

## POINT

f o r

P E A C E - D E M O C R A C Y - S O C I A L I S MVol. I, No. 2                      25¢                      September 1948Editorial Board: Ralph Burt, Ellwood Griest, Martha Samuel,  
Ted Seemin, and Louis Julia.Published by: P.R. Club, Communist Party (Expelled) and SPARK  
Maritime Committee for a Communist Party and FORE 'N' AFTTurning Point on sale at newsstand S.W. corner of 42nd St. and  
6th Ave. Mailing address: P.O. Box 24, Times Square Station,  
New York 18, N.Y. Checks or money orders to Ellwood Griest, Sec'yIn This Issue:THE CRISIS IN HARRISON GEORGE & CO.Turning Point's criticism of Harrison George's Supplement to "The  
Crisis in the C.P.U.S.A."\* and his question-answer series, The Party.

and

LETTERS AND DISCUSSION:

An excerpt on open discussion--from a C.P. comrade in Ohio.	P.52
Criticism of <u>Turning Point</u> and support for George's position from:	
An L.A. Comrade	60
Arline Flood for the "N.W. Dist.", Seattle (2 letters)	53
Building Trades Club (Suspended), San Diego	65
Frontier Club (Suspended), San Diego	66
Reprint from <u>Towards Socialism</u> , bulletin of the Bill Haywood Club "	
<u>Turning Point's</u> Discussion of Letters	68

THE CRISIS IN HARRISON GEORGE & CO.Part IGeorge's Anti-Progressive Party Position

We would only compound the confusion offered by George if we followed the fragmentary collection of political and personal impressions which constitute the Supplement. Instead, we will confine our consideration to a few main ideas. The main thrust of George's argument ( and the bulk of the material in the Supplement ) is directed--in effect -- towards the defeat of the new Progressive Party. This is not done boldly; it is cushioned by indirect attacks, by the confusing of possibilities with actualities, and by defeatist insinuations. In Part I we will investigate the following points made by George in his Supplement:

\* Both the Crisis in the C.P.U.S.A. (@\$1) and the Supplement (@10¢) are available from Turning Point--despite our disagreements.

- 1- George damns the third party by association--with Browder.
- 2- George damns the third party as an organization with dangerous fascist tendencies.
- 3- George damns the third party's peace program as "deceitful bourgeois pacifism".
- 4- George damns the third party as impotent.
- 5- George offers nothing but scriptural double-talk as his program for applying the People's Front idea to the U.S.; his People's Front approach finds it necessary to fight the third party.

An investigation of these 5 points will show that George's current position on the third party is that of Dowling as repeatedly stated in NCP Report. This is one part of the crisis in Harrison George.

1- George Damns The Third Party by Association--with Browder

George states that Browder "rather supports Wallace, and with Wallace 'opposes' the Marshall Plan" (p.1) and "acclaims Wallace as the standard bearer of 'Roosevelt's policy' of 'intelligent, progressive imperialism,' which he claims can 'gain for America' not only a 'long time peace' but also 'a vast expansion of markets' and thus save the world from 'a catastrophic economic crisis.'" (p.3)

This, one gathers from the Supplement, George quoted from Browder's World Communism and the Foreign Policy of the United States. An examination of Browder's pamphlet nets one a shock and an immediate understanding of George's scruples in polemic. The above ideas are not stated in Browder's pamphlet. They are the inventions of George himself. Accurately, for the benefit of the curious reader, Wallace is referred to 3 times in the Browder pamphlet--on pages 5, 38, 41. None of these supports George's quote or protects him from qualification for the Dowling Domain of Wild Paraphrase. George will have to go through an extended chain reaction of impressions to explain the misquotation, misparaphrase or whatever technique it is that he prefers to the simple quotation. It is hard to say who fears the quotation more--George or Dowling. Why did George have to misrepresent Browder? Browder is certainly at his worst when quoted accurately; there is no need to tamper with his original material. George had his reason; misquoting always has its reason. It is quite logical that Browder should support Wallace's continuation of many of the Roosevelt principles. But Browder has attacked Wallace's discontinuation of the Roosevelt orientation of Democratic Party loyalty. So, starting carefully with a truth (as is George's habit), he misapplies that truth--in this case, into Browder's support for the third party. George is wrong. Browder has attacked Wallace's leaving of the hallowed ground of the Democratic Party. George was trying to prove that the CPUSA Draft Resolution for the 1948 Convention states Browder's ideas ("what amounts to a parallel Thesis by Earl Browder") as against the ideas of George's last legal convention in 1945.

The truth is that Browder has, so far, insidiously opposed the third party development. Evidence for this is brilliantly offered in Parties, Issues, & Candidates in the 1948 Elections, a photo-offset pamphlet by one "Americus". Browder writing under the assumed name of Americus (assumed, we assume, after the Cominform criticism buried him under his "previous" name), offers a unique collection of the most insidious, guarded, redbaiting attacks on and advice to the third party. (A reading of the Americus pamphlet immediately convinces one that the Browderly hand operates throughout. This holds for the ideas, the style, and the bitterness at the last 3 years, (minus Browder) of the CP downgrade.) More than this we think is unnecessary to prove here. Seeking to damn the third party by any means, George damns it by association--by association with Browder. This is ill-advised. If Browder did support the third party, his support would prove nothing against it. But, to make things simpler, Browder so far opposes the third party, and to make matters a little ridiculous--he opposes the third party with some of George's arguments. But we won't damn George by association; eclectic Browder is apt to agree with anyone. As a matter of fact, ~~and~~ Browder may yet, for good reasons of Browderly expediency, support the third party, especially if it keeps on making advances. Success is Browder's irresistible mistress. If and when Browder comes out for the Progressive Party, it will entail no shame for the third party idea. It will merely indicate that the rising power of the third party has finally impressed Browder--who has a habit of tailing developments.

To illustrate George's shotgun marriage of the third party and Browder, we will quote some very shrewd passages from the "Americus" pamphlet.

"The split with the Democratic Party inevitably leaves behind many supporters, who will not go the length of going into a new party. Thus Wallace automatically loses many of the advantages that Roosevelt had, of an established party with important bases of power in the country. Roosevelt offered his supporters the protection of a powerful organization, the participation in power, the expectation of immediate and continued victory. Wallace calls upon his supporters to risk everything in the building of a new organization, the sharing of sacrifice, and the expectation of electoral victory only in an undefined future. These advantages of the Wallace campaign, compared with Roosevelt's, cannot be overcome." (p. 10) And--

"Roosevelt, from the beginning, had organized labor in his support; ...Wallace, in contrast, begins his campaign with the expressed hostility of the majority of organized labor and the support of only that minority identified as 'the left', where Communist influence is still dominant." (p. 10) And--

"...Wallace is able to preserve only one of these Roosevelt extensions of his campaign organization, namely the unofficial alliance with the Communists." (p. 11) And--

"With Wallace so identified with the pro-Communist left that his endorsement automatically weakens the position of the center, the inevitable response of the center group is to join hands with the right to

resist the Wallace campaign with all resources. They are so resisting, and with considerable success; it is not the left which is being strengthened in the struggle, but the extreme right.

"The fact is that the stage of development of the trade unions is not favorable to the success of the present strategy of the Wallace forces. The trade unions are prepared to accept and support the Wallace program, but they are not prepared to reshuffle and reorganize their leadership in the direction of the pro-Communist left; when these two things are presented to them in one package, they reject the whole package." (p. 12) And--

"Thus the left faction's strategy is not one of throwing their own growing strength into support of Wallace, but on the contrary it is to use the Wallace strength in order to stop their own decline and, if possible, to regain some of their lost positions. It is unsound strategy, for it is not improving the position of the left faction, while it is seriously hampering the Wallace campaign." (p. 13) And--

"(c) The schematic plans that the Wallace organization should be built as 'the future Labor Party'. This can only result in the immediate narrowing down of the movement, reduce its volume and striking power, and generally give it a sectarian trend, while it will contribute nothing significant to the eventual formation of the mass Labor Party in the U.S.A. of an organizational character." (p. 15)

Browder, too, is for a Labor Party. But not this one! Meanwhile, he attempts in every way to influence Communists and third party members against the third party as a lost cause (as does George). He rebaits with a finesse worthy of the more "cultured" Trotskyites. He seeks to worry Wallace into a quick get-away from the Communist kiss of death.

We cannot go into other interesting details here regarding Browder's position. A careful reading's discovery of "Americus" reveals how cunningly George damns the third party by association with its worst enemy. (Browder's objections to the third party should be kept in mind while reading George's objections in section 4.)

## 2- The Third Party Damned As "A Pacemaker for Fascism"

Without any proof or documentation (without even a stream-of-consciousness record of his own surrealist impressions) George bluntly and repeatedly shoves the third party into the category of fascist dangers in the U.S. George does not deal with other fascist dangers!

After quoting Max Weiss' description of "Wallace's formula for a 'progressive capitalism'", George states: "Here you have Mussolini's formula for a fascist economy of his 'corporative state'". (Again, lest the reader be unmindful of our warning against George's quotetechnique, we would whisper that Wallace doesn't call his plan a "corporative state".) Here is a denunciation of the third party that even the two major parties have not thought of yet!--and from George in the process of applying the People's Front to the U.S.

Perhaps George wished to soften his cruel characterization of the "fascist" economist Wallace when he decided through tricky channels that the third party "will tend to become fascist". This is done as follows (worthy the serious study of any reader desirous of applying the swivel-hips technique of football to logic):

"It can even be said that our Party is not even social-democratic, since it is increasingly indistinguishable from the liberal bourgeois party of Wallace, and in this merger of ideologies, the Communist Party is being liquidated. This is the aim of Browder. This is the aim of the National Committee.

"The positive trend given to this merger of ideologies by the abandonment by our Party of socialist ideology, is to make of the coalition an organ championing class collaboration, which, under conditions of deepening capitalist crisis, will tend to become fascist." (p. 7, Suppl.)

A small portion of truth makes a dangerous meal. Adding the spice of possibilities to some obviously correct criticisms of the CPUSA, George twists the third party's good beginning and program into a fascist tendency. Thus, the possibility is quietly transformed into an actuality--and without the aid of dialectics. We have quite a "deepened" capitalist crisis right now; we have a class collaborationist CP leadership. And yet, Turning Point doesn't feel that we have a fascist Progressive Party or tendencies thereof. Could it be that George overlooked that important factor--the conscious efforts of Communists and non-Communists to build an anti-fascist, anti-imperialist third party? It occurs to us that after George & Co. get through destroying from one side what the CPUSA leadership is destroying from the other, anything can happen. Nowhere in the Supplement is there any specific indication of a desire to determine the correct development of the third party in America towards a People's Front Party. Nowhere does George tackle specifically the dangerous, real faults in the third party, as those of us who support it have done. To discuss the faults of the third party constructively means to protect it from "possibilities". Since George has no such intention, he does not have to squander time discussing remediable faults.

Notice (above) George's idea that "our Party is not even social-democratic". This betrays a complete lack of understanding of social-democracy. It seems to him that a Party which "is increasingly indistinguishable from the liberal bourgeois party of Wallace" is not therefore social-democratic. But social-democracy is exactly that; in an endless variety of ways, it consists in "this merger of ideologies". The dangers in the Progressive Party today are due to the contributions of the social-democratic thinking of the CPUSA leadership. (On other occasions, George has shown an understanding of social-democracy, but at the moment he is too busy proving a point to be consistent.)

George goes bravely out on a limb (which we are glad to report, broke in Philadelphia) and wildly prophesizes:

"All signs point to a maneuver by the Wallace managers, and with his approval, to get, as Murray did in the CIO, the Communists themselves to 'resent and reject' their own 'interference' in the 'Third Party.' And,

also as in the CIO, our Party leaders will find 'the unity of the progressive forces' as their 'reason' to accept. Whereupon, the bourgeois Wallace managers will move successfully to dump Communists everywhere; to call in the Reuther-Carey forces as a mass labor base.

"This would strengthen the 'Third Party' trend to become a pace-maker for fascism..." (our emphasis) (p.14).

We can respect George's misgivings about our Party leaders. But it is important to remember (and here George uses high powered indirect polemic) that George cannot damn the third party now for what the C.P. leadership may yet do to it. In this connection, we must admit that this confident (and -- it strikes us -- too happy a) forecast falls flat on its back in Philadelphia (after the limb broke.) There are anti-Communist dangers in the Progressive Party which are due to the CPUSA's leadership and not the fault of the Communist rank and filers and non-Party workers in it. But, in the face of the hopeful routing of these tendencies so far in the third party, George's forecast sounds almost as if it would simplify matters for George's position if the third party would degenerate. Regarding Philadelphia, George owes his readers a correction. We suspect that instead of correcting his facts, George will refute the facts of the convention, and continue to wait for the intensification of red-baiting in the Progressive Party to prove his point.

There were attempts to ruin the Convention in Phila. There was redbaiting waiting its chance--in fact under the banner of the ADA itself. What are the facts? The herring never reached the delicatessen. The ADA was roughly handled and exposed. A few of the worst trends had to pull out and go home. There were no open anti-Soviet innuendoes. In fact, Taylor pulled the leg of the red baiters when he applauded himself in Soviet style and launched into a self-critical story on the merits of Soviet customs--all this in the first words of his acceptance speech. We know that Wallace and Taylor can, will and are backwatering, but the important point is to recognize our gains in that both leaders took the herring by the fins and refused to rebait at the Convention. This is due basically to the healthy feelings of the rank and filers (including CP members), a factor which is ignored by the Georges, the Dunnes, the Dowlings, and the Darcys.

One smooth trick at the Convention was the quiet introduction into the program of the Progressive Party of some sly words on world government. This represents finagling in an attempt to attract some "liberal" world government forces. The Communists who countenanced this were up to their usual opportunist form. These phrases must be exposed because of the whole anti-Soviet character of the world government idea. Any attempt to make use of this world government dark horse must be killed by the rank and file of the P.P. by using the rest of the program on the UN which contradicts it. Considering that the supporters of world gov't will find it hard (because of other allegiances) to take their place in the P.P., there will be no large body of such partisans present to overwhelm the UN part of the program.

The P.P. program on peace has flaws with which our readers are undoubtedly familiar. But it opposes the Marshall Plan and the get-tough

policy - and this opposition is the focal point of an American anti-imperialist program.

Our vigilance should be directed towards the implementation of the P.P.'s program. We know that there is a routine attitude (made in the CPUSA) to ignore the program and resort to finagling with the Democratic Party. The support of Celler and Delaney in Brooklyn, of six Democrat Congressional candidates in N.Y. State, and of the Democratic ticket in Illinois are examples of this. We have to fight the C.P.'s quiet persuasion that the T-H Law stand should be the measuring rod in the support of all candidates. This is designed to allow the P.P. to support any number of Democratic Party - Marshall Plan candidates.

C.B. Baldwin, campaign manager for Wallace, stated on August 30, '48:

"If the CIO looks at the facts, it will find that the Progressive Party has worked for the greatest degree of unity behind truly liberal candidates, no matter what their party label." (our emphasis), (D.W. August 31, 1948).

The Daily Worker continued:

"Of the 56 Congressmen whom the CIO News rates as 80 percent liberal or better, 'there will be few whom we will oppose', Baldwin asserted. He pointed to California as another example of accommodations being made by Progressives to secure unity. Rating 12 Democratic Congressmen in California liberal, the Independent Progressive Party invited all of them to cross-file on the IPP line, although several of them differed with the Progressives on various issues, notably the Marshall Plan." (our emphasis).

What should our attitude be to this. Should we damn the third party and cede it to the Marshall Planners, or should we fight to glue its activity to its program. Are we out to let the P.P. develop on the basis of its program, or are we determined to demoralize its best conscious elements and watch it shrivel -- away from its program? This question applies to all the criticism of George against the third party. If George, in the company of the Dunnes, Darcys and Dowlings, is out to prove that we must not interfere with the plans for the destruction of the P.P., then we are out to fight George & Co.

At his best, George says, with mild manner but bitter cynicism, of the third party, "Every party in America declares it is for 'democracy'. In the night, all cats are grey." (p.14). Certainly, if George feels that the P.P.'s fight for democracy is as deceitful as that of the Republican and Democrat Parties, he logically must fight the P.P. He might even get mad enough to discover in it a "trend to become a pace-maker for fascism" -- and he does.

George has invented fantasies about the third party development in the U.S. and fantastically ignored the facts. These fantasies have the function of defeatism and confusion, help the destructive elements in the P.P., and lend prestige to the lipservice of the CPUSA in its support of the Progressive Party.

### 3-The "Deceitful Bourgeois Pacifism" of the Third Party

George gives a little credit to the third party as he attacks its peace program. He does indicate, inadvertently, a very important point--that the third party is the party of peace in America today. But George attacks it on this very strong point in order to demolish it. He belabors the "bourgeois pacifism" of the third party. Granted -- all kinds of peace plans are held by individuals in the third party. Pacifists are logically attracted to the P.P. In the confusion of America today, many of our most militant youth are pacifist, not having integrated their ideas on peace with a real political understanding. There is every chance that they will learn some new ideas in contact with some of the more political youth involved in the P.P. The peace program of the third party is not connected with the goal of Socialism, as everyone realizes. So technically, the peace perspective must basically be a bourgeois one by definition. This is the basis for George's quibbling--off the point.

The point is: what is the correct peace program around which to collect the progressive people in the U. S., and does the P.P. have it? The correct peace program today around which to rally all the democratic elements is opposition to the Marshall-Truman Doctrine Plans, friendly relations with the S.U., support to democracy all over the world, insistence on American withdrawal from the suppression of independence struggles in Greece, China, Israel, etc.

All this is part of the P.P. program. All this is also part of the Communist peace program today, based on the Declaration of the C.I.B. So, exactly what is the sophist merit in hammering away at the deceitful bourgeois pacifism of the P.P.? Is the broad peace directive of the Cominform Declaration a bourgeois pacifist one? And if not, because the P.P. does not have a program of Socialism, is its peace program deceitful by virtue of its non-socialist basis?

George is concerned with "the deceitful bourgeois pacifism of the Wallace kind" (p.15, see also p. 16). Wallace's perspective on all things is admittedly bourgeois. But if there is one thing on which we have no evidence to claim deceit in Wallace, it is his desire for peace. The contradictions of the Capitalist system do not afford Wallace consistently his progressive capitalism and the certainty of peace--but that is Wallace's problem, and it would be tangential to our problems to try to convert Mr. Wallace to Communism. Wallace and many non-Socialist people in the P.P. want peace, whether or not they strain their imagination with vistas of progressive capitalism. They're ready to fight for the right kind of peace program--essentially that embodied in the Cominform Declaration (because the Cominform was offering a broad peace program around which all democratic people have to unite). Remember the closing paragraph of that Declaration:



"Therefore, the Communist Parties must take the lead in resisting the plans of imperialist expansion and aggression in all spheres-- state, political, economic and ideological; they must close their ranks, unite their efforts on the basis of a common anti-imperialist and democratic platform and rally around themselves all the democratic and patriotic forces of the nation."

George should support the correct program of the P.P. and work to protect it from attack by the people who oppose that program. We submit that expelled Communists in the U.S. today have nothing to gain from attacking the correct program for peace enunciated by Wallace and the P.P.--unless, they proceed from the Browder-Americus viewpoint, which is that the P.P. is not anti-imperialist anyway because it does not stand for socialism. And isn't this the point made by George about bourgeois pacifism? To master such technique, one must first master the technique of transforming Marxism into sophistry.

4- The Impotence of the Third Party:

Just in case, his previous condemnations of the third party (via association with Browder; fascist tendencies, and Bourgeois Pacifism) have not done the trick, George adds his inevitable pragmatic touch: the failure and impotence of the third party. (The reader will notice that he resorts to this pragmatic touch later in his discussion of Turning Points perspective of a new American Communist Party. This post-script-ural habit of succumbing to the pragmatic is a sign of George's theoretical uncertainty.) Let us follow George as he systematically (systematically without proof or documentation) proves that the third party has no support from all important sources and cannot discharge its responsibilities. (And here remember Americus' points).

(1) George finds "the third party virtually without trade union support." (p.9) This is the considered opinion also of the Republican and Democrat Parties, the Murrays and the Greens, the Reuthers and the Dubinskys, the Liberal Party, the ADA, and no less an authority than Earl Browder. It is the opinion of Dunne, Darcy, and Dowling. All these authorities--and Comrade George--are correct if we judge by the official position of America's union leaders. The hitch in this inventory occurs over the accuracy of the representation involved. Granted, the leaders of the unions oppose the third party. We know that the overwhelming majority of American union men stand for Wallace (and for the P.P. to a slightly lesser extent, since there is Browderian hesitation over the wasting of the vote on an unsuccessful electoral campaign). It is clear that Dubinsky stands against Wallace. But Dubinsky's union men elected Isaacson to Congress from the Bronx in an eye-opening reversal for all the defeatist ideas in the third party, CPUSA, and expelled circles. In some of the Amalgamated Clothing Worker strongholds, the sentiment for Wallace is so strong that the union leaders (Potofsky or no Potofsky) don't even publicize their opposition to the P.P. Despite all the tragic-confusion in the NMU, despite the open bankruptcy of the CP's position, despite the Curran caucus redbaiting, despite the opposition of leading ex-Communists (as distinguished from expelled Communists) the seamen will vote for

Wallace because Truman has "injunctioned" them and all the maritime workers towards the P.P. camp.

