

I-THE TACTICS OF THE PROGRESSIVE PARTY IN '48

In New York City the PP had the advantage of the ALP's eleven year old organization and a working class traditionally more advanced than in many parts of the country. As a result, Wallace polled his most substantial vote here, 423,000 votes or 13.5% of the city-wide presidential total. This is nevertheless a disappointing showing in view of the tremendous potential of the PP shown in the special election in the 24th Congressional District (Bronx) in February 1948, when Isaacson, backed by Wallace, polled almost 57% of the total vote against a previous top for the ALP in this district of about 20%. Isaacson, bidding for reelection, nearly doubled his February vote but polled only 37% of the total. Somehow between February and November the PP had lost its magic touch. In California and elsewhere it was much the same story. 447,000 California electors signed petitions to put Wallace and the PP on the ballot; yet only about a third of that number cast their votes for Wallace on November 2.

It is generally agreed, and we believe rightly, that the inability of the PP to realize in November the potentialities which seemed within its grasp in the months following the announcement of Wallace's candidacy, was due to the fact that many or most of those who believe in the principles of the PP, frightened by the truculent, openly anti-Soviet and anti-labor attitudes of the Dewey forces and hoping against hope that the frantic last minute conversion of Truman to peace, the New Deal, and most of the PP's platform was sincere, permitted themselves to be taken in by the "lesser evil" swindle. We want to discuss in some detail certain errors of tactics in the PP's campaign which made possible the success of Truman's demagogic hoax.

In New York City, for instance, as elsewhere in the country, there was the failure to sense the tremendous desire of the workers for peace and their concern lest the bipartisan cold-war policy be the prelude to a shooting war. More and more as the campaign progressed, the peace issue was shoved into the background in favor of less controversial "pork chop" issues, although this was notably less true of Wallace than of most other PP candidates, at least in the New York area. When publicity for the Yankee Stadium Rally was being planned, Publicity Director Hy Schneider discarded the slogan "All Out For Peace" in favor of the supine "Yankee Doodle Rally" (vying with the bi-partisan patrioteers in flag waving) because, as he said, "The people of New York City are not yet prepared for such a (peace) slogan."

But even when the question of the fight for peace was breached, it was seldom done correctly. If there is one issue on which the American people have been consistently and dangerously misinformed it is on the role of the Marshall Plan. Despite repeated statements by administration and Congressional leaders (in pleading for Republican isolationist backing) that it is the purpose of ECA to confine Communism, despite the brazen assertions of Director Hoffman that since we are putting up the money, American business interests are entitled to competitive advantages, and despite his insistence on exercising a directing and controlling influence on the economy of the so-called beneficiary nations, most American voters have swallowed the

propaganda line peddled by the press and radio that our interest is purely philanthropic and humanitarian, that there are no political strings attached to our bounty.

The Progressive Party is the only Party in America which rejects this false and dangerous misconception of the true nature of Marshall Plan "aid", foisted upon the American masses by the imperialists in an effort to drive a wedge between them and their European brothers. The election campaign offered a great opportunity to awaken the workers to the war danger inherent in the Marshall Plan, to demand an end to political and economic interference in the affairs of other countries, and to win untrammelled aid through the UN to all countries ravaged in the war against fascism, regardless of political complexion. But the PP failed to grasp this opportunity. Too bad; for had it done so, TP does not believe that Truman could have successfully stolen the PP's thunder, its program--and many of its votes. Because we failed Truman could cry, "More than anything else I want peace", and "Peace is my greatest aim", and millions of workers were unable to detect the contradiction that gave his words the lie. The Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan are the main factors in our cold war on the Soviet Union. They are the greatest threat to the peace, and certainly, the author of the Truman Doctrine cannot escape responsibility for them through hypocritical snivelling of "Peace, peace"!

Why then did the PP fail to concentrate its fire on the Marshall Plan until it was nakedly exposed to the masses for the war doctrine that it is? We think it was for the same reason that it wrapped the folds of Old Glory about it at the "Yankee Doodle Rally"; it permitted itself to be red-baited out of the only issue that could expose the Truman demagogy, the only issue on which Truman did not dare to agree. "Only the Communists oppose the Marshall Plan so let's let sleeping dogs lie so they won't smear us; do'nt defend or even mention the Communists or the Soviet Union. Why arouse antagonism?" More often than not this cautious advice was given (and accepted) by Communist members of the PP staff.

But take the case of the campaign in the 20th C.D. (N.Y.). Gene Connolly is one of our staunchest and most admirable fighters for the workers' demands. Yet even he failed in his speeches and campaign literature to make the Marshall Plan, on which his chief opponent, Sol Bloom, minority leader of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, was most vulnerable, the central issue of his campaign. As a result, the STAR (Nov. 3) was able to report, "On the basis of program there was little choice for 20th District voters." We think the voters had a choice between integrity and demagogy, but unfortunately Mr. Connolly for the most part chose to remain silent on the one point that Bloom's demagogy couldn't have covered up.

The same criticism applies in even greater degree to the Isacson campaign. As above noted, Isacson got 20% less of the total vote in November (37%) than he polled in February (57%). In February he denounced the Marshall Plan and Truman Doctrine, but in the fall election, after scores of deals had been made for PP support of Marshall Planners, this denunciation subsided to a whisper. Isacson then

elected to campaign chiefly on the Palestine issue against Dollinger, an opponent whose record as an Israel supporter was at least campaign-able. If, along with his demand for justice to the Jews, he had hammered away at the Marshall Plan, we believe that he could have laid a firm foundation in the 24th CD for a PP that Democratic demagoguery could not challenge and he might have been elected.

