

for

PEACE - DEMOCRACY -- SOCIALISM

Vol. II, No. 6 November 1949Published by: P.R. Club, Communist Party (Expelled)Editors: Ralph Burt, Ellwood Griest, Louis Julia, and Martha SamuelTURNING POINT P.O. Box 24, Times Square Station, New York 18, N.Y.Newsstand: S.W. corner of 42nd St. and Avenue of the Americas.

---

In this issue:

POSTCARDS AND WIRES ARE NOT ENOUGH--SMASH THE SMITH ACT

\*\*\*

FRANCIS FRANKLIN TURNS RAT

\*\*\*

## FOSTER'S NEW ROUTE TO SOCIALISM

- I Introduction: Social Democracy's New Form
- II Promotional Technique of Foster's Revisionism
  - 1. Beware of Dogma!--Rubberized Marxism
  - 2. Action as (Idealist) Theory Come Alive
  - 3. No Blueprints!--High Tariff on Imported Models

---

In the Dec. issue:

- II Promotional Technique of Foster's Revisionism (cont'd)
  - 4. Expurgated Version of the Russian Revolution
  - 5. Surgical Quoting and Anesthetic Paraphrase
  - 6. Foster Impresses Wall St. and Bucharest at One Fell Swoop
  - 7. Verboten!--Discarded Literature
  - 8. Recovery Despite Duclos
- III Foster's New Route to Socialism
  - 1. Evolutionary Socialism through "Natural Impulse"
  - 2. Peaceful Revolution through "Democratic Reaction"
  - 3. Force and Violence against the Classics
  - 4. American Exceptionalism--Foster's Law of Unequals
  - 5. Historical Courtesy--Taking One's Socialism Last
  - 6. "Purely Educational"--and Optional
- IV Outrages and Conclusions

\*\*\*

BROWDER BREAKS INTO THE ACT

\*\*\*

Articles on ELECTIONS and GIO CONVENTION

## POSTCARDS AND WIRES ARE NOT ENOUGH--SMASH THE SMITH ACT

American capitalists are ungrateful. They have refused to be broadminded and decent (as Foster might say) in "collective bargaining" with the leadership of the CPUSA. The 12 (with charming inter-class generosity) consigned Marxism-Leninism to antiquity and Socialism to eternity, and still they were convicted. This is consistent with other unappreciated concessions made by the 12 to the bourgeoisie (CIO red-baiting resolution, vote against the Soviet veto, etc. etc.). The leadership of the American bourgeoisie is, understandably, not in the habit of cringing before its cringing opposition. So--Foster summarized the CPUSA's concessions to our enemies, and then Medina summarized. Foster was an unorthodox Marxist; Medina was an orthodox capitalist. Now, what new concessions can Foster develop in attempting to reverse the convictions?

The Foley Square Trial is called the first step towards Fascism in the U.S. More accurately, it is the last step. If this is true, shouldn't American Communists and progressives decide that they have little to lose and a lot to gain by starting a militant fight now.

How can we reverse the Foley Square convictions, defend the legality of the CPUSA, and defeat American Fascism? The Daily Worker, still in brazen retreat, continues to counsel wires, postcards, and protest via a vote for Davis. Fine--but no such delicacies, on which the American Communists have dissipated their guts so long, can free the CP leaders and their lawyers, defend the legality of the CP and defeat fascism.

Nor will the CPUSA's public announcement that it will not go underground prove anything but its feeble habit of always reassuring its masters of its respectability.

1. When a CP goes underground (or prepares to go underground), it doesn't make public announcements.
2. A CP should never promise anyone that it won't go underground.
3. If the CP had any responsibility, it would have long ago made preparations for underground work--without announcements. Certainly, at this point, Communists in America should not continue to disdain Lenin's principle of the combination of legal and illegal work. They should fight to keep the CPUSA legal (without renouncing Marxism!), but at the same time, they should build an illegal apparatus--or one of these days there may be nothing left but "Al's selections" and Alan Max's daily pun.

The leaders of the CPUSA, in or out of jail, won't change; their immediate subordinates won't change. The CPUSA leadership will not lead a real fight for democracy. But the rank and file Communist can--if he faces certain things squarely, if he is willing to go beyond the business-as-usual attitude of wires, postcards, and abstract impotent protests. Until now, the comrades have not accepted such methods as we propose. They have accepted the CP characterization of these as adventurist. Now, if Communists still consider these methods adventurist, then they refuse in fact to consider the freeing of the CP leaders and the lawyers or the defeat of Fascism possible.

Wall Street knows that we are quite capable of the militancy of postcards and wires. Even dignified delegations of respectable persons are not enough. Every Communist and every progressive in America must organize mass action in his union, in the Progressive Party, in every organization to which he belongs. He should organize militant demonstrations, parades, picket lines, and, as soon as possible, protest strikes--yes political protest strikes. Can the D.W. answer this with the sweet epithets of adventurism again. And what if the 12 counsel you not to defend them in such an unAmerican way. Suppose Foster reminds you to meet the violence of the

bourgeoisie with "a democratic reaction." Remember that you're defending more than the 12--that their advice has never worked.

Despite other difficult problems, the left bloc of 11 unions and every progressive unionist must stage the biggest knock-down fight in the history of the labor movement for the defense of the legality of the CP. It is true, that the left-wing has enough troubles on its hands. But, the truth is that at this time there is no greater and more immediate danger than the outlawing of the Party via the Supreme Court's support for the Foley Square convictions. The capitalist class has made it quite clear that if the Supreme Court does not reverse Foley Square, does not declare the Smith Act unconstitutional, then the CPUSA is outlawed. It has also insisted that there be no delay on the appeal. There can be little doubt that unless the CP wakes up fast, the Supreme Court will uphold the Smith Act, and then we will have gone past the last step to fascism.

