



"Without a Revolutionary Theory
 There can be no Revolutionary Practice!"

The 1958 Elections

The results of the National elections which took place last November 4th raises many important questions relative to the immediate and basic interests of the American working class.

Any analysis of the significance of the election results must have one central point of departure and that is — how does the result of the elections 1) affect the fight for peace (foreign policy), 2) the fight for economic security, and 3) the fight for civil rights and especially its key feature, the fight for Negro rights?

Gauged from these three main premises, the Democratic sweep of last November 4th shows the added possibilities and perspective of struggle for the working class, as well as the shortcomings which it must eliminate in the process of these struggles.

The election results definitely shows new stirrings and incipient independent motion by the American working class. The defeat of the "right to work" laws in five states points to the main direction of this motion as well as to the impact of its force.

This proves conclusively the tremendous potential power of labor as yet unleashed and fettered by the class collaborationist policies of the trade union top bureaucrats. But this great victory attained by the working class cannot be ascribed solely to the efforts of the organized workers of those states. Surely, the 600,000 organized workers in Ohio could not by themselves make it possible to roll a vote ~~which~~ ^{times} their number. The additional vote without question represented, in the main, the votes of the unorganized workers in that state.

That victory was indeed one of the working class as a whole. A great victory of the working class and no one else.

Some people in the "left" are already trying to distort the results of the elections and are shouting of the tremendous political gains "attained" in the last elections. They are foretelling the "doom" of "reaction" as stemming from the trimming of the Republicans at the polls.

Indeed the Republican Party took a frightful partisan shelling on election day 1958. But where does that leave the important, we might say, life or death question of "brinkmanship foreign policy" for the American people? Does it mean that the new, overwhelmingly Democratic Congress will be expected to oppose the imperialist warmongering policies of Dulles and Eisenhower? It most certainly does not!

All the partisan opposition of the Democrats and election time criticism of the administration by the Democrats on questions of foreign policy did not transcend the realm of vote catching electioneering. Any expectancy of automatic foreign policy shifts resulting from the November 4th Democratic victory will prove to be nothing but dangerous illusions.

Speaking for the Democrats in a post-election statement Senator Stuart Symington (D. Mo.) said: "Our (Democratic Party) differences on foreign policy will end at the water edge."

The Democrats elected on November 4th last, will for certain try to begin once more where they left off in 1952. It was under Truman's administration that the cold war and the atom bomb policies started. The warmongering, expansionist Marshall and Truman Plans were a product of that administration, as

(Continued on page 2)

C. P. Sections Denounce Expulsions

J. W. Ford Section

We, members of the James W. Ford Section of the CPUSA, in East Harlem, New York, through this statement, reaffirm our endorsement and support to the line of the August 16-17, 1958, Conference for the Reconstitution of a Marxist-Leninist Party.

We fully support, and will continue to do so, the leadership democratically elected at the conference. We support the actions of the Provisional Committee for the Reconstitution of a Marxist-Leninist Party and do abide by their decisions.

The expulsion of Armando, Marino, Douglar, Kilpatrick, Lucy and others from the CPUSA is another attack perpetrated against Marxism-Leninism, and against the working class by the pseudo-Marxist leadership of the CPUSA. These comrades were expelled because of their selflessness, their courage, their consistency for a Marxist-Leninist line in the American Communist Party, and because of their uncompromising stand in their struggle to expose Revisionism and the Revisionist leadership of all shades.

The pseudo-Marxist leadership of the CPUSA by these expulsions will not arouse demoralization in our ranks. We are solidly united behind our Provisional Committee and behind our leadership. We respect, we support, we trust the leadership of the Provisional Committee for the Reconstitution of a Marxist-Leninist Party. Nothing and nobody will split us in our determination to carry on the line of the August Conference.

The rank and file of the CPUSA has no respect and no confidence in their leadership.

The pseudo-Marxist leadership of the CPUSA resorts to piecemeal expulsions because they are afraid to make good their threat to expel every party member that attended or was represented at the August 16-17 Conference.

Wholesale expulsion of these workers, Negro and Puerto Rican in the main, is something that the Revisionists wish to avoid for fear of exposing their anti-working-class line; but these tactics do not mask their purpose.

While honest and principled people are faced with expulsions, not one single confirmed, factionalist wrecker has been expelled. Gates and Charney left the party under their own steam, with a few thousand dollars from the Party treasury, charged with the task of organizing "The Party of Democratic Socialism". Now this "Party" that the so-called Left and Centerists helped to create is emerging to public light.

The 10 National Committee members who vote for anti-Soviet, anti-Hungarian and pro-imperialist resolutions introduced by Dorothy Healy on the question of the execution of Imre Nagy and General Maler are still in the Party and still remain in the National Committee.

Open liquidators that offer counter-revolutionary resolutions are rewarded with posts in the National Executive Committee.

(Continued on page 2)

Call for Reconstitution of Party

Waterfront Section

At a meeting of the Waterfront Section held on October 22, 1958, we took action based on the Statement of the New York staff that appeared in *The Worker*.

This Statement referred to the expulsion of Comrades A. Marino and A. Roman. Although Comrade Marino is the S. O. of the Waterfront Section, to this date our Section has not received any communication with regard to this expulsion. This is proof of the contempt the leadership has for the rank-and-file members of the Party, and its awareness of the ideological and political position of the entire Section.

Bill Albertson, N.Y. State secretary was convinced of this position several months ago when he was sent by the State leadership to our Section in an attempt to win the Section membership to the belief that Comrade Marino was "misrepresenting" us. At that time the Comrades in the Waterfront let "Mr." Albertson know in no uncertain terms that Comrade Marino was doing nothing else but carrying out the decisions and politics, adopted collectively, by the Section membership.

