal? Wire your Democrat or Republican congressman! Elect the candidates of the capitalist party now in power—the Democratic Party.

The health of the workingclass is at a new low level. At least 25 percent of the population need medical attention and/or hospitalization. All medical centers are jammed. There are no effective plans for general socialized medical relief—in the richest country in the world.

Opportunist Surrender

Wire your Democrat or Republican congressman. Vote for the candidates of the Democratic or Republican Parties of capitalism!

Vote for the candidates of the war parties to stop war!

that these same leaders, who had committed these crimes against the theory and practice of Marxist-Leninism, who had dragged the name of the Communist Party through the mire of class collaboration as a substitute for the class struggle before the eyes of the revolutionary and labor movements of the world, on the eve of the postwar crisis, that these leaders were not a "hardboiled group of incurable revisionists."

The fact is therefore: The first gun in the campaign to minimize in this postwar period the tremendous feats of arms of the Soviet Union and its leadership when it bore four-fifths of the military weight of Nazi Germany, and to focus attention on its "mistakes", was fired, not by the open propagandists of imperialism but by this "reconstituted" leadership of the C.P.

The fact is therefore: The first gun in the postwar campaign to create distrust among workingmen and women of the leadership of the CPSU, to create doubt about its ability and integrity among Communists was fired by this "reconstituted" leadership of the C.P. This is wrecking, under the guise of "reconstituting" the Communist Party. This is, in practice, the theory that all corruptionists, i. e. those leaders whose program and actions lead to disaster and disgrace, should be given power again to avoid "decimation" of leadership, because, after all, in spite of the wreckage in their train, they are leaders. Strange fruit, indeed!

6.) These persons who call themselves the "National Committee" of the C.P. have no mandate from anyone except themselves. On the basis of their proven record of wrecking, and their continued attempts to wreck the Communist Party of the United States, they are operating with counterfeit credentials. They are charlatans and traducers of Marxist-Leninist theory and practice. They are enemies of the struggle for a socialist United States.

Their writ no longer runs with class conscious workers, with Communists, inside and/or outside the C.P.

This crew of "hardboiled incurable revisionists" are not Communists by any Marxist-Leninist standard.

7.) But even this self-elected "National Committee", composed in the main of wreckers and defeatists, is not the controlling force in the "reconstituted" C.P. The actual control is in the hands of careerist lawyers with upper bracket incomes; all kinds of parasitic persons who salve their consciences and carve out well-paying careers by "supporting" the struggles of the workers and peasants in other countries providing this can be done "respectably"; persons in various institutions whose high living standards are little affected by the ebb and flow of economic tides; union officials whose personal careers and incomes take precedence over all other issues and who have never uttered the words "Communism", "Socialism", and/or "class struggle" for more than ten years; persons who sneer at the idea of Socialism in the United States when all goes well, but who issue desperate calls for assistance to the few rank and file Communist Party members of their unions when they meet opposition; careerist politicians in various other parties who get elected—or hope to, with C.P. aid, etc.

8.) This leadership and its program which surrenders the C.P. to the middle class and capitalist class parties has reconverted the Communist Party of the U.S. into a brake on the socialist development of the workingclass and into a force acting against the achievement of its destiny as the only class whose socialist victory will liberate all oppressed and exploited peoples—because of the decisive world position now held by the monopoly capitalist class of our country and its "executive committee"—its government.

b.) The "special" convention was held at a time when some 10,000 party members in the armed forces or absent on war work were excluded from the C. P.; after all foreign-born members had been dropped arbitrarily from membership; after the C. P. in the South had been dissolved, dropping both Negro and white membership from the rolls. It was held after the C. P. had been further de-proletarianized by the deliberate destruction of the industrial branches. All this was done in the name of "National Unity"—to appease enemies of the revolutionary forces of working class liberation and their heroic struggles within the framework of the war against the fascist Axis imperialist powers.

5.) This "reconstituted" leadership elected itself by deceiving the party members present at the "special" convention into believing that the entire leadership of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had made more serious "errors" than had these defeatist leaders of the C. P. of the United States—who had "merely" adopted a policy of class collaboration, called upon the unions to abandon the strike weapon in peacetime, assured the workingclass of the U. S. and all other countries that American imperialism was no threat to their interests, and who had then, believing it had served its purpose of ensuring an end to the open class struggle in the U. S., dissolved the C. P. (1944-45).

This treacherous deceit was accomplished by:

a.) Focusing attention of the convention and the Party members on unspecified "mistakes" made by the leadership of the Soviet Union during the prosecution of the war—and not even mentioning the unparalleled achievements of the Soviet peoples, the Red Army and their leadership, or expressing gratitude in a 6500 word report. "Damn with faint praise, assent with civil leer, and without sneering, teach the rest to sneer."

b.) It was accomplished by unprecedented slander based on political forgery, omission, and distortion of Stalin's speech on "Mastering Bolshevism." By suppressing the directives for the fight against Trotskyism—issued by CPSU and quoted by Stalin at length, these revisionists "convicted" the entire leadership of the CPSU of failing to understand, expose and fight Trotskyism. This slander based on forgery was the decisive section of the part of the convention report dealing with the question of "mistakes" and "leadership." On this basis of slander in turn based on political forgery, the conclusion was drawn for the Party membership that the entire CPSU leadership had made a "very" serious error; that "our" error was merely a "serious" one.

c.) This deception of the membership was accomplished by reducing the glorious victory of the Soviet Union, its peoples, Red Army and its Communist Party over fascism to a series of "many serious errors"; having by political forgery and slander established that the CPSU leadership, i. e. its Central Committee, including Stalin, was guilty of more serious "errors" than American revisionist leadership which had deserted Marxist-Leninism and then liquidated the Communist Party, after having urged the organized labor movement to follow its example and surrender to the monopolists.

Let the American workingclass and the Communists among them be the judges: 50,000 copies of this treacherous slander based on forgery have been published and distributed to C. P. members and non-Party people. It is to be found in "Political Affairs" for September, 1945 and on Page 72 of "Marxism-Leninism vs. Revisionism" (Save the Mark!) re-published February 1946.

d.) Deception was carried out by assuring the Party members

Vote for the candidates of the parties of the class responsible for want in the richest country in the world—to put an end to want.

Vote for the candidates of the parties of the capitalists who sabotage housing until its monopoly fixed price satisfies their greed—to get housing.

Vote for the candidates of the parties of the monopoly capitalists whose profits can be made and maintained only by creating poverty—to end poverty.

Vote for Democratic and/or Republican candidates to get equal rights for 14 million Negro people, when the Wall Street monopolists who own these parties, and run them for their own interests, make superprofits every day by double oppression and robbery of the masses of Negro people.

Vote for Democratic and Republican candidates to aid the Chinese workers and peasants when the conquest of the Chinese people by gangsters puppets of Wall Street finance-capital to make more extended plunder possible, is a major plank in the foreign policy of the imperialists who own and control both parties.

Such was the program urged upon the American labor movement and the entire American working class in the year 1946—by the "National Committee" of the C.P.

For 1948 these strategists of confusion, defeatism and surrender in the ranks of the working class propose a "third party", a peoples party, a "progressive party", a "labor progressive party", a "labor party", etc. etc.—anything and everything but a Marxist-Leninist Party of the working-class, working and fighting to win its class for a program of Socialism as the only victorious way out of mass robbery and imperialist war.

This whole program is a denial of the validity of Marxist-Leninism. It is a denial and rejection of the theory of Communism of the Parties as the leadership of the workingclass—the only revolutionary class. The organization of middle class parties or parties with the leadership in the hands of middle and capitalist class forces is not a major task of Communists. Their task is to win the working class forces in and around such parties and unite them for effective struggle against capitalism—for the socialist solution.

The class role of such parties is essentially to confuse and divide the political struggles of the workingclass and thereby aid in maintaining capitalism. With such parties, Communists can and will make election and other unit-front agreements, but never at the price of principle or at the expense of the working class and its proletarian party of Socialism.

Any unprincipled agreement or arrangement (such as was obvious in the practice of the C.P. in the New York elections 1946 and has been for ten years of "notorious revisionism") which strengthens and adds to the illusions concerning the "classless" or "benevolent" role of capitalist and reformist parties and capitalist government, is desertion of the workingclass and its immediate interest—and its Socialist objective.

This is not the way the irresistible forces of the workingclass of our country can be united and guaranteed the knowledge of effective strategy and tactics and resolute leadership for victorious struggle on all fronts against the fascist forces of monopoly capitalism and its feudal allies—and the system of monopoly capitalism. To try to separate these struggles, to create a theory of artificial "periods," to reject systematic political preparation of the workingclass for socialism as inimical to unity against fascist forces, is to leave the major objective of the workingclass and its strategy and tactics to the defenders of monopoly capitalism.

This way lies defeat—not victory.

THE CRISIS IN THE C. P. U. S. A.

By HARRISON GEORGE

CONTENTS

Foreword, by Lenin	6
Introduction	7
PART I. "ON THE RECENT EXPULSIONS" Revisionism versus Democratic Centralism	15
PART II. THE CHARACTER OF THE CRISIS The Birth of Opportunist Factionalism as Bureaucracy	24
PART III. ACCUSING THE ACCUSERS How Not to Make a United Front	29
PART IV. COALITION, CALIFORNIA STYLE Communist "Tailism" of the Liberal Bourgeoisie	36
PART V. NOT ALL COALITIONS ARE GOOD Who Leads Whom in the Coalition Between Classes	44
PART VI. FOR A "PEOPLE'S FRONT" COALITION On the Character of a "Third" Party, If Any	58
PART VII. THE SEVENTH CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL How Dennis & Company "Amends" Comrade Dimitroff	77
PART VIII. OPPORTUNISM AND FACTIONALISM How Opportunism and Conciliation Betray the Working Class	94
PART IX. PRINCIPLES OF PARTY CLEANSING FROM BELOW Against Factionalism; For a Revolutionary Party	111
Appendix	125
Index	133

PART II. THE CHARACTER OF THE CRISIS IN THE CPUSA

THE BIRTH OF OPPORTUNIST FACTIONALISM AS BUREAUCRACY

"The first and most fundamental demand of scientific research in general, and of Marxian dialectics in particular, is that a writer should examine the connection existing between the present struggle of tendencies within Socialism—the current that cries of treason and sounds the alarm bell, and the one that sees no treason at all—and the struggle that preceded it for whole decades." (Lenin in *The War and the Second International*, Little Lenin Library, Vol. 2, p. 35.)

UNDER DATE OF AUGUST 13, 1945, at the request of the Northern California Committee on Leadership of the (then) Communist Political Association, elected by the first (July 15) session of the State Convention, I submitted a letter to the said Committee in reply to its letter of August 8.¹

Because of the connection with developments since then, I quote the opening paragraphs of my letter:

"The character of our revisionist errors is RIGHT OPPORTUNISM. This was so, due, firstly, to our growing adherence for 12 years to the bourgeois reformism of the Roosevelt Era. Secondly, and more basically, our Right Opportunism grew in the soil of the corruption, historically, of considerable sections of the United States proletariat by imperialist super-profits.

"Right Opportunism, therefore, has been and continues to be the main danger. While the Party fought only the Left in the past long period, and in the time of its rankest revisionism ascribed Trotskyism even to correct Communist policies, Right Opportunism not only flourished, but took control of the Party from top to bottom.

"Politically, the persons who comprised the active leadership, as a rule, became habituated to Right revisionist thinking, in which their acceptance of the Party's Teheran line was but a climactic incident. Organizationally, they became, as a rule, an encrusted and entrenched bureaucracy, with a subjectively liquidationist, and an objectively sectarian line. This does not deny the many praiseworthy exceptions to the rule, nor the possibility of these comrades so badly infected with Right Opportunism from redeeming themselves with the aid of the membership. But this must be proven by deeds, and not by words alone.

"The Party must fight on two fronts now, as it did not do before. But the main danger is still the Right, since it is

so deeply rooted in what Comrade Foster describes as 'a whole system of revisionist thinking' on the political plane, and in our leading cadres on the organizational plane.

"If we deal firmly with the Right, the Left danger will not constitute a difficult problem, for the Left has ever been 'the shadow of the Right.' If we do not so deal with the Right, then the Left can, indeed, become a most serious danger. Both can have sectarian results. Therefore, merely to present the problem as one of guarding against 'sectarianism,' as is at present the fashion, is to resort to meaningless generalization. And if it is implied as meaning only the Left, then it opens the door to the Right to maintain its past line in open, or what is more likely at present, concealed forms. . . .

"To estimate the situation otherwise, is to ignore the lessons given us by the past history of our own Party, as well as the history of every brother Party. It would be to ignore the historical fact that no opportunism ever became deeply rooted for so long a time in any party, without struggling persistently, in open or disguised manner, to maintain its dominance. Particularly does it strive to cling to organizational control as it feels its ideological control slipping with any release of Party democracy. An instance in point is Comrade Browder."

"In my opinion, it is naive, and dangerous to our Party, to imagine that other Right Opportunist revisionists have given up their opposition in more than outward form. We were not given the *History of the CPSU* to ignore, but to learn from, and apply in our own Party. And, if it teaches us anything, it teaches us to be extremely skeptical of merely verbal recantations of habitual opportunists. It is a foremost task of our whole Party now, to deal with this problem politically. It is your Committee's especial task to

¹At the repeated insistence of Ed Lee, committee member, now expelled, that I be called, Comrade —, Committee Secretary, wrote me on August 8: "You are requested . . . to submit a letter dealing with your opinions on press and leadership and on the character of our revisionist errors. We would have liked to have had you appear before the committee but time limitation makes this impossible." The Committee had been elected on July 15; this was on August 8. "Time limitation!"

²Browder, at the National Board meeting of June 2, 1945, demanded the Board vote to expel from itself those whom he called "Trotskyists and semi-Trotskyists," and when this was rejected, he told the National Committee on June 18, that: "I failed to foresee such a crisis of leadership and therefore failed to make any adequate preparation (!) against it." This oversight is, however, being taken care of currently by Browder's successors, as we have seen.

deal with it organizationally at this juncture."

Now, then, what has been the result of ignoring the warning given by history (and merely called attention to by me in August, 1945), that "if we do not deal firmly with the Right, then the Left can, indeed, become a most serious danger"?

The result has been that we now "officially" have a serious "Left danger." Already, in his July, 1946, Report to the National Committee, Comrade Dennis spoke of this "increasing menace," and, curiously enough, spoke in the same breath of "right opportunist hangovers" (as much if not more obvious in his own report than elsewhere), while the situation in California has been given notoriety, though not dignity or truthful treatment, by Oleta Yates's article in the December, 1946, *Political Affairs*.

More, and more apropos to the unprincipled character of the Schneiderman faction in the California party, a "Party Bulletin" was issued on December 11, 1946, containing, in libelous juxtaposition to a dishonest diatribe against "leftism" in general by the State Board, a statement by myself concerning a single case of genuine leftism given to the State Security and Review Commission six months before.

Why do I say the use made of that statement is libelous?

Because it is taken out of its historical setting, and put into another and a different setting.

Because it was not accompanied with another statement, given the State Secretariat on May 18, 1946, wherein I presented facts (which nobody has since then even attempted to dispute), proving that there was, and is, a Right Opportunist (and "sectarian") faction within

"In the light of subsequent developments it is necessary to outline briefly the further contents of that letter and the strange misfortunes it fell upon. Aside from the paragraphs quoted, it contained:

1. Facts showing that a bureaucratic control of the People's World by Comrade Schneiderman had supplanted collective direction by the Editorial Board (consisting "officially" of myself as Editor-in-Chief, Vern Smith as Foreign Editor, and John Pittman as Managing Editor); that with Pittman's assistance, and strategic control over what was, and what was not, printed, an effective ban against anything not conforming to Schneiderman's opportunist outlook was effected; that such bureaucracy destroyed the editorial authority of Comrade Smith and myself, and with it any responsibility for the policy being voiced by the paper. Collective Party guidance is one thing; one man dictation is quite another.

2. Facts showing that, despite this, a concerted attack upon Smith and myself, by the entire Schneiderman leadership, began directly following the first session of the State (CPA) convention on July 15, 1945, under the quaint excuse that, although Smith and I "had not swallowed the Teheran policy," we were, nevertheless, "responsible" because we "had not given guidance" (our frequent attempts were always haughtily rejected!) and thus "had not lived up to our responsibilities."

3. Facts proving that this attack was obviously "factional," as my letter charged; facts proving Schneiderman's double-dealing in asking the National Office to supply a new Editor-in-Chief because of my health, while in California he continually represented the replacement as due to my political delinquencies. It must be noted that this factional activity was a direct violation of the National Convention Resolution (Part II, Section 9) against "all tendencies toward factionalism," although Comrade Schneiderman had, as delegate to that convention, currently voted for that Resolution. Deeds belie words!

What happened to my letter to the Leadership Committee equally illumines subsequent events. I personally delivered it at the reception desk of the State Office early on August 14 (1945). But it "got lost" for four days, finally "arriving by mail" at that same office on August 18, a few hours before the second, and final, session of the State Convention was to open. On the convention floor, delegate James Kiernan, member of the Committee (now expelled), protested that the Committee had not given my letter consideration—and no one denied his charge. Later, I learned the Committee had read the letter in Schneiderman's presence, listened to his denunciation of me as a "damned leftist," and taken no other action.