We know that some members of the PP's inner council believe that red-baiting and Soviet-baiting were an important or even primary cause of the Party's small vote; that we would have done better if we had kept completely mum on the Marshall Plan and relations with the Soviet Union. Fortunately, Mr. Wallace emphatically rejected, at the recent Chicago conference, this view, which we believe, greatly underestimates the sound instincts and political intelligence of the American working class. There are of course some few, chiefly under clerical influence, who have lost their bearings in the fog of hysteria deliberately created by those who hope to profit by it. By and large, however, we believe the PP suffered from red-baiting only because it tailed the masses and permitted its fear of red-baiting to weaken and bog down its attack on the Truman-Marshall-Dulles bi-partisan foreign policy. That policy is a policy for war, and The Marshall Plan is its essence. It represents the only basic and qualitative difference between the PP's program and that to which the Democratic Party gave lip-service. In truth, Wallace did not split Truman's vote; Truman split Wallace's. Truman borrowed part of the PP's program in order to encourage the "lesser evil" switch. But Truman didn't switch to the PP's peace program (as many people seem to believe); the PP tended to switch to Truman's abstract talk of peace while evading the "controversial" Marshall Plan. In fact, many, including CP members, were quite relieved that Truman was elected. Why? Because they also held, in varying degrees, the lesser evil theory that elected Truman. When we forsook the fight against the Marshall Plan, we abandoned also the fight for principle; we conducted a campaign for candidates but not for a program, to elect candidates but not to build a party.

Evidence of this is to be seen in Marcantonio's district. TP is highly gratified that Marcantonio was reelected, but a sober evaluation is in order. Actually his victory was one of the narrowest squeaks on record. He received only 36.4% of the total vote in a three way race, winning because the remaining 63.6% was divided with almost mathematical exactitude between his two opponents. He would have lost nevertheless had his opponents, each thinking that he could go it alone and win, not failed to get together on a single ticket as happened in a number of other New York districts. But for this fortuitous circumstance, entirely beyond our control and certainly not to be counted on in the future, Marcantonio would have been defeated by 27,000 votes. While celebrating his victory, we believe that Mr. Wallace is incorrect when, as he did at the recent Chicago Conference, he points to Marcantonio's campaign as an example of the kind of organization on the election district level which will bring the PP victory. He is incorrect, not because, as we have pointed out, Marcantonio may well get 20,000 more votes in the next election and still be defeated, but very simply because the ALP did not build the PP in the 18th CD despite its intensive and successful campaign for Marcantonio. Instead, it

built a personal Marcantonio machine. A powerful, enduring PP cannot be built on the mere vote-getting ability of strong personalities. There must be organization and of a superior order, but it must be organization around a complex of ideas and principles which truly reflect the needs, the demands, the aspirations of the working people.

The contrasted fates of the Republican Party of 1854, the Bull Moose Progressives of 1912 and La Follette's Progressive Party of 1924 illustrate this. In Wallace's proposals and the PP platform we have the correct program and basis for a real people's coalition PP. We will succeed only if we make this program the basis of our organizational work.

Another weakness of the PP's campaign, a logical outgrowth of the tendency to organize around candidates rather than around issues, is the "concentration" system employed in New York and perhaps elsewhere. In New York City the concentration campaigns were Isacson, Marcantonio, Ada Jackson and Lee Pressman and Simon Gerson. The forces from non-concentration areas were diverted into the districts of these candidates, and most of the funds available for literature and promotion went into their campaigns. As a result there were few forces and frequently no funds available for non-concentration districts. In many assembly districts no more than one or two pieces of literature reached the voters. The main drive of the campaign should have been to build the PP, and that could only be done by telling the voters what we stand for as often and effectively as possible. Any policy of concentration should have been planned and carried out within the limitations imposed by this primary objective. There can be no doubt that the concentration policy as carried out in New York resulted in failure to mobilize a very considerable part of the potential Wallace vote.

As can be seen, all of the above shortcomings developed as a result, in whole or in part, of the retreat from the fight against the Marshall Plan and the bipartisan foreign policy.

It was not merely the failure of ALP-PP candidates to make the fight on the MP the central issue of their campaign which convinced the workers that they were not in fact opposing the Marshall Plan and thus prepared them for their "lesser evil" swing to Truman. Actions speak louder than words. The ALP, bell-wether of the PP showed where it stood on the Marshall Plan when it endorsed first, Emanuel Celler, who not only voted for the Marshall Plan in Congress but was so enamored of the idea that prior to the convention he proposed the General as a Vice-Presidential candidate. Then followed in rapid succession other ALP endorsements of Marshall-Planners for Congress: Delaney, Pfeifer and Arthur Klein, not to mention numerous candidates for State Senate, Assembly, etc. Klein's case deserves special mention. Following his endorsement by the ALP, he was also designated by the Liberal Party and endorsed by the ADA which released a statement to the effect that it endorsed no candidate except after receiving his written assurance that he was opposed to the Wallace candidacy, would appear at no Wallace rally, and that he favored an extended Marshall Plan. Mr. Klein did not deny submitting such a statement to the ADA, but the ALP continued to give him its support. A functionary high in ALP councils told a T.P. editor: "Arthur is such a nice fellow; we just can't help supporting him."