(Continued on page 2)

(Williamsport Resolution)

We, the members of the Williamsport Section, Eastern Pennsylvania District, Communist Party USA, unanimously endorse the policies and political line adopted on August 16 and 17, at the National Conference to Reconstitute a Marxist-Leninist Communist Party.

We unanimously agree to detach ourselves from the revisionist policies and organization of the CPUSA under its present leadership. We will not accept their corruption and deception, nor their unauthorized and unprincipled revision of the Party's revolutionary vanguard role to that of a Social-Democratic one.

Committed body and soul to revisionism at home, the Party leadership frantically attempts to maintain a revolutionary "face" for the fraternal parties of the world to see. Fearing that mass expulsions would rip the mask from this false face, and yet faced with the growing revolt of the working-class membership of the Party, the mis-leaders attempt to maintain their position of duplicity by piecemeal expulsions of our leaders. We reject these expulsions of our comrades; we join hands in solidarity with

So. Philadelphia Section CP

The struggle to defeat revisionism in the CPUSA which culminated in the historic Conference of August 16-17, and the establishment of the National Provisional Committee to Reconstitute the Communist Party, was hailed by the majority of the Philadelphia working class and Negro Comrades . . . Already unable to accept the attacks on the consistent Marxist-Leninist fighters, Joe Dougher, Armando Roman and A. Marino, the South Philadelphia Section, the Third Congressional District Club and rank-and-file Comrades from North and West Philadelphia join with the Provisional Committee in the struggle to reconstitute the Party.

These Comrades constitute the majority of the Philadelphia actives.

It is they and the National Provisional Organizing Committee which represents us and the honest, working class elements of the CPUSA.

We hereby form the names support Provisional Organizing Committee to Reconstitute a Marxist-Leninist Communist Party, and we join with all other Committees organized nationally for this purpose.

The Soviet 41st Anniversary

On the forty-first anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution, we greet the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the peoples of the Soviet Union, who are blazing the trail to the realm of freedom for all mankind.

Out of the depths of semi-feudal backwardness of the Russia of 1917, the Soviet Union has emerged not merely as "a noble social experiment" — ending the exploitation of man by man, but as the world's most vital new productive force.

Soviet socialist production of steel, oil, coal, cement, and electricity mounts steadily, already surpassing that of every other country except the United States. Coincident with the forty-first anniversary of the Soviet Union, new, accelerated production schedules have been set, advancing the 1970 goals to the year 1965. The U. S. production lead over the Soviet Union this year will be the lowest in history, both absolutely and relatively.

The New York Times' Soviet "expert" reports apprehensively that "During the post-war years, the Soviet economy has increased its output at a much faster rate than the United States. . . . A recession in the United States, with particularly serious impact on our heavy industry, has coincided with a new spurt in Soviet industrial and agricultural production. While the specter of growing Soviet competition is an ever increasing worry for Western businessmen, it is the political impact that most worries many (capitalist) policy

makers. The contrast between rising Soviet production and stagnant or declining American output, if long continued, could have serious consequences . . . (New York Times, Oct. 26, 1958).

The Times elaborates, "The basic Communist argument in all the underdeveloped (colonial and semi-colonial (ed.) countries is that the Communist system provides a better, surer and quicker way to develop production than does the free world system, and rising Soviet production is cited to back that contention. What irks . . . particularly is the knowledge that the American economy, if given its head, could far out-produce the Soviet economy both in industry and in agriculture. But if that were done, much of the greatly increased output could not be sold at a price satisfactory to the producers in terms of . . . providing a profit." (our emphasis).

"Given its head" indeed — freed from the insatiable and overriding private, capitalist profit motive and the parasitic war expenditures, and geared to the needs of humanity, what productive heights mightn't the American economy reach! How much greater still would be the Soviet achievements, how many more hungry mouths the world over could be fed if the imperialist war threats were forever stilled, and the Soviet economy was not forced to bear the crushing burden of defense expenditures to insure survival and the utter destruction of war!

It is with these thoughts that we greet our Soviet comrades on

the forty-first anniversary of their liberation from capitalist enslavement. In the spirit of proletarian internationalism, we salute the peoples of the Soviet Union, and especially their stalwart Communist Party, which made possible their memorable successes, and which in the future will lead them to new and greater triumphs.

Inspired by the victories of the Socialist world led by the Soviet Union, we shall work tirelessly for Socialism. We shall do battle with its open enemy, capitalist reaction. We are determined to defeat the modern revisionists who today have seized our traditional apparatus for socialist struggle, the Communist Party USA, and to reconstitute it as the Marxist-Leninist vanguard of the American working class.

We hail the forty-first anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution which was the dawn of peace for a world ravaged by imperialist war. We recall our debt to the heroic Soviet people whose unmatched sacrifice and struggle kept fascist war from our shores. On this occasion, we make a sacred pledge to fight with all our strength to defeat imperialist aggression against the socialist and colonial peoples by Wall Street's "bi-partisan" regime.

As fighters for a Socialist America, world peace and national liberation of the Negro, Puerto Rican and other peoples oppressed by U. S. imperialism, we will unflinchingly defend the October Revolution, the Bolshevik Party, the Soviet Union.

Elections

(Continued from page 1)
was the Korean War, the anti-Communist witch-hunts and McCarthyism.

John F. Dulles, as U.N. representatives under Truman symbolized the oneness of the Republican and Democratic Parties if seen from the standpoint of class interests. The Republican and Democratic Parties represent the Castor and Pollux of American finance capital politics.

The two party system has served and continues to serve the bourgeoisie faithfully. And it could not be otherwise. All talk by the traitorous leadership of the C.P.U.S.A. about "preferred Party" (Repub.) of finance capital, as distinguished from the "less preferred" (Dem.) is just so much political rot and subtle class collaborationism.