Some Communists really believe that the overwhelming majority of the American working class would not respond to militant calls for organization in defense of the 11, of the CP, and in defense of American Democracy. Such people still cannot believe the fact of Peckskill. The American working class has suffered many losses, but it is still capable of mass action--if it gets the chance. Will its leaders give it the chance? And if not, let it go ahead on its own. What mistake, what over-confidence could be worse than inability to act now before the government finishes the job on us.

This case is clear cut: democracy or fascism. Medina made it very clear in also arresting the defense counsel. How many American workers need fall for any red-baiting here if we bring the merest explanation to them. The main explanation needed is simply that we have the power to stop this if we choose. We have the power to force the Supreme Court to reverse the decision of Foley Square.

What American is so prepared for fascism that he can ignore this case as his last chance under democracy. Who can refuse to recognize the upholding of the Smith Act as the end of his legal democratic operation?

Our slogan should be simple and exactly to the point: SMASH THE SMITH ACT. We should picket our American palaces of justice from the White House on down with 24 hour picket rotations. Every city and every neighborhood should have perpetual parades on a rotation basis from early morning to late at night by torchlight, warning the American people to free themselves from the Folly of Foley Square. Political stoppages, noon hour demonstrations, and in more organized spots, 24 hour strikes should be organized against the Smith Act. The Bill of Rights versus the Smith Act should face each other on placards and banners all over the U.S.

Suppose, if you're a Communist, that your respected leaders tell you that you will prejudice their case by becoming unruly. Will you then be disciplined and subside? Or will you face the facts and state, "Dear Comrade, despite your advice, I must break discipline and really defend you in order to defend American democracy." All the cringing and retreat of American Communists has been to no avail. Therefore, we must try fighting. Every time a Quinn or a Mundt or a Lehman speaks out for conviction and fascism, we must picket their places of operation, the Democratic headquarters, the Republican headquarters, places of business and in certain cases homes. Let's make it hot for fascism.

The CPUSA's lesser evil theory won't help. The CP leadership has handed under-the-table support to Lehman in the senatorial race. It has committed the crime of

not running a candidate against Dulles AND LEHMAN--and no excuses erase this development of the 1946 open backing of Lehman. (We were expelled in 1946 for exposing--- among other things--the CP's support for Lehman, Mead, etc.) Now the D.W. again hints to its readers to vote for Lehman. (Fortunately, Marcantonio has more openly condemned both Lehman and Dulles.) In the D.W. (of Nov. 2,3,4) we are told "To Beat Dulles Bigotry", "to Unite Against Dulles Bigotry" (headlines), etc. The D.W. finds Lehman correctly doing this 'n that. While Dulles is Fascism, it thinks Lehman is simply not the best man to fight Dulles effectively. This meager slap on the wrist is all the D.W. metes out to Lehman although "Dulles' program for reviving the Nazis is exactly the same foreign policy to which he, O'Dwyer, as well as Morris are all pledged." But the D.W., quoting William Norman repeatedly, states: "We share with these voters (anti-Dulles voters!) their concern, their hatred of the bigotry and the pro-fascist program of Dulles." Therefore, "it is vitally important for all the anti-Dulles voters to unite behind the Marcantonio-Davis ticket" against Dulles!

The D.W. does not say: don't vote for Lehman either. It offers a psychological coalition: we don't think Lehman is so good, but Dulles is very bad, so let us all (all pro-Lehman, anti-Dulles voters) beat Dulles. How? By electing Marc and Ben--and Lehman. (We will deal with the facts of this campaign in our next issue.)

Now all the Democrats and Republicans supported by the CP and the ALP in recent elections are hurrahing Medina. And still we support the Caddys in this election. In the Compass of Nov. 4, 1949, Caddy parries McDonald's criticism of his ALP support by citing McDonald's welcome of the same ALP support in 1945. As much as to say: "Why should you suppose I'll justify it any more than you did." In line with such cynicism, Tom O'Hara, political reporter of the Herald-Tribune, commenting (Sept. 21, 1949) on the ALP's endorsement of Caddy and Justice Francis X. Giacomone (for Supreme Court), wrote: "Practical politicians in the (Republican) party said that both men felt forced to obtain some aid to buck the strong Democratic machine in Brooklyn, figuring to win an additional 80,000 to 100,000 votes on the ALP line without compromising their Republicanism." (TP's emphasis)

The problem of defending the 16 and fighting fascism is one on which all freedom loving people must unite regardless of ideas about the conduct of the CPUSA. Whereas we think that the CP leaders are responsible for the present sad state of the CP and the American progressive movement, this doesn't alter the fact that we have to defend our democracy.

A victory in this fight will not be simply one against the Smith Act. With it will go the Feinberg Acts and the Loyalty oaths in general. Our slogan should not be a defensive one: The CP leaders and lawyers are innocent. Very few Americans are "innocent" in the bloodshot eyes of the Smith Act. The slogan behind which we should rally Americans is: SMASH THE SMITH ACT! Can we allow American democracy and American Socialism to be judged by the Smith Act? Americans have the right to work for Socialism, they have the right to prepare Americans for the fight for Socialism, they have the right to teach Americans the damn simple truth that they will have to fight with force and violence against the bourgeoisie in order to get socialism. We do not believe simply in the right to be liberal bourgeois Socialists; we believe in the right to be Marxist-Leninists who prepare the workers for the forcible overthrow of the capitalist system as soon as possible.

Dimitroff told us that the best way to fight fascism was before it took power. Fascism is taking over in the U.S. now. The smashing of the Smith Act could be the beginning of a great turning of the tables.

## FOSTER'S NEW ROUTE TO SOCIALISM

### I- Introduction: Social Democracy's New Form

From Kautsky to Foster, the ideological foundation of Social Democracy has been revisionism: the perversion of Marxism through repudiation of the fundamental ideas of Marxism--in the name of Marxism. Though, by its very function, revisionism parades as Marxism, it has been forced--more and more in recent history--to do so in open opposition to the recognized Communist movement. So badly was it exposed by Leninism that revisionist Social Democracy became that strange but understandable pillar of the bourgeoisie: "Marxist" anti-Communism. In this capacity, Social Democracy adequately served the bourgeoisie during the period when Socialism was unproven, during the period when the first Socialist state was fighting for its life, and even during the period when the S.U. was firmly established but still encircled by a capitalist world.