OK, but why then oppose Javits, a pro-Marshall-Planner in the 21st CD with an otherwise "progressive" record in order to support fence-sitter Paul O'Dwyer who received the Democratic nomination on the assumption that he favors the Marshall Plan, and the ALP designation on the ground that perhaps after all he doesn't. The same pattern was followed elsewhere. In Illinois the PP leadership subscribed to the "lesser evil" theory by withdrawing its candidate in favor of the ferocious red-baiter and Marshall Planner, Paul Douglas. In California, Representatives Holifield and Helen Gahagan Douglas spurned the IPP's invitation to cross-file, yet, spit-in-face, the IPP nevertheless forced its support upon them by withdrawing its candidates in their favor! What is this theory that we divide the progressive vote if we refuse our support to candidates who deny the most basic principles of our program? Is the PP right or wrong when it proclaims that the vital issue today for America and the world is peace or war, and that the bi-partisan foreign policy leads inevitably to war? We believe that it is completely right and that nothing must be permitted to overshadow or becloud the issue. Well then, it becomes our responsibility to expose and repudiate as hidden agents of the imperialists all candidates who support the war policies but try to confuse and divide the workers on the main issue with promises to oppose the Taft-Hartley Law or to support price controls. Instead, we have endorsed and supported these candidates. Obviously, our electoral support of these Marshall Plan Democrats has failed to help build the PP organizationally. But at the same time, it has undercut and weakened the ideological basis for such a Party.

Who is to blame for this dangerous opportunist trend? At the fund-raising dinner at the Hotel Commodore in late Sept. there was an off-the-record discussion between Baldwin and Wallace which somehow got on the record (perhaps because some city editors just couldn't resist the temptation to smear the PP by publicizing a difference of opinion between Mr. Wallace and his top advisers.) Mr. Baldwin favored the support of "liberal" Democrats, while Mr. Wallace stated his belief that the time would come when the PP should not support any Democrats, meaning, we take it, any candidate who fails to subscribe to the PP's peace policy; since that includes all Democratic candidates.

It has seemed to us that, generally, throughout the campaign Mr. Wallace has understood and reflected the strong spontaneous movement of the American people as Mr. Baldwin and the Communists in his entourage have not. We have seen Wallace resisting the bad advice which has tended to bog down the PP's campaign even when he was forced to give ground to it. And we cannot expect that Wallace can hold out without strong support from below.

Mr. Baldwin's view has prevailed, at least for the time being, because most of Mr. Wallace's advisers and lieutenants on the policy level, including a majority of the Communists in a position to make their views known, agreed with Mr. Baldwin.

As Marxists-Leninists, we of TP have been particularly incensed at the carefully conceived sabotage which CPUSA leadership has been

carrying on inside the PP while pretending to be its strongest supporters. (Here it is important to distinguish between the ronegade top leadership of CPUSA which dictates its policies and the rank and file. In New York much of the most devoted and selfless work for the PP on the AD and ED level and by volunteers in the Nat'l Office was performed by CP members.) The Draft Resolution submitted by the CP Nat'l Board for discussion at the recent CP Convention states (PA, June 1948 p.506):-"The Communist Party from the earliest days after the end of the war understood that its traditional fight for a new people's party directed against the two-party system of the monopolies had once more been placed by events as an immediate practical question before the American people, and acting upon this understanding, it boldly proclaimed the need for such a new people's party".

In innumerable instances to which we have alluded in other issues, the CPUSA leadership has given the lie to the above claim. For example, in the case of the expulsion of the PR Club (part of TP), the Bronx County Committee of the CPUSA granted an interview to the N.Y. Times, in which it stated as a reason for its action that, "By its one-sided attacks on the Democratic Party, this faction diverts attention from the danger of the main centers of reaction, represented by the Hoover-Dewey Republicans."

Here were people who for 2½ years by indecision and double-talk, by counsel now of "too soon, premature, the masses aren't ready" and now of "too late, the elections are too close", did everything in their power to prevent the emergence of a correct Third Party until through no fault of theirs, Wallace finally announced his candidacy. Now, with brazen effrontery, they insist on a major share of the credit for the organization of the PP.

In our July 1948 Supplement (p.14 to 16) we attempted to document the vacillation and contradictory directives of CP leaders on this question. They could not make up their minds, despite the crystal-clear directive of the 7th CI Congress to American Communists "that the interests of the American proletariat demand that all its forces disassociate themselves from the capitalist parties without delay", whether to join with other anti-fascist, democratic (with a small d) forces in a people's coalition or to continue work within the Wall St. dominated Democratic Party in the hope of receiving small favors.

Meanwhile the influential CPUSA leadership within the ALP continued to betray the workers' confidence by unprincipled top-level deals with such red-baiters and anti-labor demagogues as Mead, O'Dwyer, etc. In the elections, the CPUSA has consistently been willing to compromise its principles (and the workers' interests) if that would gain a few votes. So also in the trade union field they preserved "unity" with the Murray, Reuther, Rieve agents of the imperialists by supporting (and helping write) the Atlantic City red-baiting resolution and by voting unanimously for the Marshall Plan at the Boston CIO Convention.

The effect of these brilliant compromises (and others), all made in the name of "unity" with red-baiters and Marshall Plan supporters has been to wreck the American trade-union movement. Now we are

assured that the PP too must have "unity" with the red-baiters and Marshall-Planners if they will only be so good as to give lip-service to the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Law. The PP must decide (and soon) whether or not it is going to permit itself to be destroyed by the same tactics with which the same phony advisers succeeded in virtually liquidating the militant trade unions.