Since the convention, as well as the Committee, in the absence of any opposition caucus, was dominated by an organized Schneiderman faction, I could only hope that a "Press Committee," to be chosen by the "new" State Board from nominations made by the convention, might consider at least that part of my letter dealing with the paper. I took the floor and so proposed (as a matter of personal privilege, since I was not a delegate) the removal of my letter to the future "Press Committee."

I felt that "unity" in the convention required this. Also, since I had sent a copy to Comrade Foster and the National Secretariat, some sort of remedial action was "naturally" to be expected to restrain the factionalism of the Schneiderman leadership.

However, while getting a brush-off from that quarter (See Part VIII), the State Board dallied for months on choosing the personnel of the Press Committee. When it finally met, my letter was never even read. And, by a strange coincidence, Smith and myself, the majority of the Editorial Board, were excluded from the Press Committee by the "new" State Board (virtually the same as the "old" Board), though both of us were nominated by the convention. This is the way the National Convention decision "against all tendencies toward factionalism" is "observed" in California. (Cont. p. 22)

It must be underscored that a rejection, complete and even sincere, of Browderism, is decidedly not equivalent to a certificate of absolution from revisionism in other forms. Still more, the basic policy of the Party, or Party Program, as laid down by the National Convention, is one thing. How it is applied, misapplied, or wholly ignored and violated, is quite another thing.

Comrade Foster, when he talked with (or rather to) me in San Francisco (first, on August 20, and again on August 24, 1946), seemed eager when first we met to "explain" to me how it happened that, when the storm of membership indignation at the whole leadership following the Duclos article had cleared away, the net result, minus Browder, was but some slight shifting of chairs among the leadership. "Ordinarily," he said, "when such a thing happens, the faction which was in opposition would take over the leadership. But there was no faction. . . ."

Very well, there was, indeed, no faction. But that does NOT say that there was no opposition on the part of scores and hundreds of comrades (not in the then leadership) to the Browder line, before the Duclos exposure of that leadership. Nor does such "explanation" absolve Comrade Foster from complicity with the conciliation of a faction which mushroomed among Browder's close assistants directly after the Duclos article, and has been given by Comrade Foster *carte blanche* to hound out of the Party, on any and every pretext, every articulate and especially any outstanding comrade who is so unfortunate as to have been a "premature anti-Browderite"—hence a menace only to those remaining in the leadership who are bent on continuing revisionism under new and more subtle forms than Browder's open and unconcealed social-imperialism.

Comrade Duclos did not "accidentally" or for no purpose, put into his article the fact that Darcy, as well as Foster, opposed Browder's liquidationist, Right sectarian and revisionist line, and the further fact that Foster helped Browder expel Darcy from the Party for trying to warn the membership against this revisionism, at a time when Foster himself lacked the Bolshevik courage to fight for his own beliefs.²

How much like the old songs that Browder used to sing, are the tunes intoned by the present leaders of our Party, including Comrade Foster. The titles are identical, too: "Factionalism"—"alien elements"—"semi-Trotskyists"—"Left-sectarians"—"anarcho-syndicalist adventurists. . . ."

Such calling of names is easy. But where is the proof that they apply? Firstly, Trotskyism is not true Leftism, but is really Right Opportunism disguised with leftist phrases, a Right deviation which developed into outright class treachery and service to fascism. True leftism is epitomized in anarchism, which all the theoretical authorities of Marxism-Leninism have described as originating, objectively, in those periods when the bourgeoisie adopts ruthless force in the class struggle (as differing from those periods when the bourgeoisie adopts a policy of concessions and reforms designed to split the proletariat by corrupting its leaders with Right Opportunism); and originating subjectively within the proletariat, as a revulsion of honest revolutionaries against the reformist treachery of Right Opportunism.

Such true Leftism tends to over-estimate the degree of class consciousness of the masses, belittles the necessity of the preparation of the masses through daily struggle for immediate, partial demands, rejects the revolutionary use of parliament and elections in such preparation of the masses, tends to romantic, idealist concepts of waiting for "great days" and neglecting the "petty tasks" of preparation; disregards the necessity for the proletariat to obtain allies, regards the peasantry—as one, undifferentiated class—with hostility, runs ahead of the masses and thus becomes sectarian, resorting to phrase-mongering as a substitute for mass action, and, when impelled to act, tends to adventurism and "putschism."

But where is the proof that any of these attributes of real Leftism belong to the persons described as "Leftists" and expelled as "Leftists" at the time they were expelled? The National Board has not produced such proof. Instead, it uses empty name-calling, without proof.

For a close-up view of how this situation came about, as seen and experienced by myself, although apparently duplicated elsewhere and hidden or glossed over by the leadership, I take you to the State of California in August, 1945.

the Party which bends Party policy to its will, and does so with complete impunity.

Because six short articles against the ideological position of the "left" opposition to the June 15, 1946, Committee for Maritime Unity settlement with the ship-owners, articles requested of me by the Security and Review Commission at the same time this July 1 statement was also requested, were refused publication in the *People's World* by direct order from Comrade Schneiderman. Yet without these articles, the statement loses its real significance, since only these articles made clear that my criticism of the "left" was one of principle, and hence to be distinguished from the merely denunciatory attacks made by the Schneiderman leadership.

What is to be said of a State leadership which wails about "the left danger," which officially accuses you of being "a center of leftist opposition" (unanimous vote of State Board on Dec. 15, 1945), yet which—after requesting you to write against the only leftist tendency visible to you—refuses to publish it? This, although Foster told me the articles were "excellent," and no one gives me the slightest explanation why those articles were suppressed.

What, still more, can be said of a national leadership, also purportedly concerned about the "left menace," to which these articles (directed solely against the "left," remember!) were sent for publication in the "theoretical" organ, *Political Affairs*, but which also suppressed them, and becomes accomplice to and protector of the opportunist Schneiderman faction dominating the California leadership of the CPUSA by publishing instead, the factional, untruthful and politically illiterate article by Oleta Yates, which could only incite "leftism" where none existed?

Obviously, incitations against critics of its own Rightist practices, a diversion of membership attention from the fact that the elected leadership is not carrying out the program of the Party laid down for it by the National Convention, but is deviating to the Right from that program, and not any elimination of "leftist" tendencies by the only way they can be eliminated—an ideological campaign—is the purpose of such otherwise inexplicable behavior. If no "left danger" existed, it would be necessary for the opportunist leadership to invent one, to justify a regime of repressions and reprisals against ever freshly arising membership criticisms and doubts.

It required considerable audacity, after suppressing the articles that I was requested to write in July, 1946, to "propose" again to me on October 21, 1946, that I write some articles "dealing with the position of Vern Smith, particularly with regard to his opposition to our election coalition policy." But Comrade Schneiderman, assured of national leadership protection, is nothing if not audacious. However, in spite of overwhelming physical handicaps, I agreed, as I intend to "serve the Party," though not to serve Comrade Schneiderman. And I shall "deal with" Vern Smith's position. But I shall not deal with it now as I dealt with the distinctly separate situation that prevailed in San Francisco on July 1, 1946.

Then, there was a real "Left" danger to the Party program (Part I, Section 3, National Convention Resolution, referring to "maximum unity of action" of all labor; also Section 4, referring to "labor's joint and parallel action locally"), which the local leadership was upholding in the Maritime dispute, although the same leadership had violated these same sections grossly in the Machinist strike.

Then, there was the danger of blind, and hence unprincipled, opposition, arising from a factional feeling of many comrades who had correctly fought for the

²⁹It must be emphasized that a party leadership can also function as a "faction," that factions and factionalism are not limited to oppositions to leaderships. This was true, for example, of the Lovestone leadership prior to 1929; it was profoundly true of the Browder leadership; it was true of the leadership of the French Communist Party in 1929 (see *Political Affairs*, August, 1945, page 711, second column, in an article by Maurice Thorez). In such cases, however, official factionalism functions in the "legal" form of a bureaucracy, stifling party democracy and membership criticism under charges of "disruption," and, of course, "factionalism." Since it is obviously unnecessary for any leadership which pursues a policy conforming to the interests of revolutionary workers to suppress such workers' questioning and criticism, it has become axiomatic that "Bureaucracy always shelters a wrong line."

Party program against the local Party leadership in the 1945-46 Machinist strike in the San Francisco Bay area (and who had been driven by bureaucratic persecution into group resentment), accepting this "leftist" opposition to the CMU settlement to be as justifiable as their own.

Then, too, the revisionist errors of the leadership had not, as yet, clearly developed into a revisionist line.

Then, moreover, and because of this still remaining doubt as to the developing line of the leadership, there was still some faint hope that the national leadership might intervene against the Schneiderman opportunist faction (or bureaucracy, as you will); and the "leftism" arising locally over the June 15, 1946, settlement of the Committee for Maritime Unity, helped prejudice such an outcome.

Time and experience since July 1, 1946, has proven that hope vain, in that the national leadership has, since then, fully identified itself with the opportunism and factional bureaucracy of the California leadership; has demonstrated a line, itself, of increasing departure from the program of the Party, laid down for the leadership, as well as the membership, to follow, by the National Convention of July, 1945; by its organizational reprisals and repressions against all criticism.

Through these actions, and by its voluntary surrender to Rightist influences within it, the national leadership has made necessary, and hence legitimized, a discussion before the whole Party of present tendencies, and made imperative that, again, "the alarm bell" be sounded against treason and Right Opportunism as the main danger.

Revisionism & the Woman Question

²⁸Browder's former National Educational Director, A. Landy, came to the rescue of McKenney's "theory," first in *The Communist* for September, 1941, then in an official Party pamphlet, *Marxism and the Woman Question*, in 1943, in the ascendancy of Browder revisionism, in the development of which Landy played a big role generally and on this question, most particularly.

Falsely purporting to "answer" Mary Inman's book, *Woman-Power*, a slashing exposure of the McKenney-Landy revisionism on the woman question, Landy's pamphlet is, itself, a prize example of revisionism, as well as of misrepresentation, double-talk and obscurantist economics. Pursuing a Teheranist line a few months before Browder's official discovery that the Teheran Pact outlawed revolution and made socialism unnecessary, Landy set about furnishing a "theoretical basis" for the forthcoming Browder claim that bourgeois democracy (under monopolist-imperialist rule!) had been transformed by the anti-Hitler war into something "just as good" as socialism, even for women.

Imitating Kautsky's class-betraying "philosophy" during World War I, Landy said that World War II was already "undermining the entire material foundation of woman's inequality . . . in the only way such a fundamental advance can genuinely come—by way of industry" (p. 5). And, again: (p. 39) "The road to woman's equality and freedom is the road . . . which leads to the complete defeat of Hitlerism."

The overthrow of capitalism thus being held unnecessary, there was no need to involve the feminine half of the American proletariat in struggle for that aim. And this theory was put into practice. The development of the Landy-McKenney theory from 1941 to 1943 was accompanied by the Party's liquidation of women's organizations and suspension of women's publications. Women (like the Negro people) were to be "integrated" into industrial life and the general working class movement, on the excuse that there was no longer any economic basis for their separate organizations and that they had no problems apart from the rest of the proletariat. In short, that there is no such thing as a "woman question."

To lend this some pretense of justification in economics, Landy adopted as his basic line, permeating his whole pamphlet, the anti-Marxist-Leninist theory invented by the Soviet revisionist, Nicolai Bukharin, already shot in 1937 as a counter-revolutionary traitor to the Soviet Government.

Bukharin held (*Historical Materialism*, by N. I. Bukharin, p. 156) that the worker's family had become a "consumption unit only." Landy's pamphlet repeatedly (on pages 34, 57 and 58, for example) says

the same thing.

Now, it is obvious that, only after the production of the commodity, labor-power, in which the average proletarian housewife in the average proletarian family is presently engaged, has been not only partially, but fully socialized and removed from the home, and the housewife concurrently transformed fully into an industrial worker with no home-labor to perform, can the worker's family cease, in reality, to be a production unit. And it is equally obvious that this can come about only after the overthrow of capitalism.

Engels says as much in his *Origin of the Family* (see Kerr edition, pages 90, 91 and 124), in declaring that, until this happens, the worker's family is "an economic unit" or "industrial unit" of society. "With the transfer of the means of production into common ownership, the single family ceases to be the economic unit of society," says Engels on page 66 (*International Publishers* edition, 1942), adding: "Private housekeeping is transformed into a social industry."

Basically, Landy contends (despite much evasive double-talk) that this has already taken place, under capitalism, and that the family at present only "consumes" as a "blood and sex unit." On page 34 of his pamphlet he describes ". . . the character of the family as a blood and sex unit," wherein "the housewife is engaged in helping to consume the wages brought home by her husband" (p. 58). Again, on page 57, he says that "her only connection" with production "is through the consumption of its products."

Just as the present critics of revisionism are accused by the bureaucracy of "attacking the Party" because they attack revisionism in the Party, so also, already in 1943, was Mary Inman (author of *In Woman's Defense*) charged with "attacking the Party" and using "pseud-Marxism." No more absurd distortion of facts into their complete opposite could be conceived than the further solemn warning given by Landy—who was already proudly championing Browder's notorious Right opportunist revisionism—that those who agreed with Inman and who disputed his "Marxism" were (p. 42) taking "the road to Right opportunist mistakes."

This Landy libel on Marxism is still circulated as the official Party position on the woman question. And, indirectly, I learn that Ruth McKenney still insists that her original position, which the Landy pamphlet supports, was and remains "Marxist." Thus, while she remains in agreement with the revisionists on the woman question, she joined with her husband in denouncing the revisionism of Dennis and, with Minton, suffered expulsion as a "leftist."

PART VII. THE SEVENTH CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

HOW DENNIS & COMPANY "AMENDS" COMRADE DIMITROFF

"There are some people, and Comrade Dimitroff has aptly called them 'political hens,' who have got the idea that the Communists have allegedly given up their principles or are modifying them. These fanciful ideas can only give rise to laughter! . . . If there is anything at all that we are altering, it is only the methods and forms by means of which we can, in the conditions of a changed situation, spread our basic principles still deeper among the masses and establish united working class action so as to defeat our class enemies and pass over to an offensive against them. And Messrs. the capitalists will very likely soon feel this on their own necks."—From the report of K. Gottwald of Czechoslovakia (now Premier), to the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, 1935.

IN THE PRESENT CONTROVERSY within the CPUSA, the idea that the Seventh Congress of the CI revoked the previous program of the Communist parties to struggle for Socialism and the proletarian revolution, has been given furtive circulation by the "political hens," who are hatching some revisionist eggs.

The implications made have been plain enough that we, and all other Communist Parties, were so directed by the Seventh Congress as to confine ourselves to the one aim, solely and exclusively, of saving bourgeois democracy, and to refrain from even propaganda for the overthrow of capitalism.

In his statement (which he did not deliver) to the House Committee on Un-

American Activities, as published in the *People's World* of March 31, 1947, Comrade Dennis made mention of the Seventh Congress, and in a way to nourish this myth of its having "given up" or "modified" Communist principles. I quote below all that he said on the subject:

"We were at particular pains to publicize as widely as possible the decisions of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International in 1935.

"The Seventh Congress of the CI, to which we American Communists made important contributions, prepared the way for the dissolution of the Communist International. It registered the fact that the Communist Parties of the world were independent organizations, each of native origin, and making their own decisions."

"It corrected some mistakes by young Marxists who were just beginning to learn that Marxism is a scientific guide to action, and not a dogma," continued Dennis.

"It called on the Communist Parties of the world to check and defeat the fascists in every land by studying (by "studying," sic!—HG) the concrete conditions and the special methods of fascism in each country. It called on them to rally and mobilize the workers and people of every nation for united action against fascism and war."

Now then, unless Comrade Dennis could have been trying to correct the "leftism" of Congressmen Rankin, Thomas, et al., his words could only give the impression to Party members (virtually the only ones who received them, thanks to the strange behavior of Comrade Dennis before the Committee), that the Seventh Congress met, gave up all idea of struggle to overthrow capitalism, decided that all Communist Parties must limit their aims to defeating fascism and war—without touching a hair of capitalism's venerable head—and, finally, and apparently as the result of "contributions" made by our Party, the Seventh Congress "prepared" to dissolve the Communist International; to quit, to call off the proletarian revolutionary struggle as too "dogmatic."

We learn from Comrade Dennis's statement one more thing, namely, that our Party took "particular pains" to publicize the decisions of the Seventh Congress "in 1935."

Yes, in 1935, our Party did that. But what have we done since 1935? Why do we now, in 1947, conceal, and not publicize the decisions of the Seventh Congress, if they are important enough now to refer to? Why do we not now publicize Dimitroff's report there if it was worth mentioning in Comrade Dennis's statement? He said:

"The heroic Bulgarian, Georgi Dimitroff, presided over that historic Congress. Even the members of this Committee must admit that Dimitroff was well qualified by first-hand experience to lead a discussion on the subject of how to fight fascism."

The reason why our Party does not now publicize either the Seventh Congress decisions, or the report there made by Comrade Dimitroff, might be found in the fact that this would show the Seventh Congress to be not precisely as Comrade Dennis represents it to have been, as might be seen in the very closing words of Dimitroff's report, where he called upon the Communist Parties to lead the toiling masses into struggle—"to sweep fascism off the face of the earth, and together with it, capitalism!"