On the question of economic security for the workers only the naive will harbor any expectations of favorable laws by the Democrats in regards to alleviating the impact of the crisis on the workers, on the question of fiscal policy and taxation, on inflationary prices or rent controls. Whatever the workers get on this score will come about only and only as the result of their own struggle and pressure for the needed legislation. Especially organized labor will have to gear itself to fight for its own interests and those of the general working class. Even more, whatever struggles the men of labor generate will have to be done by the efforts of the rank and file of the trade union to push the friends of "the friends of labor," Reuther, Meany, et al into the struggle for the just demands of labor and the working class.

Of course, in the pre-election campaign the Democratic leadership display of vague and general promises. Democratic "friends of labor" such as ex-Pres. Truman, "Sourpy" Williams (Gov. of Michigan), Pat Brown (governor-elect of Calif.) did slice the baloney quite thin in their pre-election oratory.

It is being suggested by Social-Democrats and pseudo-Marxists that the Democrats represented the opposition to the "right to work" anti-labor laws. The great victory of the working class attained in the rejection of such statutes in California, Colorado, Ohio, Washington and Idaho is being interpreted as an outgrowth, as part and parcel of the Democratic sweep. That is not so!

As far back as September 17th last Harry Truman was trying to convey the idea, ably assisted by the trade union brass, that only the Republicans were responsible for the anti-labor drive of the monopolies.

Speaking on that date at the Steel Workers Union Convention Truman accused the Eisenhower administration of "deliberately fomenting the recession in order to help business to eradicate the gains made by organized labor." Mr. Truman very conveniently forgot that it is primarily in Democrat ruled states that the "right to work" laws are operative today. His memory also failed him in not noting that there is a direct relation between these anti-labor laws and the "investigations" carried by the federal legislators, especially by the M.M.Clellan Anti-Racket Committee.

For these Social-emocrats and pseudo-Marxists to claim any credit for the Democratic Party in the defeat of the "right to work" laws is the height of demagoguery and treachery.

Referring to the election of Michael V. DiSalle as Governor of Ohio, the New York Times stated:

"Mr. DiSalle announced that he was opposed to the proposed amendment, but did not actively campaign against it. His candi-

NEWS FLASH



QUIZ FIX: Who feeds answers for revisionists' What's My Line?"

J. W. Ford Section

(Continued from page 1)

as the Party leadership did in the case of Lightfoot and Winter.

Nelson and Stone and Bittelman are placed in the program committee as a reward for their Soviet-baiting.

The pseudo-Marxist leadership of the CPUSA has passed the point of no return. Intimately involved in the Right treason, they have to protect the traitors to save their own skin.

You, the pseudo-Marxist leadership of the CPUSA, in following the piece-meal policy of expelling individuals one or two at a time, are aiming at demoralizing our ranks and decapitating our movement. But if you think you're succeeding, you're only deceiving yourselves.

While your bankruptcy becomes more and more obvious, you do not dare to care a damn threat of mass expulsions because you will have to expel masses of workers, white, Negro, Puerto Rican and many others, in New York, in Pennsylvania, in Illinois, in Ohio and throughout the country, workers who are supporting the line of the August 16-17 Conference.

We, members of the James W. Ford Section of the CPUSA, in East Harlem, N. Y., fully support the line of the August 16-17 Conference. We fully support the activities of the Provisional Committee for the Reconstitution of a Marxist-Leninist Party.

We fully support our expelled leadership, Armando, Marino, Lucy, Dougher, Kilpatrick.

Our answer to these expulsions is a complete and radical disassociation from the corrupted leadership of the CPUSA and its revisionist line.

It's the only decent, revolutionary alternative left open to us. We will fight for the reconstitution of an American Marxist-Leninist Party!

working class to spontaneously develop its own political independent role beyond the most incipient stages. The working class needs the Communist vanguard to guide it toward such attainment.

Revisionism and class collaborationist policies have converted the present CPUSA into another Social-Democratic, reformist grouping, unable and incapable of providing such leadership or accomplishing such political task. Only the reconstitution of a vanguard Party with the purity of its ideology, solidly grounded on Marxist-Leninist theory, with a courageous fighting class position, only such a Party could cope with such a task as the realization of the independent political role of the American working class.

HELP WANTED — Experience unnecessary

Cartoons and reports of your experiences in the shops.

Waterfront

(Continued from page 1)

It should be noted that prior to this visit, members of the Foster-Davis group approached both of these Comrades in an attempt to bribe them away from the struggle.

Unanimously rebuffed in this attempt, they sought other means to achieve their main task.

The leadership of the CPUSA has abandoned all Marxist-Leninist principles. This was clearly seen in the decisions of the 16th National Convention. They (the Party leadership) are now hell bent on driving out of the Party all consistent fighters for a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary Party in the United States of America.

The expulsions are being directed in the main against workers—Negro and Puerto Ricans—as they are among the most consistent fighters against the revisionist, class collaborationist policies of the leadership.

While adherents to Marxist-Leninist principles are expelled, class collaborationism and anti-Sovietism is permitted to run rampant in all the Party organizations. Dorothy Healy, Steve Nelson and other National Committee members condemned the Soviet Union and the Hungarian Peoples' Government for the execution of the counter-revolutionaries, Nagy and Maletier . . . yet they are still members of the National Committee. Claude Lightfoot, recently rewarded by a promotion to the N.E.C. for his revisionist policies, shares the same platform with Howard Mayhew, the leading Trotskyite in Illinois.

It is to our credit that with the issuance of our pamphlet "Against Revisionism" we were among the first in the United States to raise our voice against revisionism as projected by the Gates' forces and condoned by the Foster-Davis group.

This pamphlet was instrumental in uniting, during the National and State Convention, those forces that were decided to save the Party and maintain its Marxist-Leninist purity. While unable to completely defeat the revisionists due to the conciliationist role of the Foster-Davis group, we were instrumental in temporarily checking the complete liquidation of the Party.