Today, the world looks different to the bourgeoisie--and to its ideological servants: the strongest power in the world is the Soviet Union; that part of continental Europe which is not already Socialist will be soon; Communists have taken over the heart of Asia--China; and a good part of the rest of the world is seething with revolt. Forcibly removed from this large Communist arena, anti-Communist Social Democracy lost its former potency and was relegated to the post of phraseologist for the bourgeoisie's attacks on the Communist movement proper. In other words, Marxism-Leninism has been able, over a period of time, to force revisionist and opportunist Social Democracy into the open where it stands exposed as reactionary.

But--this removal of Social Democracy from the Communist movement proper also means the inevitability of its reappearance in new form. The main factor in determining its new form is that it has to operate in a world going Socialist. If it wishes to operate insidiously within the Communist movement, it cannot--in its most effective and shrewd form--be anti-Soviet, anti-Stalin, anti-Cominform, etc. It must, of necessity, develop new subtlety and operate as pro-Communist.

Today, in the anti-Communist center of the world, the leadership of the CPUSA has bravely volunteered in the service of Social Democracy by carrying forward this new and most dangerous form of Social Democracy. Reincarnated Kautskyites--very wisely--do not go by the name of Social Democrat, Socialist, or even "CPUSA, 2nd International". Calling itself Communist, offering careful lip-allegiance to the S.U., the Communist Information Bureau, and Marxism-Leninism, attacking revisionism as it goes, the CPUSA leadership has adopted the exact tenets of revisionism and opportunism. The content is old: the form is new. The content is determined by the needs of world capitalism; the form is determined by the new conditions of powerful world Socialism.

For a time, the CPUSA leadership betrayed its opportunism and revisionism through its practice more openly than through its theory. The National Committee, after the CPA excursion, considered it necessary to be careful in what it said or wrote. The N. C. felt it would be wise to have Political Affairs read well for the overseas Parties. But all this was no damper on what was done by the CPUSA. By now, however, the destruction in the revolutionary and working class movements (resulting from the practice of the CPUSA's opportunism) has laid such a solid basis for further adventures that the CPUSA leaders have brazenly reverted to the classic formulations of the Kautskys. They have injected revisionism more deeply into the American revolutionary movement than Browder ever had.

Of what does this now open CPUSA Social Democracy consist? What classic formulations of revisionism has it openly embraced? Turning Point has traced this process in many fields. But nowhere do we find a more convincing summary of the main theoretical tenets of CPUSA Social Democracy than in two current documents of William Z. Foster: his first rejected deposition in the Foley Square Trial (published in pamphlet form by the CPUSA as "In Defense of the Communist Party and the Indicted Leaders") and his second deposition taken by special commissioner during the period July 13-Aug. 3 (published in The Worker of 9/25/49 as "Foster Testifies").

Our main purpose in this article is not to attempt to refute conclusively the individual outrages of Foster's "impositions" on Marxism, (we have done that in other issues) but rather to distil the essence of the CPUSA leadership's revisionism as it shows in the two depositions.

Part I has attempted to identify the new form of CPUSA revisionism. Part II analyzes the various techniques whereby Foster's new route (away from Socialism) is paved in order to smooth out the bumps and shocks necessarily resulting from the sacrifice of revolutionary Socialism to "orderly social progress". Part III states in some logical sequence what in Foster occurs confusingly as rambling in the realm of ethics, cringing in the realm of respectability, and scrambling toward the realm of Americanism. Part IV adds a few noteworthy incidents of Foley Square fantasy in order to round out the depraved atmosphere of revisionism, and indicates the indivisibility of two struggles in America today: the struggle against Social Democratic opportunism and revisionism within the revolutionary movement, and the struggle against war and fascism on the part of the progressive movement generally.

The question might be raised: just how accurate is TP in attempting to judge CPUSA revisionism on the basis of Foster's contributions to the Foley Square Trial? On this matter we yield the floor to Eugene Dennis, that gentleman who has so fearlessly plunged himself and his brethren into the fight against "anarchist", "conspiratorial", "leftist", "adventurist", and "DISORDERLY" social change:

"Foster's deposition is the most authoritative statement of our Communist Party's position on how to prevent the rise of fascism in the United States, and on our policies for promoting orderly social progress." (Our emphasis. Daily Worker October 13, 1949)

## II- Promotional Technique of Foster's Revisionism

The problem confronting Foster in his promotion of revisionism is the redirection of the fight for Socialism from the old route of Marxism-Leninism to the "new route" of Foster, Dennis, & Co. without arousing too much opposition to the National Committee's guides, roadmaps, and roadmarkers. Foster knows that it would not be advisable for him to repudiate Marxism-Leninism, that he must only "modify", "specifically apply", and "extend" Marxism-Leninism--with the total effect, however, of repudiation.

### 1. Beware of Dogma!--Rubberized Marxism

Part of the "props" of any reviser who is attempting to warn us off the scientific road of Marxism and onto detours leading to "safer" roads is the DOGMA WARNING. We are warned that the hard rock of "orthodox" Marxism is apt to crack our prized posteriors--if we should fall--whereas if we only detour a bit to Foster's new road, we can slip and fall and flounder about generally on flexible, rubberized foundations without critical consequences.