No sooner had Wallace announced his candidacy and offered a basically correct program of which the central core was his forthright challenge of the bi-partisan war policy, than the CP brain trusters came up with a plan to undercut and counteract it. PA (Jan. 1948, p.9-10) editorialized "The supporters of the third party ticket, where they find it advisable to support a Congressional candidate of one of the old parties, despite the fact that this candidate does not support the third party, (meaning also of course that he does support the Marshall Plan-editors TP) will be able to do so." That was the tip-off. On Jan. 12, 1948 George Morris echoed this line in more sinister form: "Regardless of differences of presidential choice, unionists can

unite on the Congressional elections. The objectives really within the reach of labor can be won. (His emphasis) It would be a tragedy if differences in the political campaign harmed labor's immediate struggle for wage increases and against encroachments of the T-H Law." It was Mr. Morris' cynical judgment that American workers can not be aroused in the struggle for peace, and that since the peace objective cannot be won, it would be silly to jeopardize pork chops that can be won by a hopeless fight against the bipartisan war policy. Now mind you, Mr. Morris is a leading member of the CP and he was writing in the Daily Worker, official organ of the Party. Moreover, this general thesis that we should not stand and fight on the Marshall Plan issue if better deals could be made by jettisoning it was repeated over and over like a theme song in PA and in the DW by a Communist Party which contended (with a straight face) that it was opposing the Marshall Plan. Plainly, the CP was still adhering to the lesser evil theory of supporting liberal Democrats despite its pledge of allegiance to the PP. Then in early July, the deals began. While the IPP was designating candidates to run against the Marshall Planners in California and the PP of Illinois was still opposing Paul Douglas, the Communist influenced ALP opened the sluices of opportunism by endorsing Cellar, Pfeifer and Delaney as a starter, and the rat-race was on.

Thus we see that the CPUSA leadership, which all along had embraced the liquidationist lesser evil theory (and carried it to its logical conclusion in the debacle of the left-wing trade unions), had now succeeded in implanting the same seeds of destruction in the PP. It is ironic that the George Morris who were the super-salesmen for the lesser evil theory now bemoan the political backwardness of the American working class in carrying the theory to its logical conclusion in switching their votes to Truman.

If the Communists, who internationally have made the fight against the Marshall Plan the main link of their struggle against American imperialism, could, in the U.S., take the lead in rushing to endorse Marshall Plan supporters, non-Communist leaders of the PP must have found it difficult to understand why they should be left holding the

line for the very issue on which the red-baiters concentrated their fire. So in the end they retreated too, and opposition to the Marshall Plan ceased to be an issue in the campaign very simply because it was no longer expedient or even possible to raise an issue which was repudiated by many (or perhaps most) of the candidates for whom the PP was campaigning. There now tended to be little principled difference between the used part of the PP's program, and the Truman demagoguery. The last obstacle to the lesser-evil sellout had been removed. Truman won votes by adopting as his own sections of the PP's platform which he had no intention of carrying out. But he won even more Wallace votes because in the end the PP by evading the Marshall Plan issue, junked its own correct and principled foreign policy in favor of Truman's abstract and deliberately meaningless position.

The working class voters in New York City and throughout the country are sick and tired of bipartisan double-talk and broken promises. They are looking for a party of incorruptible integrity to represent and defend their stake as workers vis a vis the imperialists who control the bipartisan political machines. But the PP makes a tragic error when it presumes to gain the workers' confidence and support by its own brand of double-talk; by opposing the Marshall Plan in its platform, while failing to expose to the workers the central role of the Marshall Plan in the imperialist plans of the war-mongers, and by endorsing and supporting in New York and throughout the country scores of the foremost advocates of the Marshall Plan. Confronted with this obvious duplicity on the one hand and the demagogic peace claims of Truman (which could have been punctured had the PP not declined the nettle) on the other, it is little wonder that the workers in their frustration decided to vote for the lesser of the bi-partisan evils.

II-AFTER NOV. 2ND--A PARTY TO SMASH THE WAR PLANS

The future of the PP depends on three choices--three facts or three fictions of the PP's orientation. We say facts or fictions advisedly because mere acknowledgements and lipservice accompanied by the opposite in practice won't do the trick.

1-The PP must be continued, must be built organizationally from the ground up as an American People's Front against war and fascism; it must not continue to rely on a few "names", a few post-election headquarters, and a few press releases as it quietly sleeps till the next important election emergency wakes it.

2-The PP must refuse to be swallowed up in suicidal unity with the "2nd 3rd Party" of the Reuther, Dubinsky, Green, Norman Thomas, ADA, Trotskyite variety which will continue to emerge whenever the PP shows signs of vitality. It must under no conditions contemplate retraction into the Democratic Party or send out feeler-rumors to that affect.

3-Most important--THE PP MUST BECOME A REAL SMASH-THE-MARSHALL-PLAN PARTY. The PP must, in action, lead the American peace-loving people in an every-day fight for peace by impeding and finally destroying all bipartisan war plans and by helping all the victims of America's colonial policy. By such action it will prove un-digestible for

the "2nd 3rd Party" and un-retractable for the Democratic Party. To the extent that the PP sidesteps the issue, it trips over its own feet.

If the PP adopts the correct attitude toward these three focal points it will guarantee the success of its mission as a peace party; it will be capable not merely of influencing a minority peace sentiment, but of smashing decisively America's present bipartisan plans for war and fascism. If the PP can become convincing on the main question of peace (and it has not yet by a long shot) it can that much more easily win in all its domestic struggles. If the PP continues to hedge on its essential fight against the Marshall Plan, it won't accomplish anything but its own demoralization and liquidations.

Let us examine these three interconnected points.