Comrade Dimitroff and the Seventh Congress did, most assuredly, correct the mistakes of Marxists, and not only the "young" ones. And not only "left sectarian" mistakes (which were the main danger at that time in the International), but also the Seventh Congress pointed out the grave dangers of *Right Opportunism*, as well.

It is correct to say, and even to repeat, that "Marxism is a scientific guide to action, and not a dogma." It is a good axiom. But when Comrade Dennis says it, now, we remember that he said it before, and in chorus with Browder, using it to impose upon our Party the vile revisionism of social-imperialism. And, this being true, his present use of it stands in suspicion of another mis-use of it. In-

²⁷It is false to assert that the Seventh Congress "prepared the way," in 1935, for the dissolution of the CI in 1943, any more than the First Congress "prepared the way," or that Monday "prepares the way" for Friday. The Resolution of the Executive Committee dissolving the organization declared that the movement had outgrown the forms of organization originally provided, and the latter had, therefore, become anachronistic. As to being "independent" organizations "making their own decisions," the Seventh Congress resolutions say nothing more than the following:

"Taking into account the constantly growing importance and responsibility of the Communist Parties which are called to head the movement of the masses in the process of revolutionization, taking into consideration the necessity of concentrating operative (my emphasis—HG) leadership within the Sections themselves, the Seventh Congress of the Communist International instructs the Executive Committee of the CI:

"While shifting the main stress of its activity to elaboration of fundamental political and tactical lines of the world labor movement, to proceed in deciding any question from the concrete situation and specific conditions obtaining in each particular country and as a rule to avoid direct intervention in internal organizational matters of the Communist Parties." (All emphasis mine—HG.)

deed, as we shall see, Comrade Dennis transforms this axiom against dogmas, into an argument for dogmas, the dogmas of revisionism.

Without in the least minimizing the necessity to guard, today, against "left" sectarian mistakes which the Seventh Congress (particularly in the report of Wilhelm Pieck) pointed out as the main danger at that time, it is necessary, at this time, to indicate the Right Opportunist dangers which Comrade Dimitroff and others spoke of at the Seventh Congress. To do this, we must recall some of its basic postulates.

Inherent in all the leading speeches at the Seventh Congress was the consciousness of the over-shadowing fact of the general—the historical—crisis of world capitalism, its epochal decline to its historic (but not "automatic") doom; and that this crisis confronted the Seventh Congress with "the approaching second round of wars and revolutions" (Manuilsky).

More than one speaker (Pieck and Thorez, for example) emphasized Stalin's words at the 17th Congress of the CPSU, that, as a consequence of the deepening of the general crisis, "the idea of storming capitalism is maturing in the minds of the masses"—and that in varying degrees, this was taking place in "all" capitalist countries. Thorez went on from that to quote Stalin as follows:

"This, as a matter of fact, explains the fact that the ruling classes in the capitalist countries are zealously destroying, or nullifying, the last vestiges of parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy, which might be used by the working class in its struggle against the bourgeoisie."

This over-shadowing fact of capitalism marching to its doom, was set forth by Dimitroff in the very opening of his report, where he spoke of the "sharp accentuation of the general crisis of capitalism and the revolutionization of the toiling masses" as the reason why "imperialist circles need fascism" in order to "prevent revolution."

Did the Seventh Congress, therefore, "give up" the world Communist strategic aim of proletarian revolution, and revert to a reformist aim? Did it limit its perspective to the "defense of bourgeois democracy" in the period for which it set forth the policy of the united proletarian front and the people's front? It did no such thing!

On the contrary, basing its policy on the historic change in the toiling masses, in the "growth of their revolutionary consciousness" (Manuilsky), the Seventh Congress launched the tactic of the united proletarian front and the people's front, as the means of mobilizing and preparing the masses, not merely to defend bourgeois democracy, although this was the central tactical aim, but to carry over these masses in their developing revolutionization, to the struggle for the final and strategic aim of the proletarian revolution. Here, for example, is the closing paragraph of the Seventh Congress resolution on Dimitroff's report:

"The establishment of the united front of the working class is the decisive link in the preparation of the toilers for the forthcoming great battles of the second round of proletarian revolution. Only the welding of the proletariat into a single mass political army will ensure its victory in the struggle against fascism and the power of capital, for the dictatorship of the proletariat and the power of the Soviets."

The Seventh Congress recognized that, while the masses were changing, "This change is not taking place at a dizzying speed, it does not imply that the masses are at one stroke coming over to the position of the revolutionary struggle for the proletarian dictatorship, it is not proceeding smoothly everywhere, it encounters the resistance of counter-acting forces, but it is proceeding. . . ." (Manuilsky.) And the united proletarian front and the people's front were the forms by which to guide the masses onward, changing them further in struggle, against fascism and capitalism.

"Ours has been a Congress of a new tactical orientation for the Communist International," said Dimitroff in his summary. And, again: "Our Congress has reshaped the tactical lines of the Communist International." But—there was no giving up of the strategic aim for proletarian revolution. On the contrary, the change in tactical lines was fully explained as facilitating and hastening the attainment of the strategic aim: which is, of course, the role of tactics in relation to strategy.

What is the concept of the Right Opportunist tendency toward this whole historical perspective of the impending end

of capitalism throughout the world? The concept of the Right Opportunist tendency, though rarely if ever expressed frankly in words, is one of *fundamental disbelief*. Here in America, the fabulous and mighty America, the "strongest" imperialist country on earth, those who never were Marxists-Leninists, or who have forgotten Marxism-Leninism, look around them at the vast panoply of imperialist power, and shrink back in disbelief that: "This, too, shall pass."

But the perspective itself was not new at the Seventh Congress. The Sixth Congress in 1928 had already set it forth in its very comprehensive Program:

"The capitalist system as a whole is approaching its final collapse. The dictatorship of finance capital is perishing to give way to the dictatorship of the proletariat (p. 19). . . ."

"Expeditions against the colonies, a new world war, a campaign against the USSR, are matters which now figure prominently in all the politics of imperialism. This must lead to the release of all the forces of international revolution and the inevitable doom of capitalism" (p. 29).

But the comrades who were with our Party in those years will remember that the Right Opportunist tendency in the CPUSA, then led by Jay Lovestone, although it "accepted" the program of the Sixth Congress in words, did not accept it in reality. World capitalism is decadent, Lovestone admitted, "but not in the United States." Here, he held, was an "exception." And he received strong support from the Bukharin "Rightist" group in our brother Soviet Communist Party; Bukharin writing in 1929 that "American imperialism is rosy-cheeked." The Lovestone leadership shaped all practical policies of the CPUSA according to this opportunist conception. And old comrades in our party will also remember that so tentatively did the Lovestone leadership cling to this concept and steep the membership in the idea that all opposition to it was "Trotskyism," and so *factionally* did Lovestone conduct the leadership as a *bureaucracy*, that the Communist International had to intervene, not only to end factionalism of both leadership and opposition, but to correct the Party line.

Again, the Seventh Congress, emphasizing that the post-World War I partial and temporary stabilization of capitalism was collapsing, and that the world was confronted with a "second round" of wars and revolutions, reshaped the tactical lines of the Communist movement to make the most of the intensifying general crisis of world capitalism.

And Browder, who had been one of the chief opponents of Lovestone's "American exceptionalism," a more consistent one than Foster, "accepted" the Seventh Congress program in words. But he began, already in 1937, as we have seen, to reject it in deeds. Browder became fascinated by the "success" of Franklin D. Roosevelt's bourgeois reformism. Roosevelt, as he frequently and plainly said, pursued this tactical policy of reformism for the strategic aim of preventing proletarian revolution in this country in the interest of imperialist capital; whereas the same strategic aim was sought in other countries by the tactical policy of fascism.

There was, of course, a certain elasticity in the economy of American imperialism which aided Roosevelt, but only for a brief period, in giving his tactical policy of preventing revolution by reforms a fleeting appearance of success. But we also know, and the Seventh Congress pointed it out, that American imperialism was headed for disaster, and everyone who is a Marxist-Leninist should know that the "solution" of the crisis which World War II brought to American economy only made more certain and more disastrous the crisis we now confront.

But Browder, who already in 1937, had

¹²In his *Imperialism* (Chapter VI), Lenin in comparing Plekhanov to the British Imperialist, Cecil Rhodes, gives a quotation from Rhodes, made in 1895, which might well, transferred to the American scene of 1944, have been uttered by Browder. Rhodes said:

"I was in the East End yesterday and attended an 'unemployed' meeting. I listened to the wild speeches, which were just a cry for 'bread,' 'bread,' and on my way home I pondered over the scene and I became more than ever convinced of the importance of imperialism. My cherished idea provides a solution for the social problem. In order to save the 40,000,000 inhabitants of the United Kingdom from a bloody civil war, we colonial statesmen must acquire new lands for settling the surplus population of this country, to provide new markets for the goods produced in our factories and mines. The Empire, as I have always said, is a bread and butter question. If you want to avoid civil war, you must become an imperialist."

Browder wanted to "avoid civil war," of course "for the benefit of the working class." So he became an imperialist, "for the benefit of the working class."

revoked the people's front tactic in order to "go with Roosevelt," and had remained unshaken even by the break in his cherished "coalition" when Roosevelt in 1939-40 became openly anti-Soviet (Finnish war period) and sent Browder himself to prison (perhaps even because of this), still was impressed by the "power" of American imperialism, and still disbelieved in the perspective of proletarian revolution.

The outbreak of World War II came providentially for Browder, and under the spell of the anti-Axis coalition (which was not an anti-fascist coalition on the part of American imperialism for which Roosevelt was the leader), Browder went onward from the concept of disbelief in capitalism's doom to efforts to prove his disbelief was true by "making capitalism work," and the consequent rendering of revolution unnecessary. Browder became a salesman for American imperialism; in Marxist-Leninist terminology, a social-imperialist or social-chauvinist.¹³

Browder began to discover the virtues of "American exceptionalism," which, in Lovestone, he had condemned. This thought, neatly tucked in the phrase—"whatever may be the situation in other lands," etc., became the basis of his outlook. The continuing and intensifying "revolutionization of the toiling masses," as seen by the Seventh Congress of the CI, Browder became unable to see at all. By January, 1944, introducing his "Teheran" policy, he said:

"It is my considered judgment that the American people (sic! people, not toilers—HG) are so ill-prepared, subjectively, for any deep-going change in the direction of Socialism, that post-war plans with such an aim would not unite the nation (sic! the 'nation' of warring classes!—HG), but would further divide it."

Which, it can be seen, is not only a foreswearing of any perspective for Socialism whatever, but a typical chauvinist alarm that the "unity of the nation" be disturbed by class struggle. This tender and bourgeois regard for "national unity," which naturally escaped rebuke during the anti-Axis war, but which became a putrid thing the moment the end of the war put an end, also, to the transient coalition between American imperialism and the American proletariat, is still being used by Comrade Dennis, although with the sly precaution of inserting the word "progressive" or "democratic" in front of the words "national unity."¹⁴

The same anti-class struggle ideology applies to Comrade Dennis's passion for "order," "orderly change," and "orderly methods," on the part of the proletariat, found in all his writings preceding the publication of the Duclos criticism, and to some extent later. But this Chamber of Commerce term, he has, by reason of gigantic developments of "disorder," been forced to use less and less. However, this typical social-democratic hostility to the symptomatic outbreaks of accumulated mass indignation against capitalism, has gone down to the bottom of our Party. In my meeting with the California State Security and Review Commission on June 28, 1946, Comrade Harry Glickson plaintively asked me:

"Do you think it was right to call for a general strike and disrupt industry in San Francisco and all around the Bay area?"

Came the Duclos article, and our National Convention wrote a Resolution which, although far from perfect, did provide the elements for reconstructing Party policy on a Marxist-Leninist line.¹⁵

¹³Another and more brazen attempt to smuggle this anti-class struggle "national unity" idea into our Party, was made by Comrade John Pittman (People's World, April 8, 1947), and under a shameless pretense that Comrade Dimitroff was urging this idea upon us. Completely unsupported by a single word actually quoted from Dimitroff in what Pittman, writing from Bulgaria, called "an exclusive interview," Pittman himself asserted that a "national front" was desirable in America, but asserted it in such a way that he implied that Dimitroff had used that term. Now, Bulgaria is not an imperialistic country. On the contrary it has been made the victim of imperialism, and still stands in danger of losing its national independence by imperialist aggression. Therefore, a "national front," a policy of "national unity," is right and proper for the Communists of Bulgaria. But in the United States, a country which is the very prototype of an imperialistic nation, a country whose national independence is threatened by nobody, but, on the contrary, an imperialistic nation obviously aggressively threatening the national independence of every nation on earth, a "national front" or an ideology of "national unity" no matter how neatly dressed-up in "democratic" phrases, can only be a "national unity" against class struggle, a "national unity" for American imperialism.

¹⁴I cannot believe that those comrades who were sincerely trying to get our Party back on a correct line can defend some

The National Convention Resolution rediscovered the "general crisis of capitalism" and its "fundamental contradictions" (Part II, Section 6). It at least half-way recognized the growing radicalization of the American proletariat by (Part I, Section 4) "taking cognizance of the growing interest of the American people and its working class in the historic experiences of the Soviet people in the building of a new socialist society." And it definitely provided that, while "helping the American working class" fight for and "realize" a program of immediate demands, "we Communists" would "systematically explain to the people" that "Socialism alone" can give a permanent solution to their problems.

Now, the "general crisis of capitalism" is a world crisis, as both Lovestone and Browder found out. Its "fundamental contradictions" which are taking world capitalism towards its historic doom, as the Seventh Congress pointed out, is taking American capitalism, too, along with it. Also, it is obvious that, as an integral part of this development, as the very meat of these "fundamental contradictions," the American working class is, also, along with the world proletariat, even if not at equal tempo, being "revolutionized," as the Seventh Congress put it, and as dimly acknowledged by the "growing interest" which our National Convention Resolution found to exist in American workers for the country of Socialism.

We have seen how Lovestone "accepted" the concepts of the Sixth Congress of the CI, but immediately attempted to revise them for America, because America was "different." We have also seen how Browder "accepted" the Seventh Congress line, but directly afterward began to revise, and finally to dump it completely, as "not applying" to America. Both were opportunists. Yet no axiom is more worth memorizing than the one which says that no opportunist wears a brand upon his forehead for all to read thereon: "I am an opportunist." No opportunist ever arises and declares: "I am now going to make an opportunist proposal." Such things never happen. Instead, like Lovestone and Browder, the

obvious absurdities in the Resolution. For instance, Part I, Section 3, states in part: "It is essential to weld together and consolidate the broadest coalition of all anti-fascist and democratic forces, as well as all other supporters of Roosevelt's anti-Axis policies."

Aside from the typical dennesque redundancy of "consolidating" something already "welded together," one might ask just who are these "other" supporters, over and above "all" of the "anti-fascist and democratic" forces? Are there, somewhere, some pro-fascist and anti-democratic elements who supported "Roosevelt's anti-Axis policies"? Undoubtedly there are such elements. But do we Communists want them in a "democratic" coalition which is to fight against fascism?

Again, it strains the intelligence overmuch, for the Resolution, in Part II, Section 5, to declare that we American Communists are distinguished by—"our adherence to the scientific principles of Marxism-Leninism," when it is admitted in Section 6, that we had not adhered to those principles in about every particular possible to enumerate, in fact, confessing to a "revision" of Marxist-Leninist principles.

Again, in the Resolution's opening paragraph, a prize example of putting the cart before the horse is given by the statement that: "It (the military defeat of Nazi Germany) has already brought forth a new anti-fascist unity of the peoples in Europe." It seems evident that it was rather the "anti-fascist unity of the peoples of Europe" which "brought forth" the military defeat of Nazi Germany, and not the other way round.

Once more, and more seriously, we have the horse behind the cart in Part I, Section 3, where it is recommended that:

"... labor should co-operate with those capitalist groupings and elements who, for one or another reason, objectively at times, promote democratic aims."

Here it is held that labor should co-operate with certain capitalists, rather than that these capitalists "should" co-operate with labor for democratic aims. Apparently, labor should not lead. More obscurantist is the phrase "for one or another reason." This outright concealing of class interests is obviously the work of Comrade Dennis, since the same phrase "for one or another reason" occurs in his pre-convention reports and also in his post-convention speeches. But, unless we are deliberately trying to deceive the workers, why could we not speak plainly, and say that certain capitalists "promote democratic aims," temporarily, at least, because they think that is the best way to maintain capitalism and prevent revolution; that there's no harm in having such allies, but there's harm in having illusions about them. Of course, such a clear explanation might well nullify Comrade Dennis's desire that labor should turn the most reverent and obsequious visage to such "democratic" capitalists—and instead of the labor movement tailing after such capitalists, if they want "for one or another reason" to march for democracy, to march under Labor's command.

opportunist advances his proposals while veritably dripping with assertions that such proposals are "Marxist-Leninist," and supports them with quotations (usually subtly mis-applied) from everyone from Marx to Dimitroff.