True--Marxism-Leninism is "no dogma but a guide to action". Sincere Communists who do not understand this truth are apt to become mechanical in their thinking and thereby commit mistakes which harm the cause of Socialism. But--the harm caused by mechanical mistakes in the history of Marxism-Leninism is infinitesimal when compared with the deliberate misuse of the dogma warning in order to water down Marxism-Leninism. The inflexible Communist is apt to react slowly to specific conditions. He is apt to sectarianize the Communist movement by unconsciously ignoring developments about him. But there is nothing vicious and deliberate here; there is basically a lack of understanding of Marxism which can be corrected. So much cannot be said for the Kautskys, the Browders, and the Fosters who are essentially plagued and frightened not by an alleged dogmatic principle of Marxism--but by an "unrespectable" one. Their errors are deliberate (and in their bourgeois calculations hardly errors) and the consequences are great.

Within our own recent history, Browder should have engraved in our vigilance the confusionist technique behind the dogma warnings. The CPUSA was liquidated into the CPA under the banner of BEWARE OF DOGMA. The CPUSA has worked so long on unprincipled hop-skip-jump eclecticism that even a mechanical and "dogmatic" adherence to Marxist-Leninist literature would be an improvement.

Marxism-Leninism is no dogma, but it does not follow that any old idea can be embraced for the cowardly purpose of proving the revolutionary movement respectable in the eyes of the bourgeoisie. There are certain basic ideas which cannot be removed without removing Marxism-Leninism itself. These are exactly the ideas that Foster has removed: the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the state, revolution, and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

Foster ingenuously (not ingeniously!) states that Marxism-Leninism is an alive science, that "much new Communist theory is developing" (Deposition I) True-but! The new, true Marxist-Leninist ideas are those which implement the basic ideas of Marxism-Leninism and not those which neutralize them on the basis of American exceptionalism.

## 2. Action as (Idealist) Theory Come Alive

The CPUSA leadership is embarrassed by Marxist-Leninist theory. In attempting to free itself from the stigma of Marxism-Leninism, it pleads with the prosecution (via Foster) to judge it fairly: "It would be a mockery of justice not to consider the actual practice of our Party." (Deposition I) It is in this connection that Foster turns metaphysician with his theory of "action as theory come alive".

This theory is indispensable to Foster because he would have the bourgeoisie judge the CPUSA by its respectable and impotent deeds and not by its scurrilous theory. To Foster, Marxism-Leninism is a bit of "bad blood" with which the CPUSA was cursed in birth, but he sees no reason for not fighting free of the curse.

Foster bravely tackles a necessary adjustment. McGohey, Medina, and McGrath can find nothing for the bourgeoisie to prosecute in the practice of the CPUSA. McGohey, Medina, and McGrath, however, see plenty to prosecute in Marxism-Leninism. Foster logically reasons, therefore, that the CPUSA leadership would prefer to be judged (fairly!) by its practice and not by Marxism-Leninism. (Inherent in this reasoning is the materialist observation--one of Foster's few--that there is little connection between Marxism-Leninism and the practice of the CPUSA.) The problem for Foster is of course how to indicate all this subtly without committing the foolish error of

openly rejecting Marxism-Leninism. The problem is solved ably but dishonestly in the idealist concept: action is theory come alive. More clearly: the action of the CPUSA represents its theory; Marxism-Leninism does not. To round out the picture, we should add that the action of the CPUSA does represent its actual theories of revisionism, but not its nominal ones of Marxism-Leninism.

Communist Parties should be judged by their practice as well as by their theory. Practice proves whether a CP is competently applying its valuable theories to the problems it faces. But in this respect, a CP is attempting to measure up to its wonderful theory and is not, in Foster fashion, attempting to evade the awful obligations of its Marxist-Leninist theory by bleating: please judge us by our deeds and not by our theory. Foster's basic implication in all this is simply: look at our practice where you will find the theories we really go by and not merely the ones we have to lip-serve. When a real CP judges its deeds, it attempts to continually elevate its practice to the level of its theory; Foster merely tries to pull Marxism-Leninism down to the level of CPUSA opportunist practice.

What a flagrant contradiction of dialectical materialism is Foster's concept of action as theory come alive! Of course, it expresses an incomplete truth. Because theory is a reflection of action (i.e. a synthesis of experience), action also becomes a reflection of theory. That is why theory is so highly regarded in the Communist movement. But the all important Marxist approach remains that experience takes precedence over theory (matter prior to mind). Therefore, theory cannot be a priori or whimsically eclectic. The function of Marxist-Leninist theory is to plan for the proletarian revolution on the basis of historical facts and not to evade the proletarian revolution on the basis of Foster's hysterical fancies.

Not only has Foster boldly demolished Lenin's "Materialism and Emperio-Criticism" and Engels' "Anti-Duhring" (and consequently all of Marxism-Leninism) without mentioning the victims of his demolition; he has gone much further. He has supported himself with exactly that fragment of a quote from Stalin's "Foundations of Leninism" which refutes his concept most clearly: "Revolutionary theory is a synthesis of the experience of the working class movement throughout all lands...the generalized experience." Against this, Foster has the gall to state in the same paragraph: "Action is theory come alive".

Even an idiot could gather from the Stalin quote that theory does not give birth to action but rather that theory is action synthesized. Quite a difference. This brings up a peculiar technique of the CPUSA leadership. The Fosters and the Dennises have made quite a habit of brazenly basing their revisionism on references to nothing less than Marxist exposes of revisionism. What is the theory behind this trick? Knowing how low the level of Marxist education is in the CPUSA, the leadership perpetrates a great lie and hopes for success on the basis that it "sounds good". "Foundations of Leninism", "State and Revolution", the "Communist Manifesto", etc., etc. are all referred to in the process of proving the "peaceful institution of Socialism"! How good such a trick can sound depends on a very material fact: how low is the level of Marxist understanding in the CPUSA? At least this much is obvious: many have forgotten the Marxism they once knew; many never learned any Marxism--especially recruits since the National Committee Browderhood liquidated the CPUSA into the CPA; many who knew enough to fight for Marxist principles have been expelled; and most of the rest who might know that the founder of Marxism was not Karl Kautsky and who are still in the CP, have been beaten into a sullen stupor.