1-THE PP IS HERE TO STAY. The PP said this at its Chicago Conference. But life is not so simple as a press release from an off-the-record conference. There are influential people--and prominent among them the leading Communist Party "whips"--who are currently scouting every opportunity for rapprochement with the Democratic Party. The PP must expose and destroy every effort within its own organization to liquidate it, whether openly or subtly. This sounds as obvious as: the PP should not commit suicide. It would be that obvious except for the well-demonstrated fact that the PP throughout its development, has suffered and succumbed to subtle liquidation and sabotage under the guise of "practical" politics and "practical" tactics. The liquidators--the smart ones--carefully and patiently gnaw away at the PP's guts to prove it all a mistake: too soon! too late! sectarian! not flexible enough in coalition and conciliation! too many controversial issues! Although they declare themselves for the continuation of the PP, they insist on "sensible", "realistic" bases. They hem and haw that the full-fledged campaign of the PP, completely independent of the Democratic Party, should wait for '52. They, with an iron hand, attempt to restrict the PP to a mere electoral machine while with a putty lip they agree that the PP should lead the masses every day in every way. Consistently, the liquidators preach healthy principles as fictions as they produce unhealthy facts. By the time they have said for the 1000th time that the PP must continue, they will have destroyed it. The fact is that every day in every way they will attempt to make us more an appendage of the Democratic Party. They will wake the PP only for a local election in order to support a Democrat for Congress in order to strengthen an alleged Democratic Party "progressive" bloc.

These experienced politicians whose main weapon is the quack vitamin of hypocritical lipservice, know the value (to them) of passivity in the rank and file. Their motto is: why argue against the intentions of the rank and file when we can more easily nod our heads solemnly in agreement as we practice the opposite.

There will be a motley corps of scorekeepers who will seek to prove--at least by radar-directed innuendoes--that the election results prove the PP out of the picture as anything but a pressure mechanism. The innuendoes will be offered on all frequencies. Some will suggest that we did not support enough Democrats. Some will say the PP vote

was blockaded in Berlin, Soviet sector. "Americus" (Earl Browder) will raise a patient voice to remind us that we did not heed his warning not to consort with the impotent left bloc but to consort instead with Murray. Even among expelled Communists (who should know better) a Harrison George may "I told you so" that nobody supports the PP; now lay down and die.

Of course, during the campaign, and from the beginning of the PP, these people worked against the PP. Therefore, they have the right to a fair return on their investment, the right to rejoice over all the PP's weaknesses. But they are mistaken on an important point. The support for the PP starts fighting in a convincing way, it will collect this support in a hurry, and a few ghost-written, cliché-ridden words in a Truman speech won't make the difference. The people who are convinced that the PP has been turned down have nothing to offer us anyway, so we can leave them to their rejoicings; but we have the task of building the PP and implementing its program.

The PP rank and filer may discover--if he thinks back to '46 and '47--that he produced the PP over the objections, stalls, and sometimes outright sabotage of those very people who, in too many cases, are the present leaders, official or unofficial, of the PP. From here on, let the PP rank and filer get wise. After he builds an organization, he does not have to yield hook, line, and mostly sinker to dignified "names" who stand in his way at every step--who watch cynically without commitment as he works.

Let's not quake over any Taylors who may debate their departure (or perhaps only leave of absence?) from the PP's problems. Taylor wonders whether he shouldn't be a good old Democrat Senator again--so he can work with the "progressive" Democrats against the reactionary Republicans? But do we believe this fairytale about the Democrats and Republicans; if so, what was all the PP noise about the "Republocrats"? Suppose Taylor decides to run for re-election as a Democrat. Suppose he feels that when the PP is strong enough to again merit his attention, he'll return in time to nominate himself and take his chunk of the prestige. That's all very well for Taylor. Principled problems such as building the PP cannot interfere with the building of a Taylored career. But this does not mean that we have to continue to be tails to Taylors. Let the membership decide who should lead the PP; let's stop handing over the leadership to the first group of lately-come key people. Taylor did not build the PP or encourage it until it smelled sweet. Then he appropriated his hunk of ticket and talked big while he took an electoral whiff--with his Democrat Senate seat in reserve for consolation. At least Taylor wonders about his career openly. More dangerous are those who do not expose themselves but merely manipulate the PP policy for the protection of their careers.

The New York Times of Nov. 25, 1948 reported on the CIO Convention: "Albert J. Fitzgerald, president of the United Electrical Workers, largest leftist-led union in the CIO and chairman of Labor for Wallace in the Presidential campaign, shouted during the debate that he 'didn't give a damn for Russia,' that 'Vishinsky and Molotov have engaged themselves in saber rattling and warmongering' and that if *(insert) was there before the elections and is there now. When the PP

President Truman made a 'sincere effort' to carry out his campaign program he would 'tell the Progressive Party to go to hell' and get on the 'Truman bandwagon.'

The Daily Worker's on the spot reporter, George Morris, preferred to omit most of such disturbing news, but did comment that "The Fitzgerald speech seemed to have some sobering effect on the hoodlum-like hilarity that dominates here..."

Morris is wrong. The flirting of the UE's leadership with the CIO right-wing will hardly have a sobering effect on the hoodlums. It will justifiably enhance their hilarity. The D.W. knows no limit in hypocrisy and doubletalk. The CPUSA leadership with "hoodlum-like hilarity" watches, encourages, and instructs the betrayal of the working class and the PP. Their motto is: maintain unity, any old unity-unity against the interests of the working class.

There are no ifs, buts or maybes; those people who have thrown in their lot with the PP for keeps own the PP. If they say the PP goes on, if they build it, not in words, but in the neighborhoods and the shops of America--then the whims of the Taylors and the Tugwells will count for little.

At the moment there is not much actual PP organization in the US. But if we quickly capitalize on the election activity to form chapters of the PP which go to work locally, and democratically determine how the PP goes to work nationally, we will have passed the first main hurdle since the elections.

The Chicago Conference, just passed, although it was off-the-record gives eloquent indications of great feebleness. Most important, a forthright call for an attack on the Marshall Plan through specifically stated actions was missing. Specific plans for the down-to-earth organization of the PP on a national basis were also absent. The Chicago Conference (which did say "the PP is here to stay") continued in its pre-election rut.