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<sup>idea</sup> 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.

Consider the position of reactionary union leaders. They have to lipserve many of the ideas of the third party (which is good reason for their membership's P.P. support) but can only add: it will split the Truman vote. Eloquent and recent testimony to this is the meeting of Murray and the CIO officers in Washington. What is the substance of their election advice to the CIO?

1-Republican support is out of the question. "We note and shall have occasion to point out during the ensuing campaign the failure of the Republican platform on these and other important issues."

2-A weak-kneed endorsement is given--fearfully--to the Democratic Party. "We regard it as significant that the platform of the Democratic Party unequivocally endorses President Truman's Civil Rights program and forthrightly declares for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Law and the liberalization of the Wage-Hour Law." (Despite all its confusion, organized labor in the U.S. knows that the T-H Law was the joint baby of the Democrats and the Republicans. Here lies one of the strong points of a huge P.P. vote.)

3-On the P.P., the Murray gang faced a tough nut to crack. "The Progressive Party, despite its platform (our emphasis), offers nothing but division and defeat to progressive Americans."... "The Third Party does not and cannot command the allegiance and support of laboring men and women and their organizations." A very weak

denunciation, indeed. Certainly not strong enough to Trumanize the anger of the rank and file of the Truman-sabotaged UMW, UAW, RR Brotherhoods, NMU, and other Maritime Unions.

Has George forgotten the support given to local third party movements in recent years despite the loyalties of trade union leaders to major parties? The trade union representation at the P.P. Convention was not too bad, considering how new its organization is at the moment. With a little audacity, with an open fight against the reactionary union leaders, the P.P. can capture not only the complete support of organized labor, but it can make new inroads into the mass of unorganized labor. (Of course, the CPUSA councils caution on this.) There is every reason to believe that between now and the elections the third party will pick up many times more support than it has now.

Lest we worry too much about the extent of labor's P.P. support, let the anti-third party Quills reassure us. In his own TWU which, despite the influence of the ACTU among the great number of Catholics, has been a mainstay of the ALP vote in New York, Quill found it necessary to go to foolish lengths in trying to hamstring the TWU pro-P.P. vote. He forced the resignation of the leaders of the TWU from office in the ALP. (Unfortunately, these did so "under duress" under the guidance of our Party). But this measure and the unprincipled and snivelling withdrawal of the ALP'ers (who reaffirmed their support for the third party--as individuals) will not turn the TWU vote to the injuncheoners of the major Parties.

(2) George finds that "the third party has only a shred of support from veterans in the fight for peace." (p.9) This betrays an outrageous ignorance of the movement of progressive veterans today. One of the mainstays of the P.P.'s support is the veteran. The progressive veterans originally turned to AVC and fought for some time to save the organization from the ADA-Social-Democratic-Trotskyite leaders. They failed for the reason that the CP (via the John Gates, Irv Goffs, and Saul Wellmans) pursued the same retreating, suicidal policy as the Communists in the CIO--concurrently and under the same direction. The AVC is now a licked organization as far as progressive organizations go. It is a hotbed of redbaiting. But the majority of the progressive vets have left AVC as a hopeless corpse. (Some are still trying but cannot succeed because the CP has lost interest). Where have they turned. They went to the PCA and the YPCA. Now, the best of them and in great numbers are devoting their efforts to the building of the P.P. More than this, they have turned out to be a basic source of the jimmy higgins work needed to build and to get out the vote. Whatever is wrong with the P.P. and whatever (in consequence of the CPUSA leadership) the vets don't know, they have nevertheless taken their place in the P.P. Even the capitalist papers were astounded at the youthfulness of the P.P. Convention--and the stronghold of the youth movement in the U.S. today is the vet. It is a little hard to understand George's ignorance of some of the glaring facts of the P.P. today, except as the eternally futile attempt to justify the a priori theory--made before an investigation of the facts. Let George notice in the forthcoming campaign in what numbers the veterans canvass for the P.P.

(3) George finds "no real mass support among the farmers for the third party". This is the continuation of a wishful thinking investigation. If there is any group from which Wallace has collected support over a period of years, its the farmers. Wallace's New Deal history has notted him a lot of farmers' support. Besides, Wallace prides himself on being a farmer. The question here is not how much has Wallace done for the farmers, but the fact that he has their support. And the program of the P.P. merits their support.

(4) George while indirectly admitting the support of the Negro people for the P.P. fluffs it off. The most evident fact of P.P. support today is the support of the overwhelming majority of the Negro people. In the coming election this will register a new page in American history in the South. The presence of the Negro people in the P.P. is a militant protection for the character of the Party. George, on this subject can only resort to the trick of the tangential argument: "Our party is so corrupted that the masses of Negro people who are attracted to the third party (notice this important though subordinate clause) are not reached by the ennobling message of proletarian internationalism, and hence strengthen the bourgeois and not the proletarian ideological direction of the third party." (p.10-11) George knows that the CPUSA and not the Negro people must be held responsible for the ideological trend of the third party, so why inject an extraneous point. The point is, if we stick to an inventory of third party support, that the Negro people do support the P.P.

Again, as in the case of many unions, the NAACP may dislike the situation, but it has to be careful because members of the NAACP and the Negro people are supporting the third party. Their protestations of neutrality are carefully worded to prevent a revolt in the NAACP. The boldness that Wallace and Taylor have shown on the Negro question (in striking into the heart of the South) would merit great successes if applied to other fields--in tackling the bull of P.P. opposition by the horns in the unions. It is not to be sneezed at that for the first time in many parts of the South, non-segregated meetings of black and white are held despite the rotten eggs and tomatoes and threats of worst violence. This is a new stage in the reappearance of Negro political power in the South. And it is being done through the vehicle of the P.P.

(5) On the question of women's support for the third party, George evades his own inventory: "There exists no truly mass and proletarian women's organization to give the third party the kind of support--and control it needs to develop in a democratic direction and not in a fascist direction", (p.11) There is not only no "truly mass and proletarian" organization in the U.S. of women but of any kind to lend a democratic direction to anything. The CPUSA has liquidated all that we had that came anywhere near such standards. But George--and this is the point of discussion--again evades his own point. How much support can the P.P. muster from the women? If there ever was a Convention with a solid attendance of women, it was the P.P.'s in Philadelphia. Here in N.Y. one of the movements to spring most spontaneously up around the third party was the women's movement, drawing on the fragmentary tenants-consumer's organizations. There is only one party in the field in the 1948 elections that offers a correct program for women--or for anyone else, and that's the P.P. Certainly, with all its faults, the present women's support for Wallace is not going to encourage a fascist direction for the third party.

(6) George admits begrudgingly that "considerable numbers of youth are attracted to the third party by its anti-war slogans" but "they only become victims of its bourgeois pacifism." (p.11)

To admit, half-heartedly or not, that the American youth are supporting the P.P. is to admit an important point. In the first place, it exposes the careless nature of George's point on "only a shred of support from the vets" because the spearhead of the youth movement today is the vet. Secondly, to admit this, is to indicate that basically the progressive people of the U.S. support the P.P. today because the youth are a force in the vets, in the unions, in the Negro movement. Not only are points #3 and #6 contradictory, but #6 contradicts George's whole listing of non-support for the third party. There are important groups that George could have included in his

inventory that will be a great source of third party strength. The whole Jewish voting population will vote for Wallace (including most of the Jewish Forward readers and Liberal Party members who have already indicated this attitude.) One can guess that all the progressive people in the U.S.—and there a lot of them—will vote for Wallace. In the last Congressional elections they had nothing to vote for.

So George has proven the impotence of the third party: either few support it, or wherever they do they are fooled. In this sloppy style George has paved the way to prove "that the Third Party of 1948 is a Party incapable of effectively doing what it is supposed to do—prevent war and fascism". (p.12)

His inventory of the third party is the most misrepresentative to date in the U.S. So far, George has declared the third party Browder-planned, fascist-inclined, deceitful in its peace program and impotent.

Like Dowling and others in the expelled movement, George does not consider it necessary to explain his opposition to the S.U.'s attitude towards the third party movement. New Times, a Soviet weekly journal devoted to "questions of the foreign policies of the USSR and other countries and to current events in international life," has repeatedly supported the third party movement in the U.S. These expressions have carefully been ignored by such as George, but evasion or no, George's opposition to the third party and the S.U.'s support present a definite point demanding explanations on the part of George. In a recent issue of New Times (May 26, 1948), in an article entitled "The election Campaign in the United States, M. Nazarevsky expresses the basic Soviet attitude:

"Issues of principle arise in the presidential campaign only through the instrumentality of the new party movement led by Henry A. Wallace which challenges the bipartisan reactionary policy, advocates a program of peace and co-operation with the Soviet Union and the restoration of the democratic rights of the American people." And—

"Opposing both old parties and their "bipartisan policy," is the Third Party movement which is gaining in importance as the campaign develops. Though its enemies try hard to play down the importance of this movement led by Wallace, it is steadily gaining support among millions of Americans who are eager to preserve peace among the nations, curb the militarists and restrain the omnipotence of the monopolies." (Our emphasis) And the article concludes with:

"Support for Wallace is growing especially in the trade unions and among the youth which does not wish to become cannon fodder in the new war being hatched by the monopolies, and among Negroes who are subjected to discrimination despite White House promises.

"The Third Party program meets with wide response among the people, for it is a program of peace and democracy." (Our emphasis).

This to George is Browderite talk!

#### 5-George's People's Front Against the Progressive Party

Now, what has George of a constructive nature to suggest in applying the

People's Front to American conditions along the line of the 7th C.I.? First, George offers snide insinuations in the style of Dowling. It strikes George a little funny-- the support given the third party by certain expelled groups and individuals. Notice this lofty unperturbed observation of pro-third party Communists:

"However, among the expelled comrades there is considerable huffing and puffing (our emphasis) over 'what to do' about this 'Third Party' mess the revisionists have got everyone into." (p.16-17)

This is to put it mildly, a rather greasy attitude towards the serious work of comrades for a third party of a correct type. Of all the detailed and careful analyses circulated embodying the problems of work for a correct third party, he offers this Dowling-styled assortment of sloppily misparaphrased summaries:

"One Ishmael among them speaks in Los Angeles squares, crying his slogan: 'For a Wallace World!'"\* Another in New York, joins the Wallace movement under the slogan 'Down with Wallace!'"\*\* Some adopt a 'neutral' view that Communists have no other work in the 'Third Party' beyond extracting Communist recruits from it.\*\*\* Whole groups already working as isolated segments of a Communist Party\*\*\*\* simply invent their own 'attitude toward the Third Party'."

-----  
/\*This is evidently directed at Irwin Edelman. We heartily disagree with many of the ideas of Edelman that have come to our attention. However, in view of George's snotty remark we think we should indicate that Edelman has his very good points which if one is to attack his ideas, merit more than an attack of formulated saliva such as "Ishmael".

We would like to reprint here an excerpt from an interesting letter to the L.A. Daily News (not printed), a copy of which Edelman has sent Turning Point:

"I was speaking that Wednesday night to a tolerant audience when suddenly four marines wedged their way through the crowd, made some remarks about a Moscow Jew, dragged me off the bench and started pulling me to the nearby fountain. By the time we reached the goal, a sufficient number in the crowd bestirred themselves and robbed them of their prey.

"After they left, a cop arrived, led me out of the park and told me that in the future I would have to obtain authorization to speak, I explained to him that no authorization was legally required and that it was his duty to protect me in the exercise of my rights. I then returned to search for literature and personal items which were scattered in the scuffle around the fountain.

"About half hour later the four marines arrived with heavy reinforcements--at least 20. I was not then speaking but they detected me and, against all resistance, succeeded in throwing me into the pool. My wallet with some cash was gone. Whether it was the marines picked my pockets I will not vouch. A cop appeared on the scene by the time the heroes had safely galloped beyond Fifth and Olive. A friendly spectator who was sickened by the spectacle drove me to my home in his car."

Whatever his incorrect ideas, Edelman is a man of fifty with guts that stand for peace. He deserves more than an epithet in the style of Dowling.

\*\*Our research staff is working on this one. Considering George's lost-weekend type of quoting, it could be a lot of people or none. It could be Dunne who is not only against Wallace but also the P.P. It could even be T.P. since we criticize Wallace--and Harrison George is not very accurate about these things.

\*\*\*This may be some of us, tarred and feathered and therefore not quite recognizable. May we refer the interested to a January 1948 issue of SPARK on The Third Party and the Big Switch of 1948 in which after a detailed analysis of what the third party should be we added one neglected factor which may be the murdered misparaphrase above:

"The correct work invested in building a 3rd party with the best people in the U.S. can logically turn into a valuable inventory for a real Communist Party's recruits. In the course of this work, we can find the best elements in the CPUSA now, and prove the facts and disprove the fairy tales about loyalty and renegades. We will rediscover the long-disillusioned Communists and those who never joined for understandable reasons." (p. 7)

George's phrase "extracting recruits" merits the reader's attention. It is evidently an extension of Marxism in the era of sophistry for use in snobbish circles. George's disciples "recruit"; but huffers and puffers "extract recruits".

\*\*\*We beseech George to inform us of those "isolated segments of a Communist Party". We haven't discovered any yet. Even Dowling--who may any day now-- has nevertheless not yet proclaimed a CP or segment thereof. It's bad enough that George misquotes profoundly at his readers, but he shouldn't tease them with alleged secrets of the expelled circles. In this connection, we would like information also on the derivation of the phrase: "simply invent their own attitude toward the third party!". We don't care whether people invent or adopt an attitude--as long as they have the correct attitude.

We must admit that to read George is a stimulating exercise. One must down tools and engage in a cross country meet in research--ending in the 42nd St. library for extended documentary debauches, all this to understand his quotes. This whole expedition is demoralizing because it only leads one to speculate on the motives of George's mission to the Limbo of Incomplete Quotes.

Our reader had better beware lest he too is represented--under an unlicensed knife--in (what an attachment to accuracy would classify as), George's Supplementary Crisis in Surgery.

After his snickers at the foolish comrades puffing about the Third Party, George announces that such "self-invented policy" is an anarchist tendency. This, we are told, is because Comrades have not stuck to the decisions of the 1945 CP Convention. (In another part of this article we deal with George's "last legal convention" (1945) fantasies).

George has offered a lot of criticism. Here is the total of his constructive suggestions:

"By reference to the 1945 program, by use of Leninist analysis of the "Third Party," and by observance of the CI Seventh Congress principles of how people's

Fronts should be built, a correct policy can be determined.

"The 'Third Party' represents, for one thing, a split in the camp of the bourgeoisie, and Leninism teaches us that such splits should be encouraged as an 'indirect reserve' of the revolutionary proletariat. Hence, Communists in the 'Third Party' should, for one thing, by demanding democratic control from below, mobilize mass pressure upon the bourgeois leaders to deepen the split, prevent compromises and enforce performance of promises.

"The 'Third Party' represents, for another thing, an organization in which millions of oppressed and exploited people place their hopes for peace and democracy, not realizing that it is, in its present form and leadership, incapable of attaining those aims. Hence, Communists in such a party should strive to make these millions the 'direct reserves' of the revolutionary proletariat by winning them ideologically and organizationally for a People's Front type of democratic coalition, if possible transforming the 'Third Party' into such a People's Front." (p. 18)

Now most of this is correct and on this basis we think a Comrade could set out to work for the success of the P.P. But--and this is a big but--George does not set out here; he has ended here. He has damned the third party and ended with a quote to keep himself in harmony with a few important Communist documents. He does not set out; he has "set down." There is no attitude of using correct Communist perspective to correct the valuable beginnings in the U.S. of the Third Party--of how to work for it to make it a real People's Front type of Third Party.

What George feels should be done, isn't being done in the leadership circles of the Third Party, so he has the function only of exposing the Third Party. In this he has a lot of company.

But after this short "constructive" passage, unused in George's opposition to the third party, George sails back to criticism of the huffers and puffers, namely, SPARK. In this passage George has mixed up so many simple points that to paraphrase would be to again compound the confusion. Therefore we ask the reader to follow carefully some detailed quoting. We ask you to read in full (1) George's criticism of SPARK, (2) then the original passages that started this bitter confusion in George's Crisis, (3) and then the original criticism as presented in SPARK.

After this we will approach the garbage pail polemic angle again in regard to George's misuse of the Cominform statement on Tito. Here we will reprint what the PR Club said about Tito and the People's Front and what the Cominform criticized--not what George said it did. All this while using up a lot of space is nevertheless a valuable and clarifying trek, we hope. An orderly procedure of examining ideas is very much in order, when simple ideas get as mauled they are at the moment.

First, George's criticism of SPARK on Federation:

"Of course, even a correct policy can be mis-applied. There was some friendly criticism in the February, 1948, issue of "Spark" against the emphasis which I placed in my Thesis upon the building of a People's Front in this country through "the coalition of workers and farmers by federation of organizations."

The "Spark" held that, in America, this was both unwise and impossible; firstly because it would mean "control from the top," and impossible because of the



reactionary character of "union leaders" who, it was assumed, would bureaucratically determine all questions for their unions, and first of all would determine that their unions would not federate or affiliate to any People's Front. It was assumed that I did not know of, or had not considered, this supposed "invincibility" of the trade union bureaucracy. Of course, I knew of it as a "theory," but as a wrong one, usually associated with "leftism."

"My position for the "federation" structure was further mistakenly assumed to exclude all individual membership participation in a Farmer-Labor Party by component individuals of the federated organizations. That was not my position, and I should have made it clear. On the contrary, I hold that such participation in the mass activities of a Farmer-Labor Party is what makes an otherwise formal federation real, durable, or even attainable.

"What better work in "building" a people's front party can an individual member of a union do, than to win his fellow-workers in his own union to the support of such a party so thoroughly that their union officials cannot avoid federation when it is proposed, or sabotage it afterward?

"That is the way to build and control the people's front from below. But if, as "Spark" proposes, federation is barred, and the people's front is limited exclusively to mass assembly of heterogenous class membership associated only as individuals; then, indeed, control "from the top" is assured. Not by trade union bureaucrats, but by Party bureaucrats.

"More important, by barring federation, "Spark" bars the Communist Party as a party; as an independent organization with its own separate program, and gets us back to Right Opportunist liquidation by merger." (p. 18-19 Supplement)

In the CRISIS, George did not merely emphasize federation; he based his plans on it. So let us see what the Crisis said originally. George says the CP must:

"2. Clearly and explicitly define the task ahead as one of the building of a People's Front in the United States against war and fascism, through the coalition of workers and farmers by federation of organizations, and the immediate separation of all possible forces of labor from both political parties of the bourgeoisie." (p. 76-Crisis)(George's italics)

Dennis has certainly led a suicidal policy of destroying the People's Front possibilities in the U.S. through sabotage of the third party at some points and perversion of the third party at others. It should be clear to Communists by now that Dennis more and more must deliver correct lipservice (insofar as he is able to masquerade as a Marxist) on all occasions. In the light of this important factor today, we should avoid fighting a straw man in a correct statement by Dennis. We should only expose its hypocrisy. George, however really confuses matters on federation by attacking a quote from Dennis, chosen by himself and rewritten by himself. Standing "as is" in the Crisis, as quoted by Harrison George, it is not so bad:

"What is required is the organization, in every ward and township, in every city and on a Congressional district basis (this is the bad part which escapes George's attention—the parliamentary restriction) of some form of independent, political, legislative membership organization...building down below, everywhere, a grass roots mass membership political action organization."(Dennis, Dec. 1946 Plenum)

George then comments:

"Observe that this is not a united front of proletarian organizations united in a delegate council; neither is it a people's front alliance of parties and organizations, each of them retaining its independent identity, and federating together, as in a Farmer-Labor Party, on a program common to all, but infringing on none of their separate programs. No, this is a "mass membership" organization." (p.92 Crisis)

Here you have more than emphasis for a federation. You have definite opposition to a membership organization (we, as the reader will see, never accused George of excluding individual membership) and reliance on a federation base. It is the incorrect concept of federation as an organizational base for a third party in the U.S. now that we criticized originally.

Again we have to catch George deliberately chopping out a focal part of Dennis' quote and eliding two sentences together to mean something else--because Dennis was not against federation.\* Notice in the January 1947 PA that Dennis was not even talking about a third party. He was talking of some preliminary preparation work needed "to forge a new progressive party alignment" in 1948.