And so, now comes Comrade Dennis (with plenty of company, as had Lovestone and Browder), "accepting" in 1945 the new line of the Party, which expressed, even if somewhat lamely, the concepts of both the Sixth and the Seventh Congresses of the Communist International, and certainly expressed the general viewpoint of our Party. More, Comrade Dennis comes out now, in March, 1947, in the role of a valiant champion of the Seventh Congress of the CI, its leading reporter, Comrade Dimitroff, and the whole line of the Seventh Congress.

But is Comrade Dennis (and those in his political company) carrying out the guiding line of the Seventh Congress? On the contrary, he is violating its every precept. Is he then, perhaps, carrying out the National Convention Resolution? No, he is violating that, too, distorting to the Right its fundamental line in practice and interpretation, and defending this departure from its policy by violating, also, its categorical condemnation of bureaucracy.

True, Comrade Dennis does mention on rare occasions, that there is a "general crisis" of capitalism. But that this general crisis is carrying capitalism all over the world, including the United States, to its historic doom, is a thought evidently too horrible for him to entertain, much less to utter. That there could not possibly be a general crisis of world capitalism, intensifying (with certain spotty interludes of ephemeral "stabilization") through the years since World War I, without affecting the toiling masses of America with some measure of what Dimitroff called "revolutionization" and what Stalin described as "the idea of storming capitalism," is a fact that escapes Comrade Dennis completely.

Therefore, we find the Dennis leadership adopting an outlook of "American exceptionalism," to the effect that the American proletariat is not affected at all, or in a degree not worth mention, by the stimuli which have affected the rest of the world proletariat; and that the American working class is not only relatively, but absolutely "backward" politically, so much so that, instead of leading the "democratic coalition," and from the "very first phases of its development" (Bittelman), such leadership must be given over to the liberal bourgeoisie.

From this viewpoint of "American exceptionalism," it naturally follows that to call for a Farmer-Labor Party is a piece of rank "Leftism." So we, ourselves, left the workers with the sole choice of voting for one of the two capitalist parties, and no chance to vote against capitalism. And when, we having insisted that one capitalist party was better than the other capitalist party, the workers ignored our advice, we came out with solemn declarations about the workers' "backwardness." Thus, in the editorial on the election of 1946, in the December *Political Affairs*, we find this slander against the working class:

"Important sections of the working class were misled, especially because of the low level of class consciousness among the workers. It (the Republican Party) was able to secure the votes of workers who only yesterday expressed their militant demands for better conditions on the picket lines in struggle" (p. 1061).

This nonsense is put forward as profound "Communist analysis," and its outright foundation upon "American exceptionalism" is given on the previous page (1060), where it is declared that "the basic reason" for the Republican victory "... must be found in the factors that are peculiar to the United States, and that distinguish it from the countries in which the masses voted in increasing numbers for the parties of the Left." Here we have, under new auspices, the hardy perennial of Lovestone-Browder "American exceptionalism" in full flower. And a left-handed assertion that the Democratic Party is a "party of the left."

This at a time when Boris Vronski, cited by the Associated Press from Moscow on Nov. 5, 1946, as "one of Russia's foremost political scientists," was quoted by *Red Star* (the Red Army's daily paper), as saying that the difference between Democrats and Republicans "was never so insignificant as now," and that "Democrats as well as Republicans are waging with equal determination an offensive against the vital interests of the

American popular masses."

It is not surprising, therefore, to find, if we read carefully what Comrade Dennis wrote in his March, 1947, statement to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, boldly advanced behind a seeming "agreement" with the Seventh Congress of the CI, a studied rejection by the CPUSA of any positive guidance by international principles and policies.

The main thing which Dennis sees to admire in the Communist International was its dissolution. Secondly, the Seventh Congress supposed "registering of the fact" that the various Communist Parties were in no way bound to any guiding general principles and policies of the world movement, because we "have changed our views on many questions of theory" (*The Worker*, March 30, 1947). Which is Dennis's way of saying what Bob Minor said during the "Teheran period," that we "couldn't find the answers in the dusty old books" of Marx and Lenin.

Certainly, not only the Seventh Congress, but all CI Congresses, and all Communist teachers, back to Marx, urged a "study of concrete conditions" in each country as a basis for formulating policy for the Communists of that country. Al have remarked that the law of *unequa development* and the consequent *differences* in conditions prevailing in various countries must be taken into account that there must be no "mechanical" application of tactical policies found good in one country, to another country; and Dimitroff, at the Seventh Congress, declared war on "cut-and-dried schemes which 'doctrinaires' might wish to apply to any and all cases and countries.

But, with all these qualifications, neither Marx, nor Lenin, nor any CI Congress, in urging that the *differences* between countries be taken into account, ignored the *similarities* existing in the class struggle of all capitalist countries; and they urged the reckoning of the *differences* only in the application of a general and *uniform* program for proletarian revolution to overthrow capitalism.

Comrade Dimitroff correctly condemned "cut-and-dried schemes." But it would be a travesty on Dimitroff as a theoretician, to say that he had no "scheme" at all; to imply that at the Seventh Congress he told us to throw away the compass, blindfold the pilot and set to sea without the chart of Marxism-Leninism to guide us. Comrade Dennis has, himself, a "cut-and-dried scheme," a scheme "cut" by Lovestone and "dried" by Browder, a scheme of "American exceptionalism."

And what Comrade Stalin says about such attempts to impose any national "exceptionalism" upon any Communist party, with tricky chatter about "studying concrete conditions," is stated in his *Foundations of Leninism* (Chapter III, Section 3), as follows:

"Formerly, it was customary to talk of the existence or absence of objective conditions for the proletarian revolution in individual countries or, to be more exact, in this or that advanced country. This point of view is now inadequate. It is now necessary to take into account the existence of the objective conditions for the revolution throughout the whole system of imperialist world economy which forms an integral unit, for the existence within this system of some countries that are not sufficiently developed from the industrial point of view cannot form an insurmountable obstacle to the revolution, if the system as a whole has become, or to come nearer the truth, because the system as a whole has already become, ripe for Socialism.

"Formerly, again, the proletarian revolution in this or that advanced country was regarded as a separate and self-contained unit, facing a separate and distinct national capitalist front, as its opposite pole. Today, this point of view is inadequate. Today it is necessary to speak of proletarian world revolution, for the separate national fronts of capital have become links in a single chain called the world front of imperialism, to which should be opposed the united front of the revolutionary movement in all countries.

"Formerly, the proletarian revolution was regarded as the consequence of an exclusively internal development in a given country. At the present time this point of view is inadequate. Today it is necessary to regard the proletarian revolution above all as the result of the development of the contradictions within the world-system of imperialism."

Comrade Dennis is familiar with all this, no doubt. But Comrade Foster (July Plenum, 1946), reminded us that Comrade Dennis "worked for many years as a highly responsible leader"—helping

Browder—in the Party's national center. He was, indeed, "highly responsible" for imposing revisionism on our Party. And his attempt to perpetuate "American exceptionalism" is a necessary part of his attempt to perpetuate revisionism.

But not in the identical form, not in the visible and shameless form of "Browderism," of outright *social-imperialism*. That has proved to be self-defeating as it is too easily discerned for what it is. But rather in the more subtle and deceitful form of *social-reformism*, which makes use of a pseudo-Marxism, which "deceives the workers," as Lenin said, with "the repetition of commonplaces about capitalism," which gains the confidence of the workers by seeming to "fight" for their elementary demands, but only to betray them by holding back, demoralizing and demobilizing the proletarian army (the *subjective* factor), when every *objective* condition, spoken of by Stalin in the above quotation, is favorable for the proletariat and its allies to "storm capitalism."

It is quite correct that "the immediate economic and political interests of the working class, the defense of the latter against fascism, must be the *starting point* and form the main content of the workers' united front in all capitalist countries" (Seventh Congress resolution). But it is incorrect when we stop at the "starting point," and limit our propaganda to "repetitions of commonplaces about capitalism."

Lenin pointed out, in his *State and Revolution*, p. 30, that "commonplaces about capitalism" and "acceptance of class struggle" is not enough. Denying that "the class struggle is the main point" in Marxist teaching, Lenin added: "Out of this error, here and there, springs an opportunist distortion of Marxism, such a falsification of it as to make it acceptable to the bourgeoisie. The theory of class struggle was not created by Marx, but by the bourgeoisie before Marx and is, generally speaking, acceptable to the bourgeoisie. He who recognizes only the class struggle is not yet a Marxist; he may be found not to have gone beyond the boundaries of bourgeois reasoning and politics. To limit Marxism to the teaching of the class struggle means to curtail Marxism—to distort it, to reduce it to something which is acceptable to the bourgeoisie. A Marxist is one who extends the acceptance of class struggle to the acceptance of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Herein lies the deepest difference between a Marxist and an ordinary petty or big bourgeois. On this touchstone it is necessary to test a real understanding and acceptance of Marxism."

Our press, quite rightly, is filled with accounts of "labor disputes," of the daily contests between "progress" and "reaction," with the "commonplaces" about capitalism. But, missing from this, is the "systematic explanation" called for by the National Convention Resolution (1945), informing the workers that only when they fight for and win Socialism, can these problems be solved and their demands permanently secured. To do so, our leadership says, would be "sectarian," since our leadership holds that the workers are so very "backward" that they would be frightened away from us. Which is opportunist nonsense.

The workers must "learn from their own experiences," we are told. Which is true enough. But, unless our own Party introduces *Socialist* concepts into the minds of the workers, as a part of their "experiences," and simultaneously with their struggles for their immediate demands, the workers learn *nothing*. This has been repeated and emphasized by all Communist theoreticians, in their struggle against "the theory of spontaneity"; the theory that workers acquire a Socialist political outlook *spontaneously* through participation in economic struggles for immediate demands.²⁴

²⁴The 'theory' of spontaneity is the theory of opportunism. It is the theory of deference to the spontaneity of the labor movement, the theory that actually denies to the party of the working class its leading role of vanguard of that working class. . . . It is opposed to the movement which follows the line of struggle against the foundations of capitalism, and is in favor of the movement which follows exclusively the line of 'possible' demands. . . . The theory of spontaneity represents the ideology of trade unionism. . . . the ideology of 'dragging at the tail,' the logical basis of all 'opportunism.'—Stalin, in *Foundations of Leninism* (Chapter III, Section 2).

The reader can take note how this theory of spontaneity has been given official approval in practice by our Party leadership in its sanction of the CIO Resolution, sponsored by Murray, against Communist Party "interference." Compromises on the question of trade union "independence" are sometimes permissible for the Party; compromises are sometimes forced upon us, but in such cases the Party must take its case to the widest rank and file masses.

Carried into life, this theory of spontaneity leads to a major crime of opportunism, the separation of theory and practice. It destroys the dialectical connection between the class struggle's strategic aim and its tactical aims, and nullifies not only the former, but the latter as well. For unless the labor movement is given the vision and virility of a revolutionary ultimate aim, the reforms it wins, or has granted it, are easily revoked and swept away. It is the duty of Communists to bring up the consciousness of the masses to the level of the consciousness of the Party, to get them to understand what we already should understand, that "the main thing is revolutionary work and not reforms, for reforms are mere by-products of the revolution" (Stalin, *Foundations of Leninism*, Chapter VII, Section 6).

As with the economic phase, so also does the social-reformist, the social-democrat in practice, no matter if calling himself a "Communist," tear apart the tactical aim of defeating fascism and war, from the strategic aim of putting an end to capitalist imperialism which is the source of fascism, and war.

Because fascism and war deeply injure all intermediate strata between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat; and because, for that reason, the proletariat can mobilize and lead these middle strata for anti-fascist and anti-war aims that are comprehensible to them, the social-reformist insists that neither the proletariat nor its vanguard party shall have aims further than these, that no Communist dare entertain (or, if he does entertain, he not disclose to his fellow workers) any concept of a revolutionary perspective beyond the "defeat of fascism and war." Because, forsooth, the "democratic coalition," or the "majority of the people," cannot be expected to entertain any such perspective or have any such strategic aim.

Thus rejecting the strategic aim of revolution, not merely for the platform of the coalition (which is correct), but for the program of the Communist Party (which is incorrect), the social-reformist, whatever his occasional "tipping of the hat" to Socialism, ends his perspective of the historical process with the saving of bourgeois democracy. *Period*. Then, the monopolists will be "curbed." Which is, of course, *not* Browderism. And, under the joint auspices of the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie, capitalism is to continue indefinitely, with the Communists loyally striving to "make it work." Not, of course, as Browder conceived it, but, let us say, as Henry Wallace conceives it should work.

True, Comrade Dennis has confessed having a vision of Socialism, which he "keeps ever bright before him." But so did Browder—after "many generations." But neither of them allows such visionary matters to interfere with the practical task of "making capitalism work."

Does this agree with the perspective outlined by the Seventh Congress for the guidance of all Communist Parties? It does not.

The Seventh Congress, and Comrade Dimitroff's report there, gave general indications of the line to be followed by Communists when, the "united proletarian front," or "the people's front," having gained strength, and enough strength to defeat fascism, the movement might face the contingency of forming a government. Let us see what Dimitroff said:

Firstly, he said he referred to a government possible to form "on the eve of and before the victory of the Soviet revolution." But that only "specific prerequisites" make its formation politically necessary, however. These are, said Dimitroff:

"First, the state apparatus of the bourgeoisie must already be sufficiently disorganized and paralyzed, so that the bourgeoisie cannot prevent the formation of a government of struggle against reaction and fascism;

"Second, the broadest masses of toilers, particularly the mass trade unions, must and explain the role of the Party in relation to the trade unions. But this CIO Resolution was not a compromise, but a complete surrender to the Murray policy of excluding Communist propaganda and Communist policy from the CIO. Nor was any adequate effort made to reach the CIO workers with enlightenment as to the necessity of a Communist Party to their interests, only an exercise in semantics on the definition of the word "interference." The results speak for themselves.

be in a violent state of revolt against fascism and reaction, though not ready to rise in insurrection to fight under Communist Party leadership for the achievement of Soviet power;

"Third, the differentiation and Leftward movement in the ranks of Social-Democracy and other parties participating in the united front must already have reached the point where a considerable proportion of them demand ruthless measures against the fascists and the other reactionaries, struggle together with the Communists against fascism, and openly come out against that reactionary section of their own party which is hostile to Communism."

Dimitroff went on to explain that, in 1922 and 1924, the Fourth and Fifth Congresses dealt with the analogous question of a "workers'" or a "workers' and peasants' government." Certain mistakes were made then:

"The first series of mistakes was determined precisely by the circumstance that the question of a workers' government was not clearly and firmly interlinked with the existence of a political crisis. Owing to this, the Right Opportunists were able to interpret matters as though we should strive for the formation of a workers' government, supported by Communists, in any, so to speak, 'normal' situation. The ultra-'Lefts' on the other hand, recognized only such a government as could be formed exclusively by armed insurrection, after the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. Both views were wrong.

"The second series of errors was determined by the circumstance that the question of a workers' government was not interlinked with the development of the militant mass united front movement of the proletariat. Thus the Right Opportunists were enabled to distort the question, reducing it to the unprincipled tactics of forming blocs with Social-Democratic parties on the basis of purely parliamentary arrangements. The ultra-'Lefts' on the other hand, shouted: 'No coalitions with the counter-revolutionary Social-Democrats!' regarding all Social-Democrats as counter-revolutionists at bottom.

"Both were wrong, and we now emphasize, on the one hand, that we are not in the least anxious for such a 'workers' government' as would be nothing more or less than an enlarged social-Democratic government. We even prefer to waive calling it a 'workers' government,' and speak of a united front government which in political character is something absolutely different, different in principle, from all the Social-Democratic governments which usually call themselves 'workers' (or Labor) governments.' While the Social-Democratic government is an instrument of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie in the interest of the preservation of the capitalist order, a united front government is an instrument of collaboration between the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat and other anti-fascist parties in the interest of the entire toiling population, a government of struggle against fascism and reaction."

Comrade Dimitroff then explained at length that there were "two different camps of Social-Democracy," one reactionary, rejecting the united front because it "undermines their policy of compromise with the bourgeoisie," and the other, a "growing camp of workers who are becoming revolutionary," who favor the united front, and how, "the better this mass movement will be organized from below . . . the greater will be the guarantee against a possible degeneration of the policy of the united front government." Proceeding, Dimitroff said:

"The third series of mistaken views which came to light during our former debates touched precisely on the practical policy of the 'workers' government.' The Right Opportunists considered that a 'workers' government' ought to keep 'within the framework of bourgeois democracy,' and consequently ought not to take any steps going beyond this framework. The ultra-'Lefts' on the other hand, actually refused to make any attempt to form a united front government."

Comrade Dimitroff then cited the 1923 case of the "workers' government" in Saxony and Thuringia (Germany), where—in a revolutionary situation—Rightist Communists, Brandler and Thälheimer, pursued an opportunist policy; and although they correctly entered the government with Left Social-Democrats, they refused to "use their positions to arm the proletariat," doing "nothing to organize the revolutionary mass move-

ment of the workers," and "behave generally like ordinary parliamentary ministers within the framework of bourgeois democracy."

"Comrades," he stated, "we demand of every united front government an entirely different policy. We demand that such a government carry out definite and fundamental revolutionary demands required by the situation. For instance, control of production, control of the banks, disbanding of the police, its replacement by an armed workers' militia, etc."