For years our Section has fought for a revolutionary program — a Marxist-Leninist approach to the labor movement, and consistently fought to put into practice Marxist-Leninist principles in the class struggles of the maritime workers.

Having abandoned Marxist-Leninist principles, the CPUSA cannot offer any solution to the problems facing the American working class.

As Communists, we recognize our responsibility to our fellow seamen, and in particular, to the American working class. The present leadership of the CPUSA has abandoned the struggle for Socialism and Peace; is collaborating with capitalism; is permitting through a policy of "no struggle" the continuation of colonialism and is helping to strangle the peoples' fight for national liberation. These policies also aid and abet American capitalism to further the oppression of our working class.

A Party leadership that has abandoned the working class, that gives lip service to Socialism and Peace, no longer, deserves the support of workers who want a Marxist-Leninist vanguard organization.

Therefore, we members of the Waterfront Section feel duty bound in the face of our class responsibility to come to the following conclusions:

1. To join forces with the Provisional Organizing Committee For The Reconstitution of a Marxist-Leninist Communist Par-

Vanguard

Box 231 - Planetarium Station, New York City

Published by the Provisional Organizing Committee for a Marxist-Leninist Communist Party.

A. Marino Editor

Joe Dougher Chairman
Armando Roman Gen. Sec'y
Howard Penn Labor Sec'y
Lucille Bethancourt, Chicago
Mary Moore, Chicago
Les Thornton, Pennsylvania
Archie Miller, Pennsylvania
A. Kilpatrick, Ohio
James Josephs, New York
Izzie Farber, New York
Anna Ramirez, Harlem
Hilda Moore, Harlem
Bill Porter, Pennsylvania

Arithmo-Theoreticians

Among theoreticians of the old Party, a fashion has been developed of elevating raw statistics to the level of political, economic and historical theory. Thus they contend that the oppressed-nation theory of the Negro question in the United States is obsolete, not because the oppression is being ended, but because the nation is "melting away" (as if Wall Street would preside over the loss of this source of super profits.) These theoreticians like to scan the government census reports and are filled with glee when they can thereby reduce "the number of counties of Negro majority." This is a major basis of their polemics against what they call "dogmatism" (read: Marxist-Leninist theory) in relation to the Negro question.

For these "arithmo-theoreticians" we have a friendly warning: "Look out for the 1960 Census! Especially if 1959 fails to show a return to economic conditions!"

For, there is a hint of possible surprises to be seen in a Wall Street Journal article (October 7, 1958), titled "Dixie Exodus". Exodus, yes, not of Negroes, but of white college graduates. As far as current population shifts may be affecting the Negro-white proportionment of the southern population, consider this observation:

"The departure of better-educated young people may surprise those who have shrugged off migration from the South as primarily a movement of unskilled Negroes. Actually figures from Mississippi, Arkansas, Tennessee and some other states indicate whites may be leaving at a faster clip than Negroes — despite recent flare-ups over school integration . . . In Arkansas eight whites have left the state since 1950 for every five Negroes who departed . . . whites generally are leaving the South faster than Negroes."

" . . . migration of educated Negroes . . . was partially offset over the past year by a backflow of unskilled Negroes from the North who during the recession were unable to secure steady employment. One Mississippi employment official claims that this back-flow is running 20 percent higher than a year ago in his state."

We, ourselves, don't regard raw bourgeois government statistics as infallible guides. But those who do should get set for a possible shock! To paraphrase Mark Twain: Rumors of the death of the Negro nation have been greatly exaggerated!

In Bulgaria there is not a village without a school. Under the monarchy, one-third of the population had no school or teachers. Today, one out of 6 is going to school.

2. To consider the expulsion of Comrade Marino as our own expulsion.

The "Dogmatist" and Vasili Georgevitch Panyin

From John Reed's Ten Days That Shook The World

We sallied out into the town. Just at the door of the station stood two soldiers with rifles and bayonets fixed. They were surrounded by about a hundred business men, Government officials and students, who attacked them with passionate argument and epithet. The soldiers were uncomfortable and hurt, like children unjustly scolded.

A tall young man with a supercilious expression, dressed in the uniform of a student, was leading the attack.

"You realize, I presume," he said insolently, "that by taking up arms against your brothers you are making yourselves the tools of murderers and traitors?"

"Now brother," answered the soldier earnestly, "you don't understand. There are two classes don't you see, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. We —"

"Oh I know that silly talk!" broke in the student rudely. "A bunch of ignorant peasants like you hear somebody bawling a few catch-words. You don't understand what they mean. You just echo them like a lot of parrots." The crowd laughed. "I am a Marxian student. And I tell you that this isn't Socialism you are fighting for. Its just plain pro-German anarchy!"

"Oh, yes I know," answered the soldier, with sweat dripping from his brow. "You are an educated man, that is easy to see and I am only a simple man. But it seems to me —"

"I suppose," interrupted the other contemptuously, "that you believe Lenin is a real friend of the proletariat?"

"Yes, I do," answered the soldier, suffering.

"Well, my friend, do you know that Lenin was sent through Germany in a closed car? Do you know that Lenin took money from the Germans?"

"Well, I don't know much about that," answered the soldier stubbornly, "but it seems to me that what he says is what I want to hear, and all the simple men like me. Now there are two classes, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat —"

"You are a fool! Why, my friend, I spent two years in Schlussemburg for revolutionary activity, when you were still shooting down revolutionists, and singing "God Save the Tsar. My name is Vasili Georgevitch Panyin. Didn't you ever hear of me?"

"I am sorry to say I never did," answered the soldier with humility. "But then, I am not an educated man. You are probably a great hero."

"I am," said the student with conviction. "And I am opposed to the Bolsheviks, who are destroying our Russia, our free Revolution. Now how do you account for that?"

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..."