Where George put in four dots in Dennis' quote, Dennis was misrepresented in that he was agreeing with George. Notice: where Dennis said that what is required is a "legislative membership organization (George struck the following out) as well as united front committees. Local coordinating centers comparable to and allied with the Conference of Progressives are important, but they are not enough. Independent united progressive committees for the city elections are extremely important also and must be promoted. But something else is needed, something which will result in (and here George continued Dennis' quote) building down below", etc.

Dennis makes a statement with which Harrison George agrees in part, so George deletes parts of three sentences, puts the remnants together,--and disagrees with Dennis. Such juggling is criminal. Enough of this juggling and the comrades won't know what ideas they're fighting--only whom they're fighting.

On top of all this, George did not state Dennis' real point which comes 2 short paragraphs below in the same report:

"However, as we stressed in the report, all this activity must be connected with a determined and greatly expanded effort to help unite and activate the pro-Roosevelt forces in and around the Democratic Party."(Dennis italics)

Quite a point to miss. The CPUSA leadership was actively sabotaging the formation of a third party, something George does not know. Only a few months earlier the PR Club was expelled for--among other crimes--demanding that the CP start work for a real People's Front third party.

-----  
/ \*All through the Supplement, one is confronted by a multitude of quoted fragments, 1, 2, and 3 words. One never knows exactly what is quotation and what is paraphrase. In moments of literary generosity George quotes a complete phrase at once. Under cover of this irresponsible quotation-marking (not always quoting) anyone may be held responsible for having said anything. George is too often guilty of misquoting to be guilty by accident./

Now, in the original criticism of the February SPARK you will notice that, although we attacked federation as a basic orientation today, we did not exclude federation. We also did not accuse George of excluding individuals. Also notice that SPARK (amazing thought!) does not bar a Communist Party from the People's Front! Evidently George gave us the same cute quotechnique he used on Browder and Dennis.

The passage under George's attack is the following from February SPARK:

"Certainly, Comrade George is correct in exposing the CPUSA leadership's liquidationism (elaborated on pages 92-93). But, as he pointed out to Comrade Smith, he should not confuse the CPUSA's misuse with the correct concepts. We think that the membership concept of a Third Party in the U.S. is essential for the promotion of every requirement for a correct Third Party given by George in his book. It is true that in European countries a federation is involved--but even there, Tito made some very important criticisms. In his recent report to the People's Front Congress in Yugoslavia, Tito emphasized the character of the People's Front as the 'organization of all progressive individuals'. He pointed out the weaknesses in People's Fronts in other countries where the People's Fronts consisted of the various parties headed by leaders who were not only waverers but were reactionaries and traitors'. He warned against a 'predominantly formal character instead of constituting a fighting unity'.

"The unions, progressive organizations and minor state parties which would have to be the separate parts of a federated third party are all controlled from the top by a consistently opportunist and often reactionary leadership. The workers in those unions can have little to say via their leaders (and isn't this 'via leadership' channel exactly where the CP leadership has misdirected so much mass pressure?). The many good mass organizations which once existed in the U.S. have long since been liquidated by the CP and are out of the picture. Unlike Europe where many small parties are involved in the fight against fascism and for national independence, we have two Wall Street parties. Also,--- very important---we have no Socialist Party (i.e. outside of the Social-Democrat CPUSA) in the U.S., which would be an important consideration in a People's Front. Even such organizations as PCA are controlled from the top (with the help and handover by the CP) by such as Kenney. Those organizations whose membership will be the greatest strength in a Third Party cannot be represented through their heads.

"For the various Third Party beginnings around the country, federation is a dangerous thing. These are tied to the old machines in their areas. The most backward of these want a federation which will fall apart the day after election. This will leave their members free to drift back to the old machines. A membership Third Party is needed in the U.S. exactly for the purpose of smashing the old affiliations of its members. Isn't the purpose of a Third Party to smash the war program of the U.S. government--but at the same time to be a transition for the most advanced elements in the Third Party to a Communist Party? Consider a member of the Kenney-led Third Party in California in a federated set-up. After Nov., he is prey to Kenney's local plans. But if he is part of a new national membership party, he has new loyalties and responsibilities to it--not to any renegade part of it. As long as the American worker has to worry over war and fascism he needs permanent organizations and not temporary election coalitions.

"To help form a Third Party with separate state and national organizations is logical, but to restrict the Third Party to their federation is suicide!"(p.18-19)

George realized that the weakest possibility of third party development at this point is a federation of organizations. Most of the existing organizations and groups whose members support the third party do not officially (from the top) support the third party. They bitterly oppose it. Therefore, logically, we who support the P.P. believe in utilizing its strongest base in America today—the progressive millions of individuals in all sorts of reactionary led institutions.

Wherever there is a possibility of federation, affiliation, or any type of endorsement, the possibility should be used. But the participation of the masses of oppressed in America should not be contingent on the favorable vote of their committee-leading leaders. Ours is a solution for the U.S. third party at this time—not for the other countries of the world that have a powerful base to federate nor for the U.S. at any time when it does have such a base. But both George and we agree it does not have that base now. We can't therefore accept the invitation to bury the third party.

Here, so far, is the material involved in what has become a desperate point with George. For this reason we want to ask: why is federation so important to George? George takes many pains to prove in that part of the Supplement that we have already reviewed that there is nothing to federate. He finds no union support, no women's organizations, no youth organizations, nothing supporting the third party. He does begrudgingly recognize that there are many individuals attracted to the third party.

It is therefore logical—and dishonest—for him to proceed in this fashion: 1-George declares the correct basis for a third party to be federation; 2-George finds that since there is nothing to federate in a correct, federated third party, that therefore the third party is impotent and cannot carry out its responsibilities. This bluntly George cannot say it; George cannot even bluntly say: I oppose the third party. But via Dennis devices in doubletalk, & criminal misquotations, he fights the P.P. today. And from all charges he is protected by the mere testament that he agrees with the decisions of the Seventh C.I. Dowling also, makes this point of absolution clear,

Therefore the point on federation exposes the main tactical devices of George's attack on the P.P., an attack more insidious, more obstructionist and defeatist than that of Americus.

But there is another item of unfinished business regarding an unprincipled, intriguing attack, (but so polite) on the PR Club as supporting Tito since it did quote him on occasion. (Here again Dowling led the way.)

Directing following the above quoted section, criticizing SPARK on federation, George concludes:

"In its criticism of my emphasis on a people's front through federation, and to support its idea of limiting the organizational structure of a people's front to a mass association of individuals, 'Spark' (February, 1948, p. 18) said: 'It is true that in European countries a federation is involved—but even there, Tito made some very important criticisms. In his recent report to the People's Front Congress in Yugoslavia, Tito emphasised the character of the People's Front as the 'organization of all progressive individuals!.'

"In the light of recent Communist Information Bureau (CIB) criticism of Tito for this very thing; this 'leaving of the Party dissolved in the impartial People's Front', it would seem that the 'SPark' might reconsider its February position and publish the result of such consideration." (p. 19)

Let us spotlight George's sinister but polite mudslinging. Here is George's insinuation stated crudely: Tito had a certain idea on the People's Fronts shared by the SPARK and opposed by the Cominform.

George distorts and misrepresents all three sources: Tito, the Cominform and the PR Club. In this connection we will show very simply with quotes that he gives Tito undeserved credit, and the Cominform and SPARK undeserved discredit by misrepresenting the ideas.

In its December Issue, SPARK analyzed the first meeting of the Cominform on October 5, 1947. In some prefacing remarks, it showed the motion towards the Cominform organization and a general, tightening up before Oct. 5th, quoting such leaders as Togliatti, Zachariades, the Chinese Party, and including Tito. SPARK quoted from "The People's Front and the New Yugoslavia" by Tito, reprinted in January 1948 PA.

There is a tendency among some of our Comrades (in the famous sloppy CPUSA manner) to switch mechanically without analysis and confuse past ideas and actions with the current status of the person under discussion (a habit that Lenin used to warn against as in the case of the once valuable Plekhanov). In this connection we would like to make a few points clear on Tito's status then.

In his People's Front Speech, (Sept. 27, 1947) which was made about one week before the first meeting of the Cominform, Tito practically announced the Cominform. In his introductory remarks he said:

"I think the time will come when the representatives of all the democratic forces of the world will be able to meet and discuss the forms of international cooperation which are required, and the activities and struggle which should be waged, in order to prevent the catastrophe of a new war." (p. 76 PA)

The Cominform headquarters was put in Belgrade—a great compliment which Belgrade has squandered on careerism. The Cominform denunciation was printed on June 29th, 1948. Its summary states:

"The Information Bureau maintains that the basis of all these faults of the leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia is the incontestable fact that in its leadership in the last five to six months openly nationalistic elements prevailed and were formerly masked." (Our emphasis)

The speech we quoted from was made about ten months before when the international prestige of the Yugoslavia Party was high. Whatever preparations Tito was laying for his scheme were masked, and completely unknown to us in the U.S. where we get practically no inside information (before the issuance of the Cominform Bulletin).

It is unthinking to bury Tito by insisting that nothing good was ever done in Yugoslavia. The opposite should be done and will be—to damn Tito with his own former, correct advice and exposures of anti-Party methods.

We did wonder about the following passage in Tito's People's Front speech:

"Has the Communist Party of Yugoslavia some other program outside that of the People's Front? No." etc. We didn't criticize this point because American Comrades (before the appearance of the Cominform Organ) have a difficult problem to solve in the matter of the PA's authenticity. We read unMarxist speeches under the names of

Dimitrov, Gomulka, and others. We still do not know if these were authentic, but it is not our mission to throw doubt on international Communist leaders on the basis of a PA reprint. The CPUSA was casting enough off-the-record aspersions without irresponsible guesses on our part. We are not Prophets who have to make a pronouncement in the manner of the Road Ahead outfit every time our incomplete data causes us to wonder at certain statements.

There are other parts of the Tito speech that may turn out to be self-adulation, but here again we would be merely blowing a horn if we attempted to judge. The accurate facts of Yugoslavia's history will come out in good time. The Cominform statement, Tito's answer and the current actions of the Tito clique are sufficient evidence against Tito. We are sure that many more facts will come to light on the situation in Yugoslavia--and elsewhere, as already indicated in the published letters from the CPSU(B).

There is also an indication in the Cominform attack that Tito's criticisms at the first meeting of the Cominform were considered. The ideas quoted from Tito's speech of Sept. 27th are correct ones. Tito's sellout occurs elsewhere.

George attempts to insinuate (if not prove) that Tito's People's Front was a mass organizational, unfederated party; he thought perhaps that we took our idea of the organization of third party in the U.S. from Tito. This was an unfounded guess, born of the strain of unprincipled polemic. Actually, George should have checked first. He would have found that the Tito People's Front was based on federation. (2nd issue of the Cominform Bulletin in an article by Djilas.) And would George damn the Cominform for printing so much material by Yugoslav leaders? And also, in connection with Comrade Bering's hallucinations in the Cominform Bulletin, shouldn't this prove that a mere printing in the Bulletin does not guarantee the ideas on all occasions of all individuals.

Djilas, high co-conspirator of Tito said that the People's Front was "a mass organization with millions of members. The People's Front was joined by the mass organization of women (AFZ) and youth (USAOJ)...United Trade Unions of Yugoslavia. Various political groups as well as prominent political and cultural figures also joined the People's Front". And--

"A member of the Front may be any person who works in one of the existing Front organizations..." etc.

So where does this presence of Federation in the Yugoslav People's Front leave George and his unprincipled attempt to stick us with the stinking corpse of Tito, by proving Tito and SPARK were vs federation. Is such technique better in any way than the technique of the N.C. in calling us Trotskyite. (And on this point we hear that, off the record, via letters, George and Franklin find that Turning Point has Trotskyite tendencies!!!! (We would like to read an open discussion of this.)

So Tito was wrong--not where George points for the purposes of attacking Turning Point--but where the Cominform statement clearly stated. This brings us to George's worst misquoting--of the Cominform. George said above, "In the light of recent Communist Information Bureau (CIB) criticism of Tito for this very thing; this 'leaving of the Party dissolved in the impartial People's Front', it would seem that the 'Spark' might reconsider its February position and publish the result of such consideration". (Our emphasis) (And so we are!) George, via the pornography of his polemic has seen fit to foist on his readers the idea that when the Cominform talked of

the dissolution of the Party in the People's Front, they meant "this very thing"-- Turning Point and Spark's idea of a mass membership base for an American P.P. Now let's check in the Cominform statement:

"In Yugoslavia, on the other hand, the Communist Party is not considered the leading force, but the People's Front. The Yugoslav leaders undervalue the role of the Communist Party and in fact, they leave the party dissolved in the impartial People's Front which includes quite different classes,...as well as various political groups including some bourgeois parties". /Even here George, if he had read carefully, would have found the evidence of federation and then not ventured on his absurd attack on Turning Point./

So what has George done? He has taken a simple and clear statement by the Cominform on the dangers of forgetting the independent role of the CP and has applied it to a discussion of an organizational problem (not touched on in the Cominform statement) involving the third party. Our argument with George on the third party question does not involve disagreement over the need for the independent role of the C.P. And thus, George answers what he called SPARK's friendly criticism.

The Cominform in this section has attacked Tito for the burying of the independent role of the C.P. This accusation has been made against the C.P. by all the expelled people. That's what our SOS to ALL Communists in 1946 demanded. It is to the discredit of the expelled movement that Comrades have to answer the drivel that they are for the dissolution of the CP in the People's Front. There may be a million and one varieties of different positions in the expelled movement, but we have yet to come across (with minor exceptions) comrades who aren't sure of one thing--and that's the independent role the C.P. must have. To conjure up an argument in one of the few arenas of agreement is certainly a masochist pastime.

One parting word on Yugoslavia. It is a small tragedy that some comrades in N. C. lost their faith in the S. U.--and after that everything went! It is a great tragedy that the whole nation of Yugoslavia has been thrown into turmoil by a band of old style bureaucrats such as the International Communist movement has had to vomit every so often.

In this situation it is important to expose the Tito outfit and its tricks, explain the Cominform accusations and recheck all our ideas as the other European parties are doing. There is no benefit involved in a pat statement which explains little, such as has come from Dowling or George. There is still less room for misuse of the Tito case in order to slander ones 'friendly' opponent--as in George's case. One can be safe and respected with honest forthright thinking; gags, maneuvers, "whipping boys" always bounce back.

We are putting out in our next issue some data on the Road Ahead group and the Tito case in general. It will be more than an "I condemn" statement because there is a lot to clarify for other American Communists--including some in the C.P.--who are losing faith in the S.U. Browderism is now paying its highest dividends, because when doubt about the S.U. slips in, it's pretty late in the attempt to save old Communists. They've rotted.

In leaving the third party question, as part of our reconsideration, we aren't sure whether George has supplemented the Crisis as much as depleted it. What were minor weak or incomplete points in the Crisis have now flowered. A general if rather dangerously stated point on the dangers of fascism in third parties in the

Crisis blossoms without reason into a scurrilous attack on the third party today in the Supplement.

Certainly the greatest danger of many facing the third party today is the danger of redbaiting or subservience to redbaiting which will allow the worst elements in the third party to take over. But the arguments of the Georges help this process, and they cannot restrain their glee whenever Wallace or Taylor do backwater. Faced with the irresponsible conduct of C.P. operators in the P.P., with snide rather subtle advice from the Americuses, with the too complacent rank and file (although this rule is broken more and more) Wallace certainly stands close to the possibility of an increase in redbaiting. As Wallace watches the CP hacks redbait and hound expelled people in the third party in an unprincipled way he becomes very unstable in his resolution not to redbait a little himself, (to take the heat off the redbaiting of the P.P., he thinks). He did this recently in reassuring Tugwell. Our responsibility is to fight this, hang on to the best in the P.P., and not yield the organization to its destroyers.

George has not offered a constructive approach to the People's Front in the U.S. If he really thinks the People's Front can't be worked for till we get a real C.P., let him say that bluntly--like Dowling, so we can all know where we stand.

Finally, it is strange (except to those who understand how mutual admiration circles work) that Franklin's Bill Haywood Club endorses George's ideas in the Supplement, since they had basically a correct position on the third party. But what's a change of political position, when a personal alliance is being molded in the U.S. of a handful of men with political convictions that fade before the vista of a new mutual admiration circle signing manifestos for American Communists. (This we will consider in a later section.)

-----  
/As this was being stenciled, The New York Times of Sept. 12, 1948 carried the following report of the Soviet Union's attitude towards Wallace and the P.P./

"The New Times, internationally-circulated Moscow journal through which the Soviet Foreign Office on frequent occasion makes known its views on foreign policy to Communists abroad, has taken the measure of Henry A. Wallace as the Presidential candidate of the Progressive Party.

"Mr. Wallace, The New Times reports, is a 'resolute' champion of the cause of improving Soviet-American relations and one of the few American politicians seeking 'an understanding' with the Soviet Union who has formulated a program welcomed by the Soviet Government 'as a realistic basis for negotiations.'

... "But he is combating the fascistization of the U.S. and fatal bipartisan home and foreign policy of the American reactionaries, and in this fight he enjoys the support of all progressive circles in America."

"By selected quotations Mr. Berezkhov represents Mr. Wallace as believing that American democracy is subject to control by 'the monopolies and the military,' control which is the prelude to a modified form of fascism; that the Western Powers are cooperating with reactionaries, although everywhere popular sympathy is with the S.U. and the reforms it urges, and that American 'monopoly interests' are the real masters of the U.S., and their profits depend upon huge military appropriations."

... "Mr. Berezkhov cites various passages 'of a naive and utopian character. These include Wallace's idea of the possibility of establishing a 'progressive' capitalism in the U.S. and of 'reforming' the capitalist system,' the article declares... What-ever the outcome of the elections, the forces behind Wallace will continue to play 'a very essential role' in American political life, the Soviet organ believes."/



II- George Rewrites the Draft Resolution of the CPUSA

George states that "the political line of the Browder Thesis (World Communism and the Foreign Policy of the U.S.) dominates the line of the Draft Resolution of the National Committee". (p. 1) It is to reinforce this project that George proves that Browder supports the third party, that the CP supports the third party, and that George opposes it as Browderism.

Actually, George falls here for the deceitful technique of lipservice of the National Committee. Certainly, the CP leadership is still Browderite; but what George misses is the important and dangerous development whereby the N.C. leaves its former, openly Browderite position AND NOW WRITES AS CLOSELY AS IT CAN TO THE C.I.B. In deeds, it serves Browder; in words, it lipservices the Cominform. The point, then, is to expose the hypocrisy of lipservice. The point is to indicate the lapses of lipservice, which do exist in some quantity. The point is not to fall for the N.C.'s trick and slip into a criticism of correct statements. This could become a fatal error for the expelled movement. It is Dowling error. George misses the essence of the N.C.'s development since 1945; he has missed the big switch of 1948.

As a result of this initial error, George discredits the expelled comrades with uncalled-for, snide attacks on the Draft Resolution--in the wrong places. Such criticism will not convince the CP membership of the bankruptcy of the N.C. nor will it give them anything but a distorted picture of our policy and our attitude.

There is only one way to fight for ideas: know the idea and stick by it; don't get thrown for a loop when the opposition starts using your arguments for their purposes, usurping the very ideas for which you were expelled and insisting that this was always their policy. For a long time, now, the CP brains have been attempting to write "orthodox Marxism" as a replacement for Browder's sophisticated revisionism. They are rather sloppy at it, and the Draft Resolution is well supplied with revisionism and opportunism.

We would be foolish to accept the words of the N.C. as their ideas. In that case we would find ourselves--a good part of the time--fighting our own ideas. This is the fate of George. He attacks correct parts of the Resolution, misquotes, and amazingly enough (considering that his Supplement is allegedly a consideration of the Draft as one of three theses,) he lets the blatantly un-Marxist parts stand unmolested.

What is the reason for this? George was so intent on attacking only those parts which he thought showed a parallelism with Browder that he failed to comprehend the Draft Resolution as a whole. In order to show such parallelism, however, he deliberately misquotes. With almost no exception, every attack George makes on the Draft is either based on a misquote or is an incorrect attack.

At first one is quite bewildered by such unnecessary distortions (which can only play into the hands of the N.C.), but this is explained

later when George reaches the climax of his thesis -- namely the idea that we must base ourselves on the 1945 Resolution, until "a new convention must carry through the unfinished business of 1945". It is essential to George's theory of continuity (the continuity of his career) and his attack on the raising of the perspective of a new American Communist Party, to maintain that the 1945 Resolution was in the main correct, whereas the 1948 Resolution has reverted to Browderism. But the fact is that the 1945 Resolution was written by exactly the same crew of undemocratically elected, hypocritical Browderites. And it played exactly the same role the 1948 Resolution is supposed to play -- that of deceiving the membership with an ostensibly half-correct program and a few words of self-criticism (very few). The fact is that the 1945 Resolution did not reconstitute the CPUSA as it was before the complete betrayal into the CPA. It was a hypocritical forum of maudlin self-critical sermons spoken as a cathartic before resuming power.