Foster, without shame, explains why his leadership wants to be judged only by its action: "The Communist Party of the United States is an independent organization, with no organic connections with the Communist Parties of other countries. Our Party is not bound by programs, strategy, and tactics as enunciated and applied by other Communist Parties." (Deposition I)

In leaving this detour which Foster has constructed in order to bypass the responsibilities of Marxist theory on his road away from Socialism, we must at least touch on a famous example in order to put the "true-but" quality of Foster's concept into perspective. The Russian Revolution was certainly the translation of certain theories into action. It was theory come alive. True. But--where did its theories come from? Didn't Marx and Engels draw from the experiences of the Paris Commune? The whole revolution in philosophy produced by Marx and Engels insists on the priority of matter--of experience. The action of the CPUSA leadership is not theory come alive, but fear and respectability come alive. Insofar as it can be considered theory come alive, it is an eloquent example of IDEALIST theory come alive.

/\* omission: the necessity for smashing the state machine/  
3. No Blueprints!--High Tariff on Imported Models

Probably Foster's most hysterical injunction to get off the orthodox road to Socialism is "NO BLUEPRINTS". So completely has Foster littered the road to Socialism with warnings against "blueprints", "plans", and "models" that--on purely legal grounds--McGohey could have prosecuted the CPUSA leadership for impeding traffic. (The reader is invited to test for exaggeration by witnessing the phenomenon of FOSTER VERSUS BLUEPRINTS AD INFINITUM on the following pages--and we mention relatively few cases--of the first deposition: 5,9,10,17,18,19,94,95. These are direct references. Indirect references will be found in virtually every paragraph of both depositions.)

Essentially, this detour has been constructed by the CPUSA leadership for the purpose of a flank attack on the international significance of the Russian Revolution. Since all of Foster's contributions are refuted by the experiences of other CP's and mainly by the Russian Revolution, Foster--logically for his purposes--must develop an allergy to foreign models.

It should be axiomatic for Communists that we work on the basis of generalized experience. Can any Communist in his right mind deny that generalized experience might include such excellent examples of the correct and successful application of Marxism-Leninism to life that the examples become valuable as models. All McGoheys, Medinas, and McGraths aside, Mr. Foster, what's wrong with using the Russian Revolution, led by the genius of Lenin, as a model? We didn't say blueprint; mechanical blueprints as raised in this problem are a diversion. Model is a pretty clear word. So is plan. Foster rejects all three words.

Foster's belaboring of the bogey he has set up (or happily usurped from McGohey) is simply an example of cringing before the bourgeoisie. Foster's point is that his evolutionary Socialism (Made in U.S.A.) has nothing in common with foreign models of revolutionary Socialism. This we cannot contest.

In the interests of accuracy, we have to admit that Foster concedes certain uses to Marxism-Leninism. He muses that Marxism-Leninism can be used (may we suggest over a cup of tea) "as expressions of theoretical principles" or as "historical material" or "primarily in the sense of (gird up your loins for this one) warnings to the workers and the people". True--but!--thrice compounded and confounded. It is unfair and indecent of Foster (as he is wont to enjoin the prosecution) to object to our

recognition of models in the "Short History of the CPSU(B)". We cannot be expected to search for them in Foster's writings inasmuch as Foster has placed most of his pre-Browderite books on the verboten list.

We must again grant Foster a certain amount of logic in his much heralded (if you follow the D. W.) "world outlook". We grant that there is little place for model or example on Foster's new route because, as he said in his first deposition: "Wherever there is capitalism there is Communism. The Communist movement is spontaneous and is native to all countries. It is not a world revolutionary plot, as our enemies declare." The spectre of world Communism (we omit the word "plot") certainly does not haunt Foster; he simply doesn't believe in it.

In leaving this detour, we refer back to the April '49 issue of Turning Point. In a much documented article, "The '12' Are Definitely Innocent of Marxism-Leninism", which checked the current revisions against quotations from Marxist-Leninist originals, we included:

"....the masses of proletarians of all countries are realizing more and more clearly every day that Bolshevism has indicated the right road of escape from the horrors of war and imperialism, that Bolshevism can serve as a model of tactics for all." (Original emphasis. Lenin, Selected Works Vol. II. p.409).

Stalin emphasizes this point: "One of the special features of the October Revolution is the fact that this revolution represents the classic realization of the Leninist theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"Certain comrades assume that this theory is a purely 'Russian' theory and applies only to Russian realities. That is wrong. That is absolutely wrong." (Stalin, The October Revolution, p. 100, Int'l Pub. 1934.)

We suspect that Foster does not object so much to "models" as he does to foreign, imported "models". In order to protect his domestic, American exceptionalist product, he counsels a high tariff on imported models. In this he has no quarrel with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

(Continued in Dec. issue. See page 1.)

\* \* \*

#### FRANCIS FRANKLIN TURNS RAT

Francis Franklin has denounced all Communists--both CP members and expelled--who have fought the opportunism of the CPUSA leadership.

Francis Franklin is suddenly "most decisively opposed to any unification" of expelled comrades. To Francis Franklin, expelled comrades are now: "professional enemy agents"; "cold and calculating anti-Party conspirators"; "every variety of anti-Party adventurer"; "very decidedly worse than the present leadership of the C.P.U.S.A."; "thoroughly opportunist themselves, in many cases absolutely unprincipled, and even in some cases completely anti-working class"; "caricatures of one variety or another".

With sudden Budenzical revelation, F.F. discovers that expelled comrades: "bring grist to the mill of enemies of the Party who wish to create a rival organization competing with the Party in order to confuse and split the class conscious workers"; "obstruct the healthy developments" in the CPUSA; "strengthen the grip of opportunists".

and bureaucracy"; "serve objectively as a diversion, as an obstacle retarding the process of normal internal Party development"; etc. etc.

On top of all this, expelled comrades (who are guilty of "infantile and anti-working class phrasemongering") "are really quite unimportant"!