Then Comrade Dimitroff went into a phase of Leninism most upsetting not only to ultra-'Lefts,' but to the concepts guiding the Rightist Dennis leadership, if, indeed, any concepts can be determined from what this leadership has to say. He said:

"Fifteen years ago Lenin called upon us to focus all our attention on 'searching out forms of transition or approach to the proletarian revolution.' It may be that in a number of countries the united front government will prove to be one of the most important transitional forms. The 'Left' doctrinaires always evaded this precept of Lenin's. Like the limited propagandists that they were, they spoke only of 'aims,' without ever worrying about 'forms of transition.' The Right Opportunists, on the other hand, tried to establish a special 'democratic intermediate stage' lying between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the purpose of instilling into the workers the illusion of a peaceful parliamentary procession from the one dictatorship to the other. This fictitious 'intermediate stage' they also called the 'transitional form,' and even quoted Lenin on the subject! But this piece of swindling was not difficult to expose; for Lenin spoke of the form of transition and approach to the 'proletarian revolution,' i. e., to the overthrow of the bourgeois dictatorship, and not of some transitional form between the bourgeois and the proletarian dictatorship."

This bit of Dimitroff is absolutely fatal to the Dennis vision of Socialism as "but an extension of this (!) democratic process." And to his evident concept of the defeat of fascism and the consequent saving of bourgeois democracy as the end of the social struggle."

Comrade Dimitroff continued, in his report, to show the absolute necessity for both "transitional slogans and special 'forms of transition or approach to the proletarian revolution,'" in order to help the masses develop a consciousness of what path to take; which party to follow:

"Otherwise, the great mass of the people, a prey to petty-bourgeois democratic illusions and traditions, may waver even when there is a revolutionary situation, may procrastinate and stray, without finding the road to revolution and then come under the axe of the fascist executioners."

This doesn't look like the present CPUSA leadership's obvious alarm lest somebody point out to the masses that beyond the transitional slogans and forms lies "the road to revolution." Indeed, Dimitroff made this difference emphatic when he added:

"That is why we indicate the possibility of forming a government of the anti-fascist front in the conditions of a political crisis. In so far as such a government will really prosecute the struggle against the enemies of the people, and give a free hand to the working class and the Communist Party, we Communists shall accord it our unstinted support, and as soldiers of the revolution shall take our place in the first line of fire. But we state frankly to the masses:

"Final salvation this government cannot bring. It is not in a position to overthrow the class rule of the exploiters, and for this reason cannot finally eliminate the danger of fascist counter-revolution. Consequently, it is necessary to prepare for the Socialist revolution! Soviet power and only Soviet power can bring such salvation!"

Does the present leadership of the CPUSA ever "state frankly to the masses" this Communist concept? Never! That the united front or the anti-fascist people's front program is by common agreement limited to demands for re-

"I say it is Dennis's 'evident' concept because, firstly, every positive statement of his is so formulated as to imply such a concept; and, secondly, because he gives no other concept whatever. If he has any other than the social-reformist concept visible in all he says why cannot he be as frank as Dimitroff; as clear as Lenin, in voicing it? Whom does he think he is fooling? The imperialist bourgeoisie? He cannot fool them. And he should not fool the proletariat.

forms and the defeat of fascism and war, and rightly so limited, is undeniable. But that we, the Communists, limit our own program to the same aims, is utterly impermissible, and inexcusable by the exact given—that to do so would be "sectarian," that we cannot support the limited program of the united front without giving up our own program of propagandizing the masses within the united front to raise their level of class consciousness and prepare them, ideologically, to carry the struggle further, to the Socialist revolution.

Yet that is exactly the sum total of such "theories" as are voiced by Comrade Bittelman in the *Daily Worker*, in a series of articles whose complicated sophistries can be summed up in the thought that, while it is all right to "believe" in Socialism, it is "left opportunism" to propagandize and work for Socialism among the masses; and a perfidious allegation that any Communist who wants to do so, is *ipso facto*, an "agent" of reaction, a "renegade," and so forth and so on, who is trying to "isolate labor from its allies," etc., an allegation based on the falsehood that propaganda for Socialism among the masses who support the "democratic coalition" is identical with trying to force into some yet non-existent written compact of the coalition the demand for a "direct" fight for "immediate" Socialism on the part of our allies.

This sort of thing is exactly what Comrade Dimitroff warned against at the Seventh Congress, when he said:

"While fighting most resolutely to overcome and exterminate the last remnants of self-satisfied sectarianism, we must increase to a maximum our vigilance in regard to and the struggle against Right Opportunism and against every one of its concrete manifestations, bearing in mind that the danger of Right Opportunism will increase in proportion as the wide united front develops more and more.

"Already there are tendencies to reduce the role of the Communist Party in the ranks of the united front and to effect a reconciliation with Social-Democratic ideology. Nor must the fact be lost sight of that the tactics of the united front are a method of convincing the Social-Democratic workers by object lesson of the correctness of the Communist policy and the incorrectness of the reformist policy, and that they are not a reconciliation with Social-Democratic ideology and practice. A successful struggle for the establishment of the united front, demands constant struggle in our ranks against tendencies to depreciate the role of the Party, against legalist illusions, against reliance on spontaneity and automatism, both in liquidating fascism and in conducting the united front against the slightest vacillation at the moment of determined action."

And toward what end is the "determined action," which Comrade Dimitroff spoke of, directed? Is this great movement of the masses going some place after fulfilling the official aim of the "coalition" itself to "liquidate fascism"? Evidently. In the course of discussion at the Seventh Congress, concerning united front governments, Comrade Dimitroff (See the magazine *The Communist International*, September 20, 1935, p. 1235) said, in arguing against "any hard-and-fast rules":

"It would be wrong to imagine that the united front government is an indispensable stage on the road to the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship. That is just as wrong as the former assertion that there will be no intermediary stages in the fascist countries and that the fascist dictatorship is certain to be immediately superseded by proletarian dictatorship."

"The whole question boils down to this: will the proletariat itself be prepared at the decisive moment for the direct overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of its own power, and will it be able in that event to secure the support of its allies? Or will the movement of the united proletarian front and the anti-fascist people's front at the particular stage be in a position only to suppress or overthrow fascism, without directly proceeding to abolish the bourgeois dictatorship?"

Nor was Dimitroff alone in this conception that there is no Chinese wall between the defeat of fascism and the proletarian revolution, beyond which wall no Communist dare look on pain of expulsion from the CPUSA. Comrade Wilhelm Pieck, in concluding his report, asserted that:

"... the indignation of the masses at the capitalist regime will continue to grow, the revolutionary crisis to mature and the idea of storming the citadel of capitalism to mature in the minds of

ever larger masses of proletarians. . . .

"Our task is to organize the toiling masses who are rising against capitalism into a solid revolutionary army of the proletariat and to lead them to storm capitalism."

Comrade Maurice Thorez, speaking at the Seventh Congress, before the formation in France of the first (1936) People's Front government, headed by Leon Blum, spoke of how such a government would have to fight off "an attack of reaction and fascism even more cruel and persistent" than before.

"But," he said, "the people's front and the Communist Party would occupy new positions which we should have to make use of in preparation for the setting up of Soviet power, of the dictatorship of the proletariat."

And in his explanation of the character of the French Communist Party, American comrades can see the contrasting character of the present CPUSA. He said:

"Our party can realize such a policy. It no longer risks losing itself in other parties or being confused with them . . . We acquired this independence especially thanks to the adoption of the tactics of 'class against class,' tactics by force of which the face of our Party was shown to be absolutely different from all other parties, including also the Socialist Party."

Is the CPUSA in danger of "losing itself in other parties"? To answer that question, one has only to look at what is being proposed by our leadership. Firstly, basically, the tactic of "class against class" is completely outlawed.

Ideologically, in our actual practical work among the masses, we are commanded not to propagandize for Socialism, since this would "isolate" us from those terribly "backward" workers among our allies; and, in effect, to limit our propaganda to the need for defeating fascism and war, without injecting any conception that this can be done, finally and effectively, only by struggle of "class against class" to overthrow capitalist rule.

By this practice, the Communist Party emphasizes to the masses the likeness in its program to that of other "progressive" political groups, and the Democratic Party particularly in respect to its so-called "pro-Roosevelt" section; and, by this practice, the difference in our Communist program from these other groups and parties become obscured to the masses—and, finally, to ourselves.

Who are the Communists in the CIO, and what are they doing there? The answer by our National Trade Union Secretary, John Williamson (published by the Waterfront Section of the Communist Party, undated, but early in 1947), reveals that Communists differ from other CIO members only in being extraordinarily good union men "fighting selflessly for the progressive policies of the CIO and for its unity around its elected leader, Philip Murray."

Who are the Communists who are messing around the Democratic Party, and what do they mean by it?

The answer to this question can be found in any Dennis report or Schneiderman speech: these Communists are only extraordinarily passionate defenders of (bourgeois) democracy, and they are only trying to get the Democratic Party to remain true to the (bourgeois) reformism of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Obviously, it is this sort of thing, this hiding of the face of our Party, and not of bold assertion of our identity as Communists, with a Communist program of distinct aims going beyond the aims of Philip Murray and of Jimmie Roosevelt, which invites red-baiting and destroys, rather than builds, any real "coalition" on the basis of a commonly agreed upon fight against fascism and war.

The anti-Communist resolution of Philip Murray is virtually asked for; and Jimmie Roosevelt, Chairman of the Democratic Party in California, is practically forced to do the job of differentiation that we don't do, by exclaiming: "We must make clear that we Democrats are not Communists" (UP press report, December, 1946).

That is the sort of Right Opportunist practice which Comrade Dimitroff was warning against at the Seventh Congress of the CI. More, it is precisely what our 1945 National Convention Resolution condemned in Part II, Section 6, as follows:

"We Communists began to carry on the historic struggle against fascism, for democracy and national freedom, in a way that was not always clearly distinguishable from that of bourgeois democrats and bourgeois nationalists."

So much for the current practice of liquidating the CPUSA ideologically.

Organizationally, and proceeding under this banner of identifying ourselves only as defenders of bourgeois democracy, we are commanded by Comrade Dennis (December, 1946, Plenum "Remarks," published in *Political Affairs*, January, 1947, pp. 11-12) to go forth, each and every Communist Party member, and lose ourselves in another political party, by recruiting individuals (regardless of class, too!) into something which Comrade Dennis cagily calls "a grass roots mass membership political action organization." Here is what he says:

"What is required is the organization, in every ward and township, in every city and on a Congressional district basis, of some form of independent, political, legislative membership organization. . . . building down below, everywhere, a grass roots mass membership political action organization."

Observe that this is not a united front of proletarian organizations united in a delegate council; neither is it a people's front alliance of parties and organizations, each of them retaining its independent identity, and federating together, as in a Farmer-Labor Party, on a program common to all, but infringing on none of their separate programs. No, this is a "mass membership" organization.

And who is going to do the actual work of organizing it? The Communists, of course. Yet not as Communists, because we have already foresworn any propaganda of Communist ideology and aims; and, having organized such a "political action organization," we Communists, but not as Communists, must assume the main if not all the burden

PART IX. PRINCIPLES OF PARTY CLEANSING FROM BELOW

AGAINST FACTIONALISM; FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

"Real democracy means that it is the Party membership that acts in the Party organization, that the Party membership decides Party questions and general practical questions as well, that the Party membership passes its own resolutions, and obliges its organization to put these resolutions into effect. . . . What we are referring to is democracy in action, whereby the Party membership decides questions itself, and acts itself. And we must say that this is just the kind of democracy that must be fundamental in our organization." (Stalin, June 1906, in *New Life*, a Bolshevik paper then published in Tiflis; quoted in *The Communist International*, June, 1940, p. 400.)

HOW TO STRENGTHEN THE PARTY PROGRAM POLITICALLY by the adoption of a new National Convention Resolution, which will arm the Party membership for unrelenting struggle against both Right Opportunism and "leftism," has been indicated in previous chapters. Already, as a result of our Right Opportunism, there is a "left" danger arising, not inside our Party, nor in any important way among the expelled comrades, but outside the Party, where some syndicalist trends (helped by clerical leadership) are appearing in the CIO, and where, as a result of our Right Opportunist sectarianism, strong anarchist currents are bound to appear in the labor movement. The wide and growing distrust among workers of "all politics" and "all parties," arising from their seeing in our Party no difference from the bourgeois parties in representing their class interests, is the mass basis for this anarchism, which fascism can make great use of in its demagoguery.

But as to leadership to apply Party Program, it is evident that, as a rule, the present leadership cannot be trusted to carry out a revolutionary line, no matter how carefully our National Convention may write one into its resolutions. From top to bottom, this corrupt and incorrigibly opportunist leadership must be swept away, and replaced by fresh and proletarian leadership from the depths of the Party.

It is said, and not without some grain of truth, that even the Party ranks, especially those who came to the Party in the years of reformist domination, coming in, all too often, on the basis of an acceptance of a reformist outlook as final and sufficient to meet their approval, have had their ideological development "frozen" at that level, and are incapable of generating a new and revolutionary leadership.

This is, no doubt, a factor. And that it exists as a problem in other countries—the problem of development and use of those who have come to the Communist movement in the period of legality and when it was "easy" to be a Communist Party member—is testified to by Dimitroff's remarks on that subject in his speech of February 27, 1946, concerning the Bulgarian Communist (Workers') Party. (*Political Affairs*, August, 1946.)

of its activities. All of which, as anybody of experience can see, will certainly result in liquidating the independent activities of the Communist Party as a Communist Party. It will do the job of liquidation just as surely and even more effectively than did Browder's "Teheran" policy of liquidation in 1944.

And, to top off all this Right Opportunist liquidation of our Party in fact, without doing it "officially" as Browder did, Comrade Dennis, directly after instructing us so to do, says he "stresses" that:

"All this activity must be connected with a determined and greatly expanded effort to help unite and activate the pro-Roosevelt forces in and around the Democratic Party."

So, if the members of the Communist Party want to know where they may be found after losing themselves in this anonymous "political action organization," the answer is: together with that organization, "in and around the Democratic Party."

Browder could do no better. In fact, he couldn't serve the imperialist bourgeoisie half so well as does Comrade Dennis.

But the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, which Comrade Dennis so professes to admire, never provided him with any decision to justify that. Neither did the CPUSA National Convention of 1945.

"Liquidationism," said Lenin, in his *Selected Works*, Vol. IV, "is the attempt of a certain section of the party intelligentsia to liquidate (i.e., to dissolve, destroy, abolish, close down) the existing organization of the Party, and substitute for it an amorphous association within the limits of legality, even if this is attained at the price of an open renunciation of the program, tactics and traditions, i.e., the past experience of the Party."

If it is a problem for such a strong and Bolshevized party as that of Bulgaria, it is trebly a problem for our Party. Our opportunist leadership is living, and apparently expects to continue living, on the enthusiastic new people who come to believe in our Party, not so much from anything our Party itself offers or teaches them, but from what they cannot help but see and learn from the successes of the Soviet Union and the Communist parties of Europe and Asia.

These people are raw material. But they are not developed. They are not taught that independent thinking and a critical attitude are indispensable equipment of every real Communist, and are also the foundation of true Party discipline based upon conviction. Instead, they are taught a one-sided conception of discipline, that they are to believe what the leadership tells them, regardless of whether or not they are convinced by it after independent thinking and a critical objectivity in approach to it; and to disbelieve anybody who voices criticism of the leadership. In short they are taught hero worship and the fetishism of leadership infallibility.

Hence this matter of the ideological level of the present membership is a problem, within the larger problem of the Bolshevization of the CPUSA. But it is not a dominant factor. For these comrades want to be good Communists. And the coming gigantic struggles, wherein their vital interests as proletarians are bound to come into conflict with gigantic treacheries of the Party leadership, will, in spite of that leadership's present reckoning on losing them and getting a "new crop" of recruits on which to live, keep the Party in continual crisis.

More, it can be written down as inevitable, that the American proletariat is bound to have its revolutionary political party of Communism, no matter how desperately any clique of opportunists tries to maintain a monopoly of the honored name—the Communist Party.

One would have to be wholly unrealistic to "set a date" for such a development, to express a "leftist" impatience with the laggard unfoldment of events, or an over-estimation of what can be done, once what is wrong and what to do about it, has been stated. Action does not follow so quickly the realiza-

tion of error. And, still more, bureaucratic censorship and double-talk can play a hindering role. Besides, the fact is that our Party membership, no less than the masses, has to learn from its own experiences, sometimes tragic ones.

The long and formless struggle in the old Socialist Party, which first climaxed in 1912, by taking form in the expulsion of Bill Haywood, and the bureaucratic suppression of "the Reds" by "the Yellows," did not end matters. Although tens of thousands of revolutionary workers left the old Socialist Party, this settled nothing. The rival I.W.W. was not built up in like numbers, neither was the Party "wrecked" by this mere desertion, as the makers of empty phrases fondly imagined, nor was that party isolated from the masses as an organization attractive to the proletariat, by such futile tactics. In that very year of 1912, it got over a million votes. Only four years later did it markedly fall off from that figure.