Another Panyin — U. S. A. 1958

"What is the political face of dogmatism in our Party today?" asks Robert Thompson, National Organizational Secretary of the old Communist Party in his report to the June 28-29, 1958 National Committee meeting. Making clear that he is referring to the so-called "ultra-left" caucus, primarily, as the face of "dogmatism", Thompson characterizes us thus:

"... the central theme of everything they say is that the be-all and end-all of revolutionary policy today is the reverting to the pre-7th Congress class-against-class line." (Political Affairs, August, 1958, p. 50 — emphasis ours—Ed.)

Since the Provisional Organizing Committee for a Marxist-Leninist Communist Party is the continuation of the former so-called "ultra-left" caucus in a new and expanded form outside of the old Communist Party, it is an ideological task of primary importance for us to expose the falseness of this charge of "dogmatism". For Thompson's false charge against us is the common denominator of the attacks made upon us by all the other factions from the extreme Right to the neo-conciliators.

But it is equally important to smash these false charges, in order that real dogmatist errors can be fought. For, while revisionism such as that of the National Committee of the old Party remains the main danger to the Marxist-Leninist Parties of the world, it nevertheless is true that, in the words of the 12-Party Declaration: "Dogmatism and sectarianism hinder the development of Marxist-Leninist theory and its creative application in the

changing conditions; replace the study of the concrete situation with merely quoting classics, and sticking to books; and lead to the party from the masses."

Of course, it strikes one at once that if isolation of the Party from the masses is a result of dogmatism in the Party, then the record of the leadership of the old Party gives a very poor recommendation for their opinions on how to identify and combat dogmatism. After all, the 16th National Convention said: "to end its isolation and expand its mass work, the main task of the Party today is to overcome completely the influence of left sectarian estimates, policies and tactics in all fields of work." That was two years ago, and that same Convention resolution said that the leadership had already been following that line on "sectarianism" since the end of 1952. Today, after six years of "serious struggle" under conditions of "favorable changes in the political climate," as the resolution put it, what is the harvest in "ending our isolation"? The harvest of their revisionist-conciliatorist "anti-dogmatism" is a mortal crisis in which the isolation of the old Party from the masses has become worse and worse!

And, let us not be put off in this connection by cunning references to the effects of McCarthyism combined with the illusionary effects of prolonged prosperity. We repeat: The 16th National Convention, which the present National Committee constantly reaffirms as its basis of line, itself characterized the period since 1952 as one of "favorable changes in the political situation." (Main Political Resolution, 16th National

Convention, Convention Proceedings, pg. 317.)

This then, is hardly a record to inspire confidence in this "leadership" in the struggle against isolation from the masses! Furthermore, for all their frothy-mouthed fulminations against the "dogmatists" of the so-called "ultra-left", one thing they must admit: Whoever is responsible for the policies which have led to this state of affairs, it is certainly least of all the "ultra-left", because we were the one and only faction which was always excluded from national leadership of the old Party. We, and only we, were excluded from the revisionist-conciliatorist "unity club", which included everybody from Gates to Foster. And this distinction we wear as a badge of Marxist-Leninist integrity.

Yet, they accuse the line of the "ultra-left", the caucus movement and the present Provisional Committee of being the center and main embodiment of dogmatism, and therefore, by logical extension, the main barrier to ending the isolation from the masses. In this connection, as well as in others, the evidence shows that the "great victory over revisionism" which the Center and the "Left"-conciliators claim to have won at the February 1958 National Committee meeting actually changed nothing but the label; the prescription remains the same one which Gates helped to write at the 16th Convention. Thompson and the National Committee have re-stated as their present view, exactly the same description and John Gates and Norman Schrank "analysis of dogmatism" that put forward at the time of the 16th Convention two years ago, except that now since the Spotniks and the 12-Party Declaration, the open anti-Soviet edge is folded under." The 16th Convention catalogued as one of the

main "dogmatic errors" was: "And, let us not be put off in this connection by cunning references to the effects of McCarthyism combined with the illusionary effects of prolonged prosperity. We repeat: The 16th National Convention, which the present National Committee constantly reaffirms as its basis of line, itself characterized the period since 1952 as one of "favorable changes in the political situation." (Main Political Resolution, 16th National Convention, Convention Proceedings, pg. 317.) (Continued on page 4)

In Refutation of Modern Revisionism's Reactionary Theory of the State

By WANG CHIA-HSIANG

(Continued from October issue)

IN repudiating the Yugoslav revisionist theory of the state it is necessary to touch on the contradictions within socialist society. Some of our comrades at one time held that in socialist society there were no contradictions between the relations of production and productive forces, between the superstructure and the economic base and so they denied the existence of contradictions among the people in socialist society, or contradictions between the people's government as the apparatus of the state power and the masses. This was a metaphysical viewpoint. If this viewpoint guides national construction in the socialist countries, it is impossible to overcome these contradictions in good time, to make the socialist relations of production conform better to the growth of the productive forces and the socialist state structure conform better to the development of the economic base; and it becomes impossible to further develop the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state in the light of the rich experience gathered from practice. But the Yugoslav revisionists regard the contradictions within socialist society as primarily those between the state power and the working people; they then allege that these contradictions are antagonistic and maintain that the existence of the state is the source of these antagonistic contradictions. In fact, contrary to the Yugoslav revisionist nonsense, the antagonistic contradictions which exist in the socialist countries are those between the masses of the people led by the proletariat and their class enemies who oppose socialism. It

is not that proletarian dictatorship breeds antagonistic contradictions, but that proletarian dictatorship is necessary to resolve them. To attack the socialist countries, the Yugoslav revisionists mix up contradictions among the people in the socialist countries with contradictions between ourselves and the enemy; they also mix up contradictions in the socialist system with those in the capitalist social system. Comrade Mao Tse-tung, in his essay On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People, creatively developed the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state. He pointed out that the internal contradictions in the socialist system of society are fundamentally different from those in the capitalist system of society. In socialist countries, contradictions between the relations of production and the productive forces, between the superstructure and the economic base, are non-antagonistic. The people's government representing the people's interests and the masses of the people are united as one. By contrast, irreconcilable and antagonistic class contradictions exist between a government of the exploiting class and the people. The contradictions between the people's government and the masses are those within the ranks of the people; underlying them is the basic identity of the interests of the people; and therefore they are non-antagonistic. They can be overcome and resolved by the socialist system itself. By magnifying them and labelling them antagonistic contradictions the Yugoslav revisionists serve no purpose other than to besmirch proletarian dictatorship.