Into what we might term an omnibus cubby-hole of his past, F.F. shoves the following (via implication or designation): Trotskyites, MCP, N.Y. Notes, Harrison George, the "West Coast Committee to Restore the Revolutionary Principles and Built the CPUSA", Max Bedacht, Manhattan Communist Bulletin, The Key, Turning Point, and endless other "certain" comrades and groups in L.A., Frisco, etc. etc. With one eye peering into this motley cubby-hole and the other scanning Jefferson School for vacancy possibilities, F.F. intones: "We cannot emphasize too strongly that the basic character of all these little groups is either opportunist or reactionary".

The eye scanning Jefferson School turns in a hopeful report, and F.F. unsleeves his trump card: "Any Party member who participates in any way with the activity of any such organization or who meets with any so called 'Communist' organization outside of the Party should be expelled from the Party (our emphasis) unless he publicly repudiates his errors and discontinues such practices."

How do those CP members who have contacted F.F. since his "Open Letter" feel? Is there any doubt that F.F. has turned rat!

F.F. has given the wink to the CPUSA leadership that he is now ready for a deal. He has lists, he has correspondence with expelled and CP members, and he attempts systematically to indicate that he has an overall knowledge of the active personnel of the expelled movement. F.F. has evaluated his virtues, and he now poses the question to the CPUSA leadership: WHAT AM I OFFERED? He has put in his bid to become the National Committee's "finger man", or possibly its McGohey prosecuting the expelled movement and those CP members who may have written F.F. encouragement after his "Open Letter". A deal will be made. It is only necessary, first, for a few technical preparations to be made revolving about the contacting of our profound, professorial prostitute by one of the very political pimps attacked in his "Open Letter".

In its May issue (Vol.II, No. 4), Turning Point rang a warning bell on F.F.'s switch to "Socialism Through Constitutional Amendment". Before we consider F.F.'s next movements, we should note his 3 justifications for turning informer: (1) His "work" has been accomplished"; (2) "The best way, therefore, for us to demonstrate our firm opposition" to the idea "that some new organization operating outside of the Party or seeking to form a factional grouping inside the Party can solve the problems of the Party" "is to dissolve, to cease publication, and to renounce completely any endeavor to intervene, even by advice, in the internal affairs of the Communist Party"; and (3) this action will "help the Party".

F.F. insists that he can do this now because the CPUSA leadership has changed for the better, and the American working class is now under correct leadership: (1) "complete capitulations...have not recently been occurring and are now generally recognized as errors"; (2) "The mobilization of the masses for active struggle" in defense of democracy "has been decidedly improving"; and (3) "resistance to the right-wing agents of the employers...is definitely increasing".

F.F. fails to remind us that while the CP leadership does on rare occasion refer to certain capitulations as errors, blame for these is laid on unnamed "left-wing progressives" (usually termed "they"). The National Committee has not owned up to

such capitulations as the CIO redbaiting resolution, the anti-Soviet veto resolution, Marshall Plan support (at the Boston CIO Convention and in supporting for Congress the Cellars, Douglasses, Hollifields) etc. It is not that F.F. does not recognize the National Committee's hypocrisy; it is simply that F.F., himself, has been inducted into the regal order of hypocrites.

Since when have the capitulations ceased? It is true that conditions in the U.S. are forcing the American working class, rank and file CPUSA members, and even CP trade union leaders to fight for dear life, but the CP leadership gets no credit for this. Even at this late date, CP union leaders have to break Party discipline and buck the instructions of the N. C. in order not to betray the workers.

Have capitulations on the T.H. affidavits ceased? Haven't the UOMW and the UE followed the affidavit procession? The N.C. advised such leaders as Henderson, Perlow and Travis to resign from the Party in order to sign the T.H. affidavits. Its supreme hypocrisy in this case was its refusal, despite the pleas of derelict trade union leaders who look to the N.C. for leadership, to offer specific advice regarding the T.H. affidavits.

What greater capitulation can there be than the Dennis-Foster butchery of Marxism-Leninism at the Foley Square trial? But F.F. agrees with this so it is not butchery. If the theory of peaceful institution of Socialism does not register with F.F. as capitulation to the bourgeoisie, then, we are sure, very little will. But in this case, F.F. should not imply that the CPUSA leadership has changed. He should state that he was wrong about them until now.

Does F.F. think that a correct fight is being conducted for the freeing of the CPUSA leaders and their lawyers, for the legality of the CPUSA, and for democracy. Is he satisfied with wires and postcards at a time when Washington is implanting a deadly fear into the American people and strong examples are needed to develop the potential militancy of the American working class. Doesn't F.F. know that if the rank and file CPUSA comrades were not held back by their leaders that they could work up a real militant and telling fight for the smashing of the Foley Square outrage?

The main point is this. Exactly because the American workers are being forced into militancy by their everyday problems, exactly because the indictments are revolting to the American people as a whole, it is important for us to continue our fight for a real party. What a time to give up--with reasons!

Before, says FF, the CP leadership supported Marshall Plan candidates. But doesn't it do that today? Where does Caddy stand? The real reason that the ALP is endorsing fewer capitalist candidates this year isn't because CP leaders are more principled or less willing to sell out. It is simply because the red-baiting hysteria has reached such a pitch that most Democrat and Republican candidates now refuse ALP endorsements.

"At that time", FF finds that there was bureaucracy and opportunism; no channels for democratic discussion. "At that time", FF finds that "discussion and criticism, however, were driven out of the Party. Hence certain aspects of normal Party life have been necessarily conducted, although to a very limited extent, outside of the Party." Can FF tell us seriously, even from the respectable side of the fence, that discussion and criticism have been welcomed back into the CP, and if not, what has happened to those "aspects of Party life...conducted outside". No, FF has not admitted the real reasons for his switch.