Indeed, by 1917 the Socialist Party regained a large measure of its attractive power. On the eve of America's entry into World War I, the Party's national convention at St. Louis adopted a "militant" (though hardly a Leninist) anti-war resolution. Then came the February revolution overthrowing the Russian Tsar. Both these events attracted new masses to the old Socialist Party. But that very fact was the ultimate undoing of the revisionist leadership.

With the entry of the United States into the war, and the passage of restrictive laws, such as the "Espionage Act," the cowardly Party leadership, clinging to the fetish of "legality," ignored the "anti-war" resolution of the national convention. No, it did not repudiate it, but neither did it implement it. The leadership sabotaged the Party program, much as our present leadership has sabotaged our 1945 National Convention Resolution, weakened as it was by their own writing of it in the first place.

When scores and hundreds of individuals and local Party organizations, especially the Young People's Socialist League, used their own initiative in various anti-war actions, and clashed head-on with imperialist policy, the leadership deserted them. Then, with the October Revolution, the leadership began increasingly to exhibit its Menshevism. Especially after the arrest of the five national leaders, who managed by "deals" postponing their prosecution finally to escape penalty, did the leadership feel forced to become more openly the lackeys of imperialism.

While hundreds of Party members were jailed and some tarred and feathered, several obscure workers being killed by frenzied "patriots"; while Debs and Ruthenberg and Kate O'Hare were sent to prison for "overt acts"—speeches against the war, the top leadership "magically" avoided any personal discomfort. The anti-war "Green Corn Rebellion" of Oklahoma farmers got no Party support, the I.W.W., against which was thrown the full force of chauvinistic mass terror, was officially shunned as outside the pale. And, more and more the Socialist Party leadership took, visibly, the anti-Soviet path, defending the imperialist lackeys of the Second International and the Russian Mensheviks.

All this developed on an increasing scale, a sharp cleavage between the membership and the leadership, which grew swiftly and took shape in a powerful Left Wing after Lenin's official appeal in March, 1919, for the formation of the Third (Communist) International. Local party organizations everywhere began adopting resolutions demanding that the Party affiliate to the Third International. Papers and pamphlets began appearing, sponsored by rebellious Left-Wing organizations, openly challenging the Right-Wing officialdom, and voicing the Left-Wing Program, drafted by delegate conferences of the rebel party organizations.

Fighting for control of the Party, the Left Wing won 12 out of 15 seats on the National Executive Committee in the party election (where national officials were elected by referendum). The Right-Wing leadership refused to yield, officially declaring the election null and void. They "suspended"—virtually expelled—seven language federations and the whole Michigan state party, which were pledged to the Left-Wing Program. And, when the national convention met in Chicago in August, 1919, the old Party leadership refused to seat the Left-Wing delegates, finally calling in the Chicago police to eject them from the hall.

But all this made the issue clear, and also proved that the Left Wing represented the big majority of the member-

ship. Therefore, being ejected from the "regular" convention, the largest group of Left-Wing delegates met separately and formed the Communist Labor Party. Another group of Left-Wing delegates, who had refused even to attend the "regular" convention, or even have any dealings with those Left-Wing delegates who tried to attend, declaring themselves against so doing as a matter of "principle," met in a third hall and formed the Communist Party. It is worth note that two years passed before, in December, 1921, these two Left-Wing parties solved their quarrel and merged in one party. Meanwhile, on November 7, 1919, the repressive "Palmer Red Raids" began, and both Communist parties were driven underground.

However, the persistence of social-democracy's attractive power is worth mention. In 1920 (of course, with both Communist parties outlawed), the Socialist Party won nearly a million votes, with Debs, a convicted "disloyal seditionist," remaining throughout the campaign, behind bars in the Atlanta Penitentiary.

And Debs, although he had exclaimed to the world: "From the top of my head to the soles of my feet, I am a Bolshevik!"—nevertheless was not Bolshevik enough ever to break with the opportunist leadership of the Socialist Party and go with the Left-Wing majority into the Communist Party. Like Foster today, Debs served as a fig-leaf for an incorrigible reformist bureaucracy, and his verbal "leftism" was tolerated by that bureaucracy, in similar fashion as Foster's "leftism" in words is today tolerated by the Dennis bureaucracy, for that service. Because Debs attracted to and held within the old reformist Socialist Party, thousands of revolutionary workers who would, otherwise, have been attracted to the new Communist Party.

This illustrates the difficulties, the time, the objective developments, and the subjective determination, and the organizational labor, necessary to bring forth a revolutionary party, out of a situation where the leadership of the existing party is monopolized by an opportunist bureaucracy. These difficulties were, no doubt, uppermost in Comrade Foster's mind when he declared, with complete but mistaken assurance, in his August, 1946, talks with me in San Francisco, that expelled comrades "had no place to go but to the Trotskyite organization."

For these difficulties were overcome by those who formed our present Communist Party. That success illustrates that the renovation of a party can be done, in one form or another, by the birth of a new organization if need be, given the time and necessary development of both objective and subjective requirements. And these requirements can mature, after sometime slow beginnings, at lightning speed. Only six months after Lenin's appeal for a new international in March, 1919, the new Communist Party emerged from the battle which had been slowly approaching for seven years. Both Lovestone and Browder smugly prided themselves on a great majority support in our Party, but lost that majority overnight. In the imperialist epoch, opportunism has a short life.

But the history of the birth of our Party likewise has a lesson for those impatient ones who imagine that they can, like some magician, pull a "new party" out of their hats, without considering the party which the past has brought forth, and without the time and labor to overcome the difficulties in building the future out of the present, working with the material at hand.

Writing in the midst of imperialist war (1915), Lenin said that, with that war, the socialist movement had "entered a stage of revolutionary action, and a complete break with opportunism, the expulsion of the opportunists from the labor parties, has become imperative." Clearly, a similar "imperative" has come with the ending of the recent anti-Axis war and the inevitable dissolution of the wartime "coalition" and "national unity" in this imperialist country.

But, Lenin added, "This outline of the tasks . . . does not indicate directly how fast and in what definite forms the process of separation of the workers' revolutionary parties from petty-bourgeois opportunist parties will take place." (*The War and the Second International*, p. 48.)

At the same time he wrote: "The gigantic power of the opportunists and chauvinists comes from their alliance with the bourgeoisie" (*ibid.*, p. 43). And

although he wrote (*ibid.*, p. 53.) that: "The imperialist epoch cannot tolerate the existence in one party of an advance guard of the revolutionary proletariat on the one hand, and of the semi, petty bourgeois aristocracy of the working class . . . on the other," he also said (*ibid.*, p. 37) as regards the German movement: "As for the creation of a new organization, time is required; determination to throw out the old, rotten, obsolete organization, is required."

History proved Lenin was right, and not only about the German movement. Time was required, and determination, too, for years of struggle inside the parties of the Second International, before Communist parties of importance emerged. Today, of course, objective developments rush upon us with greater speed. And today the subjective factor of determination to "throw out" the old, the rotten and the obsolete, is the laggard factor, the principal requirement in attaining a truly revolutionary party of the United States proletariat. In the face of onrushing crises, the interests of the workers of the United States demand that the membership of the CPUSA sweep away, at once, the old corrupted leadership, completely.

And it is not Bolshevism, but Menshevism, which contends that opportunists must be kept in office because they are "experienced." They are experienced traitors, experienced bureaucrats.

Neither must there be tolerated the present widely prevalent use of functionaries who "deteriorate into unprincipled plodders, who blindly and mechanically follow instructions issued higher up"—("Democracy in the CPSU," from *The Communist International*, June, 1940), and become mere time-servers out of mental laziness and the desire to retain a comfortable post. Such people prostitute their intellects as apologists and ideological "night watchmen" for any and every four-flusher bureaucrat who climbs into authority, and must be driven out of their cozy positions with whips of steel.

Neither, also, does the Party need, in its leadership, "trade unionists" who are only trade unionists, but are not thoroughbred Communists. Trade-union officials are, indeed, one of the most dangerous sources of opportunism. More, the Party has had enough of "leaders" brought into the top leadership directly, and without the tough probation an ordinary worker is supposed to undergo, merely because they are "big names." All too often in the past this has been done with persons whose chief claim to "fame" was that gained by fighting the Party. Budenz stands out as an example, but there are others, and from now on no beautified biography must permit such people attaining posts of authority which they by no means deserve.

"Bob Minor attained fame as a cartoonist. But he was a leading anarchist who fought the revolutionary ideological concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat before he came to our Party after 'changing his mind a little' (his own words). But that it was only 'a little' change was shown when he threw himself so wholly into the building of the Lovestone faction that he was rewarded by being made a top leader by Lovestone, whom he dropped, however, to retain his own prestige when Lovestone was discredited. His even greater prominence as ideological policeman for Browder is too well-known to need comment. But, he is still presented by our leadership as one of them, and as one to be honored by the membership."

Elizabeth Gurley Flynn has a biography which should disqualify her as material for our National Board. As agitator for the I.W.W. in its and her earlier years, she served the working class well. For a time. But in 1916, when a frame-up was engineered (the Masonovitch murder case) against some iron miners in the Mesaba Iron Range strike, involving three I.W.W. organizers, as well as three humble miners, a "deal" was arranged secretly between crooked lawyers and the capitalist court in Duluth, Minnesota, whereby these Slavic miners were induced to plead guilty, and, in exchange, the three I.W.W. organizers, Sam Scarlett, Joe Schmidt and Carlo Treaca, went free. The humble miners went to prison. And upon the indignant protest of Scarlett and Schmidt, "Big Bill" Haywood, who was incensed at the fact that any I.W.W. should ever plead guilty to anything, at the following session of the General Executive Board, took steps to exclude Flynn from any future activity in the I.W.W. for her part in this shameless "deal." (This is all a matter of record, being told of in Bill Haywood's *Book*, International Publishers, New York, 1929, pp. 290-2.)

The next year, 1917, when all I.W.W. leaders were indicted for "seditious conspiracy"—and later sent to prison—Flynn and a few other I.W.W. "intellectuals" in New York, instead of making common cause with the persecuted, retained their own attorneys, made separate pleas, and, again, a "deal" was arranged and they did not even come to trial, while Haywood and the rest of us were sentenced to Leavenworth Penitentiary.

Granted that old leaders must go, and that new leaders are needed, the question remains: how can this be done in the face of a factional bureaucracy determined by hook or by crook to cling to organizational control?

There is a right way and a wrong way to attain these ends. And, although factionalism in opposition appears to be most appealing to many comrades, it is the wrong answer.

The right answer is mass criticism from below; mass control from below.

Mass criticism from below should be encouraged by the topmost leadership. But even if that is entirely lacking in this case, or there is only a partial gesture from that quarter, mass criticism from below, accompanied by mass control by the Party membership from below, still can be effective against any opportunist bureaucracy.

Comrade Stalin, who is an inveterate foe of factions, has many times urged mass criticism and mass control from below as the cure for bureaucracy. In his *Tasks of the Youth* (Little Lenin Library, Vol. 27, pp. 23-26), he had the following to say, in part:

"The Communist bureaucrat is the most dangerous type of bureaucrat. Why? Because his bureaucracy is masked by the title of Party member. And, unfortunately, we have quite a number of such Communist bureaucrats." (He cites some examples and then continues.) "How are we to explain these disgraceful instances of corruption and moral deterioration? By the fact that the monopoly of the Party has been carried to absurd lengths, the voice of the rank and file has been stifled, internal Party democracy destroyed and bureaucracy implanted.

"How is this evil to be combated? I think that there is not, nor can there be, any other way of combating this evil than by organizing control by the Party masses from below, and implanting inner-Party democracy. What objection can there be to rousing the fury of the Party masses against the corrupt elements and allowing them to throw these elements out? There can scarcely be any objection to that. (My emphasis—HG.)

"I know that in arousing the fury of the millions against bureaucratic abuses in our organizations it may sometimes be necessary to punish some of our comrades who have past services to their credit, but who now suffer from the malady of bureaucracy. But can this be allowed to stop our work of organizing control from below? I think it cannot and ought not. We must sincerely honor past services, but for present mistakes and bureaucracy, it would be well to give them a little jolt in the back. How else? Why not do this, if the good of the cause demands it? . . .

"Only by shifting the focus of criticism from below can we rely upon bureaucracy being successfully combated and eradicated.

"Hence it is the immediate task of the Party to wage a relentless war on bureaucracy, to organize mass criticism from below, to take heed of this criticism when adopting practical decisions for the correction of our shortcomings." (May 16, 1928.)

Again, in his *Mastering Bolshevism*, For years Flynn was passive; reported ill. Then she became one of the directors of the American Civil Liberties Union, during the years when one of its chief "activities" was attacking the Soviet Union for its supposed "persecution of political prisoners"—that is, counter-revolutionists of both Right and "Left," including Trotsky. True, she broke with the ACLU in 1937, over the issue of the defense of Communists in the United States, and in 1938, amid the fanfare of trumpets, she was brought by Browder directly into the National Committee. Yet it is obvious that anybody like Flynn, who had already in 1910 or earlier, professed to be a revolutionist, but who took twenty years—from 1917 to 1937—to "discover" the political value to the working class of the Bolshevik revolution and the establishment and role of the Soviet government, is hardly to be acclaimed as a revolutionist of great vision. Yet she was not only on Browder's National Board, but she was retained on the 1945 National Board in spite of—or perhaps, because—she frankly confessed that she knows nothing about theory.

But there is no such thing as a theoretical vacuum. If a Party leader does not have a Bolshevik theory, he or she has a theory that is anti-Bolshevik. And Flynn, as head of the National Women's Department, has followed a line of sabotage of genuine Communist work among women, adopting as her own the revisionist "theory" of A. Landy, warmed over from Bukharin's original cookery, and still sponsored by the Party. Obviously, such persons do not belong in the Party leadership, if, indeed, they belong at all in the Party.

This whole practice of a proletarian party being so "thrilled" every time some bourgeois intellectual, "progressive" politician or former enemy of Communism speaks a kind word for us, or protests that we should not be hung but only shot, that we must rush, in our admiration, to beg of him or her to please be our leader—this rotten liberalism must be done away with—and forever.

Comrade Stalin has the following to say:

"Some comrades think that people can only be checked up on from above, when the leaders check up on subordinates, on the results of their work. This is not true. Check-up from above is necessary, of course, as one of the effective measures for verifying people and checking up the fulfillment of tasks. But verification from above does not exhaust by far the whole business of verification. There is still another kind of verification, the check-up from below, in which the masses, the subordinates, verify the leaders, point out their mistakes, and show the way of correcting them. This kind of verification is one of the most effective methods of checking up on people" (p. 36).

Factionalism is something entirely different. Once before, when our Party was led by the Right Opportunist faction of Lovestone, and there was an opposition faction, Comrade Stalin gave our Party, in his *Speeches on the American Communist Party*, a lecture on the evils of factionalism. In part, he said:

"Factionalism weakens the Party spirit, it dulls the revolutionary sense and blinds the Party workers to such an extent that, in the factional passion, they are obliged to place the interests of the faction above the interests of the Party, above the interests of the working class.

"Factionalism not infrequently brings matters to such a pass that the Party workers, blinded by the factional struggle, are inclined to gauge all facts, all events in the life of the Party, not from the point of view of the interests of the Party and the working class, but from the point of view of the narrow interests of their own faction, from the point of view of their own factional kitchen.

"Factionalism interferes with the training of the Party in the spirit of a policy of principles; it prevents the training of cadres in an honest, proletarian, incorruptible revolutionary spirit; free from rotten diplomacy and unprincipled intrigue. Leninism declares that a policy based on principles is the only correct policy. Factionalism, on the contrary, believes that the only correct policy is one of factional diplomacy and unprincipled factional intrigue. That is why an atmosphere of factional struggle cultivates not politicians of principle, but adroit factionalist manipulators, experienced rascals and Mensheviks, smart in fooling the 'enemy' and covering up traces.

"It is true that such 'educational' work of the factionalists is contrary to the fundamental interests of the party and the working class. But the factionalists do not give a rap for that—all they care about is their own factional diplomatic kitchen, their own group interests.

"It is, therefore, not surprising that politicians of principle and honest proletarian revolutionaries, get no sympathy from the factionalists. On the other hand, factional tricksters and manipulators, unprincipled intriguers and backstage wire-pullers and masters in the formation of unprincipled blocs are held by them in high honor. . . .

"Weeks and months are wasted lying in ambush for the factional enemy, trying to entrap him, trying to dig up something in the personal life of the factional enemy, or, if nothing can be found, inventing some fiction about him. It is obvious that positive work must suffer in such an atmosphere, the life of the Party becomes petty, the authority of the Party declines and the workers, the best, the revolutionary-minded workers, who want action and not scandalmongering, are forced to leave the Party."

No, factionalism, the organization of permanent groups in centers and clubs outside the Party centers and clubs, in duplication of the Party apparatus, with a program opposed to the Party program as basically laid down by the national convention, with functionaries apart from the Party functionaries, and the giving of directives apart from and opposed to the directives of the Party organizations conforming with the Party Constitution and Party program—in brief, the formation of a "party within the party," is not the answer to the problem of the purification of the Party leadership faced today by the membership of the CPUSA.