Although, in the words of Simon Gerson (Communist leader in the ALP), the Chicago Conference showed that PP leaders have a "common estimate", "a united program for the future" and "a clear tactical line-- a line developed in no small measure as a result of the elections"-- the Conference was still off-the-record with all the signs of dangerous disagreement. There was no good reason for this conference to have been off-the-record and hidden from the anxious eyes of its own supporters. Gerson unwittingly gives some insight into the off-the-record quality when he states that "It was over the fulfillment of Democratic promises that the Conference heard some warm discussion. Some thought the Democrats would deliver; some that they wouldn't." Obviously, this "warm discussion" was not for plebian ears. The one-and-a-half million firm supporters of the Progressive Party were not given the "favor" of knowing how their representatives at this Conference voted in that "warm discussion" of PP independence from the Democratic Party. In a "warm discussion" on November 2nd, these million-and-a-half had voted that the Democrats would not deliver; it is therefore

understandable that they should not be told which of their leaders insisted in Chicago that the million-and-a-half voted incorrectly--that they disowned the Democratic Party prematurely.

Although Gerson says that "it also emphasized that the fight for peace remains a paramount question" he did not discuss the fact that the fight against the Marshall Plan was notably missing from the publicized Chicago program of the PP.

Knowing the PP's weak attitude so far toward the Democratic Party, one cannot feel secure with the Conference's exposition of "a 48-state party with a tactical policy in each state reflecting the precise relationship of forces in every state of the U.S. demands that the oppressed people of the U.S. separate themselves from the 2-in-1 major parties without delay and build the Progressive Party. "The precise relationship of political forces" in no state justifies the continued support for Democratic Party candidates. Judging by its 1948 performance, especially in New York, California, and Illinois, the above "flexible" orientation is a vision of happy life in the wake of "intelligent" and "sober-minded" Democratic candidates who will use the PP to their good advantage as the occasion warrants.

*(ins.)relationship of political forces in each state." The precise re-

Gerson states: "In elaborating its legislative program, the conference made clear that it was seeking unity on specific issues with those who believed they were voting for progress under the Democratic banner."

We agree that the PP should unite on specific issues with other groups, but not in the style of its '48 elections. It can unite with a Klein in a housing demonstration, with a Celler in a civil rights protest; it cannot elect these candidates to Congress (as in '48) to fight against its own peace program. A justifiable housing date with a Democrat must not mean a shotgun marriage with a Marshall Planner. The danger of so-called unity talk arises when (PP leaders assume that) we have to elect people with whom we have agreed on a few issues to misrepresent us in Congress on most issues, including the most fundamental issue, peace.

Only danger is signalled if Gerson's impression is accurate that "it felt that New York's relatively successful combination of independence and united front offered invaluable practical lessons to Progressives throughout the nation." We have analyzed these "practical" lessons in Part 1. We had better make certain that the "practical lesson" here does not become that other localities should support as many pro-Marshall Plan candidates as New York did.

Gerson is impressed with "Marcantonio's firm insistence" on the duplication of his own district captain system nationally. We are certainly for the most minute attention to local organization but not along the restricted election machine lines of Marcantonio. We need more than captains to guarantee the vote. We need membership organizations that fight for the people every day and--even hold meetings.

Gerson refuses to consider that Taylor may have meant what he said about defection from the PP.

More eloquent than Gerson is Michael Singer in the same Worker of 11-21-48. He writes what is an unofficial open letter from the CPUSA to the lords of Tammany Hall. He reminds Tammany that "Had the Democrats accepted a coalition based on principle (WHAT KIND OF PRINCIPLE WOULD THAT BE? MICHAEL) with the ALP, they would have elected Mullen overwhelmingly and strengthened their chances for 1949." WOW! Is elder brother Singer, harboring no grudges, referring to the suggested deals that the newspapers rumored between Tammany and the ALP. He winks and pleads with Mayor O'Dwyer that "This defection, if not healed by 1949, could doom O'Dwyer's hopes for reelection." We say WOW again. Singer, singing for the N.C. of the CPUSA, is working hard at healing this unfortunate breach between certain ALP and CPUSA whips and the Tammany boys. Singer, in a hopeful key, cajoles (as William Weinstone once told the PR Club we had to do with Democratic leaders): "The ALP ruined Tammany's hopes for a Surrogate and Marc's reelection to Congress against a Tammany-GOP coalition convinced key sections of the Democratic machine in New York County that conciliation is the better part of valor." WOW! The CPUSA via the Worker advises the Tammany machine to work with the PP or we won't reinflct dime-a-ride O'Dwyer on the working class of this city. Comrade Singer certainly demonstrates "vanguard" guts in publicly identifying himself and his editorial superiors with such a deal.

Suddenly, Singer becomes prophetic and ecstatic: "City Hall observers expect a series of rapprochement proposals by Tammany toward the ALP." A hint to the wise from Singer is sufficient. Too many such hints and the PP will be an initial on a tombstone.

Such is the atmosphere of the Chicago Conference. The Chicago Conference has not helped the PP. At least it has testified to the good instincts of its members by keeping the proceedings secret as long as possible.

The PP should inaugurate recruiting campaigns in every union, every mass organization, and in every neighborhood in the U.S. It should build a conscious membership organization--which we definitely don't have now. The PP should be the active and visible civil rights organization, the tenants-consumers council, and most of all, the peace organization of all peace-loving people. The oppressed of the U.S. should be able to turn to the PP in any community on any issue for support and defense. This is a large bill to fill, but the PP can attempt to fill no less a bill if it is to grow.