FF recounts his former criticisms of the Party leadership and then states: "In this situation, it was and is our considered judgment that it was absolutely necessary that comrades voice their criticisms even at the risk of expulsion." Absolutely necessary! And yet it is obvious that the situation in the CPUSA is the same today. So why isn't it still absolutely necessary for Franklin to voice his criticisms instead of avoiding intervention in the affairs of the CP, instead of advocating the expulsion of those CP comrades who are still fighting within the C.P.

Now, let us see what F.F. is worth. Let us assess his Communist Morality (see FF. on Communist morality). Why did F.F. suddenly decide to throw in his career with the anti-opportunist movement, and why did he, as suddenly, decide to sell out? After all, F.F. is a very timid man. Hence, why the ring of resolve in his overture and the squeal of Reisel in his finale?

It is very simple. F.F. watched the anti-opportunist movement for some time quietly, attempting to gauge its strength. While he watched, he prepared his long "Open Letter". Noticing the rising ferment around him, noticing that other leaders were throwing in their lot with the expelled comrades--and having finished his "Open Letter"--F.F. contacted the P.R. Club, CPUSA (Expelled) in haste. He announced his intention to take part in the fight for a real Party and asked that his "Open Letter" be spread. He read the letter to a member of the P.R. Club, and despite some disagreement, we decided to help turn it out and circulate it. It turned out later that F.F. had omitted certain bad sections in that reading. In this first step, F.F. considered that he was moving with the tide. We will skip the involved finagling of F.F. in the expelled movement. (See some discussion of this in Turning Point, Vol. No. 2, "The Crisis in Harrison George & Co.")

We have already witnessed several leaders who burst on the scene with a document, waited for the acclamation of disciples, and when these didn't materialize automatically in the quantity and with the dispatch desired, reconsidered their original resolutions. To these characters, the life-breathing axiom is "Leaders must have Followers--if I don't find them in heaven, I'll find them in hell." So F.F., as he fanned his original heat with a copy of the "Open Letter", waited impatiently to be acclaimed. He waited for the objective forces of U.S. history (in the "disciple" season of 1948-49) to respond to the subjective impulse of F.F. And when the building of a real CP went along its slow, tiresome way, F.F. began to reconsider his tactics in pursuit of prestige, followers, respectability within the Communist movement, and a job at Jefferson School.

Again he prepared--this time his exit. He found his reason in the trial at Foley Square. F.F. began to mutter "unityunityunityunity". After a period of "unityunity" muttering, F.F. rared back and formulated: anyone who dares criticize the leadership of the CPUSA destroys unity and is an enemy agent. (The reader will remember that this all-purpose formula was leveled at F.F. himself at the time of his expulsion.)

It occurred to F.F. without too much heavy thought that his activities within the expelled movement could be transformed from liabilities into assets. Wouldn't he be acceptable to the CP leadership if he proved to be unstingy with any information he had on the expelled movement? He was sure everything would be worked out somehow. And if necessary, until the political pimp made contact with him and arranged the wages of virtue, he could relax while he prepared a new course of study for his return to Jefferson School.

So F.F. again prepared a document, this time rather brief (because a word to Max Weiss is sufficient--in the switching of philosophical horses), and in the issue #13

(Oct. 10, 1949) of his Bulletin, "Towards Socialism" announced "we are discontinuing publication and our club is dissolving."

Why did F.F. turn rat at this point. He turned rat on the occasion of the Foley Square Trial when it became a little dangerous to continue to be a revolutionary Communist. Faced with a hysterical America seemingly in the hands of McGohey, Medina & Co., F.F. decided that it would indeed be an excellent idea to renounce revolution and force and violence. But how does one do this without exposing one's cowardice?

F.F. reasoned thus: (1) in the light of the Smith Act and its current application, I renounce the revolutionary theories of Marxism-Leninism; (2) I must also make my personal fortress more secure against any FBI encroachments; (3) I can do this either by reentering the CPUSA for added protection of numbers or by completely disaffiliating myself from all formal organizational Communist groups, Parties, or societies while establishing some understanding of aid or at least neutrality with the CPUSA leadership; (4) either of these two alternatives necessitates a denunciation of the expelled movement.

Notice that F.F., who renounces the expelled movement and hollers three cheers for the CPUSA leadership, does nevertheless, not openly state his desire to rejoin the CPUSA. He only makes it quite clear that a wonderful deal of sorts could be consummated. What is the opportunist logic in this position.

F.F. warmly adopts the label "non-Party Communist" (meaning, he takes great pains to make clear, completely unaffiliated Communist). He advises all non-Party Communists to turn to new work, "to the general mass movement and not to further efforts to intervene in inner-Party development", to "develop mass struggles" as individuals, to "the general advance of the working class", etc. etc. F.F. pants that we should as liberal individuals, believing generally in Socialism, turn to the immediate problems of the workers and work in unions and mass organizations as non-Communists. In the light of the Smith Act, this is certainly a safer perch than the one expelled or Party comrades have been sitting on. (Doesn't F.F. know that the CP leadership does everything possible to prevent any work by expelled comrades in the mass organizations? Doesn't he know that during this election campaign, the CP leadership has been expelling comrades from the CP and forcing them out of the ALP for objections to bureaucracy and opportunism?)

Having rid himself of subversive affiliation with revolutionary expelled groups, he now has the choice of remaining completely unaffiliated or returning on an unprincipled basis to the CPUSA. F.F. has decided that, depending on which position (in or out of the CPUSA) is more secure in these trying times, and depending on how much prestige the CPUSA might offer in a little collective bargaining, he can determine his route without (supposedly) exposing his cowardice on one simple basis. If at any point, F.F. wishes to return to the CPUSA on an unprincipled basis, he can frame his appeal so that he will readily be accepted as a "finger man". If at any point, F.F. feels that he prefers to be rejected, he can frame his appeal on an unacceptable basis, but then, nevertheless, establish at least pleasant relations with the Party by means of a little information on the expelled movement.