Mass criticism from below, made effective organizationally by mass control from below, which is the only real answer, is, however, something new for our Party, something never truly and fully practiced, even in periods of pre-convention discussion. Always there have been some Pecksniffian "rules" imposed, under one excuse or another, to rob it of its democratic vitality and blunt its organizational effect, to make the worker, with his rough but expressive language of the workshop, feel embarrassed and un-

welcome to speak and speak freely.

Even less are members encouraged to propose organizational changes among the leadership. Should any individual member have the temerity to propose that this or that Party official be sent back to the work-bench for some outrageous incompetence, both he and his proposal are looked upon with indignant horror, as "anarchistic." The mutual protection of a bureaucratic clique "takes care of" any incompetent, who, though sometimes "removed" from a position, turns up in another, and often a better one, the work of which he can ruin and sabotage, in turn. He can repeat this performance endlessly, without ever being thrown out, unceremoniously, by the action of the membership, exercising the right which belongs to it of control from below.

It is this paralysis of membership initiative which Comrade Zhdanov was striking at, when he sharply attacked, in the 18th Congress of the CPSU—"the practice of setting official discipline up against and higher than Party discipline, thus demoralizing honest Party members."

Party officials are subordinate to "Party discipline." They have no right to violate the Constitution or the Party Program written basically into the resolutions of the National Convention. When they do so violate these, and attempt to impose their policy, their revisionist line, upon the Party, by "setting official discipline up against and higher than Party discipline," it is the right and duty of every member not only to insist that Party Program is higher than official policy, but that "Party discipline," enforced by "mass control from below," displace such officials.

What has occasionally been asserted as an empty abstraction, that Party positions are the property of the Party, and not of persons occupying such positions, must become a living practice. More, divisions in the Party membership, based upon class categories, where a socially elite circle of members whose wealth, professional or bourgeois standing, or leading position in trade unions, sets them above "ordinary" working-class members in the esteem of Party officials, and corrupts those Party officials by absorbing them into such circles, must come to an end.

There must be no "second class citizens" in our Party, whose opinions, and whose right to voice them, are held inferior to those of other individuals because the latter are lawyers, professors, union leaders or Party functionaries. If a worker has something to say, he must say it. But it must be his own opinion, based upon his own thinking, not the instructions of a faction, neither a subservient parroting of some individual leader. By thus making "Every tub stand on its own bottom," factionalism and cliquism is prevented, and a true measure of every comrade is attained. If a comrade "has no opinion," then he lacks something of being a Communist. As Maurice Thorez (*Political Affairs*, August, 1945, p. 711) said about the Communist Party of France:

"In 1929, fighting a sectarian group which stifled all political life in the Party and cut us off from the masses, we carried on, as the old comrades remember, a public campaign under the slogans: 'Let the mouths be opened! No mannequins in the Party!'"

There must be an end to obstructing "rules" put forth under the false excuse that the bourgeoisie might benefit from public and free self-criticism, or that moldy hobble on criticism that demands it be "constructive"—meaning inoffensive to the pride and position of some bureaucrat. Let the workers take over, and make their own rules on the spot. Who has a better right, and who better judgment of what is "constructive"? Remember that Lenin said:

"A revolt is an excellent thing when it is the advanced elements that revolt against the reactionary elements. It is a good thing when the revolutionary wing revolts against the opportunist wing. But it is a bad thing when the opportunist wing revolts against the revolutionary wing."—*Little Lenin Library*, Vol. 29, p. 42.

Our Party has already had enough of that "bad thing." The "good thing," which, in some measure, was started by the Duclos article in 1945, was aborted by the chicane of a faction of opportunists who, in effect, successfully revolted against the revolutionary elements of our Party. The aborted revolt of the revolutionary elements must now be carried through, and not only a revolutionary policy re-established, but its putting into practice must be guaranteed by a thor-

ough house-cleaning. Comrade Stalin's words mean exactly what they say. There must be:

1. A rousing of "the fury of the Party masses against the corrupt elements."

2. Mass criticism from below, expressed in unrestricted terms, and regardless of the "past services" of some of those criticized.

3. The "organizing of control by the Party masses from below." This may, as precedents have shown, take the form of temporary "control committees" elected by the membership; traditional, when occasion warranted them, in the CPSU, and in the German Communist Party when in the early 1920's the membership helped clean the Brandler-Thalheimer opportunists out of the Party.

Those political "lawyers" who try to bring in some "writ of injunction" against the mass revolt of the membership, must be shown the door.

As to objections that such "control committees" are "illegal," and wrongly supplant the "legitimate" so-called "Security and Review Commissions," the answer is plain. The functions of these commissions have been subverted and already supplanted by the functioning of a faction.

We have already seen how the California Security and Review Commission pursued a factional line. The National Review Commission is evidently no better. In *The Worker* of Dec. 2, 1945, page 2, there was published the report of Comrade Saul Wellman for that Commission, which, under the guise of claiming that the Party "needs the experience and ability" of those pre-Duclos officials whom the membership refused to re-elect in the 1945 convention period, urged that these rejected bureaucrats be "placed in work." The result was to nullify what little organizational effect the revolt against opportunist bureaucrats had attained.

One of the basic organizational principles of the Party (Article VI, Section 6, Party Constitution) that "All officers and leading committees . . . shall be elected," is thus flouted. And these rejected bureaucrats and opportunists have been re-imposed upon the membership by co-option. No, the existing Party organs, including the Security and Review Commissions, are clearly too corrupted to serve as purifying organs, and are rather obstacles to be overcome by "control by the Party masses from below."

The revolutionary elements in the CPUSA must feel that they stand in the foreshadow of such events as demand that they speak NOW and act NOW, or bear forever the shame and responsibility of being accessories to mass starvation, fascism and atomic war, not to speak of their own personal impoverishment, enslavement, torture and death.

History is a cruel task-master, as we may learn from the German proletariat, whose sons and daughters died miserably, not only in Hitler's slaughter pens, but also under Soviet artillery fire, because their parents found the illusions of revisionism comfortable to live with, and supported actively or passively, those leaders who, from 1918 to 1933, claimed they had a painless, easy way to socialism, and who howled down as "enemies of the working class" the Leninists who called on Germany's workers to drive out the reformist agents of the bourgeoisie from their Social-Democratic Party. These workers, of course, "believed in" socialism. But they did not summon up "the determination" to fight for it, first of all by overthrowing a party leadership of traitors to their class. The end we saw in May, 1945.

(Postscript: As Lenin wrote in 1915, so again today, no one can say "how fast or in what definite forms" the process of attaining a really revolutionary party in the United States may proceed. History and its dialectics point to the inevitability, as well as the necessity, of struggle within the existing CPUSA, as the key for such attainment.

"No doubt this will be attacked as expressing an 'anarchistic' anti-leadership theory. But unless Comrade Stalin is an 'anarchist,' it is no such thing. Criticism from above, and the purging of corruption from above is necessary, too. But when it does not serve the attainment of the desired end, it is not enough. And when it is absent or the top leadership itself is corrupt, all the more reason for vigorous and effective control from below. Stalin, in the speech quoted, spoke of control from above, of the role of the Central Committee, and the famous 'Workers' and Peasants' Inspection,' as both being 'very good.' Nevertheless, he added: 'But it is by no means enough. Furthermore, it is not the main thing just now.' And he added that to think otherwise is to 'think that only the leaders possess experience in constructive work.'

(The membership, acting through its regular Party organizations, fights for unity on the basis of the Party Program, adopted by the 1945 National Convention in its convention Resolution and approved by membership vote, while fully conscious of the weaknesses of that Resolution as revealed by time and experience, and fully determined that a new convention must take account of the need of strengthening the Party Program in a new resolution. The membership does not fight to split the Party, but on the contrary, to keep all members in the existing Party Clubs and Units, in which "the membership decides questions itself, and acts itself."

(The leadership, which has already introduced the beginnings of a Party split by expelling those who protested the leadership's violation of both the Party Program and Party Constitution, is pressing its splitting policy by sending its supporters, organized as a faction, into Clubs and Units and committees to fight those who want unity upon principle and conformity with Party program. The leadership claims to defend "party unity," but only if the membership accepts the leadership's current practice of violating Party Program and Party Constitution. The leadership backs up its factional supporters with expulsions against those who insist upon inner-Party democracy of the kind advocated and practiced by Lenin and Stalin.

(One can only conjecture "how fast" the process unfolds, and in what forms. Already, it has gone through what, roughly speaking, might be called two inter-linking phases.

(The first phase, of course with its background of dialectic development, began with the January, 1944, adoption of the "Teheran line" of the Browder-Dennis leadership. Membership opposition to this was marked, passively, by, firstly, 18 per cent of the members "failing" to enroll in the Communist Political Association. Secondly, as Comrade Williamson reported in June, 1945, by the first five months of 1945, the true indicator of membership, dues payments, had fallen to a national average of 58 per cent; in industrial districts, as low as 32 per cent. Also, there were some individual expulsions in this phase, which, again roughly speaking, ended with the Duclos exposure. Generally speaking, this could be compared with the 1912 to 1917 period in the old Socialist Party, starting with the expulsion of Haywood and the mass desertion of members that followed.

(The second phase of the inner-Party struggle, beginning roughly with the 1945 National Convention, exhibited complications, when the leadership, as a unit, dumped Browder but clung to official positions in order to carry on in a more concealed form, a revisionist line. As this deceit, at first successful, began to wear thin, this phase of the struggle was marked by individual expulsions of "premature anti-Browderites," then mass expulsions, the "reorganization" of many Clubs and the expulsion of some, with an increasingly intolerable bureaucratic suppression of Party democracy, as membership opposition passed over from a passive to an active form.

(A third phase of the struggle within the Party, again roughly speaking, opened with the National Committee meeting of June, 1947, violating the Constitution by abolishing the National Convention—under the excuse of "postponing" it—thus usurping authority by refusal to submit its mandate to the membership for renewal or rejection.

(Evidently, the suspension of party democracy for individuals, and the expulsion of such individuals as insist upon it, no longer avails; the leadership thus suspends the right to party democracy for all the membership, without exception. Of "democratic centralism," there remains only centralism. Under this rigid centralism, the factional bureaucracy may, or may not, prepare a factional caricature of a "convention," which would rubber-stamp its violations of Constitution and Program and lend false color to its usurped authority.

(If so, the membership will be able to recognize the fraud. Because, in any case, with or without such a "convention," the logic of its development carries the leadership ever deeper into the swamp of class collaboration, chauvinist anti-internationalism, of actual if not official liquidation of the Party, in brief, of lackeydom to imperialism in deeds [of omission as well as of commission], and hence into ever sharper conflict with the proletarian membership, against which repressive measures must increase.

(Objective development may greatly speed up the ultimate climax of this struggle, whatever form such climax may assume. Economic crisis, war, and

—not the least—the inevitable clarifying function of the international Communist Bureau established recently at Belgrade, can be among these objective factors.

(But the development of the subjective factor, the determination of the Party membership to carry through a Party cleansing from below must be the decisive element. The Party Clubs, as "the basic organizations of the Party" [Article VI, Party Constitution], have the power, under the proper functioning of democratic centralism [summarized "legally" in Article IV of the Party Constitution, and elaborated by Lenin, Stalin and other authorities quoted in this Thesis] to serve the membership in carrying through such Party cleansing. There is no need for factionalism. But only the aggressive initiative of the membership, expressed through its Clubs and such delegate bodies as they elect, can prevent the bureaucratic leadership from splitting the Party with its factional insistence on rule or ruin to perpetuate revisionism. The Party is not growing, but stagnating, after two years of this leadership.

(Two facts seem self-evident. The members of the "old" party are not going to rush from the "old" bureaucracy to any "new" bureaucracy merely out of boredom with the "old" one. Likewise, the first and faintest attempts to carry on "practical work" without paying "any attention" to the "old" party, will run head-on into the insoluble contradiction of (1) either falling into step with the members and sympathizers of the "old" party in the carrying through of revisionist policies, or (2) conducting a terrific struggle for leadership of the masses as against such members and sympathizers of the "old" party; members and sympathizers whom these unrealistic tacticians have imagined they could "ignore," and thus left under revisionist ideological control.

(It is also obvious that such an attempt to "skip over" the difficulties of struggle inside the "old" party, merely transfers the struggle from the field where ideological clarification primarily belongs, to the trade unions and other non-party organizations, where factional struggle without the necessary preliminary and legitimate struggle inside the Party, can ensue, and with harmful consequence to proletarian unity and proletarian interests.

(Dogmatic and sectarian rigidity is thus out of place, as always. And this, of course equally applies to any contrary theory. For it is obvious that, in the latter phases of the struggle, if and when mass expulsions of Clubs and other subordinate bodies as well as of individuals, can possibly force the formation of more than embryonic, but still minority, opposition organizations, flexibility in organizational questions is imperative.

(But whatever organizational forms thus result from the insistent splitting policy of the bureaucratic leadership, they must remain for a period as clearly provisional bodies, dedicated primarily to winning to their side the majority of the membership and unifying the Party membership against the revisionist elements. Events then take their logical course. But only after the basic issues have been thoroughly clarified for all members, when it is clear to all that the "new" organization offers revolutionary workers what the "old" one rejects, and gives them the democracy in choosing leadership and program denied to them in the "old" organization, can any final organization be constituted. And even then, its policy must include friendly appeals to the proletarian elements remaining in the "old" party, for united action in common struggle. Not one single honest worker must be left under revisionist leadership.)

Let every single Party member stand on his or her two feet and speak frankly and fearlessly what he or she thinks. This is mass criticism from below.

"What is there wrong," said Stalin, in his 1929 fight against the Right Danger in the CPSU, "about district meetings of active members of the Moscow organization demanding that an end be put to the mistakes and vacillations? Is not our work governed by the slogan—self-criticism from below?" (*Leninism*, p. 86).

This "revolt of the revolutionary elements" is not against Party program, but a revolt against the leadership which has sabotaged Party program and refused to carry out the plain and written resolutions of the National Convention. No comrade can be allowed to sit silent and "abstain" from "taking sides." Neither can the excuse be accepted that they are "intimidated." In the Party, there are Communists, not cowards; Communists who have enlisted in the struggle to

overthrow capitalism. And shall they, then, shrink in fear from the much easier task of "overthrowing" a miserable petty bureaucrat? Tomorrow, these Communists will lead the masses in clashes with the capitalist police on the picket line. Shall it be said, then, that today, however, they are to cringe in fear before the frown of a Club organizer?

Such a "revolt of the revolutionary elements" will be, naturally, looked upon with utter horror by the bureaucratic opportunists against whom it is directed, and who, until this revolt occurs, have everything very "orderly." Like the German revisionists who cried at Liebknecht, and the Mensheviks who screamed at Lenin, they will howl—"Anarchists!"

Let them howl. Remember that this is a struggle to throw the ideology of the bourgeoisie, and those who act as its agents, out of the Party of the proletariat. That it is, therefore, a part of the class war which must go on until a "revolutionary order" is established, with the proletariat ruling not only its own Party, but all society. Not without reason did Marx say:

"You will have to go through fifteen, twenty or even fifty years of civil and international war, not only to change relationships, but also to change your own selves, to render yourselves fit to assume the political reins."

Nor must the crafty words of the opportunist elements be allowed to argue that those who have already deceived and misled the Party twice, be given "another chance" on the theory that, by "ideological efforts" they can live down their mistakes. This is Foster's "theory" of conciliation with the Right. Stalin, in his *Foundations of Leninism* (Chapter VIII, Section 6), warns us against this:

"The theory of 'overcoming' these opportunist elements by ideological efforts within the Party; the theory of 'living down' these elements within the confines of a single Party, are bad and dangerous theories that threaten to reduce the Party to paralysis and chronic infirmity, that threaten to abandon the Party to the corrosive influence of opportunism, that threaten to leave the proletariat without a revolutionary Party, that threaten to deprive the proletariat of its stoutest weapon in the fight against imperialism."

No, every single one of the opportunist bureaucrats must be kicked out of our Party, and the conciliators, thrown after them. Because, what Comrade Stalin told our Party in 1929, when he urged us to "set about cleaning the Communist Party of Right and conciliator elements, who objectively represent the agency of Social-Democracy within the ranks of the Communist Party," is more true and more urgent than at that time:

"And we must set about this matter, not at the usual pace, but at an accelerated pace, for, I repeat, time does not wait, and we must not allow events to catch us unawares" (*Speeches on the American Communist Party*, p. 34).

Already, the year before that, in 1928, and during his fight against the Bukharin-Rykov "Right" group in the CPSU, Comrade Stalin had said:

"Under capitalist conditions, the Right Deviation in Communism . . . is a tendency on the part of a section of Communists to depart from the revolutionary line of Marxism in the direction of Social Democracy. . . .

"A victory of the Right Deviation in the Communist Parties in capitalist countries would mean the ideological collapse of the Communist Parties and an enormous accession of strength to Social-Democratism. And what does an enormous accession of strength to Social-Democratism mean? It means the strengthening and consolidation of capitalism, for Social-Democracy is the main prop of capitalism in the working class. Hence a victory of the Right Deviation in the Communist Parties in capitalist countries would add to the conditions necessary for the preservation of capitalism" (*Leninism*, pp. 78-79).