2-STEER THE PP CLEAR OF THE REACTIONARY "2ND 3RD PARTY". This point is connected in an important way with the first. There is one liquidation threat, worse than all the rest--the fake "2nd 3rd Party", designed to retract the PP into the Democratic Party, which the high leaders of labor have always on the griddle. Heretofore, as we have pointed out in previous issues, the "2nd 3rd Party" of the fake labor leaders, the fake Socialists and the Trotskyites has awakened and wriggled in a politically obscene way at every sign of the PP's growth. It has settled back to wait at every sign of collapse in the PP. In the Sept. issue of Turning Point, we said in this connection:

"Reuther's farcical maneuver, his promise of a third party after Truman is elected, only reflects the terrific vote that Wallace has already cornered in the UAW. We think a very illuminating point is made by the tactics of the Reuther-Dubinsky-Trotskyite gang on the third party. In 1946, during the early boom for a third party when many CIO councils and strong unions were going on record for the third party, the phony Reuther-Dubinsky-Trotskyite third party idea was launched as a counter-offensive. The idea was that since the workers were spontaneously moving towards a third party and since there was no conscious guidance given to this by the CP, which was suicidally sabotaging all third party talk in its allegiance to Truman at that time, the Reuther gang could capture the show, control it and turn it towards the Democratic Party. However, when the effective sabotage of the CPUSA leadership had dribbled out the third party boom, the Reuther gang closed up shop; their third party was no longer needed. This is fortunately, where the Reuther gang pulled a major error. It did not understand that the third party issue had to re-emerge. When, in 1947, the third party issue did re-emerge with new vigor, the Reuther forces considered it a dead duck and did not hasten to remove their third party from the moth balls where it had carefully been stored. This was a continuation of the Reuther error. However, once they saw that the P.P. was in the running and very strong, they belatedly and sheepishly had to get into the picture. It was too late to start a party, so the best Reuther could offer--lamely--was the promise of a third party after the elections. Even Reuther's self-exposing finagling against the P.P. tends to strengthen the UAW rank-and-file support for the P.P.

"In other words, the Reuther gang has acted as an indirect barometer of the support of American labor for a third party. This is logical because it is Reuther's function to sell out the labor movement from within. We can expect that after the elections, the Reuther third party gag will attempt to castrate the P.P. with a deal. Our job is to prevent this; our job is not to prophesy and damn the third party."

The potentialities of the PP late in the '48 campaign so worried the labor leaders of the Democratic Party that even the Greens were recruited to the strange notion of a new third party immediately after the elections. Luckily, again they made a mistake (because they are basically far removed from the workers they lead.) They misinterpreted the election results to mean the impotence of the PP and passed the word that the Reuther third party could relax. But let us not think for an unguarded minute that Reuther and Co. is not continually watching. At the first show of PP activity, it will again pop out the "2nd 3rd Party". Its mission is one of two alternatives. Confronted by a strong PP, it will attempt a unification move swallowing up the PP and liquidating the left as it goes. In that case, the PP will have been made into a tool of the Democratic Party by the Social-Democratic-Trotskyite gang. The talent scouts of the fake labor independence move will have abducted the PP back to Harry's harem. This intention is not as weak as it might seem because there are in the PP, and definitely in its left section also, the glowing idea that this suicide would be a wonderful broad unity.

If this "preferable" procedure should fail, the Reuther group will

compete with the PP, attempt to redbait it into a suicidal retreat (which the American labor movement has shown it is capable of), confuse the people with two third labor parties and basically act as a divider of the progressive force in the U.S. If we are on the alert, understand the desperation of their methods, and resist the seduction of nondescript unity moves with fakers, their own schemes will backfire and help to accelerate the departure of the labor movement from the major parties. The only threat from the fake 3rd party that should cause worry among us is the weakness in our own--the tendency to take the course of least resistance and become respectable in an alliance with Dubinsky, Reuther, Green, etc. This idea of any old unity with powerful people is not hypothetical. It has--carefully, to be sure--raised its ugly head already--before the elections. We should hark back to the old legend of Ulysses and the Sirens. As ships passed anywhere near the rocky coast, sirens would sing so beautifully, that the sailors could not resist approaching, and would destroy their ships and themselves on the rocks. Ulysses, knowing that he too might be unable to resist, tied himself to the mast and stuffed cotton in his mates' ears as the ship approached the rocky coast. And, although he struggled to free himself and rush to the sirens, he could not and survived.

We know that in the PP we have such sailors who also cannot resist the seductive concepts of corrupt unity and who, if they get the chance, will smash the PP on Reuther's rocks. But we have a very special mast and strong rope (and we don't need the cotton). Our mast and rope are our opposition to the Marshall Plan. If we hold to this part of our program--better than we have in the past--we can get by all the rocks waiting for us. And this leads to our third and most important point.

3-SMASH THE MARSHALL PLAN. The essential characteristic of the PP is that it is the peace party, and a peace party in the U.S. in '48 is nothing if it does not actively fight to smash the Marshall Plan and all variations of U.S. war plans. It is also, incidentally, our inoculation against ending up in bad company, because if we stick to our anti-Marshall Plan fight, the pro-Marshall Planners won't dare unite with us.

The determining, although not exclusive, reason for existence of the PP is the fight against the Marshall Plan. It cannot be less than that or it is indistinguishable today from all the fake progressive feints of reaction in the U.S. We should have learned that already from the '48 campaign in which we watered down our strongest point by avoiding it, by Trumanizing our peace speeches. From here on, the PP cannot defeat such moderate slogans for a Yankee Stadium Rally as "All out for Peace" in favor of "Yankee Doodle Rally." Such non-controversial, allegedly red-baiting preventatives as "Yankee Doodle Rally" and all other shamefaced, afternoon tea illusions that the PP is only a bit left of the Democratic Party will only continue to emasculate the PP.