A priori ideas seem to be inevitably forced to sink to the low level of deliberate misquoting. We now pass to proof that this is the case.

George accuses the N.C. of American exceptionalism because it asserts that: "In the United States alone, imperialism emerged from the war militarily and, in certain respects, economically stronger. (Part I, Sec. 1)" (George's emphasis).

This statement is an accurate account of what took place. British, French and German imperialism were crushed under the weight of the war and America's "assistance", and only in the U. S. did imperialism emerge with far greater military forces than it had before the war, and as Banker for the world. George precedes his quoting of the above statement with a cut-up explanation from the Draft Resolution which qualifies it quite correctly. This he quickly dismisses. However in trying to prove his point he proceeds to deliberately misquote.

"Further on, its Draft Resolution discards even this appearance of qualification about 'certain respects,' and repeatedly and flatly speaks of the 'increased economic and military power of American capitalism as a result of the war'. (our emphasis)

"Misinterpreting productive power, technique, gold assets and aggressive belligerence as constituting the 'strength of capitalism' (which they are not, because 'capitalism' consists only of the social relationships of economic classes), the National Committee not only holds that American capitalism is an exception in 'alone' enjoying 'increased strength' as a 'result of the war,' but bases its program on this 'strength' being durable for a period of time it sets practically no limit upon." (Original emphasis) (p.3)

Thus sayeth George. But the following is the complete section from which George quotes the Draft as discarding "even this appearance of qualification":

"The increased economic and military power of American capitalism as a result of the war, (here George's quote ended) far from lessening, has greatly intensified the major internal contradictions of American capitalism - the contradiction between increased productive capacity and

capital accumulation, on the one hand, and the greatly decreased and further decreasing imperialist market, on the other; the contradiction between production and consumption, etc. These are expressions of the basic contradictions between the social character of production and the private capitalist nature of appropriation which is irresistibly driving the American capitalist system toward a new economic crisis." (Part I, Sec 3)

All but the underlined part was omitted by George and then attacked for such omission. Not only is this section distorted by George, but it actually states exactly what George does in his correction of it!

In his next paragraph George accused the Draft of holding that it would be: "'left sectarian' to begin to prepare the American proletariat to accept the solution of socialism, a solution it contends should be advocated only during 'higher stages'" (p.3)

Actually the two quoted phrases come from the following paragraph of Part III, Sec. 5 of the Draft Resolution:

"We must not make the fatal Leftist sectarian error of failing to rally the masses for the realization of the immediate tasks of the coalition because there are higher stages of struggle to come. Equally we must guard against the fatal Right-opportunist mistake of failing to treat the struggle for the immediate tasks in the light of the strategic needs of the struggle as a whole and of the coming higher stages...

"In connection with this, it is necessary to expose the illusion that the abolition of monopoly rule in the U.S. will usher in a system of 'progressive capitalism' or restore the era of free competition. On the contrary, the elimination of the power of monopoly capital must lead inevitably to socialism."

These paragraphs are full of subtle reformist illusions about the possibility of first breaking the power of monopoly capital and then going on to socialism.

If one wants to attack the Draft Resolution, therefore, why attack it for what it doesn't say when the very next paragraph of the Draft really exposes the N.C.'s fear of socialism, fear of the dictatorship of the proletariat, fear of the proletariat revolution:

"The special path along which the transition to socialism will proceed will be determined by the democratic choice and struggles of the American working class and its popular allies, on the basis of the concrete conditions in the United States." (Our emphasis) (Part III, Sec. 5).

Yes, the C.P. National Committee prays for a special path, any path but the path of the dictatorship of the proletariat. But George only succeeds in confusing Communists by transplanting the N.C.'s reference to "left sectarian" as applied to immediate tasks to the question of the advocacy of socialism.

Continuing with his attacks on the Resolution (drafted by Dennis, and grafted by George), George asserts that the "National Committee falls in step with Browder in propagandizing without limit 'to the people' and to the proletariat its unconditional support of the 'return to Roosevelt's policy' under the 'Progressive capitalism' championed by

Henry Wallace and the liberal bourgeoisie, to whom the proletariat must yield hegemony within the 'coalition' throughout the 'present stage' of the fight against war, fascism and economic crisis." (p.3)

However hypocritically (since the Draft Resolution is the essence of hypocrisy), it does attack the idea of "progressive capitalism" over and over again. As for yielding hegemony to the liberal bourgeoisie, Part III of the Draft states: "...there can be no doubt that it (the working class) is capable of becoming, and that it must become the leader of the people's struggle against the monopolies, if these struggles are to succeed."

This faint and hopeful explanation hardly counteracts Bittleman's series in the Daily Worker in February, 1947, which did openly advocate the tailing of the proletariat in the "coalition", but it is not this contradiction which George exposes, but rather in his blind desire to prove that the "National Committee falls in step with Browder, he grafts onto the Draft the opposite of what it states, is

Later in discussing the "Third Party" and its bourgeois pacifist program", George states:

"This being Browderism, the Draft Resolution has to use the magic word 'Teheran', as a sign by which all true believers can be recognized. but in so doing, in its conjuring up the ghost of Teheran to express its own Browderite reliance upon bourgeois pacifism, it injects a dangerous note of anti-Soviet renegacy by its implied demand that the USSR, also, rely upon American imperialism being 'brought back' to the 'promise of Teheran'. In Part I, Sec.1, it says: 'Its (the Soviet Union's) policy is directed firmly toward securing a lasting democratic peace by carrying out the decisions of the Big Three at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam!'"

The section of the Draft immediately following the part quoted above states: "It (the S.U.) strives to complete the destruction of fascism and to make possible the growth of the forces of democracy all over the world. Its determined struggle for peace is demonstrated by the steady demobilization of the wartime strength of its armed forces. This is in sharp contrast to American imperialism's aggressive war policy and systematic rejection of all efforts of the Soviet Government to establish friendly relations and cooperation in the interests of world peace."

"The real danger to the peace of America and of the world is a military onslaught by the war incendiaries of Wall Street." (Part I, Sec1)

Nowhere is there anything said about American imperialism being "brought back" to the "promise of Teheran." Indeed it seems that in this case "Teheran" has become the "magic word" to George by inversion. There is nothing anti-Soviet in the above. What is incorrect is what is left out -- the fact that the CPUSA must itself insure that there will be no war, and that it will fight any such war not only in words, as Cacchione and Gates declared, but in deeds. George points out the disgusting cowardice of Gates, but he does not help us fight for a correct anti-war program by attacking a statement because it is "conjuring up the ghost of Teheran" for George himself. Communists should certainly use the statements of the S.U. which show through the newspaper distortions, its great desire for peace.

Finally in his one-track attack, George reaches the point where he argues in true Dowling fashion: "The National Committee is not only dishonest, but utterly anti-Marxist, when in its Draft Resolution it speaks of the danger of a 'police state,' as if there could be any other state but a police state." (p. 14).

This is Dowling semantics. Communists must always point out the nature of the state as a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie kept in power by the force of its armies and police. But this is not to forget the distinction between bourgeois democracy and fascism. At present fascism is recognized by many who know nothing of its true nature as a "police state". There is nothing wrong with this generalized usage and connotation as far as it goes. It certainly points to the terroristic aspect of the fascist state, if to nothing else. It distinguishes between the kind of "democracy" one has in a bourgeois democracy and the complete destruction of even this under fascism. Not to distinguish between bourgeois democracy and fascism, leads to Dowling's false alternatives for the United States at present: "fascism or socialism." George's attack leads to substantially the same point. Furthermore what exactly does he mean by "dishonest"? Doesn't he believe there is a danger of fascism, a danger of the "police state"? Along this line, it is rather ironic to note that George quotes the Draft Resolution to support his thesis that the "coalition" "will tend to become fascist" when he says that even the "National Committee admits the possibility of a 'mass fascist organization' being 'created'".

The Draft Resolution quite correctly states that:

"Here, existing bourgeois-led mass organizations and existing bourgeois political parties are being subverted to do the work done in Germany and Italy by an openly fascist political party..."

"The absence at present of a mass fascist organization in the U.S. should not lull anyone into a false sense of security that therefore the threat of fascism is not actual, or that such an organization may not be created..." (Part I, Sec. 2)

What is ironic is that the Draft analyzes the danger of fascism correctly as far as it goes, whereas George over and over again declares that this danger comes from the third party. After prophesying that the third party will redbait at its Convention ( a section we have already dealt with), he declares:

"This would strengthen the 'Third Party' trend to become a pace-maker for fascism, allow it to develop the attractive demagogy of the 'Third Force', already voiced by Wallace in his book, as a force against 'both' Fascism and Communism."

But the C.P. correctly identifies the Social Democrats as a "third force" against the Progressive Party while George pays little attention to them, and centers his main attack on Wallace and the third party. Francis Franklin, in a criticism on this very error in N.C.P. Report correctly pointed out:

"...it is not Wallace at the present moment who is holding labor back from fighting war and fascism... On the contrary, it is those within the labor movement who have led the trade union federations to endorse the Marshall Plan, to endorse red-baiting and Soviet-baiting resolutions who have tried to prevent labor from endorsing and playing a leading role

within the third Party, and who are trying to get the third Party to endorse supporters of the Marshall Plan - it is such people within the labor movement who are exerting the greatest influence in holding labor back from the struggle against imperialism." (original emphasis) (Towards Socialism, # 5, August 1, 1948).

Thus George, consumed by his a priori thesis of the Draft Resolution's parallel to Browder's ideas, has neglected to attack the Draft Resolution on any number of weaknesses which we will only mention. Fore 'N Aft in its June 1948 issue analyzed the true nature of the statements in the Draft in an article appropriately entitled "The Archive Rats Behind the Draft Resolution". This article points out that the Draft: "...must be judged in the framework of the recent statements of the Party leaders, and of the Party's policies in the recent period, as well as by internal evidence in the Resolution itself, by what it says and what it fails to say."

This article exposes a fraud which has been swallowed whole by a good part of the expelled movement as well as many Party members, namely the statement that the party "boldly proclaimed the need for such a new people's party." (Part III). Fore 'N Aft points out:

"Yet, as a matter of fact, nothing could be further from the truth, than that the Party took a forthright stand in favor of a new people's party directed against the two party system at any time until Wallace had settled the argument for the Party by announcing his independent candidacy on Dec. 30, 1947. Nor did the Party make any effort to assume a vanguard role in the emerging coalition. On the contrary it deliberately shunned the initiative which it now seeks for the record to credit itself." (p.7, Fore 'N Aft # 6).

The Draft Resolution piously preaches that "the American labor movement in its major sections has to date not accepted this responsibility" (of anti-imperialism) (Part I, Sec. 4). It blames the reactionary leaders of the CIO and AFL for the lag in the labor movement, and blames the American working class as a whole for its sins of misdirection. Fore 'N Aft stated on this that:

"No one expected anything else from most AF of L and right-wing leaders, but it was precisely the capitulatory and reformist role of the very CP labor leaders to whom the class-conscious workers looked for guidance which proved the most damaging blow." (p.7)

Besides deliberately falsifying the facts, and using the saapegoat technique liberally, the Draft Resolution succeeds in absolving the N.C. of its worst sins merely by omission. As Fore 'N Aft pointed out:

"The Draft Resolution fails also to mention the Party's support of the CIO 'no interference' resolution, or its decision not to affiliate with the C.I.B. for fear of reprisals by the bourgeoisie." (p.9)

Yes, amazingly enough, in order to discuss the non-affiliation of the C.I.B. a party member had to inject an extraneous (!) note into the discussion, since the N.C. did not deign to mention this fact.

For the rest, we will only mention a few of the numerous errors which the Draft Resolution made, and which certainly should have been discussed by anyone considering it as a "thesis." (A future issue will carry our evaluation of the CPUSA Convention in detail.)

In all its discussion of fascism and the "people's coalition", the Resolution never really discusses the nature of fascism as capitalism, nor the nature of the people's front as the most direct and powerful blow against capitalism and for socialism in the period of the fascist danger. As Dimitroff said in his report to the 7th World Congress; we want all this in order "... to sweep fascism off the face of the earth and, together with it, capitalism!" In the same way its "explanations" of the role of the working class in the people's front, and the role of the C.P. as the vanguard of the working class bear no relationship to a Marxist and revolutionary analysis, an analysis such as Dimitroff's. It is so "liberal" and rhetorical, so querulous and half-hearted an analysis that it could convince people of only one thing: that the CPUSA doesn't believe that it should lead the working class and the people's front in our country. If the CPUSA really considered itself the party of the workers, it would not hesitate to take leadership, but since it has succeeded in isolating itself from the working class especially through the CIO "non-interference" resolution, it can only tail Wallace. As for the Progressive Party, the Resolution gives adequate directions on how to murder it, a task it has been conscientiously carrying out:

"...every effort should be made by the supporters of the new party forces to unite with all groups for the election of progressive, anti-war Congressmen irrespective of party labels." (our emphasis), (Part II.) But, as we pointed out in our "Letter to the C.I.B." there are no anti-war, anti-Marshall Plan Congressmen in either of the two parties. It would be bad enough if this were the program of the P.P., but the truth is that it has been primarily through the 'good offices' of the C.P., that this policy has unofficially been put into effect. Actually the C.P. is guilty of all the errors in regard to the people's front that Dimitroff warned against:

"A successful struggle for the establishment of the united front imperatively demands constant struggle in our ranks against tendencies to depreciate the role of the Party, against legalist illusions, against reliance on spontaneity and automatism, both in liquidating fascism and in conducting the united front against the slightest vacillation at the moment of determined action." (Report to 7th World Congress, p. 64, Workers Library Publishers.) (All emphasis in the original.)

All this is unimportant to those who oppose the Progressive Party anyway and justify it by saying that it may turn fascist, when the particular warning that Dimitroff gave is that it must not be allowed to turn anti-Communist.

When the total lack of a Communist youth movement finally came to the attention of the National Committee by the sheer conspicuousness of its lack, it blandly included the necessity for a Y.C.L., as if it had not fought it tooth and nail, expelled the P.R. Club for its support of a YCL, and demoralized some of the best youth into dropping out.

What more need be said of the Resolution than to mention its conclusion in which it calls for "social progress" rather than Socialism, and for the "Socialist reorganization of society", but not of course for the proletarian revolution. With all of these obvious deficiencies, it was not necessary for George to misquote, distort, and even attack some correct statements.

### III-George "Dowls" at Dowling

In a section of the Supplement called The Class Enemy's Double Play, George considers Dowling of NCP Report. George is concerned with spies. First, he suggests that "The correct method of meeting this eternal offensive is not to go about shouting 'Spies!' and alarming and weakening the movement with 'fear campaigns'. Too often, that is precisely the way real spies act." (p.24). Then he decides that "nevertheless, when lack of real vigilance and neglect of theory has led a movement to the brink of disaster, it is necessary to speak of spies." (p. 24)

George then introduces a "Mr. X" -- "who later turned out to be a Mr. Kennan of the State Department's special policy-making bureau that includes all military and civil (FBI) intelligence representatives combined." (p. 24)

Now--this is how George introduces Dowling:

"But, while the Party bureaucracy waited three months before it even said it 'need not answer' my thesis, it was no surprise to me that the 'answer' of the class enemy came instantly and by detour 'from the left'. For 'Mr. X' and his kind are not such fools as to work out a plan to influence Party leadership policy to the right, and then take no steps to influence and cripple the inevitable opposition which was bound to arise against that Right Opportunism.

"Enter: Mr. Bona Fide; Without His Bona Fides

"While the Party bureaucracy remained silent, my Thesis drew instant furious and sustained attack from what calls itself the 'NCP Report,' being the publication of what calls itself 'the New Committee for Publications,' edited by one Lyle Dowling, of antecedents so suspicious, apparently, that he chooses, when possible, to let them remain a mystery." (p. 24-25)

So George tells us that by detour from the left, Mr. X has sent us Dowling--a spy. That's a serious charge. The PR Club has attacked NCP from its first publication--and was alone in this for a long time. We consider the ideas and the methods of Dowling very dangerous, we considered his spy-scare technique suicidal, and we have devoted the great amount of space in our material demanded by this danger.

But now, we are confronted with George's use of the Dowling smear technique. For some time George pressed the PR Club for information regarding Dowling. Since our information was limited and unimportant, and since we were worried about George's intentions, we tried to dissuade him from any personal spy attack and insisted that if he wanted to attack Dowling, he should do so politically and by name, as he had avoided doing in the Crisis. To help George resist the Dragon of Temptation, we avoided sending George information on Dowling for some time. Thereupon, George demanded such information from Spark and later from Fore 'N' Aft (which also did not send him any) and went so far as to suggest that we "tail" Dowling. This idea we ridiculed and informed him that we had much better uses for our time.



Finally, after some repetition of the request, we told George what we knew about Dowling, but warned him that this was no basis for a political attack. -- Now we find Spark embroiled in George's smear campaign without any logical reason--and without permission. George's attack is so bad--the political level so low-- that we are going to clear up one thing--George's misuse and remolding of our information to fit his own needs--and leave the subject. Certainly, the lowest point in the expelled movement has been reached in this personal Dowling versus George fight.

We wrote George on April 7, 1948:

"About Dowling. We couldn't possibly indulge in a 'tail'. We don't have the manpower (who has) and it would be wasting it if we did...The little I know is this. Some time ago, when we had contact with Dowling (and the other D's) he told me that he never belonged to the CP. Very strange. But stranger still-- he would say this rather ambiguously and then desperately switch the conversation. From another source, I find that he was on the Irish commission. Also, he was managing editor of the Brooklyn Eagle and the story he circulates is that he was sacked during its strike some years back due to sympathy with the strikers. /The underlined part of the above was edited out by George/. He told me he was overseas in the OWI during the war.

"The part I know about Dowling is simply this. He played the triumvirate Dunne, Darcy, and Keith for suckers, got started with their help, took their lists and prestige (!) and then kicked them in the face in a struggle for power. These four have no disagreements politically. Power is the problem."

So, George, who knew nothing before this information, thought it was enough with which to holler spy--and even at that rewrite the little information there was. George has worked this way before and is in the process of working similarly against Turning Point. He found it necessary to refer to Dunne as a dipsomaniac in his Crisis--god knows for what good reason. Such stuff is always smear technique--learned in the CPUSA.

We wouldn't guarantee Dowling's next move because he is too bitter. He is a crackpot who loves to quote Value, Price and Profit against Capital. He is a provocateur for the promotion of Dowling--not for the FBI. He is more dangerous as an anti-opportunist in our movement than as an FBI spy. He should be watched vigilantly--for his political development. But George is only going to help Dowling by ridiculous attacks without basis. If Dowling is a spy, let George prove it--or try an attack on a political level.

George had written us on May 15th: "Oh, yes, you've attacked Dowling politically, but not the same way as I intend to do it." THIS TURNED OUT TO BE TOO TRUE.

As for Dowling--he has asked for this. He is the author of this smear technique in the expelled movement. He has accused the PR Club and Fore 'N' Aft of being agents of the National Committee in the expelled movement. So Dowling's trick comes home to roost. In this case, it is

Dowling versus Dowling, without principles or information involved. "one good slander conceives another." All this horsing around is dangerous because it lessens real vigilance against bad elements--like Dowling--in our movement. It lessens vigilance against real spies.

Spy isn't enough for George. He must go farther into garbage pail polemic and speak of "Dowling's way of gradually winning over comrades among the expelled to a position of Trotskyism". Again, we feel, that such an unprincipled character as Dowling is a good beginning for a future development towards Trotskyism, but Dowling isn't a Trotskyite today. He is most careful in his stated allegiance to the Cominform--(and carefully steers clear of those Cominform statements which expose his politics). Dowling is a careerist using the vehicle of leftism to attract comrades on the rebound from a long siege of apportunism. At this time he's working for Dowling, not for the FBI, not for the Trotskyites,--and certainly not for the formation of a real CP in this country. And we're sure that our attacks on Dowling, minus the undemonstrable charges of George are more effective. We feel that at this point, Dowling has begun to yelp a little hysterically, and he could suddenly do anything--EVEN POSE VALUE, PRICE, and PROFIT AGAINST CAPITAL.

We hope that in the intensified discussions to come, comrades will stick to politics which includes accusations of spy and Trotskyite only when supportable.

For Spark's criticism of Dowling's ideas and methods, see:

SPARK #1, April 1947. P. 6.

SPARK #2, May 1947, P. 7-8.