For the purpose of attacking the socialist countries, the Yugo-

slav revisionists, on grounds of their own fabrication, describe the socialist state system as the source of "bureaucracy" and maintain that as long as the socialist state system exists, bureaucracy will "continue to manifest itself as a tendency." Everyone knows that bureaucracy is a product of the state apparatus of exploiting class rule. The bureaucracy that exists in the Party and state organizations in a socialist country is a hang-over from the old society rather than a product of the socialist system or of the Communist Party. Such bureaucracy is totally incompatible with the political party of the working class and with the socialist state system. The history of proletarian dictatorship proves that only the socialist state system can effectively overcome bureaucracy; because only it can bring into full play the initiative and activity of the masses, and only when this is done can there be elimination of bureaucracy, a product of the influence of the old society. In other words, the conquest of bureaucracy demands reliance on the masses and resolute struggle against the influence of bourgeois ideology. This struggle needs on the one hand leadership from above to help the government workers carry out continuous ideological remoulding, to correct their erroneous ways of thinking and doing things and to improve their methods of work; on the other hand, the struggle requires mobilization of the masses from the bottom up, the raising of their active mass supervision over the state organs, and leading the masses to fight against bureau-

cracy. Our country's experience also gives proof of this point.

In the nation-wide rectification campaign, we have found the methods suited to the conditions of our country, during which we mobilize the masses fully to practice criticism and self-criticism, according to the "unity — criticism — unity" formula, by encouraging a full and frank airing of views, great debates and the posting of *tatsepao*. As a result, the democratic life of our socialist society has achieved a mighty leap forward. Here we may well ask: Dare the Yugoslav revisionists practice democracy on so broad a scale?

The Yugoslav revisionists also attack the leading role of the Communist Parties in the socialist countries. They deny that the Communist Party is the highest form of organization of the working class and, on the pretext of opposing "a fusion of the organizations of Communists with the state apparatus," insist that it is not right for the Party to exercise direct leadership and supervision over the state. They maintain that the inevitable outcome of "an ever closer merging of the Party and state apparatus" is the "growth of bureaucracy" in the Party. Lenin's doctrine on Party building stresses that the Communist Party is the highest form of organization of the working class and only the political party of the working class that is the Communist Party can give political leadership to the proletariat and through the proletariat unite all the working masses to carry out proletarian dictatorship; "without this dictatorship of the proletariat is impossible." (Lenin: Preliminary Draft of the Resolution of the Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party on

the Syndicalist and Anarchist Deviation in Our Party. This truth has been borne out by practice in the socialist states.

The primary lesson taught by the history of proletarian dictatorship is that the proletarian cause of revolution and construction cannot advance a step without a Communist Party that takes Marxism-Leninism as its guide to action, builds itself on the principle of democratic centralism, establishes close ties with the masses, strives to become the very heart of the working people and educates its members and the masses of the people in Marxism-Leninism. In the course of socialist revolution and socialist construction, the Party must play the leading role, as regards both the general line and policy of building socialism and the line and policy for the socialist state; there must therefore be no separation between the Party and the government. It would be absolutely wrong to separate the Party from the leadership of the Communist Party. Of course, the Party and the government must do their work in different ways; the Party does not have to take on the routine work of the government organizations. But in all circumstances, the fundamental guarantee that the countries of our socialist camp will unite the people to vanquish the enemy is the strengthening of leadership by the Communist Party in the cause of socialism and over the organs of the state.

(To be concluded next issue)

* Opinions and criticisms written in bold Chinese characters on large sheets of paper, publicly posted for all to see.—Ed.

Another Panyin -- U. S. A. 1958

(Continued from page 3)
Party also viewed uncritically developments in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries." Such open barbs directed at the Soviet Union are no longer "stylish," but Thompson's June report declares that the Party "must (develop its work) on the basis of the line of the 16th Convention." What this amounts to is a grand "Burning-the-Candle-at-Both-Ends" Operation: Trying to assure the U. S. bourgeoisie that they are not revolutionaries and the international movement that they are! There can be no doubt which end shows them in their true light; revisionists and conciliationists base themselves on the 16th Convention; Marxist-Leninists can not!

The specific effect of this line on "sectarianism" was two-fold: It was made to substitute for a self-critical study by U. S. Communists of the lessons of the 20th Congress of the CPSU in regard to the anti-Marxist ideas of the "cult of the individual" and "the worship of authority". And, it gave a "safe-conduct" for a long period of time, to every variety of anti-Soviet slander within the Party. This attitude toward the 20th Congress was another point of the 16th Convention "unity" agreement among the Gates, Dennis and Foster forces.

Let us now turn to the specific charges with which Thompson on behalf of the National Committee of the old Communist Party, develops his "analysis" of the ultra-left, "the face of dogmatism".

"Would Have Party Ignore Changes"

"It would," he says, "have our Party ignore the great changes wrought by an epoch of socialist people struggles."

But when a working-class government was fighting a bloody battle for life, when it was a question of a socialist victory or defeat, when the question was precisely "class against class" two years ago in Hungary—then this crowd of "victory shouters" sought to say, like Peter, "We know not the man".

"The action of the Soviet troops in Hungary does not advance but retard the development of Socialism." Daily Worker editorial, Nov. 5, 1956.)