The American people desperately need a real weapon for peace. They can be expected to turn to a PP that fights for peace without the powder-puff gloves that our candidates threw around in the elections. This outspoken popular front weapon for peace cannot be usurped by a Truman

and a whole bevy of ghost writers, because they cannot afford to fight the Marshall Plan. This is the insurance that the PP will get the support of the oppressed people in the U.S.--as soon as it proves itself worthy of support.

More than the American people look hopefully to the PP; the whole world's oppressed wait impatiently for the PP to act decisively in the defense of all democratic struggles. Are the supporters of the PP ready to advance from a mild, verbal attack on the MP to an active fight against it--with no holds barred? Let's face the main task bluntly. Isn't it our duty to prevent American weapons from bolstering fascist Chiang against the Chinese people; to sabotage aid to the Greek fascists and collect aid for the Greek guerrillas; to help Spanish democracy? Face an eloquent example of our unconvincing attitude in the '48 elections. The PP was really prominent in aiding Israel's fight by continually pounding away at the issue--money, rallies, boycotts. But can anyone deny that there was a studied evasion of any such all-out campaigns on behalf of Greece, China, Spain, etc. Did we do anything substantial to answer the SOS of the striking French miners? The PP does not have a papal dispensation to serve the "unrespectable" causes of peace (Greece, China, Spain) only with magpie lips and crocodile eyes while it becomes all-out militant in the respectable causes (Israel). What the PP did in the fight to help Israel was correct, but it should have done the same for other oppressed peoples fighting decisive world battles. As we build the PP now let us do it through real help to China, Israel, and Greece, to all the workers all over the world who have made clear their support for the PP. Then, the democratic forces of the world will really consider the PP the American peace army.

There were many times when the PP did a good job of exposing red-baiting attacks on it, but there were also times when it retreated, when it evaded the issue and hedged. The supporters of the PP know that the S.U. has fought for peace, that it has no interest in war. They know that the S.U. has helped the cause of peace while the U.S. state dept. has helped the cause of war. Therefore, let the PP be blunt on this point. Let it support the position of the S.U. for peace as it fights the war position of our bipartisan state dept. Otherwise we might as well retire to a wing of Truman's amorphous peace drive factory. We won't smash war plans by fancy ballet footwork in answer to every question on the S.U.

Let us incur the wrath of our opposition by encouraging American workers to use the stoppage, the political strike, the boycott, in helping defeat the war plans. Defeating the Marshall Plan is not merely an electoral-congressional matter; it is actual help to the victims and opponents of the Marshall Plan. Let's stop pleading with the powers that be to recognize their "mandates". Let's start forcing them to come across. Let's free our vision from the restrictions of election campaigns. If we act militantly every day we go far beyond election campaigns--and we, incidentally, insure victory during election campaigns. The most valuable election machine we have is the year around confidence and support of the American people.

One important fact hovers over all this. Certainly, we as Communists, feel that the best insurance for a strong, correct PP is a real CP in the U.S. We don't consider the CPUSA that, but we know that the rank and file of the CPUSA, despite their leaders, want what we want. The best that could happen for the peace of the world is that the U. S. should get in 1949 a real CP and we consider that the most important job because it will strengthen the whole progressive movement in the U. S. But the American people, in the organization of the PP and in their waves of powerful strikes, have proven that there is an important spontaneous movement for progress in the U. S. that waits for no leaders. Therefore, it is also the responsibility of all Communists to help build the Progressive Party as they fight for a real CP.

There are many obstacles facing the PP in the U. S., but we feel that an adherence to these three points will constitute solid ground for the PP to grow on and demolish all obstacles.

We must build in the U. S. a Progressive Party which is the hope of the whole world for peace through the smashing of the Marshall Plan, the Truman Doctrine and all disguised war plans. If the Progressive Party adopts this perspective, it will become convincing and powerful.

This is a sample copy...

Because of our very limited funds, we will be unable to mail other material to you. However, on your request, we will send you past and future issues of TP. These will offer some information on the attitude and efforts of members of the CPUSA who, during the past 2 years, have been expelled for fighting against the CPUSA leadership's betrayal both of the American working class and of the other Communist Parties of the world. TP bases itself on the Declaration of the Communist Information Bureau and works towards the organization of a real Communist Party in the U.S. which would affiliate to such a Communist Information Bureau.

Available: (Oct.) "The Futile Maneuvers of Tito and the World Vanguard Role of the CPSU(B)"; (Sept.) "The Crisis in Harrison George & Co.", dealing with the problems of attitude and policy among expelled members of the CPUSA; (Aug.) "Save the NMU"; (July Supplement) "Letter to the Communist Information Bureau--Regarding the Harmful Effects of Comrade Bering's Article"; (July) "Declaration of Turning Point"--aims, perspective, and attitude for American Communists in the fight for a real Communist Party in the USA; back issues of SPARK and FORE 'N' AFT; the original "SOS to ALL Communists from the PR Club, CP" the issuing of which caused the expulsion in Oct. 1946 of the PR Club, CP in the Bronx. TP distributes "For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy", (10¢), the organ of the Communist Information Bureau, and the Soviet magazine, "New Times" (15¢), published by the newspaper Trud in Moscow.

We will appreciate your contributions and new names for sample copies. We urge you to write us your comments, criticisms and news.

IN THE NEXT ISSUE: The CPUSA Throws in the Sponge--at the CIO Convention, in the UOPWA Taft-Hartley-signing festivities, in the AYD-YCL reincarnation, and the CCNY "Oust Knickerbocker-Davis" fizzle.