SPARK #3, June 1947. P. 3-13. "An Analysis of NCP's Position"

SPARK #4, July 1947. P. 14. The main article, "Magic Caps and Monsters" is an attack on Dowling's boycott of the CP member--an appeal to the CP'ers to assert themselves.

SPARK #5, August 1947. P. 3-9. A continuation of "Magic Caps".

All the subsequent issues of Spark and Fore "N' Aft" have been a continuous attack on the NCP ideas.

As this issue is being stenciled, we notice from Towards Socialism and other sources that George and Franklin are trying to shift the avalanche of condemnation resulting from George's spy-scare to Spark. For this reason, we will now reprint here what we couldn't before, because we felt it too completely damned George. We have room only for this:

"There's one item, small but rather important, that I'd like to reprove you about however; that is, why in heck don't somebody reply to my question about where Dowling came from? What is his background? If his demagogy didn't bear so strong a taint of conscious provocation, this question wouldn't arise. But it does bear such. So why can't anybody answer my question, anybody back there where he is? If I were there, and had any physical possibilities for so doing, I'd 'put a tail' or a couple or three 'tails', on him, to at least try to spot his connections, before he takes alarm and covers up; while yet the movement in which he operates is young and he may think he can escape observation for the lack of vigilance. Think it over!" (Our emphasis) (From a letter from George dated Mar. 30/48)

--continued on last page--

#### IV- George Rewrites Turning Point

In the last pages of his Supplement George made some points which he later carefully developed in a question-answer series, called The Party. We would like to examine these before considering The Party. George says:

"But if the San Francisco comrades advanced a step in their concept of the Party, some New York comrades, of the three groups represented by 'Turning Point', slipped backwards in the first issue of that journal. They slipped back to the anarchist concept of Dowling. They discovered that factionalism has virtue. /Our emphasis./ Logically, they also discovered the need for, not a "new kind" of party, but a 'new' party, about which they quarrel with Dowling merely on the question of timeliness." (p. 32)

Editor George has edited Turning Point. This is what Turning Point had to say on factionalism:

#### "IX. The Bogey of Factionalism

"We feel that there is one problem that seriously retards the work of many good comrades fighting opportunism--especially in the C.P. This is the idea that a comrade in the CP cannot coordinate his fight against opportunism and bureaucracy with the work of another comrade, that he cannot coordinate his work with or contact the expelled movement. We want to make one simple point on this misconception of factionalism.

"Communist inner-Party democracy and abhorrence of factionalism rest on democratic centralism. Certainly, in the U.S. today, an understanding of factionalism must rest on democratic centralism, a factor which is completely absent from the scene in the CPUSA. Communists Parties outlaw factionalism on the basis that it is not needed, that within the channels of Democratic Centralism, the unity of the Party and the right to contests of opinion go hand in hand.

"Factionalism is unneeded and harmful because it makes a mockery of Democratic Centralism. It follows, therefore, that in the absence of Democratic Centralism, there is no real CP and all fear of factionalism is uncalled for, misleading, and itself a misunderstanding of Democratic Centralism and factionalism. There is only one faction and that is the leadership's opportunist faction which swallowed the Party and its democracy and thereby destroyed the Party. Therefore all fear of acting factually, except in cahoots with the N.C. should be dismissed.

"From a simpler angle--if there is no real CP, no vanguard of the working class, and if the peace of the whole world is endangered by that fact, if American democracy and the existence of every union, etc. is endangered by that fact,--then it's about time we all started organizing without squeamish, legalistic crutches as to what we can and what we cannot do according to the dictates of the N.C." (p. 11-12, Declaration of Turning Point)

We're afraid--again-- that George has deliberately misrepresented the above passage in our Declaration. By no stretch of the imagination can the above be quoted as "factionalism has virtue". We are against factionalism--under all conditions. But we are also against the mystical

fear that coordinated work--including that between CP'ers and expelled comrades--is factionalism. The implied problem in the George-Franklin approach to factionalism is: are we allowed to be factional? The answer, of course, is no; but the question itself is off the point. If there is no real CP today in the U.S., there is no problem of our being factional in our organizational efforts. (And we use the term factionalism in the strict Leninist organizational sense. In this discussion we should avoid any quibbling over the general usage of the word in non-Party organizations or by non-Communists--e.g. factionalism in unions.)

Turning Point's short passage on factionalism was evidently a shoe that fitted on several feet. The fact that George and Franklin fell for the bogey of factionalism in the Crisis and the Open Letter and thereby betrayed their lack of understanding of factionalism is a tender spot which is causing nervous sensations in the expelled movement these days. If the shoe fits, cut the leg off...

As for the game, "new party" or "new kind of party"--we're for both. But we're not for the promotion of anagrams as the organizational sport of the expelled movement. Despite the lengthy section on our disagreements with Dowling, George rewrites T.P. into a disagreement with Dowling over "timeliness". Although we were against Dowling's irresponsible and ungrounded call for a new Party, we were mainly against all his ideas. Today, while George has moved closer to Dowling's ideas, we are are opposed to them as much as we were in early 1947. And certainly, we are opposed to Dowling's new Party--even more than to George's new Party. As we stated in detail in our Declaration, we oppose Dowling's opposition to the People's Front, his inevitability of war, his sabotage of work for a real CP (his refusal to countenance work with CP'ers), and his "sophistry as Socialism".

George offers the ludicrous analogy of Yugoslavia as an argument against raising the perspective of a new Party in the U.S.:

"In the current case of Yugoslavia, where the struggle of the 'healthy elements' is obviously far harder than here, where there is neither a Party Constitution nor Party Program, where a conceited bureaucracy acting as a faction may well split the Party, the Communist Information Bureau nevertheless approaches the question as a struggle for 'the Party'. The C.I.B. 'does not doubt the ability of the C.P. of Yugoslavia' to fulfill its tasks. There is a concept here which all comrades would do well to heed." (p. 33)

George must really be a strange Communist if he thinks it's harder in Yugoslavia than in the U.S. Certainly, there is more physical terror there, but that isn't the essential point. There are terrific, subtle obstacles here--mainly a dearth of real Communists and Marxist understanding. There is a real corps of Communists in Yugoslavia today fighting Tito. George finds that the Yugoslav Communists don't have a constitution or program. The hell they don't. There is a corps of Communists in Yugoslavia today who have their Communism and their faith in the CPSU (B) to go by. How it will be done organizationally is not for our speculation. We do not have the needed intimate knowledge of specific situations in Yugoslavia. George should not saddle the Yugoslav

comrades with his ideas about the American situation.

One thing is clear: the Yugoslav comrades are forced to work in an underground way. They are "illegal" within their own Party--as we are. They are fighting Tito without moanings about the danger of their becoming factional. Tito's gang are the factionalists because they are destroying the party and its democracy--and there can be no other factionalism involved. The C.I.B. and the CPSU(B) have not confused the Yugoslav Communists with warnings about the danger of their becoming factional in fighting Tito. Whatever organizational measures it takes, there will be a real CPY. In America, where we know the score full well, we know it will take a new CP.

Now, George continues on dangerous ground:

"And, too impatient to await general consent in the calling of a new democratic convention sponsored by the revolutionary wing, they invent a 'new program,' whom is George quoting here? TP/ too. This they urge in 'Turning Point', all other groups to adopt." (p. 32)

George snickers: "This they urge in 'Turning Point' all other groups to adopt". George is again misquoting. What we said was quite different--something we have always said:

"We urge groups in New York and around the country to endorse our views so that the ideological and organizational unification we desire nationally can proceed systematically and visibly. For this purpose, we, also, will endorse groups and publications with which we basically agree. (Emphasis not in original.) (p.2, TP)

An honest George would have quoted the second sentence to allow the first to be read in context. We have always worked for a comparison of positions in an orderly way. This has always been hard to get. We have found it hard, in letters to George, to find his position on the third party. We now know why: In TP and before it, we have always urged comrades to state their positions. It usually takes a fight to get these positions into the open. In this connection, it took bitterness against SPARK and TP for the ideas of George (his real ideas) to "supplement" the Crisis.

Was Turning Point too impatient. No, we got a plan for a hurried convention and the works from George and Franklin. The "operators" were picked, nothing else was figured out--and we rejected the plan. Our rejection has caused the George explosion. The simplest way to make clear the basis for the current controversy is to reproduce the documents on which it is based. These documents have been discussed backwards and forwards. At this point, we should consider the original ideas which shed so much light on their subsequent development. Following are pertinent parts from a letter from George to Franklin (dated June 16, 1948) sent for the consideration of the New York groups:

"It is my opinion that we, all of us, would do well to quit the undiluted propoganda of complaining at expulsions, and reshape all propoganda to direct it toward preliminary provisional organizational independence; organizational steps. True, such things as the last issue of

Spark with its story of Griest does have ideological value, since he raised questions of policy, but this continual 'They did me dirt' propaganda without organizational direction as to what to do about it, is wearing out.

"In my opinion, we must now holler our heads off that the membership must reject any (ANY) resolution adopted by the Convention, if it is not accompanied with a complete removal of the old leadership. Bear in mind that the Dennis gang of finks may well try to and really dump Foster. From the way Dowling is howling against Foster, I judge that the stoolie group in the National Office wants to get rid of Foster. But in any case, the whole National Committee must be dumped. The Convention may give us--just 'may'-- a resolution that will look a lot better than the Draft thing. It couldn't be worse. And we must warn the members not to accept it no matter how good it looks, if the old leadership is left. And if the comrades expelled remain expelled."

"In fact, and this is what I want you all back there to consider: I think that, during the convention the Left Wing must come out with some sort of 'Communist Manifesto', stating as briefly as can be, in somewhere between 500 and 1000 words, the gist of the Left Wing's differences with the leadership, set forth a positive program of our own, denounce the convention as rigged by bureaucracy denying the membership democratic expression, asking the membership to reject everything it does and -- prepare to send delegates 'a few months hence' to a real and democratic convention, meanwhile boycotting the superior Party bodies, refusing to pay dues, and await the call for a new convention on a date to be announced by something like the 'National Committee for the Restoration of the CPUSA' -- with a name and address given of the same's secretary."

"This should ask, also, 'all American Marxists' who have been forced out of the Party and kept out by opportunists and opportunist policies, to align themselves in the Left Wing units and participate in the coming rank and file convention, uniting all real Communist forces when possible on a state scale prior to any national convention."

"We should make clear that the bureaucracy is responsible for the disunity, but we shall unite only upon principle, and citing the first announcement of the Editorial Board of the old Iskra, we should make our slogan: 'Before we can unite, and in order that we may unite, we must first of all firmly and definitely draw the lines of demarcation.'"

"As stated above, we should have it signed by some Committee, defined as provisional to carry on the struggle until a democratically representative convention can act, and after enough clarifying discussion has gone on. If it is thought necessary, perhaps the names of the Committee personnel should appear, besides the Secretary of it. And if so, this will require some time to get this sort of committee organized. That's why we should begin to move now quickly. For such people as Flood in Seattle, Vern Smith in S.F., someone here in L.A., and in San Diego, will have to serve as signers -- with whatever people you have from your eastern groups. And perhaps, some others like the comrades in Montana."

"Such a manifesto should be printed, with space left so that copies circulated in a specific area, say Los Angeles, could have rubber stamped on them the name and address of the local secretary of the organization, --and, it is to be hoped, the cost of it could be apportioned and paid in by those local groups obtaining the manifesto for local distribution."

"It should be issued during, or at the end, of the National

Convention, and with as much demonstrative appearance as possible. We, here, have thought that it would be well to distribute in front of the National Convention itself, if you can find its meeting place, or before the Party offices on 13th Street. And copies should be sent to the press as news. This may be the only way many Party members will be apprised of it. And it will help, also, in getting some foreign attention." (All emphasis in the original.)

The above shows clearly exactly what George was driving at. A meeting of 4 groups was held to discuss George's suggestions and the following brief answer sent. As a result of this letter, great heat was generated by George--resulting in the current discussion.

"Dear Comrade George: Received your letter of June 30, 1948.

"A meeting was held last night for the purpose of hearing and discussing your letter of June 16th to Comrade Franklin. Present were representatives of the Maritime Committee for a Communist Party, P.R. Club, and Bill Haywood Club. Representatives of the Trade Union Group (Members CPUSA) could not attend but will be informed of our discussion.

"I was asked to write you the essence of our discussion. This I'll try to do briefly.

"Although we agree that a manifesto is needed and that it should come on an national scale as soon as possible, we cannot agree with any provisional committee of names; such a manifesto should be organizational -- signed by groups. At the moment we cannot see such an organizational base. It would be impossible in anything like 500-1000 words to state our 'differences with the leasership', 'a constructive program', an expose of 'the convention as rigged', and a call to the membership 'to reject everything it does and -- prepare to send delegates "a few months hence" to a real and democratic convention', etc. We cannot see the possibility of state preparations followed by a real national convention 'a few months hence'. It would be a waste to distribute this manifesto in front of the national convention, and certainly, in front of the 13th Street HQ. Generally we want to avoid a top-down procedure on this. Although a national set-up will stimulate more local set-ups, a national set-up will never materialize without the basis of local set-ups. Therefore we suggest:

"1- Each of our groups should proceed without delay to draw up drafts for such a manifesto. Once all the groups involved have done this the agreements and disagreements will be clear. The N.Y. groups will proceed with this at once.

"2- We suggest that some comrades in L.A. form a group and also submit a draft to the other groups. At this time the only expelled group in L.A. is an incorrect one -- LACC.

"3- Since the SFCC does not yet support a correct program, a group must be formed in Frisco also. We should all try to effect this through our contacts without delay.

"4- The manifesto should stem from the clearly stated positions of groups around the country. Then it can really have organizational meaning.

"May we hear from you soon on this.

Comradely, For the meeting of June 29<sup>th</sup>

\*\*\*\*\*

V-"The Party" of George, Flood, and Franklin

Harrison George has written 20 questions and answers as a hoped-for "tour de force" against (what he prefers to label) factionalism and against the raising of the perspective of a new American Communist Party. Some of the ideas in this article were hatching timidly in the "Crisis in the CPUSA", emerged in George's Supplement to the Crisis and are now polished up as a rounded-out theory in The Party. Francis Franklin and the Bill Haywood Club of illegally expelled members of the CPUSA have reprinted "The Party" in their Bulletin, Towards Socialism and endorsed it. (The letters reprinted in this issue reflect the support for George's ideas.)

Before starting on the long haul from #1 to #20, we can demand 20 points of endurance from our readers on the basis of a surprise in the area of #17. In #17 the reader will find that Comrade George's non-factional Left Wing, having called a non-factional new Convention and having expelled the opportunist faction of the CPUSA (which did not attend) "will have to establish a new apparatus, and it may well be necessary for purposes of identifying the Party from the expelled and discredited faction, to adopt temporarily a distinctive name." George who opposes the raising of the perspective of a new Party has rushed ahead to a convention which produces a new party with a new apparatus with a new name. But this is not a new Party. Is it the CPUSA? No, because it has to distinguish itself from the CPUSA to avoid confusion. Why didn't it take the apparatus? Because it couldn't; the N.C. boys wouldn't recognize George's fine legalities. Are there 2 parties? Yes. Has the non-factional Left Wing started the second Party? No, because that would be factionalism. Did the N.C. boys start the second Party? Of course not; we were fighting them before. Let's really tackle this rather difficult Georgic mysticism. Here is a building on East 13th St. New York. An N.C.-full of opportunists live there in an organization called CPUSA. Over here is another headquarters--probably in a P.O.Box, if George and Franklin rush it too much--with a "distinctive name". Everyone knows that the house on East 13th St. was there first. Therefore, may we call this ill-conceived P.O. Box Party the new Party. George says no. At this point we declare his "tour de force" to have materialized as a "tour de farce".

From #1 to #17 George pads his way with correct statements which have no bearing on the conclusions and with some quoting from Marx and Lenin and Stalin which is misapplied. Although it is not necessary to go through this preceding material to prove our above point, there are some important related problems that should be demystified.

First George makes some incomplete, fragmentary remarks on (1) What is a party? (2) What distinguishes that party from the whole class? (3) How does the proletarian party differ from the bourgeois party? (4) How was this concept expressed by Marx? (5) How was this concept expressed by Lenin? We refer Comrades to a short and wonderful pamphlet by Stalin, "Foundations of Leninism" which is required initial reading for any Communist. It is unnecessary here to pick on George's sloppy paraphrase of "Foundations of Leninism".

In point #6, in quoting Stalin's speeches "On the American Communist Party", George makes the correct observation: "There, he warned American Communists not to seek to justify their factionalism by referring to the actions of the Bolsheviks in the pre-revolutionary period of the old Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party."

We believe that nothing justifies factionalism within a Communist Party today. We also believe that, as understood in the Communist Party organizational sense, there can be no factionalism in a so-called CPUSA which has demolished all democratic centralism--except in the leadership faction which destroyed the Party. By



definition, without democratic centralism there is only a fake CP, and in such a case, the organizational efforts of genuine Communists cannot be disturbed by what in fact becomes a N.C. engendered "bogey of factionalism". George does not understand this and misinterprets its formulation in Turning Point's Declaration as a call for factionalism.

Now, at last, this fear of factionalism is out in the open, and comrades can determine whether or not this fear has to be part of their work. It is instructive to go back to the Crisis (with a few observations on Franklin's Open letter which followed suit).

The history of the CPUSA is one of ever-recurring factionalism, sometimes open, sometimes under cover, but finally ending in a leadership faction which destroyed the Party. This does not prevent the N.C. from utilizing the fear of factionalism as a weapon against all independent thinking and action in the CP. George & Co. are outwitted by their own Party history on this question. They are subject to this fear perpetuated by the factionalists themselves.

In George's book, organizational activity is hampered by a contradiction which calls for action and then restricts it with a false concept of factionalism. It asks comrades to awake, to object, to take matters into their own hands and rescue the CP. On the other hand, it warns them against coordination among themselves or with the expelled movement. It overemphasizes constitutionalities and legalities.

George says:

"No, factionalism, the organization of permanent groups in centers and clubs outside the Party centers and clubs, in duplication of the Party apparatus, with a program opposed to the party program as basically laid down by the national convention, with functionaries apart from the Party functionaries, and the giving of directives apart from and opposed to the directives of the Party organizations conforming with the Party Constitution and Party program—in brief, the formation of a 'party within the party', is not the answer to the problem of the purification of the Party leadership faced today by the membership of the CPUSA." (p. 117-118, Crisis)

In the introduction to his book, George says:

"And I emphasize that I am not a part of any faction, have not organized any faction, and shall not organize any faction within the Party. Factions are impermissible, and this pamphlet will prove to the reader that its entire purpose and spirit is directed against factionalism, as well as against both Right Opportunism and 'leftism' which generate factionalism.

"Neither am I a part of any 'group', nor am I organizing any 'group' within the Party, for 'groups', when not an organic part of the Party organization, are in essence, factions. More, I am not organizing any 'committee' in the Party; for it is the function of the membership and the membership alone, acting officially through its clubs and other basic Party units, to elect any committees or delegate bodies as may be required by these regular Party organizations to carry out their decisions.

"Any assertion, charge or accusation of 'factionalism' against me, is therefore, manifestly false..." (p. 8, Crisis)

This back-breaking defense of one's unfactional integrity betrays a deep ignorance of factionalism and democratic centralism. It has been the habit of "leaders" in the expelled movement to deliver such personal testaments and hold up down-to-earth organizational efforts wherever possible. It has also been their custom to deliver

this advice to the membership, but not to observe it themselves. Franklin also delivers his personal testament a la George--and as untrue--in his Open Letter:

"I am not seeking to form or to help to form a faction, for I am unalterably opposed to factionalism. And I do not want comrades to write to me or to consider that I regard myself as part of any new center, for I do not, and I have no connection whatsoever with any organized group, except the Communist Party, of which I am still a member. (The only reason I place a box number on the envelope containing this letter is so comrades may write for additional copies, and I wish to urge comrades to circulate this letter as widely as possible, but to refrain from writing to me for any additional advice, since I do not engage in any personal correspondence concerning these matters.) Writing to me will not help solve our problems, and I ask comrades not to do this. What is necessary is that every comrade act himself, in his own club." (p. 28-29, Open Letter)

All this is verbiage, not written seriously, not adhered to and worthy of a diploma in double-book-keeping. Franklin's idea for correct procedure, not applicable to himself, is as follows:

"The comrades who criticize the present leaders not only have no slate of candidates, but they are unorganized, and no one of us knows how many others like himself there are. He merely knows from personal experience that there are widespread criticism, dissatisfaction and frustration. In other words, the comrades representing the revolutionary trend in our Party are not an organized faction. They have been voicing their criticisms as disciplined and loyal Communists in the correct Party manner." (p. 3)

What a liberal and cautious approach this is. And how incorrect the facts. What is so good about the fact that "they are not organized" and don't know and work with each other? The comrades are not an organized faction--but not by Franklin's definition. By the George-Franklin definition of factionalism, they are both guilty of factionalism--if the truth would out.