Therefore, the necessity to clean the CPUSA of "Right and conciliatory elements," thoroughly and finally, if our Party is to lead the American proletariat to the ultimate goal of a Socialist America.

END ITEM



I.
PREFACE

Class Struggle Abandoned

The basic cause of the revisionism that so terribly infects the Communist movement today is the same as it has always been. It is the inability of the reformists to think in terms of "for what class." In short, the policy of the Communist Party is not due to the weakness of one or another of its leaders but to their abandonment of the very starting point is of Marxism itself, namely, the class struggle.

Every action of the Communist Party reflects this. The Party tails after Henry Wallace, Philip Murray, the late Sidney Hillman, Roosevelt, or any other spokesman of the liberal and petty bourgeoisie because it has no Marxist policy of its own and no orientation. The present leadership of the Communist Party, for this reason, fears nothing more than discussion based on any of the revolutionary classics of Marxism. Their attempt to hide the Marxist classics from the membership of the Party and the working class; their contempt for theory generally; the failure of the Daily Worker, in spite of repeated requests, to publish analyses based on Marxism; the most shameful political forgeries in which Lenin, the leader of the proletarian revolution, is portrayed as the "Russian Roosevelt"; the portrayal of the alliance between the proletariat and the poor peasantry of Russia as the same as the coalition with the bourgeoisie that took place under Roosevelt and Browder—all these are additional evidence that the renegade leaders of the Communist Party of the U.S. have forgotten what the simple Russian peasant-soldier in, "The Ten Days That Shook The World", knew:

"The soldier scratched his head. 'I can't account for it at all,' he said, grimacing with the pain of his intellectual processes. 'To me it seems perfectly simple—but then, I'm not well educated. It seems like there are only two classes, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie . . .'

"There you go again with your silly formula!" cried the student.

" . . . only two classes,' went on the soldier, doggedly. 'And whoever isn't on one side is on the other . . .'"

This simple truth—"only two classes and whoever isn't on one side is on the other"—was too much for the clever reformists of the Second International and it is again today too much for the clever reformists of the U.S. Communist Party.

II. Spontaneity —
Root of Opportunism.

As one studies the whole period through which the Party has just come, one question looms larger and larger. How did we, with the exception of Comrade Foster, accept Browder's notorious revisionism? How was it possible for the

The Fight Against Revisionism in the U. S. Communist Party

By Burt Sutta

CONTENTS:

1: Preface—The Need for Marxist Discussion in the United States	Page 1
2: Spontaneity—The Root of Opportunism	" 6
3: The Fight for Peace	" 12
4: A Letter to Expelled Comrades	" 15
5: U. S. Communist Policy in the C. I. O.	" 24
6: A Negative Note	" 33

thousand of members who had read the Marxist classics to accept a theory which was in direct opposition to every Marxist-Leninist precept? How could a Party which only fifteen years ago had defeated and repudiated Lovestoneism accept its twin brother so easily? How did our National Committee, all of whom had studied Marxism deeply, all choose Browderism over Marxism when offered the choice by Foster at the January 1944 Plenum?

"Tailism" or Economism

Stalin gives the key to the answer in "Foundations of Leninism": "The theory of spontaneity is the theory of belittling the role of the class conscious element in the movement, the ideology of 'dragging at the tail,' of 'khovostism' the logical basis of all opportunism." (Leninism, Vol. I, p. 29.) Lenin in his famous and unfortunately little read work, "What is to Be Done," gives a full analysis of spontaneity or economism. The workers and the people generally are forced to enter into struggles with the capitalists to protect their immediate interests. These struggles are struggles of a trade union nature for wages, hours, conditions, etc. These struggles are spontaneous struggles because, in the words of Lenin, "the workers were not, nor could they be conscious of the irreconcilable antagonism of their interests to the whole of the modern political and social system, i.e., it was not yet Social-Democratic consciousness . . . This consciousness could only be brought to them from without." (What is to Be Done—p. 32.) Further, "modern Socialist consciousness can arise only on the basis of profound scientific knowledge. The vehicles of science are not the proletariat but the bourgeois intelligentsia . . . the task of Social-Democracy is to imbue the proletariat with the consciousness of its position and the consciousness of its tasks. There would be no need for this if consciousness source emerged from the class struggle."

(Kautsky—quoted *ibid.*—p. 40) From this Lenin goes on to draw the conclusions. "Then the only choice is either bourgeois or socialist ideology. Hence to belittle socialist ideology in any way, to deviate from it the slightest degree means strengthening bourgeois ideology." (*ibid.*, p. 40) "Hence our task, the task of Social-Democracy is to combat spontaneity, to divert the labor movement within its spontaneous trade unionist striving from under the wing of the bourgeoisie and to bring it under the wing of revolutionary Social-Democracy." (*ibid.*, p. 41)

In the balance of my thesis I will quote more extensively from "What is to Be Done." Now, however, I wish to include from History of the CPSU the estimate of this great work. "The historic significance of this celebrated book lies in the fact that in it Lenin:

"1. For the first time in the history of Marxist thought laid bare the ideological roots of opportunism, showing that they principally consisted in worshipping the spontaneous working class-movement and belittling the role of Socialist consciousness in the working-class movement;

"2. Brought out the great importance of theory, of consciousness, and of the Party as a revolutionizing and guiding force of the spontaneous working-class movement;

"3. Brilliantly substantiated the fundamental Marxist theory that a Marxist Party is a union of the working-class movement with Socialism;

"4. Gave a brilliant exposition of the ideological foundations of a Marxist Party.

"The theoretical theses expounded in 'What is to Be Done', later became the foundation of the ideology of the Bolshevik Party." (CPSU—p. 38)

American Trade Union History
Confirms Lenin

The history of the American working-class movement gives convincing proof of the principles

outlined by Lenin. The spontaneous struggles of the American workers against the capitalists (trade union struggles) have been more bitter and bloody than in any country except Tsarist Russia. Haymarket, Molly McGuire, Homestead, Pullman, Ludlow, Memorial Day massacre, the Western Federation of Miners struggles, the Great Steel Strike, the Auto Sit-downs, are but a few of the many great struggles wage by the workers against their bosses and the government. The struggle for the eight hour day, which was begun in America served as one of the main slogans upon which the Bolsheviks won Socialism in Russia. Yet with all this background of militant trade union struggle, the American working class is the least class conscious, the least socialist conscious in the world. If there were any doubt that the spontaneous struggles of the workers cannot lead them to Socialist consciousness, then the history of the American Labor movement should give a final answer.

Tailism in CPUSA

Is the thesis that spontaneity is logical basis of all opportunism confirmed by the facts in Browder's revisionism? Let us examine our Party's role in the past.

The Communist Party of the United States has participated in many great struggles. Let us list some. We participated and played a leading role in the textile, maritime, garment, fur, electrical, auto, steel, coal, and many other union struggles. We led the great unemployed struggles in the 30's. We organized and pioneered the fight for Negro rights. We led the fight for collective security and against fascism. We can justly be proud of our role in defending the day-to-day interests of the working class and the people against capitalism. This is true. Did we, however, in these struggles make the workers conscious of the "irreconcilable antagonism of their interests to the whole of the modern political and social system" or not? Did not these struggles become ends in themselves rather than levers to make the working class socialist conscious? Did we not participate in the workers struggles as champions of trade unionism (economism) rather than as champions of socialism? A few examples will suffice. The lack of class consciousness of workers even in the Furrier's Union is a good illustration. The struggle for a new contract (which is important) became an end in itself. The secondary role of the Party branch whose members became, in Communist-led unions, simply actives for the leadership is another example. The promotion of the best forces of the Party to union work rather than the best union forces to Party work was another illustration of the economist role played by our Party. It was this absorption in the practical day-to-day trade unionist tasks which was the basis for the acceptance of Browderism in the Party. The ideology of trade-unionism, bourgeois ideology, conquered Socialist-Marxist ideology.

END ITEM

(C) an initial summation of the CPUSA's historical development of political line on three major questions facing the communist movement:

- i) Trade union work - factory nuclei and trade union fractions;
- ii) Black National Question - Marxism-Leninism versus revisionism;
- iii) United Front - right opportunism, the path to social-democracy.

(D) Suggested bibliography of important readings from the international and U.S. communist movements.

Issue No.2 of COMMUNIST LINE presents for study and investigation several historical documents which have long been suppressed. These can give comrades a beginning grasp of the nature of the struggles we face today, how they are part of the whole history of the struggle for socialism in the U.S., and how the revisionist forces who are "getting together" today also have a long standing place in history. The documents we are producing are:

(A) Selections from various articles from the Communist Political Association, formed in May 1944 as a "political-educational association" to meet the needs of the "new" conditions of post-war U.S. imperialism.

(B) "On the Dissolution of the Communist Party of the U.S.A." by Jacques Duclos (selections), an investigation carried out by the Communist Party of France as to the reasons for the dissolution of the CPUSA; published in the New York WORKER on 5/27/45, only after the CPA learned that, if they did not publish it, the NEW YORK TIMES intended to publish it in their columns.

(C) "The Struggle Against Opportunism in the Labor Movement - for a Socialist United States" by William F. Dunne (selections), a founding and charter member of the Party and a candidate member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

(D) "The Crisis in the C.P.U.S.A." by Harrison George (selections), who served as editor-in-chief of the DAILY WORKER for several years and was a founding and charter member of the Party. With great tenacity Harrison George carried out the struggle upholding Marxism-Leninism in the face of expulsion and the sort of character assassination used by opportunists to squelch principled attacks - even during the last years of his life when a painful heart condition only allowed him to work for short periods of time.

(E) "The Fight Against Revisionism in the U.S. Communist Party" by Burt Sutta, (selections) a member of the New York section of the Party, also expelled for struggling against the unprincipled reconstitution of the Party.

(F) Selected statements and analysis of the CPUSA from the Communist International, Comrade Stalin, and the Chinese Communist Party.

While we wished to republish the George, Sutta and Dunne articles in their entirety, the combined length made it prohibitive to supply them to the movement in an inexpensive form (however, we will make xerox copies available at cost plus mailing to any who request it), therefore, we had to select those passages which seemed to give the clearest view of the nature of the struggle that took place. It is important to note that these articles were all written after Browder had been expelled from the Party, the CPA dissolved, and the CPUSA reconstituted.

In September of 1946 the National Board of the Communist Party expelled Vern Smith, Ruth McKenny, Bruce Minton and William F. Dunne for "left-sectarianism"; subsequently, Harrison George, Burt Sutta and many others were also expelled on the same basis. Essentially, this "leftism" was the unwillingness to white-wash the reconstitution of the CPUSA on the very same foundation as its dissolution 14 months earlier, for in fact only Earl Browder, William Browder and A. Heller were expelled from the CPUSA in 1946 for their "revisionist factionalism".

There were actually only two members of the Central Committee who openly opposed the revisionists' policies, and only one who principally opposed the call for the dissolution of the party. That Marxist-Leninist was not William Z. Foster, but Sam Darcy, a long-time Communist from Pennsylvania who had waged a battle against opportunism in the CPUSA, and against Browder's clique, from as early as 1934; Foster was the only other member who spoke up at this time but his opposition was a mixture of luke-warm conciliationism and inner-circle factionalism. In fact, it was Foster who led the drive and headed the committee which expelled Darcy for his principled opposition to the liquidation of the Communist Party. Foster withdrew his stand against the revisionists' political line when threatened with expulsion. But, as the Duclos letter points out, *not once in his letter of January 20, 1944, did Foster oppose the liquidation of the Communist Party.*

Thirty years ago Marxist-Leninists in the CPUSA took up the struggle against modern revisionism which had consolidated its control of the Communist Party, had dissolved the Party on clearly opportunist political and theoretical justifications and had abandoned the international working class to the whims of U.S. imperialism.

It is no accident that modern revisionism arose in the United States, the heartland of imperialism, where a small stratum of the working class has been bribed with the super-profits resulting from imperialist plunder. Communists in the U.S. have a special responsibility and duty to struggle resolutely against opportunism and to smash modern revisionism. All genuine Marxist-Leninists must grasp the profound importance of Lenin's statement that, *"the fight against imperialism is a sham and humbug unless it is inseparably bound up with the fight against opportunism"* (IMPERIALISM, THE HIGHEST STAGE OF CAPITALISM, FLP, 1969, p. 153).

Marxist-Leninists must wage a vigorous struggle against modern revisionism, the ideology and political line of the bourgeoisie in the communist movement. In order to unite on the basis of correct proletarian ideology and political line to take up the task of reconstituting a genuine vanguard party of the proletariat this struggle must be waged. In order to lead the proletariat and all exploited and oppressed peoples of this country in proletarian revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, this struggle must be won.

Guided by Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, we can wage a successful and effective campaign against modern revisionism. The history of the two-line struggle in the U.S. communist movement teaches us that there is nothing "new" about modern revisionism, nor is there anything

"new" about the communist movement. Throughout the history of the revolutionary struggle, Marxist-Leninists have had to wage an unrelenting campaign against opportunism of all hues and shades.

Thirty years have elapsed since the great victory over fascism, a victory shared by many countries and peoples of Europe, Asia, Africa, Oceania and America. And thirty years have elapsed since modern revisionism emerged openly in the international communist movement with the dissolution of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. in May, 1944. The dissolution of the CPUSA came about by the development and consolidation of class collaborationist policies and activities. These policies and activities stemmed from an opportunistic application of the United Front strategy, a distortion of Dimitrov's line at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International which in no sense called for an alliance with the bourgeoisie for the communist movement in the United States, as was put forward by the CPUSA.

When extended into the post-war period, without the recognition of either the incorrectness of this line or the fact of the defeat of fascism, these policies and activities amounted to nothing less than the re-emergence of social-democracy in a new form.

Today modern revisionism is social-democracy in the revisionist parties in the capitalist countries and is social-fascism and social-imperialism where it has seized state power. Parties like the CPUSA, which uphold modern revisionism, assist the policies and activities of the Brezhnev-led revisionist clique in the USSR and around the world.

All genuine Marxist-Leninists must take up the study and investigation of the nature and historical roots of modern revisionism, so that it may be smashed in the forms in which it appears today.

In order that comrades may better struggle against opportunism on the theoretical front, it is necessary to study struggles waged by our comrades in the past against the same enemies we face today. We must analyze the history of how modern revisionism arose, what stages it has gone through in its development and, from this knowledge, examine the forms of modern revisionism we are struggling against today.

Lenin stated clearly that only on "a granite foundation of theory" can a vanguard party of a new type be built which will lead the proletariat in "the seizure of political power by revolutionary violence to overthrow the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat so as to achieve communism".

This means making a systematic and thorough study of the situation around us; study the history of the proletariat in all levels of existence and study the practical problems of our revolution using the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought as the guide to investigation and action.

SMASH OPPORTUNISM!

UPHOLD MARXISM-LENINISM-MAO TSETUNG THOUGHT!

ENERGETICALLY STUDY, INVESTIGATE AND APPLY THE THEORY OF MARXISM-LENINISM-MAO TSETUNG THOUGHT TO THE CONCRETE PRACTICE OF REVOLUTION IN THE UNITED STATES!

CONTENTS

- (A) Introduction..... Page 1
- (B) Selections from the Communist Political Association, formed in May, 1944, upon the liquidation of the CPUSA..... Page 2
- (C) "On the Dissolution of the Communist Party of the U.S.A." by Jacques Duclos of the Communist Party of France..... Page 4
- (D) "The Struggle Against Opportunism in the Labor Movement - for a Socialist United States" by William F Dunne (Selections) candidate for the Executive Committee of the C.I..... Page 7
- (E) "The Crisis in the C.P.U.S.A." by Harrison George (Selections) editor-in-chief of the DAILY WORKER for several years..... Page 22
- (F) "The Fight Against Revisionism in the U.S. Communist Party" by Burt Sutta (Selections)..... Page 30
- (G) Selected Statements and analysis of the CPUSA from the Communist International, Comrade Stalin, and the Chinese Communist Party..... Page 17

**Marxist-Leninist
Organizing Committee**
BOX 26457, S.F., CA 94126 USA

UNITE! COMMUNIST LINE
POLITICAL ORGAN THEORETICAL JOURNAL

COMMUNIST LINE NO. 1, October 1, 1975. \$1.25.
AGAINST OPPORTUNISM: The Historical Struggle Between Marxism and Opportunism in the International and US Communist Movements and Our Present Tasks. Study guides on the CPUSA-Black National question, Trade Unions, United Front.

COMMUNIST LINE NO. 2, October 1, 1975. \$1.25.
LIQUIDATION OF THE CPUSA: Major Polemics Against Modern Revisionism in the CPUSA by Harrison George, William Dunne, Burt Sutta, Jacques Duclos, etc.

COMMUNIST LINE NO. 3, November 7, 1975. \$0.75.
THE HISTORIC MISSION OF THE WORKING CLASS: Articles from ALBANIA TODAY and other sources on the nature of the working class today, reformist and revisionist trade unions, labor aristocracy, etc. Material on US unions.

COMMUNIST LINE

October 1, 1975



No. 2, \$1.25



LATE 1940'S
POLEMICS WITHIN
THE CPUSA!

The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Manifesto*
to of the Communist Party (February 1848)

**Theoretical Journal of the
Marxist-Leninist Organizing Committee**