In other words, F.F. has arrived at the highway of his new route. To the north, he can travel clear of the FBI; to the south, he can retrace his steps to the CPUSA--if enough is offered him or if hysteria lets up a little. Either direction is controlled precisely by his approach to the CPUSA leadership. Whether F.F. ends up in the CPUSA or merely in quiet contact with its leadership, he has volunteered as "informer".

Let us pose our attitude against F.F.'s. The PR Club comrades are quite willing to rejoin the CPUSA. We never left it; we were thrown out for defending Marxism-Leninism. Any time the leadership (hypothetically) agrees to reverse our expulsion, we will be glad to return--but without forsaking one iota of our principles and without ceasing the fight for a real CPUSA committed to the principles of Marxism-Leninism. Of course we realize that we will not be accepted back on such terms so we do not confuse people by purely hypothetical mutterings about eagerness to rejoin the CPUSA. On the other hand, we pose the problem for F.F.: considering what you have to say, you should have openly appealed for reinstatement. Also, considering that you say the leadership has changed, you should be reinstated without changing any of your principles, and the CP leadership should acknowledge its errors in expelling you. But, alas, you have already traded your principles for those of the Dennis-Foster clique.

There is another less focal but interesting aspect to F.F.'s defection, as we indicated generally in our "Open Letter to Stalin." (August TP) F.F. could denounce Jack Bering's approval of the heroes leading the CPUSA in private conversation, but he could not work up the steam to admit it openly. Therefore he could not reconcile what he was doing with confusing articles in the CIB organ on the CPUSA. He could not set aside the one important weakness of the CIB organ on the CPUSA and recognize the overall importance of the paper in our work. F.F. had to play it safe, so he simply adopted the attitude of Bering.

F.F. is through with his discussion: "It should be recalled of course that it is never the practice of Communist Parties to continue discussions indefinitely." Well, F.F. probably was indulging in a discussion. We were and are fighting opportunism for a real CP--and there are no limits to that.

It should be recalled too that F.F. published only a "Pre-Convention Bulletin", even though it is now one year past the convention. F.F. could justify his remarks only as pre-convention discussion (and therefore legal). Now that F.F. has closed his own discussion and ordered all other comrades to follow suit on pain of being considered enemy agents, we must raise an important point with F.F. Since this is the end, why didn't FF merely print his farewell speech and quit; why did he have to conclude all his serial articles after his self-set time was up. Why, if FF is through with advice and independent thinking, did he pompously have to "intervene" in Party thought with the last installments of his articles on Communist Morality, the Trade Unions, and 3 others. Isn't he firing past his own cease fire deadline? We are also amused or confused by the fact that FF still gives the PO Box for CP members to contact him?

It seems that TP was correct in severely attacking FF for the recent signs of his impending sellout in the article, "Some Legal Advice and Thoughts on Legal Rights". Contrasted with a poor but better article in #4 of Towards Socialism, it was obvious that FF had found it profitable to switch. It didn't take long for the proof to materialize.

A comrade has remarked that the Franklin "back to work for Foster movement" is depressing. But is this really so? We feel it is a healthy sign. Let all the rats show their tails now, the sooner the better. When a real CP does emerge in the U.S., there will be very few "sleepers" trying to usurp leadership without the danger of exposure. Many American Communists who are currently arguing bitterly (but with a lot of sincerity) will end up in the same CP and with mutual trust and respect. But in the hard work of preparing for this CP, we will witness the exposing and the self-exposure of the phonies. We have watched some ex-Party people turn rat, some simply succumb from combat fatigue. But the real CP will be built visibly on the consistent work of honest comrades who have no alternative but to get a real CP via a bulldog grip on "the recognition of necessity".

"Requiescat in Pace." From the Browderite bowels of revisionism did he come; to the more open brothels of political prostitution goes he now.

13

NEW SUBSCRIPTION RATES

For \$1.00...3 month sub to CIB organ (weekly)  
and Turning Point (monthly)  
For \$1.50...3 month sub to New Times (weekly)  
For \$1.50...1 year sub to Turning Point

Now that the CIB organ is appearing weekly, TP has changed its rates. In order to get as many readers as possible to subscribe to the CIB organ we are offering it below cost and without including postage (which has gone up this year). Most of our literature goes free, mainly to comrades who are not convinced of our ideas. The people who help us conscientiously are--understandably--few. For financial reasons, we are forced to rotate our mailing list. We would prefer--with your help--not to do this. Subscriptions cannot cover an iota of our expenses. We depend on contributions. With a little help from our readers, we could extend our field considerably. We urge you to become a contributor. The smallest contributions will be appreciated; to us, they are big political contributions. Also, may we suggest that you send us a sub for a friend, and that you order several copies of our issues to pass around. We will appreciate lists for sample mailings.

We would like to explain to our present subscribers that irregular mailing is usually not our fault. The CIB organ and New Times have not always come in regularly. We mail the foreign literature as we get it. Also, we notice that, recently, papers have come back with stickers removed. Since we cannot tell exactly which copy went astray, if our subscribers will always inform us of non-delivery, we will remail the literature to them.

\* \* \*

R E A D

For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy! -- Organ of the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties in Bucharest.

Included in the Issue of October 21: Stalin's message to the leaders of the German Democratic Republic; articles by Maurice Thorez (France), Maria Maddalena Rossi (Italy), Major-General Popivoda (Yugoslav Army), Liu Shao-chi (China) and Jozef Kowalczyk (Poland).

Included in the Issue of October 28: Articles by Otto Grotewohl (Germany), Kivu Stoica (Rumania), Georges Cogniot (France), Vaclav Kopecky (Czechoslovakia), and "The Voice of the American Goebbels" by P. Todorov.

New Times, "devoted to questions of the foreign policies of the U.S.S.R. and other countries and to current events in international life".

World Trade Union Movement, Monthly Information and Documentary Review of the World Federation of Trade Unions. Order from: Collet's Subscription Department, 40 Gt. Russell St., London, W.C.1.