Both George and Franklin prove very simply in their writings that the CPUSA is not a real CP, that there is no democracy, no democratic centralism, that the leadership is the faction. Therefore, one would suppose that George and Franklin had proven to themselves that comrades working towards a real CP do not have to worry about their factional (?) organizational efforts. But instead, George has to go so far as to admonish expelled comrades for their factional rebound (see p. 121, Crisis). Why does George have to observe the niceties of monolithic discipline in a fake CP when he says himself that "the Communist Party is, itself, not a true Communist Party" (p. 64) Do we have to follow the rules that the National Committee's doubletalk gives us, which allows their factionalism and destruction of the CP but calls our activity for a revolutionary Party factionalism--and frightens us back a few steps?

Any assertion, charge, etc. etc. of factionalism against George and Franklin is manifestly false, but not for their reasons. The reasons of George and Franklin tend to retard the development of a real CP in this country. The only reason is that they could be factional only in cahoots with the N.C.

George wants every tub to stand on its own bottom but what gigantic responsibilities he gives his tubs. This tub may not contact another tub. It may not even write Franklin for advice--only for more copies of the Open Letter. Are we to believe that George's crisis is a crisis in a tub, that Franklin's document is a letter from a solitary tub? We urge George to consider the Turkish Bath where one

can at least talk things over with a comrade.

Despite all their oaths of pure, alleged unfactional activity George and Franklin do indulge in what is factional by their standards (if not by ours). In fact, Franklin agreed with Turning Point's formulation of the bogey of factionalism before it was printed. Back in April, we discussed the errors on factionalism in his Open Letter with Franklin. Although he did not admit them as errors, but pleaded misunderstanding or inadequate emphasis, Franklin did agree that our formulation was accurate and correct. He took pains to write this correction (of a misunderstanding?) around the country and gave us copies which we requested for our use in an article. In the following quote from a letter from Franklin to a comrade in the west (dated April 26), the reader will notice that Franklin gives basically the same formulation as TP's—even if a little indistinct due to his explanation of a misunderstanding instead of an error:

"From what you write, I don't see that we really have any basic disagreements on methods of fighting. If anything in my letter created the impression that I'm opposed to extra-Party organization, I'm very sorry. I certainly meant to make it clear that I was very much in favor of expelled comrades organizing and of individual comrades still in the Party, when unable to swing their whole clubs into action against the leadership, resorting to whatever extraordinary methods prove necessary...

"... My statement that I am still unalterably opposed to factionalism should not be construed to mean that I consider such irregular methods factional, for I do not. Probably, I should have elaborated on this more, and I shall at some future time. Now, for the surprise, considering that Franklin thinks that TP's formulation is factional-TP/ For the moment, I should like to say that when a bureaucratic faction is in control and when democratic centralism is not operating, whatever organizational forms of struggle are established to get rid of the factional leadership do not constitute factionalism. I think it very important that we do not seek to justify factionalism in seeking to organize revolt against the present leadership, for the simple reason that our aim is to restore democratic centralism, which cannot tolerate factionalism."

In a letter dated April 15th, Franklin wrote to a comrade: "For instance, a comrade still in the Party, upon hearing that some of us were forming a club of expelled members, said, 'Why limit it that way? I want to be in it.' I am not sure that he should be in it. But certainly one of the functions of our club should be to maintain regular and organized contact in some form with the many comrades in the Party like him."

We agree generally with Franklin's statements quoted. Does Franklin? No, Franklin and George think that TP has embarked on a dangerous road—the road offered by Franklin above. Franklin has accused the TP comrades of dishonesty in suggesting that CP comrades work illegally—with the expelled movement. But Franklin offers this also. How many positions may a man have?

George and Co. tell us that there is no Communist Party. Elsewhere they tell us not to split this non-existent Party. Elsewhere, George states that there is nothing wrong in splitting an opportunist setup. Elsewhere, George states that we are for unity—not split. Elsewhere, George denounces such talk of unity. How many positions can a man have?

The opportunists split what was once a CP. We have to widen that split so that there is a growing chasm between the leadership and the anti-opportunist rank and file

That's a split--a good old fashioned, Leninist split, designed to keep the anti-opportunist movement from being swallowed up by the legal arguments of the CP lawyers.

There are clear reasons for the bogey of factionalism today in the U.S. It didn't come with the "night ill-wind". It came from a back-firing of our whole CPUSA history. That history is one of the fight for the throne and subsidiary positions at court. Even in our good days it carried on its debauches in style. The cringing courtiers stooged effectively for awhile and became trusted enough to graduate into first-class arrogant courtiers. These in turn developed their own stooges who cringed till they became arrogant graduates. Leadership became a machine offering rewarding positions and ratings.

Stalin tried to analyze and destroy the CPUSA's factionalism for all time. He plagued both unprincipled houses in their struggle for power. His advice was never heeded; it was hated by both sides because all the factional operators were branded. Their finagling merely advanced to a new, more disguised level. Honest comrades have made a point of this and never forgotten it. But it turns out, rather ironically, that parts of the expelled movement have misapplied and misused the Stalin speeches of 1929. They have used them unconsciously to retard the organization of a real CP in the U.S.

The Stalin speeches act as a great separator of Communists from factionalism, but there is nothing in them to prevent Communists who don't have a CP from getting one. On the contrary, those speeches should serve now as a starting point in condemning the CPUSA leadership. Its lessons on factionalism--if read carefully--should prove to us that there is nothing we can do in our fight for a real CP than can be interpreted as factionalism. And finally, when we get a real CP it should be a guide and a warning against the danger of factionalism that will then confront us.

Stalin's 1929 Speeches have been perverted into a fear out of context for American Communists. Those who say that they have a right to act factionally do not understand that they are not acting factionally. And those who do handsprings and doubletalk organizationally to avoid the stigma of the word factional understand still less.

(There is a danger connected with the attitude of factionalism that does exist. There is currently an unhealthy attitude in work and in discussion that engenders intrigue, lying in wait, unprincipled maneuvers--all of which will blossom one day, when we have a Party, into real factionalism. That is going on in the expelled movement in full force. It includes the tendency to unite with names and people regardless of ideas. It includes the evasion of open discussion and the quiet boycott of groups and individuals who do not agree to become disciples of a sect or a name. At this point, we do not have to indicate all the recent intrigue. Where the shoe fits... Our expelled movement has been an endless series of such intrigues. Now within the best part of the expelled movement, scandal is being peddled in place of politics. Comrades should check very carefully on the politics offered them. Especially in the absence of politics should they check on the latrine

rumors and the "reliable" word of so-and-so regarding a new boycott.

When the PR Club agreed with anyone, it put its agreement into practice by distributing literature and helping in every way. When it disagreed, it openly disagreed, and when necessary it cut off relations with certain groups and individuals. But this hasn't been a general practice in our movement. "Leading" comrades have worried too much about support as against principles. They have engaged in boycotts of groups that they could not openly attack. One of the most interesting manifestations of this attitude has been the sudden switch technique. Out of nowhere, and without any readjustments, Comrades on opposite sides of the fence find a new enemy and join unprincipled hands in a boycott. All this is a delusion of temporary grandeur and irresponsibility in the face of the problems of getting a new Party in this country that can effectively lead the working class.)

According to the advice of George and Co. the comrades must accomplish a lot and yet avoid a large tabooed area. They must avoid factionalism. This means, we are told, no centers and no coordination. George condemns groups because groups "when not an organic part of the Party organization are in essence factions" (p.8) Also no committees allowed because only the membership acting through the party channels is not factional. (You can find this advice contradicted throughout the Crisis when other points on the degeneracy of the CPUSA leadership have to be made.) George doesn't split the Party. He wants unity. But he condemns the idle babblers who prate about unity at this point. He says don't let the fight reach into other organizations like unions (p.122). Keep it in the Party. But what are comrades supposed to do after expulsion--stop mass organizational work or support the CP when incorrect in the mass organizations?

All this time George says take over. But how? Through myriad over-constitutional schemes and legalities that make the Dennis legalities pale by their side. And when George and Franklin get stuck they suggest let's wait and see after the Convention. And after the convention they see less than before.

George himself feels a little unsure so he allows a loophole that he forgot about in the article THE PARTY. In the Crisis, he considers the possibility of being forced to form a "new" party.

"(But whatever organizational forms thus result from the insistent splitting policy of the bureaucratic leadership, they must remain for a period as clearly provisional bodies, dedicated primarily to winning to their side the majority of the membership and unifying the Party membership against the revisionist elements. Events then take their logical course. But only after the basic issues have been thoroughly clarified for all members, when it is clear to all that the "new" organization offers revolutionary workers what the "old" one rejects, and gives them the democracy in choosing leadership and program denied to them in the "old" organization, can any final organization be constituted. And even then, its policy must include friendly appeals to the proletarian elements remaining in the "old" party, for united action in a common struggle. Not one single honest worker must be left under revisionist leadership.) (p.122,123)

Here George slipped and really exposed his semantic handsprings. He speaks of the new organization and the old. The new Party and the old. This only proves our point--that George in denouncing our perspective of a new party, himself envisages such a possibility but considers it undiplomatic to talk that way.

In point #7, George asks: "But is there not a different situation in the American Communist Party now, in 1948, than there was in 1929? There is no essential difference."

There are essential differences (none of which justify factionalism), but since his concept of factionalism includes the perspective of a new party as a factional one, it is interesting to note his comment that "It is not an essential difference that, now, the present factional leadership expels, illegally under the Party Constitution members who criticize its opportunism, where the Lovestone leadership faction did not expel the opposition, in the struggle which went on from 1925 to 1929." This is a statement without proof and obviously wrong because, if we were not being continually expelled our whole procedure would be different. There is an essential difference in the fact that the CPUSA then was a Communist Party. The CPUSA today is not--even as proven by George in his Crisis.

The essential differences are many, but as affecting our discussion of the fight against opportunism, the most important one is that in 1929 there were two factions, both unprincipled, both incorrect, both fighting for power. Stalin stated there was no principle involved. Today, ours is a fight against the opportunist leadership; despite all the wrong ideas in the expelled movement, ours is a principled fight. This is a big difference.

George himself senses a refutation of #7 when he asks in #8: "But is there not a difference now, in that, then, there was a Communist International to adjudicate disputes in our Party, where now there is no Communist International?" Then George correctly points out that there is a C.I.B. with authority growing among the membership.

But here, again, an essential difference affecting our struggle eludes George. In 1929, the CPUSA, despite all its faults belonged to the C.I. whereas today, the fake CPUSA cowardly boycotted the C.I.B. Our whole procedure would be different if the CPUSA belonged to a C.I.B.

Point #9. George: "But is it not true that the CPUSA has become, in fact, a social-democratic party? And that it is allowable therefore, as in Lenin's time, to form factions of revolutionary workers against it?" "No." When George answers no to both of the above questions, we wonder whether he seriously meant to answer "no" to the first. In the Crisis he considers the CPUSA Social-Democratic; in the Supplement he considers it not even Social-Democratic--but liberal-bourgeois. By this point, in the Party, he has so confused himself, that he fails to answer at all. Does George think that the CPUSA leadership isn't social-democratic? Although we think it is, and have elaborated on this point in our literature, that doesn't mean that we form factions. Factions are centers within a CP and we have no CP and we don't fall for the bogey of factionalism in a social-democratic CP.

But George inadvertently makes a fine point when he refers us to Stalin: "the 'new tasks' could not be performed by the 'old Social-Democratic parties.' Then, he said, 'Hence the necessity for a new party,' and added, 'This new party is the Party of Leninism.'"

If the Social-Democratic Parties cannot perform the new tasks and if the CPUSA is Social-Democratic, then we too need a Party of Leninism--a new party. And this aside from the whole mumbo-jumbo about factionalism on George's part.

In #10, trapped in his own bogey, George suddenly has to say: "You forget that the CPUSA...is historically obliged to play the role of a Leninist party; that is, already the new party of which Stalin speaks." This is nonsense. George knows it is and pads it with further nonsense, "That the opportunist faction has, for a time, tried to make something else of it, tried to fill its Leninist form with a social-democratic content, must not be allowed to prejudice our own concept of its historic role, our own attitude toward it as 'the Party.'" (In #17 we find that this CPUSA is not "THE" Party, but that George's Left Wing is). The hoax in the above is the word: "tried". The CPUSA leadership did not only try, but did the job completely. They did fill the shell of what was once a CP with Social-Democratic content. When George realizes this, he will decide that the CP is Social-Democratic, and he will feel freer to speak in a forthright way instead of in doubletalk.

George should consider, dialectically, just how far one can fill a Leninist form with Social-Democratic content and retain the Leninist form. George has missed the qualitative change in the CPUSA. In #11, George insists that the CP leaderships' filling of the CP's Leninist form with a Social-Democratic content can't continue long because "The whole world Communist movement, itself required by history to be a revolutionary movement, inescapably exercises 'predominant' influence on our own Party, requiring it to live up to its tasks, to purge itself of temporary deviations and opportunist trends."

This is one Lenin didn't have to answer--as far as we know because none but George has thought of it: how historical forces wipe out opportunism and guarantee a reformation in the C.P. Here we have another variation on the vulgarized concept, inevitabilities and historical forces doing our job in a neat and orderly way. George himself could never have thought of such an unLeninist idea. Most fantastic errors originate in the justification of earlier errors.

In #12, George considers what to do if our CP leaders reject the advice of our brother parties. (By the way, George will find out very soon that the CP leaders will accept the advice of their brother parties--always--and then proceed to ignore it.) George finds that "the revolutionary elements can do nothing else than take matters into their own hands by organizing a revolt from below, of the party masses, in a Left Wing..."

If the CPUSA isn't a real C.P., then there isn't any question of factionalism. If the CPUSA is a real C.P., then George's Left Wing is a faction; Left Wings are not allowed according to democratic centralism

in a real CP. George must take his choice: if the CPUSA is a real Communist Party, then Harrison George is factional; if the CPUSA is a fake CP, then George's factionalism scare is a bogey.

Now that despite all the obstacles of history and word quibbling, George has envisaged a Left Wing, he has to prove in #13 that it isn't a faction: "If we are not opposed to the Party program, we are not a faction."

With such definitions of factionalism, we will never get a democratic centralist Party. We can guess that a la George, there will be twenty factions, none factional because they do not oppose the Party program. What exactly is this Party program? George bases himself on "the last legal convention, the convention of 1945." This is a careerist lie designed to protect George's loyal record up to his recent expulsion. George feels that he must have had a reason for having kept quiet so long. He discovers that he simply did not oppose a correct program, a democratic Party which held a legal convention! But, the truth of the matter is that the 1945 Convention was a world disgrace. 94 delegates picked a central committee of 74. It was a Convention in which all criticism was shut off; only the erring leaders were allowed to criticize—even themselves—and resume power. If the Duclos speech produced one state convention speech from Francis Franklin (on the dissolution of the Party in the South), it did not produce a second one. It was made clear to the Franklins: only one blast allowed; now shut up and support us. So Franklin did the following: he wrote such a completely revisionist article\* on the Negro question, that it was worse than the other revisionism on the Negro question. It was so bad that even the CP wheels found it possible to jabber at him. And to this day, Franklin refuses to admit that revisionism and correct it. (We will deal with this in a future issue.) George and Franklin should go back before 1945 and try a little self-criticism. It's amazing that neither has started in the fight against opportunism by criticizing himself. If they refuse to criticize their own records, they have only one alternative: rewrite the history of the 1945 Convention and prove that it was legal and correct and that they stuck by it.

Sometimes, George forgets himself and denounces that legal year 1945: "Just as in 1945, the bureaucracy is making up its lists of all those who, in the present discussion, have opposed them with even the least criticism of their basic line." (p33) On the last page of the Supplement George speaks of "the hypocritical 'change of line' which these same leaders pretended to make in 1945." So, even George doesn't quite believe the myth of the legal year.

Now, we approach the Dennis doubletalk. This is pure extract of doubletalk from here to the end. In #'s 14, 15, 16, George discusses the question: "But they, the factional leadership, will claim to be 'the Party,' and does not this place us, of the revolutionary wing, under the necessity of organizing a 'new' party?"

George says, "By no means. This is confusing 'the Party' with the 'party apparatus'." He continues that this would violate organizational principles and the Party constitution. George warns us not to invent new programs. But what does this mess of legalities actually add up to; what does George actually do? George starts a new Communist Party with a new apparatus and a new name after holding a new convention.

\*"The Status of the Negro People in the Black Belt and How to Fight for the Right of Self-Determination"—F. Franklin in May 1946 Political Affairs. (E.G.—"In a word, they are in a contradictory, ambiguous position--halfway in the American nation, halfway out." In a forthcoming issue we will prove that FF is not halfway in and out of a Marxist position --this being a revisionist feat.)



: Having raised the perspective of a new American Communist Party and having heard it labeled Anarchism in the record and Trotskyism off the record by George & Co., we read--as in a dream-- the following be-legalized, be-rushed, ,sophist-ridden , hypo-critical ACTUALITY of George's theory:

"It will mean that the revolutionary wing must prepare and sponsor a new convention, legal and fully democratic under the provisions of the 1945 Party Constitution, which convention alone can change Party program, Party Constitution and Party leadership." Then George asks:

"But won't this be confusing, this appearance of two parties, the 'new' party and the 'old' party?" /Notice: George has two (2) parties at this point--one of which is about to disappear, we suppose, into George's logic/

"If, upon being expelled by a legal convention / not legal by their standards-- and not attended by them--TP/ the old factional leadership insist upon clinging to the old apparatus, in defiance of the membership demand to surrender it, then, indeed, there may be some confusion--for a time. Such a convention will have to establish a new apparatus/George's underlining here; the rest is ours/, and it may well be necessary for purposes of identifying the Party from the expelled and discredited faction to adopt temporarily a distinctive name. But by no means must one inch be yielded in the concept that this is not any 'new' party, but is 'the' Party."

George must be pulling our leg, if we have a leg left after chasing this un-new Party around. To George, who won't give an inch, THE Party is NOT NEW, it is born at an UNFACTIONAL convention. But George has just said that a new group (i.e. not the N.C.) calls a new convention, gets a new apparatus, a new name, refers to the CPUSA (as George does here) as the "old" party. Everything, the attitude, the program, the setup, the works--all new. But only TP with its Trotskyite tendencies could possibly raise the perspective of a new Party. Of course, we wouldn't bleat baloney during the convention about calling this new convention "a few months hence". There are two plans for a rushed nondescript new Party in the U.S.--Dewling's and George's, and both incorrect. We haven't yet called for anything but the raising of the perspective of a new Party. We have to get the people and the ideas straightened out first.

George notes "the appearance of two parties". Well, who claims the new one? Are we word quibbling over the Talmud that we have to run a rat-race finding this orphaned new Party which was born legally and then left in a basket somewhere because George couldn't stand the disgrace of a new Party--uncertified.

Comrade Bering has messed George up worse than ever. Yes, George--with inhibitions is for a new Party. Franklin was privately for a new Party till George founded THE Party. On page 122 of the Crisis, quoted in this article, even George considers the possibility of a new Party.

Can it be that we are really fooling ourselves with such legalisms and constitutionalities? Will we ever get a real CP this way? No, there is something quite political in George's concept. There is the old opportunist fear of telling the rank and file the score--the factual score. There is an opportunist fear of being wrong and thereby spoiling one's record. Here the scene becomes grotesque because we find the worst former Browderites protecting a non-existent record. Worst of all we have an opportunist hankering after quick successes and a violent reaction to the slow pace of our former work. This shows in George's last two points. George asks in the engaging way he has of betraying his pragmatic orientation "within" Marxism: "# 19. Still,

isn't there any practical difference, aside from theoretical concept and legal angles?"

"If we do not make very clear that we are for unity, and for observance of Party Constitution and Program, as against the anarchy of unprincipled factionalism...then we cannot win support from anybody. This has been proven by experience during the past two years..."

Did George say unity? But in his Supplement (p.34) didn't he say, "Until this end/ a new convention/ is achieved, all talk of Party unity is truly anti-Party, the babbling of what Engels called 'unity fanatics'..." In other words, for practical ward-healing reasons, George instructs us to be what he calls babbling unity fanatics. And he's right in the use of the term--but how dare he instruct our degeneration!

George really wants success--even if he has to fool a few people into it. Except, that doesn't work--for Marxists. That is the copyright scheme of the opportunist. George is for a new Party; the only hitch is that he's for a very shaky program these days. It doesn't matter at the moment what name George gives his un-new Party. Even a shamefaced name should not stand in our way. We won't argue over the name--and haven't yet. George has worried over "new" and "old" and "some other". He has fore-fingered the split hair soup of "new kind of Party", not "new Party".