"The response of the Soviet authorities to the request for armed intervention . . . violated the Leninist concept of self-determination because the call for troops was not in accord with the wishes of the Hungarian people." (Statement of the National Committee, November 2, 1956.)

Oh, it is fine to celebrate the victory; but unless a Party leadership stands firm when nobody knows how the battle will go, it should be more discreet about appealing for support for itself on the basis of the "great changes wrought by an epoch of socialist victories." For when the imperialist inspired fascist counter-revolution in Hungary was smashed—that was, contrary to the view of the leadership of the CPUSA, also a victory for Socialism!

New World Role Of Soviet Union

The position taken by Vanguard today, in the opinion of Thompson and the National Committee "would ignore the new world role of the Soviet Union and of the vast changes in relationship of forces on world scale and in individual countries which open up new forms and possibilities for social progress and advance toward socialism."

We have already noted how the National Committee showed its appreciation of the "new world role of the Soviet Union" at the

time of the 1956 counter-revolution in Hungary. But they of course, are not thinking of Hungary in connection with this point.

Nobody of the least political awareness, whatever his social class, can ignore the new world role of the Soviet Union, nor the vast changes in relationship of forces on a world scale. As for such changes in "individual countries", we American Marxist-Leninists are particularly interested in that "individual country", the United States. We are certain that changes in the relationship of forces, of class forces, will take place favorable to the struggle for Socialism in our country. But, if we are to be accused of ignoring actual "vast changes" of this kind (which have supposedly already taken place with the U. S. in recent years), Thompson or some other such "analyst" ought to try to give us a list of some of those changes.

In the absence of such a list, we believe that class-conscious workers will continue to consider it more realistic to "ignore" things which actually do not exist. After all, Marxist-Leninists are realists, materialists, and it's hard to teach an old "dogmatist" new (revisionist) tricks.

Such factual details apparently are to be left aside in the "struggle against dogmatism" a la Thompson.

What he is driving at is the vindication of the revisionist concept of "peaceful, parliamentary and constitutional transition to socialism in the United States, which Thompson himself, has previously spelled out in the following way: ". . . We are speaking of the possibility of the assumption of state powers by the working class . . . due to the transforming of parliament . . ."

We reject this theory as a revisionist distortion of the lessons of the struggle for socialism in the post-World War II period, as a Right-opportunist deviation from the generalized experience of the world working-class and Marxist movement. The transformation of parliament follow after the winning of state power. The dictatorship of the proletariat can bring about a transformation of parliament, but no parliament has ever transformed a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie into a dictatorship of the proletariat.

It is quite useless for revisionists to cite the case of Czechoslovakia to support the thesis of "achieving power by transforming parliament." First: the main repressive forces of Czechoslovak capitalist rule had been broken along with the smashing of the Nazis by the Red Army; Nazi rule was not only the instrument of imperialist rule by the German bourgeoisie but also the bulwark of Czechoslovak reaction as well. Second: The Czech Parliament of the mid-1945-to-early 1948 period was, itself, already greatly transformed by the circumstances of the defeat of the Nazis, being thus, however, the reflection of this change in relative strength of contending classes rather than its cause. Third: Since the Communist Party, headed by Premier Gottwald, played a leading role in the Cabinet and the National Front, it was possible in the main to give parliamentary forms of legality to the seizure of state power by the workingclass at the head of an alliance of the toiling masses of town and country. But the substance of the events, as distinct from its incidental parliamentary forms, lay in the role of the "Action Committees", the February 24 general strike of two-and-a-half million workers organized by the Congress of Works Councils, in the deployment of armed workers at the

factories and at important buildings. (Reference: "The People's Victory in Czechoslovakia, by Walter Storm, New Century Publishers, New York.)

No, the Czechoslovak events confirm the thesis of Lenin, not that of the revisionists: Without the smashing of the bourgeois state and the seizure of power by the masses of people led by the working class and its Marxist-Leninist vanguard — without that, all the votes in parliaments or cabinets can change nothing. On the other hand, parliamentary consent or no, when the instruments of repression are struck from the hands of the bourgeoisie by the mass action of the working class, state power will pass into the hands of the working class.

What the Czechoslovakian events do show, of course, is that changes in the relative strength of contending classes, nationally and internationally, can greatly facilitate the relative peacefulness of the winning of state power by the working-class. In Czechoslovakia, the socialist revolution was accomplished without civil war. The historic 12-Party Declaration of a year ago took note of such experiences in the post-World War II period. At the same time it pointed out that ". . . the possibility of non-peaceful transition to socialism should be borne in mind . . . In this case degree of bitterness and the forms of the class struggle will depend not so much on the proletariat as on the resistance put up by the reactionary circles to the will of the people." This was fully consistent with the previously expressed view of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, as presented in the Khrushchev Report: "In countries where capitalism is strong and has a huge military apparatus (We wonder if these engineers of the American (exceptionalist) Road to Socialism could think of any such country. — Ed.) at its disposal, there the transition to Socialism will be attended by strong class (our emphasis.—Ed.) revolutionary struggles."

Is it not clear? Whether socialism comes through civil war (as in China) or through relatively peaceful means (as in Czechoslovakia) — it is still, in the post-World War II period it was before — a question of class against class. If we are in Thompson's "dogma house" for our "reversion to class-against-class" struggle ideas — then, at least, we can know we have better comrades inside of it than he has outside of it!

On the Fascist Danger

According to Thompson and the National Committee, the position now represented by the Vanguard:

"Would ignore the phenomenon of the rise and existence of the threat of fascism and the necessity of the working class pursuing a line of popular and people's front alliances."

Such a charge against us is a lie out of the whole cloth.