When all is said and done, it turns out that George is rushing off schedule and off principle. We're in a hurry but not the eclecticists hurry--the hurry that picks up any theory or anybody--for support--for success. George should only worry about doing the right thing and fighting and working for support to the correct ideas-- no matter how slow it comes. At the end of The Party, the real venom comes out:

"Still more, since certain New York groups (PR Club, Fore 'N' Aft and a Trade Union group) began raising the 'perspective' for a 'new' party, the triumphant cry of Dowling that his anarchist line was winning support among those who formerly opposed it, has reunited the strongest Dowlingite group (that of Los Angeles), where it previously was becoming divided over this issue."

The PR Club was the only organization that fought Dowling from the beginning--without any help from the Georges and Franklins. Franklin thinks, in fact, that we gave Dowling too much publicity. What is the political story on George and the LACC? George needed support so he gradually altered his line to fit Dowling's. With this he wooed the LACC. He would not take our advice to start another group in L.A. No, he was a cunning codger who would fool the LACC out of Dowling's barnyard. George even came out against the third party to woo the LACC. But then, George pulled a boner--as manueverers are apt to do. He pulled a spy scare on Dowling; and the LACC spit in his face. What would have happened if the LACC did not spit in his face. He probably would have finally convinced them to become Georgian followers by adopting Dowling's program in toto. A Pyrrhic Victory.

We are glad that George goes on to say: "Also, the C.I.B. will understand any yielding to the 'new party' slogan as a growth of anarchism in the Left Wing, and a failure to observe Leninist principles of Party organization." Now, the various positions are in print. One day, the C.I.B. will clarify its position on the whole American problem, and then we can all face our "self-esteem" that Stalin talks about and adopt a unified program without any under the table snivelling.

George ends by sputtering about "grasping for quick gains!", premature crystallizations of 'new Party' formations; and undemocratic formulations of 'new party'!

programs," anarchist disintegration, etc. etc.

Comrade George, identify the woman you're hanging. And prove the nasty words or throw away the rope. Yes, there certainly are careerist ventures in the expelled movement, but in every case, the careerism shows through the politics. We name Harrison George as the man behind the current national mutual admiration circle. George is running Dowling a close second in general intrigue and unprincipled maneuver. We should all learn one thing from the fate of the CPUSA: talk straight, right or wrong. If wrong, at least our errors will stand exposed and we will be forced to admit them and correct them, or ourselves be exposed. Let us not like Dennis write our records two ways for "eventualities"—as George is now doing in a creative manner.

With all the talk of "continuity" of the Party from George, we're afraid that he is concerned with the continuity of his career. And where the record is damning, George will write no continuity.

Turning Point thinks that we need a new Party, including new ideas (Marxist-Leninist ones), new attitudes, new apparatus, etc. George agrees. But because TP wouldn't go along on a top-down scheme to get a new CP quickly with George on the basis of a mutual admiration circle and anti-Cominform ideas on the Progressive Party, George must find that our ideas are now anarchist and (off the record) Trotskyite. Any man who continues "the continuity" of his career in the fight for a new party will inevitably end on the wrong side—because he didn't stop using the big operator tricks learned "in committee" in the CPUSA higher brackets. George will learn that his new-unnew Communist Party cannot be born through maneuver. We will see where George's "The Party (Historical Forces), U.S.A." ends <sup>in</sup>—to use Franklin's term—contradictory and ambiguous life.

\*\*\*\*\*

And in all this heat over TP's "raising of the perspective of a new American CP" one important thing is forgotten, TP said: "Insofar as you disagree with us, test the party program and judge by your own experience". Our point on the new Party was not included in the 5 points necessary for basic agreement (on p. 2). But George & Co. have made of our point, a crucial one. How we all get a real CP, we will decide as we get close to it. We will decide together. Before we reach this point, many people will have gone through crises. George is in the midst of one. What is this Crisis which racks George, leaving his writing pockmarked with quoted fragments misrepresenting friends and enemies? The crisis is in George's use of the People's Front against the Progressive Party, in his fighting the C.I.B. and the CPSU(B) position in favor of the P.P. The crisis is in the transformation of 1945 into a legal year, whereas the CP leaders perpetrated a hoax and didn't reconstitute the CPUSA. The crisis is a Dowling-styled character assassination attempt on Dowling, and smear and gangup on TP or any non-disciplar group. The Crisis is George's new Party posed against the concept of a new Party.

George is all tangled up now. That's the reward of people who work eclectically, without continuity from day to day, bending over backwards to attract support from hostile sources. What George says here is contradicted there. This is the nervous state of people who don't work on principle. There is only one classification of people who can be consistent in the absence of principle: people with photographic memories. And this is true only to a good-humored extent. For the rest of us lowly strugglers --we have to be content with operation on principle. Principle is the best memory. In the absence of a photographic memory, George is a bad polemicist. In the absence of principle, he is a poor Communist.

\* \* \*

II-LETTERS and DISCUSSION

Turning Point has received many valuable letters. Some show over-all agreement and readiness to work with us. Others are valuable through definite statements of disagreement. Nothing is more essential for the foundation of a real C.P. in the U.S. than the taking of open and definite positions. Even if, unfortunately, slander and intrigue are mixed in, it is still better now than later. Otherwise, one day, when we think we have finally achieved the correct groundwork for a real C.P., all our work will "unaccountably" explode in our face.

In the main, we are publishing critical letters connected with our discussion of George's Supplement to the Crisis. But, we are also including letters which raise other important questions. We have received an encouraging number of forthright, ready-to-work "organizational" and "contact" letters. We are thankful for some of the wonderful letters of encouragement comrades have sent us. Communists who are working against all odds in America have a right to take new encouragement from such a note as:

July 20, 1948

Dear Fellow-Workers:

...you have undertaken a Herculean task. I've felt what it means to be scabbed on by reaction. But I've also felt what it means to be scabbed on by our comrades--yes, right from the top. But my Marxian education has served me in good stead, tho I'm too old to help in the active day-to-day struggle, I extend to you my most sincere greetings, so accept this \$5.00 to help you get started. I'm a laborer and only earn small wages. I've never been in the Big Money Class because I've always fought for what you're fighting for. More power to you in your great fight, the only fight worthwhile. Yours for the World October. Here's hoping. I grasp your hands in comradely encouragement.

--from a California Comrade

We publish the first excerpt (following) as the theme of our discussion/

...And now for my general opinion of the views expressed in July's Turning Point. The thing that impressed me most favorably about it can best be summed up in your page 2 quotation from Lenin. Wide-open inner Party discussion and polemical criticism are the main prerequisites for a sound, virile and constantly maturing Communist Party. One is indeed entitled to state axiomatically that the healthiness of any CP can be virtually measured by the extent to which such wide open inner Party criticism prevails. The fact that you started right out on this main theme was, to me, an extremely encouraging sign.

I should like to add my emphasis to yours by saying that criticism and theory have reached such a dangerously low ebb in the C.P.U.S.A. today, that before either the existing Party or a new Party can even begin to recognize its tasks, criticism and theory will simply have to erupt all over the landscape. This very fact in itself, relative to

the existing situation, implies an organizational and theoretical revolution within the American C.P. movement. The theoretical work alone confronting American Marxists is simply prodigious. And not only in quantity, but also in quality. First of all, it must be thorough-- i.e. dialectical. Absence of dialectical analysis is, incidentally, one of the main faults I have to find with both expelled writers and Party writers. This situation is, of course, nothing but the by-product of the short and narrow communication channels afforded by the Party apparatus.

I whole-heartedly agree with your emphasis on the necessity for the most widespread distribution and study of the Marxist classics. In my opinion, the primary reasons necessitating such a diligent study of the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin is not because of the invaluable factual information contained in them; nor for the knowledge they impart in the way of conducting strategy and tactics. No, the most valuable treasure that can be discovered through a careful and prolonged study of those master dialecticians is the lesson they afford in dialectical-materialist thinking. Without a perpetual and disciplined study of the Marxist classics, American Marxists must inevitably succumb to the easy-going simplifications of American pragmatic philosophy.

--Communist Party Member in Ohio

\* \* \*

Seattle, Wash.,  
July 27th, 1948

Dear Comrades,

We received the first copy of "Turning Point" from you over two weeks ago. I immediately dispatched a letter, with order for more, to you, so that our District Committee might have a copy and for their consideration. These arrived on July 24th, the Committee studied "Turning Point" and we held a meeting, with the discussion of "Turning Point" the one item on the agenda. I have been instructed to communicate to you the results of our discussion and also to send copies of this letter to all other groups with which we have contact and friendly relations. This is being done so that all groups may know, at once, and the same time, what is the position and attitude of the Northwest Dis.

Our discussion centered on two points. One, the timing of the publication of "Turning Point". Second, criticism of the material, as to the most important points. On point No. 1, our discussion ran as follows:-

As a point of departure, we understood that the PR Club, the Vanguard group and Fore 'N Aft, all were as aware as we are of the imminent possibility of a major number of the Left Wing groups getting together in an organized Left Wing group, with some sort of a Committee to represent the component groups. In the face of this, to have stepped out ahead, and without consultation with the other groups, to

have issued "Turning Point" smacks very much of the opportunism that we are trying to shed from the Party.

In a letter to me, from Comrade \_\_\_\_\_, dated July 21, 1948, there was an enclosure of a copy of a letter from him to Harrison George. In his letter to Comrade George he proposed that; "Each group proceed without delay to draw up drafts for such a manifesto. Once all groups involved have done this the agreements and the disagreements will be clear. The N.Y. groups will proceed with this at once. The manifesto should stem from the clearly stated positions of groups around the country. Then it can really have organizational meaning." The above quoted letter was dated on June 30th, 1948.

It was but a few days later that "Turning Point" was published, and thereby giving evidence that even while Comrade \_\_\_\_\_ was asking all other groups "to draw up drafts" etc., "Turning Point" was even then in the hands of the printer. Clearly, there was no thought or attitude expressed in this action that could be construed as complying with Comrade \_\_\_\_\_'s expressed desire of a comparison of all drafts being made before a common manifesto was issued in the name of all groups. Rather, it was a matter of jumping the gun and then expecting the other groups to endorse something already presented as an accomplished fact. This would seem to indicate, to us, at least, that the groups composing "Turning Point" might well re-examine their knowledge and attitude of how to act in a collective and comradely manner.

We feel, further, that the issuing of "Turning Point", in the manner in which it was issued, is indicative of that "locked-door-committed" type of disunity restricted from the vision of the very comrades to whom our appeal is made"....as is noted, by "Turning Point" on Page 1, Section 2.

Also, on Page 2, point 5 it is said; "We act to unify Communists in the U.S., ideologically and organizationally, wherever they are", Certainly this action taken in New York, by the 3 groups involved, in the manner in which it was done will serve quite well as a basis for suspicion rather than for unification. And, finally, if the entire contents of "Turning Point" had been above reproach and criticism, it's issuance before the National Convention of the Party had taken place, and without consultation with any groups other than those in New York, would only serve to highlight the opportunism that went into it's publication.

On Point No. 2., criticism of the material. We dealt primarily with the most glaring items on matters of program or policy. We did not quibble over small words or phrases, although that could easily have been done also.

First, the criticism of the CIB that occurs in the footnote, on Page 13. We feel that unjustified criticism of the CIB and it's editorial Board is one sure way to display our ignorance and possibly our egotism. It seems to us, that the collective experience of the CIB is something to be treasured and to be used as a guide in our daily work, in this country. A careful reading of the Jack Bering article turns up no "endorsement" of Foster and Co. but merely records what they

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

demagogically said and inserts the small line about the CPUSA not yet being an "independent" Party. The Daily Worker carried a full page on the Jack Bering article, with a top heading: "The Cominform Praises Our Party". This is sheer demagoguery on the part of Foster and Co., as the CIB praised the statement of some fundamental Marxist theories... it did NOT praise the CPUSA, as such. We understand that Foster and Co., have no intention of putting life into the statements they made, they were made as pre-convention window dressing and nothing else. This does NOT, however, give us license to "criticize" the CIB for something that it did not do. We feel, finally, on this matter, that had there been any doubts in your mind as to the real meaning of the Bering article, a letter of inquiry to the CIB would have been in order before jumping out and "criticizing" them in "Turning Point", or elsewhere.

Second, the long quote from the Editorial Board of ISKRA, on Page 2, is rather out of context. Lenin was referring to the acceptance or rejection of Marxism as the fundamental theory and guide of the revolutionary movement and it was on this that he was drawing the "line of demarcation". With the various Left Wing groups in this country...the theory of scientific socialism, as propounded by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, are accepted by all groups as their guide to action, so that no "line of demarcation" is called for. The "line of demarcation" implied by "Turning Point" seems to be relative to other matters...such as the building of a "new" Party, etc.

Third, we are in agreement with the position of Harrison George, on the matter of whether we are trying to build a "new" Party or whether we are trying to clean up and restore "the" Party. We believe he has sent you a copy of his position on THE PARTY, as he has to all other Left Wing groups. It is therefore unnecessary to record here, his full treatise on "the Party". In this connection many references are made to a "real Party" etc., in "Turning Point".

On Page 10, point 3, ...we refer to the last paragraph beginning with; "what had to be done and so on...". This paragraph concludes with this phrase; "...clear up the confusion of ideas, and in this way insure the emergence of a real CP" (Emphasis mine). Here is a goodly remnant of Dowlingism indeed. The "emergence of a real CP" would indicate that "the Party" is to be left to the tender mercies of Foster and Co. and this we refuse to concede.

Fourth, it is stated on Page 3, Section 3, 1st paragraph that "These objectives must be worked for simultaneously; there are no contradictions between them, and there can be no artificial order superimposed upon them". We agree that there is no contradictions in the struggle for Peace, Democracy and Security. However, to place the restoration of the CP on a "simultaneous" plane with the struggles for peace, democracy and security underestimates the role and importance of the CP in these struggles. Therefore, it is precisely because we DON'T have a Marxist Party that work for it's restoration is primary. The sooner the CP is restored as Bolshevik Party, the sooner we shall make progress in the struggles for peace, democracy and security. The CP will not be cleaned up by trade unionists or other progressives....

it will be done by that small but growing corp of Bolsheviks who have been active in this work, these last 2 years and for them the building of a Bolshevik Party is primary. The fact that the working class must have a CP as it's vanguard, is completely overlooked for "simultaneous work" in other fields. There are plenty of trade unionists etc. to be active in peace work etc. so that field of work will not be neglected as it is virtually being carried on NOW by just that sort of people as the present CP is not fulfilling it's vanguard role in these matters. It will be much more effectively carried forward with a Marxist party than if we dropped our efforts to restore our Party and dabbled around in other fields of activity...again indicating the primary position of working as Communists to rebuild the CP.

Fifth, on Page 2, point 3, the "good program" of the Wallace 3rd Party is referred to. We feel that this was being a little bit naive, both as to politics and as to timing. We grant that many things are "good" about the Wallace 3rd party and that we don't quibble over. To come out into print, in the name of the Left Wing, before any official declaration of program was made by the 3rd party and which could only be done at it's convention in Philadelphia, after you were on record, underestimates the possibilities of surprises and embarrassments that may derive from a bourgeois liberal party, where Communists are concerned. Communists do NOT "endorse", sight unseen, anybody's program... least of all the program of a 3rd Party that is not, as yet, led by the working class and it's allies. Here, too, is a spot where we must watch for "deeds" as well as "declarations" and the 3rd party may not hew exactly to the line...once the Philadelphia convention is over. Remember, the CP...a true Bolshevik Party...is NOT, at this writing, or in the near future can it be, a component part of the Wallace 3rd party. It will take time, on this one, and many changes and surprises...as only bourgeois liberals can manage them...may occur.

Sixth and last, we feel that the issuing of a common statement of program and immediate objectives of the Left Wing should have come out after the National Convention was held. This statement should have been agreed upon by as many groups as could be got to agree and should have also contained an analysis of the results of the Convention. Thus, it would have represented, and rightly, a coalescence of the Left Wing and a joint statement by the Left Wing. No harm would have been done by waiting for 4 more weeks. Contrary-wise, considerable damage has been done by coming out prematurely with a publication that contains... to put it mildly...a considerable number of "bugs". Time will now be consumed, after the publication of "Turning Point" that should have been spent previous to it's publication, to the end that we might have come out, unified, and in agreement on program of immediate organizational steps. Finally, coming out just prior to the Convention, and revealing an imminent concrete unity of the Left Wing, undoubtedly gave impetus to the FBI arrests of Foster and the others. This would tend to rally the Party around these misleaders rather than around the growing Left Wing. The Convention would have revealed how bankrupt these so-called "leaders" really are...while now there is the possibility that the Convention may be called off "for security reasons", with all that that may imply in terms of impeded work for the Left Wing.



To conclude, on a constructive note, we recommend for your earnest consideration and as evidence of your wish to "unify Communists in the U.S.", as stated in Point 5, Page 2, that you hold up your publication of the second issue of "Turning Point", Volume 1, No. 2, until a joint statement, from all the Left Wing groups, can be worked out. Since Comrade \_\_\_\_\_ has indicated his approval of a tentative organizational plan submitted by myself to the PR Club, on July 16th, when he wrote to me, on July 21st and said; "The ideas you mentioned in your letter are much better and generally, I think, in line with ours. I hope that George, despite his original letter, can agree with the few simple organizational points", I suggest that he submit this tentative organizational plan to the PR Club for it's consideration.

We feel rather sure that the Editorial Board of "Turning Point" and the sponsoring groups of it, will be hearing from the rest of the Left Wing, as to their agreements and disagreements. Even though an announcement has been allowed to stand in the way of ironing out the differences and of correcting any mistakes that have been made. The unification of the Left Wing is of paramount importance and all obstacles standing in it's way would be eliminated and set aside.

We hope and expect, that the groups represented in "Turning Point" will accept our criticisms in the comradely fashion in which they were given. Ours is the common goal of cleaning up the CP and we should not allow difficulties that can be resolved, to stand in the way of our achievement of that goal.

With best wishes and comradely greetings, I remain,

Arline Flood

For Northwest District.

\*OMISSION ABOVE:

made of intention to publish every 2 months, no hard and fast rule should be---

\* \* \*

Seattle, Wash.  
July 30th

Dear Comrades:

Yours of the 21st arrived and we were glad to get your viewpoint on the several matters that you raised.

Since you went into some detail about your attitude towards the phrase, as used in T.P., about "not a few names and committee decisions", our committee did not include it in the letter that was sent from the District to your Club. We did, however, feel that possibly you should have been as explicit in T.P., with the chance for misunderstanding being greatly lessened.

Now, to answer some of your questions. No, we are not trying to see how many comrades we get expelled out of the C.P. However, once they take a principled stand, that is inevitably what happens to them. We endeavor to keep them in, as long as possible because of their worth in being in touch with other CP members and for what information they can give us that is useful. We realize that it is the CP member who has had a nominal exposure to Marxism, who will more readily see what we are striving for, than some worker who has never joined the Party.

However, we are not overlooking or neglecting to pick up along the way, such workers as are willing to struggle for Socialism and who are willing to join us.

Like you, we have endeavored to get as much work done, in a Branch, as possible, before they are expelled. However, out here, the attendance at CP meetings have fallen to as low as 3 or 4 comrades, to a Branch. When a Section convention was held, consisting of 6 Branches, only 10 delegates showed up. 3 were elected from this Sec. convention, to the District and if my information is correct about the size of the other sections, there would have been about 30 people at the District convention. The District is composed of Wash., Idaho, and Oregon. They used to have Montana, also, but some change has been made recently on that one. Some Sections are non-existent, such as the Waterfront Section. A port town, this size, with no Waterfront CP organization indicates how capable the characters are that are running the show, out here.

You say you can't see any reasons for it's having to wait till after the convention...referring to our "putting our organization on a definite organizational basis". Well, we do have reasons. We feel that the experiences gained by the CP members just prior to the convention in these so-called "conventions" will be of great value in revealing the complete bankruptcy of the leadership. Then, the National Convention, once it is held will only serve to confirm what the comrades have experienced on a local scale. I am sure that you know that people learn by their own experiences a helluva lot faster than by propganda. Besides, all this time, we have asked them to try to get something done inside the Party, through their Branches and in these conventions. We'd look like a bunch of premature nitwits if we tried to set up a formal organization before the national convention. We know it'll be lousy so we are willing to wait a few more days and let any splits that occur come about on the basis of the lousy convention, rather than by us asking Party and expelled Party people to get together, formally, before the convention.

One of our biggest agitational points, once we do formalize the organization we have, \* is the appeal to the CP membership to repudiate the farce of a convention, soon to be held. But first there must be something to repudiate...so we must wait till after August 6th.

\*Comrade Flood has written us: "However, if you print the two letters, we would like this note of clarification to be added, so that no misunderstandings may occur.