It has been only the so-called "ultra-left" which has opposed before during and after the 16th Convention the Right opportunist line on this question. That idea was stated in the Convention Main Resolution (which Thompson insists upon as the basis of present political line) that one of the main dogmatist errors was "The overestimation (our emphasis — ed.) of the danger of fascism in the McCarthy period: 'Failure to recognize that the ruling class was not so hard pressed as to be unable to continue its established method of governmental rule'; and, 'underestimation of the strength of American democratic traditions among the people, their readiness to defend the Constitution' etc. etc.

We need not go into a discussion of these particular passages just at this moment, but certainly it is obvious that Thompson's beloved 16th Convention did not

think that the "face of dogmatism" was featured by an ignoring of the fascist danger in this country!

On Monday, it seems, the old Party leaders denounce us "dogmatists" for "overestimating the fascist danger", then on Tuesday demand our political execution for "ignoring" the fascist danger — and all in the name of the revisionist-conciliationist "American Road to Socialism." Now, we want to learn from criticism regardless of its source; and surely we must be alert to check any real sectarian, dogmatist tendencies. But this sort of crossed criticism coming from the old Party leadership is absolutely worthless. It is simply an implementation of the revisionist-conciliationist agreement which provides that "any stick is good enough to beat a 'dogmatist' with."

Incidentally, Thompson suggests that these characterizations of the "ultra-left" were formed by reading our documents "on the Negro question, the trade union question, the peace question, etc." He goes on to recommend that his readers "Examine what is said in them . . ." This is one suggestion of Thompson's with which we are in enthusiastic agreement. Therefore we propose to make our documents available to his readers as far as possible. In order to facilitate such a development, perhaps he would be willing to accept our challenge to debate publicly any of the points

We wonder whether Thompson also "examined what they say" in the 12-Party Declaration. If so, perhaps Thompson and the National Committee would accuse the international Communist movement of "ignoring the rise and existence of the threat of fascism" because they are able to find no mention of it in that document! Is this what Thompson was thinking of when he said "We should not endorse the 12-Party Declaration"? (Political Affairs, February, 1958.) Somehow we don't feel so bad if our documents in the struggle against revisionism provide no more basis for the charge of dogmatism that is to be found in the historic 12-Party Declaration!

However, let us set forth directly the elements of our view of the fascist danger and its relationship to the present struggle against revisionism in the American Communist movement:

1) The forces of fascism throughout the world suffered a historic defeat in World War II.

2) As long as monopoly capitalism (which is the final stage of capitalism) exists, the threat of fascism will exist, and the international Communist movement will rally the masses against it through the united front and people's front, and through the might of the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union.

3) An effective people's front against fascism requires the promotion of the united front of the working class; and that united front, in turn, can be welded only where there is a strong, healthy, militant, clear-headed, highly-organized, mass Marxist-Leninist Communist Party.

4) Such a Communist Party does not at the moment exist in the United States because the leadership of the old CP is dedicated to the revisionist-conciliationist line of the 16th Convention, and because the forces for reconstitution of a Marxist-Leninist Party are just now in the process of being mobilized on a national scale.

5) Therefore, if one wishes to fight as a Communist against the threat of fascism in our country, he MUST begin by seeking to settle accounts with revisionism in the U. S. Communist movement.

So, when the National Committee finds itself sorely beset with principled and documented Marxist-Leninist criticism, and charges of revisionism based thereon, they do not help but seriously

undermine the struggle against fascism if they resort to baseless unprincipled and undocumented counter-charges of "dogmatism".

Labor and Negro Liberation Movements

Finally, Thompson charges that the "ultra-left":

"... would ignore the important changes that have occurred as a result of the growth of the unions and the Negro people's movement in our country . . ."

In 1940 there were three times as many trade union members in the United States as there were in 1930. Between 1940 and 1950, growing at only one-fourth the relative rate of the preceding decade, the trade unions grew by two-thirds. If the 1950-55 rate of growth continues until 1960, this decade will be one of practically zero growth of the membership.

As the economic crisis develops and the government-and-employer offensive against labor is stepped up — then those, who speak so assuredly of the "growth of the trade union movement" will be surprised to find that the underlying internal crisis has broken through the surface stagnation. Then the trade union movement will have to fight for its very life. The "honeymoon" is about over on the American industrial scene. This is the first thing which must not be "ignored".

Secondly, the significance of the "growth of the unions" in general can not possibly be evaluated without relating it to the critical task of organizing the South, and that means championing Negro equality there. The omission of this consideration is especially glaring when Thompson is lecturing us "dogmatists" for "ignoring the growth of the unions and the Negro people's movement in our country."

For, the most outstanding aspect of the current crisis of American democracy is the deterioration of the Negro-Labor alliance, the failure of the trade union movement to take up the Wall-Street-Dixiecrat challenge to the struggle for Negro liberation.

Of course, the labor movement and the Negro people's movement have grown. Who can possible ignore such facts? But awareness of them must not be allowed to serve as a basis to attack Marxist-Leninists, and to call them "dogmatists", just because they seek to apply dialectics, to see not only what is, but also what is becoming, in order to prepare the workers for impending stern sharp class struggles.

If the National Committee is so foolish as to present these "growth" phenomena in this one-sided way, it must be ready to answer the question of the international Communist movement:

"And the Party, comrades? Does it also grow?" The National Committee follows the Convention line of "Socialism through coalition", basing their strategy upon the general growth of the labor and people's movement. But when such growth is accompanied by the disintegration of the CPUSA, it really takes some tall "ignoring" to expect this "general growth" to be the basis of the transition to socialism. There is only one logic which can accommodate this contradiction — the logic of liquidation of the Party — the logic of the 16th Convention.

Today Communists should be arousing the workers for the 6-hour day movement; advancing militant strike and demonstration actions in support of the Negro people's struggles; demanding a concerted and determined drive to curb the "run-away" shop threat and to organize the South; exposing the Cold-War two-party austerity plot against living standards of the people — and above all building a Marxist-Leninist Communist Party.