"In the July 30th letter, it says: 'Once we do formalize the organization we have, etc'...at the bottom of page 1. We wish to make clear that we are NOT starting anything in the shape or form of a 'new' Party. When the comrades, in the various parts of Town, and also out of Town, are brought together in a "formal" group it will be on the basis of a Communist Party Unit. Since we are, in the main, all illegally expelled Party people, we feel that we are only temporarily separated from the main body of the Communist Party. Until such time as we may be able to again rejoin the main body of the CP, we must take

You say you think it is wrong to call for a convention shortly after the national convention. I don't know of anyone who is doing that. I'm sure that all of us are too old hands in this work not to know that one must have the pre-requisites for a convention before one is in order. In this connection, you write: "If a manifesto were to come out over the names of about 15 groups (more or less), it would be a bombshell." I certainly agree with that and therefore we, here, can not understand why 3 groups, in N.Y., came out ahead of all the rest of us. You may have some explanation on this and if so, we would certainly like to have it.

Farther along in your letter you say:—"Towards a Committee For the Restoration of the CPUSA....I hope we never move. As far as Mexico is concerned it may be correct. I don't know enough facts to judge with. In the U.S., I think it's incorrect; the CPUSA unfortunately, can't be restored"

Comrade, I think you are exhibiting some of that "American exceptionalism" that Stalin warns us about, so many times. If you will refer to your copy of the CIB organ No. 13, on the statement of the CIB on the Yugoslav Party, the last 4 paragraphs will be of considerable help. In those 4 paragraphs, they appeal to the rank and file of the Yugoslav Party to clean house....which is just what we have been doing over here. Apparently the Comrades in Mexico are acting in the same

\*footnote cont'd

some means to be able to carry forward Communist work.

"This can only be done by meeting in an organized Party group, and whether such a group is recognized by the present CP "leadership" or not, as a bona fide CP group is immaterial. Such a Unit as we would form would conduct itself under CP Rules and procedure and under full CP discipline. It would carry on Marxist educational work, it would do practical political work and would recruit to itself such workers as are willing to struggle for socialism. The Unit would take as it's guide to work, the Main Resolution of the 1945 convention of the CP, the central purpose of which was to restore the CPUSA as an independent political organization of the U.S. proletariat.

"This main Resolution of the 1945 convention of the CP forms the basis for our continued work with the present rank and file CP membership. It is for the restoration of the CP as a Bolshevik Party that we are asking the rank and file CP member to struggle. It is for the same thing that we...the illegally expelled CP members...are also struggling. Our interests are identical although our forms of struggle are different...due to the fact that some of us are temporarily prevented from uniting with the main body of the CP. This explains, I think, the basis upon which we 'formalize' our contacts into a Party Unit and explains the method and purposes under which such a Unit would operate.

With the inclusion of the above 3 paragraphs, we would be happy to have you publish the two letters referred to. Please do not leave them out, as we wish to contribute clarification to the discussion and do not wish to add any confusion, as such could well be the case if they were omitted."

manner. If we had any doubts as to the correctness of our approach... the CIB's action relative to the Yugoslav Party... should certainly put our doubts to rest. The CIB seems to feel that there is one Communist Party in Yugoslavia and that the comrades there have the responsibility of cleaning it up... since they, themselves allowed it to get in that condition. There is NO suggestion of any sort that can be construed to indicate that the CIB feels that a "new" Party should be built, in their statement. This, too, is another guide, to us, for our enlightenment, over here.

You ask me; "What do you think about George and Franklin's idea of calling upon the membership to call for a convention over the heads of their leaders. To me, that is blind alley rhetoric." The expelled comrades and the CP'ers working with us have to move quickly towards a national center and publication (which can really unify our movement ideologically and organizationally) but till we get this, we can't call any half-baked convention. Certainly we can't ask the membership of the CP to do it. Those who do agree with us have at the moment less organization than we. I think it is misdirecting the main emphasis. The main emphasis from here on should be the organization of the CP'ers within the Party for work in the Party in coordination with us.

Taking your last statement first.... since you think the main emphasis is on CP'ers within the Party... just what in hell do you propose to ask them to do... after the convention? Go along with it's decisions or to repudiate them? If you ask the members to repudiate the decisions doesn't it then follow that they must also be asked to call for another convention that will produce a program that Communists can support? Anything but a refusal to go along with the convention results is blind alley rhetoric. What is your objective, of the "work within the Party", if it isn't a repudiation of the leaders and, now, the convention results. If you have some other objectives in view, that would serve to clean up the Party more quickly, let us know about them.

As for "moving towards a national center and publication"... yes, BUT only after the main disagreements among all the groups have been ironed out before hand. This can be done by letter and is now in the process of being done. I'm sure you are as familiar with this effort to reach a common agreement, as I am, so I need not recap it here. I know you are very busy, but won't you let us hear from you, when you get the chance to write? The best, till next time,

Arline Flood

July 27, 1948

Dear Comrades:

I have just received and carefully read "Turning Point", and completely agree with you that you have reached a turning point in your deviation from an apparently correct line. I further agree with you that, "the most criminal 'hobby' possible is the addition of one more group or idea incorrectly advising already bewildered workers",

I do not agree when you state, "We are certain that this declaration, also, can prove nothing...". On the contrary, you have proven that the subtitle of "Turning Point" should be "The Pot (Turning Point) calls the Kettle (Lyle Dowling) Black".

You urge groups in New York and around the country to endorse your views so that the ideological and organizational unification you desire nationally can proceed systematically and visibly. The reverse would be the truth, as your expressed views will obstruct the necessary ideological and organizational unification so vitally needed for a Bolshevik Party.

I shall not attempt to discuss your deviations point by point, nor shall I question your statement on page 3 that "although our declaration goes beyond this basic agreement"-(of your 5 points).... I do wonder if your declaration goes beyond these 5 points why you do not state how far beyond they do go. I trust you would not want us to endorse a position not made known to us; as that would smell of bureaucracy.

I shall list only three points of disagreement, the three points which I would consider indicate a serious turning point from what your previous positions had indicated to be an apparently correct policy before.

1- On page 5, you state "Such a Party-(Peoples Front)-can unite effectively the peace-loving people of the U.S. if it is built on a mass membership base (not a few "names" and committee decisions,) if the Communists within it exert a correct and independent role...."

The draft resolution submitted by the national committee for the national convention of the CPUSA states, "The peoples coalition is a loose alliance of workers, farmers, the Negro people, city middle classes, professionals, national groups, etc."

You state "mass membership", the opportunist, revisionist CPUSA leadership says, "loose alliance". Either way, both your formulation and that of the CPUSA are similar in content and both are incorrect.

In any "Peoples Front" or "United Front", it is necessary, and correct, that the C.P. enter such a coalition, not only as individual members, as does the CPUSA in the Wallace 3rd ticket movement, but as a Party with its own program and its right to participate in that coalition and to criticize when necessary. Such a "Front", or coalition if you wish, must of necessity consist of federated groups who would each affiliate within the "Peoples Front", plus the large mass of peoples who are not joined to any group. Only in this manner can the CP maintain its identity, its entity and its Communist program.

Not to conceive of a "Peoples Front" in this manner leads down the paths taken by the CPUSA and the Yugoslav CP. Not for nothing did the Communist Information Bureau say regarding the Yugoslav CP that,

"The Cominform is sure that the leadership of the Yugoslav Communist Party is revising the Marxist-Leninist theory about the Party.

According to the theory of Marxism-Leninism, the party is the leading basic power in the country, which has its separate program and does not dissolve in the non-Party mass. The Party is the highest form of organization and the most important instrument of the working class."

"In Yugoslavia, on the other hand, the Communist Party is not considered the leading force, but the Peoples Front is. The Yugoslav leaders undervalue the role of the CP and in fact, they have the Party dissolved in the impartial Peoples Front, which includes quite different classes...."

"The fact that in Yugoslavia it is only the Peoples Front which is playing its part on the political scene, whereas the Party and its organizations do not act openly under its own name before the people is not only diminishing the role of the Party in political life of the country, but also undermines the Party as an independent political force...."

I quote at length what you have already read yourselves, read, but not applied to the situation in the U.S. Tito evidently made an original error in his conception of having a Peoples Front built only on a mass membership basis without a federation of groups in which the left wing groups, and the CP specifically, would play a leading role as the Communist Party.

2- On page 13, footnote bottom of the page, you say, "In #14 of the C.I.B. organ, there appears a BOOK REVIEW by Jack Bering, "The Communist Party of the U.S. in the struggle against the warmongers", which quotes and paraphrases the Plenum Reports of Foster, Dennis, Williamson and Winston in the March 1948 Political Affairs. Comrade Bering apparently accepts the documents of the CPUSA leadership at their face value, but he fails to note that the CPUSA's actions falsify the documents at every point. We believe the appearance of this review to be an editorial inadvertance which will be corrected."

It might be possible that you do underestimate the C.I.B. when you believe that their review of the CPUSA Plenum reports are, "an editorial inadvertance which will be corrected". Your position is similar to Dowlings, and here is sewn another anti-Marxist deviation germ. Upon what basis do you believe there is "an editorial inadvertance". Would you say that our brother parties are unaware of the political situation in the U.S. when B. Vronsky in his review of Earl Browder's booklet, "World Communism and the Foreign Policy of the United States", in "For a Lasting Peace, for a Peoples Democracy" of the April 15, 1948 issue (lest you forget, the organ of the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties) said in the book review "Today we know where these incorrect views led the American Communists and above all, Browder; in 1944, the Communist Party of the United States was dissolved and replaced by the non-Party "Communist Political Association." The consequences of this false step are felt to this day, not withstanding the efforts of the American Communists to rectify their errors and to restore their party as an independent political organization of the working class."

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Comrades, this would not indicate that our brother comrades "apparently accepts the documents of the CPUSA leadership at their face value." I assume you attach the same importance to this statement-unless you agree with Dowling's slanderous attack on Vronsky in his N.C.P. Report No. 91.

Would you say it was, "an editorial inadvertance", when I. Kuzminov reviewed James S. Allen's book, "World Monopoly and Peace" in the Bolshevik, No. 20; October 1947; pp.75-88 (the Bolshevik is the theoretical organ of the CPSU): Kuzminov in his review says, "It should be pointed out that, in his book, Allen does not subject to the proper analysis the question of the organic connection of the monopolies with the state apparatus in the USA...." "It is necessary to note the weak sides and the inadequacies in Allen's book...." "In order to characterize the foundations of the new democracy, he constructs his "theory" of state monopoly capitalism. In his opinion, state-monopoly capitalism can be reactionary and imperialistic, and it can also be progressive and democratic" (Did not Browder talk about "the progressive nature of American Imperialism?)" Kuzminov then goes on to say, "Allen evidently, does not realize how much nonsense is contained in the concept he has invented of "progressive" and "democratic state monopoly capitalism...."

.. Would the comrades of "Turning Point" say after these reviews that our comrades in Europe "fails to note that the CPUSA actions falsify the documents at every point." I trust that your criticism of our comrades in the C.I.B. is "an editorial inadvertance which will be corrected."

3- After all your constant attacks on Dowling's policy, and rightly so, because he wanted to build a new party at all times, it would now seem that your real basis of disagreement with him was only on a matter of timing-not of principle. I refer you to your statement that "to call for a new CP after the Duclos Letter and until recently was the expression of an irresponsible clique...."

Further, on your page 12 you say, "although we are not calling for a new Party now, we do raise the definite perspective for a new American Communist Party. We declare our aim to start a new Party."

On page 13, your 'MCP' line continues to say, "We need a new Party because the control of the CPUSA is completely in the hands of confirmed bureaucrats".

These statements would not indicate there is any basic difference between T.P. and N.C.P.; both raise the perspectives for "a new Party." I am unaware if this decision of yours in "Turning Point" is rather sudden, or one which was made previously and was kept hidden from view until the present moment. If the first, then you advance no logical reason why you suddenly adopt Dowling's line which would only cause a split in the working class, and its vanguard party; if the latter, then you are guilty of deception-which is what our present party leadership is guilty of-amongst other things.

I can find no historical precedent for yours and Dowling's position about the formation of "a new Communist Party" to be formed in opposition to an already existing Communist Party-no matter how corrupt that Party was-or is.

I find constant references to the struggle against "liquidators", "opportunists", "revisionists", Trotskyites" etc. I find references for the need to cleanse the party of such elements. I find references for the need, "to restore the revolutionary party of the proletariat with a single program, single tactics, and a single class organization."

Dowling to try to prove his point about "a new party", refers to the struggle between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks within the framework of the old Russian Social Democratic Labor Party. At that time, the Bolsheviks did find it necessary to build a new kind of party, a "Bolshevist Party, which would serve as a model for all who wanted to have a real revolutionary Marxist Party". The Bolsheviks did proceed to build that new kind of party, different from the social-democratic parties of that historical period; they built the Communist Party, which is the new party that Dowling talks about, and which you now talk about. Now that we have the new kind of party, different from the old social democratic parties; our task is strengthen-thru struggle-the Party.

If you will recall, the Bolsheviks at the Sixth Party Conference in 1912, expelled the Mensheviks and formally constituted themselves a party different from the Social-Democratic conception of a working class party. It was only because the Bolsheviks expelled the Mensheviks from 'The Party', that they were able to preserve "the old banner of the Party", of the R.S.D.L.P.

Lenin wrote to Gorky in 1912 that; "at last we have succeeded, in spite of the Liquidator scum, in restoring the Party and its Central Committee".

Page 144, "History of the C.P.S.U." states that: "The purge of the ranks of the proletarian party of opportunists, mensheviks, effected at the Prague Conference, had an important and decisive influence on the subsequent development of the Party and the revolution"

If the comrades of the "Turning Point" will recall the criticism against the C.P.U.S.A. made by Jacques Duclos in April 1945, they will notice that he never mentions that the way to correct a revisionist line was to build, "a new party". No, Comrade Duclos recommends that the CPUSA "be strengthened". To strengthen the Party means to follow the historic example of the CPSU-to purge the liquidators, the opportunists, and all the scum.

Again, if the comrades of "Turning Point", will reread the C.I.B. statement about Yugoslavia, they will read that, "the aim of those sound elements of the CP of Yugoslavia is to force their present leading factors to confess openly and honestly their faults and correct them, to part from nationalism, to return to internationalism, and in every way to consolidate the united socialistic front against imperialism, or, if the present leaders of the CP of Yugoslavia prove unable



to do this task to change them and to raise from below a new internationalist leadership of the CP Yugoslavia".

Please note, comrades, not a demand for "a new party", but for a revolt from below. So it is in this country, we must carry on the struggle to have one Bolshevik Party, and we must be the vanguard of that struggle. A Communist Party has two weapons, its theory and the people. If our theory is correct, we can win the people to our side in a struggle for a revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist Party. If our theory is incorrect, we can have a dozen Communist Parties-and they wont mean a thing.

No, comrades, I for one cannot and will not endorse your present position. I can, and will, endorse only a position that has been reached after a full, Marxist and democratic discussion. I refuse to approve your abortive attempt, a "putsch", to set up a full blown committee and program arrived at independently of the other comrades in this country, both those within and without the Party.

Only at such time as the left wing, the revolutionary wing of the Communist Party, both expelled and within the Party, hold a convention and formulate a correct Marxist-Leninist program, shall I endorse any views so that we may preserve the "old banner of the Party", THE COMMUNIST PARTY.

Comradely yours,

A Los Angeles Comrade

\* \* \*

Postmarked August 20, 1948

OPEN LETTER TO "TURNING POINT"

COMRADES:

In a collective discussion of your book by our club, we find that we cannot agree with your perspective on forming a "New Party". As a correct approach to this problem, we feel that all the expelled and suspended clubs should be able to draw a parallel after reading the Cominform article of July 15th on the situation in the Yugoslav Party. The program of the 1945 Convention of the C.P.U.S.A. is yet to be carried out and it is up to the "healthy core of the party" to do this. The bureaucrats who are in temporary control of the C.P.U.S.A. will be exposed in due time but we of the "left wing" must develop a correct position of the coalition, labor, etc.

We ask that your club hold a collective discussion of our letter and send us an answer.

Comradely yours,

Building Trades Club

of San Diego

APPEAL TO "TURNING POINT" COMRADES TO RECONSIDER THEIR COURSE

(Reprint from "Towards Socialism", Editor: Francis Franklin)  
Issue No. 6, August 15, 1948

In July, the publishers of Spark, Fore 'n' Aft, and Vanguard, viz the P.R. Club (Expelled), the N.Y. Maritime Committee for a C.P., and a Trade Union Group, issued a joint declaration in a new publication called Turning Point (P.O. Box 24, Times Square Sta., N.Y. 18). A few weeks thereafter, Turning Point began circulating an Open Letter to the Communist Information Bureau.

We sharply criticised the Declaration of Turning Point when first requested to endorse it for two reasons: (1) We considered the issuance of a "perspective" for a "new Party" in the middle of the pre-convention discussion by groups who had previously resisted this N.C.P. "perspective" a rash and irresponsible action. (2) We objected to the appeal of Turning Point to comrades in the Party to work with them in a factional manner. Turning Point, under the influence primarily of Spark, apparently considers its role to be that of the leader of a faction. To that we are unalterably opposed.

In its Open Letter to the CIB, the Turning Point comrades for no good reason have accepted the opportunist leadership's distortion of an utterly non-committal "book review" in the June 1st issue of the CIB organ, have presented a false and distorted conception of the anti-opportunist movement to the Communist Information Bureau comrades, and have used insolent language in addressing the leaders of the world proletariat, thus making it easier for our opportunist misleadership to misrepresent and slander all expelled comrades. Here again, Turning Point has acted in a rash and irresponsible manner.

The Turning Point comrades are moving in a dangerous direction. We appeal to them to practice some criticism and self-criticism within their own ranks. It is demagogy for comrades to demand criticism and self-criticism in the Party while refusing to practice it, in their own ranks.

LETTER FROM THE FRONTIER CLUB

Dear Comrades:

September 1, 1948

The members of the Frontier Club of San Diego Co., California have read with great interest your "Declaration of Turning Point" and found it interesting and in the main constructive. We are amazed, however, at your reference to a NEW C.P., since we feel that there can be but one C.P., that which is founded on the teachings of Marx, Lenin and Stalin, and that we are trying to work for the restoration of "The Party" to its original concept as an Independent Political Party of the Working Class.

We feel that your perspective of A NEW C.P. is in many respects comparable with the position of the German Leftists who advocated leaving the reactionary trade unions, as Lenin said "to create an absolutely brand-new immaculate 'Workers' Union' ". Lenin says, "We can (and must)

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

begin to build Socialism not with imaginary human material, not with human material invented by us, but with the human material bequeathed to us by Capitalism." And so with us of the Revolutionary Left-Wing of the Party, we have to take the Party as it is, for a starting point, and proceed to restore the Party so that it may be cleansed of its rotten opportunist leadership. A correct approach to the "human material bequeathed to us" by the present leadership will inevitably win many more good elements to the position of the Left-Wing and thus restore the Party to its original aims and concepts.

The Cominform did not appeal to the Yugoslavian members to form a NEW Party. Their appeal was to the "healthy Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist elements to restore their Party." Recent events confirm the correctness of this position, and it is becoming increasingly apparent that the Party of Yugoslavia will be restored despite the temporary deviations caused by its mis-leaders.

We agree that a National Organ and Center with elected National leaders must be established, but only after and as a result of a legally held convention. Such a Convention should proceed openly and publicly as THE PARTY CONVENTION. It should in the main:

Present the traitorous record of the present leadership and vote their expulsion.

Proceed to establish a clear perspective of aims.

Establish a National Organ with a sound and clearly enunciated Marxist-Leninist Editorial Policy.

Elect a National Board and Committee.

Affirm our belief in the principles of Democratic-Centralism and agree that these principles will be lived up to, etc.

In the meanwhile, pending the calling of such a Convention, we of the Left-Wing should carefully evaluate the overall picture, i. e., how really widespread is the opposition movement? Is now the time for any kind of organizational leap? Would it be premature at this time for these steps? We must guard against premature actions in setting up a National organization, since an improper estimate of the degree of support for our position could lead to failure, defeatism and despair.

The members of the Frontier Club wish, in closing, to commend the Comrades of Turning Point for the very fine work they have been doing in exposing the corruption of the present CPUSA leadership. It was through the help of your bulletins that a sizeable section of the San Diego membership have had their eyes opened for the first time. None of us of the Frontier Club lays claim to being long time veterans in this fight against Revisionism. Your bulletins opened our eyes, but our own experience was the best teacher. We conclude that if it can happen to us, then certainly there are many essentially good Comrades who are still misled, but who will come around to our position, providing we proceed correctly.

We should like to hear from all clubs affiliated with Turning Point after they have had a discussion of the contents of this letter.

Comradely yours,  
Frontier Club, San Diego

TURNING POINT'S DISCUSSION OF LETTERS

There are several interesting letters which we have not printed in this issue—for two reasons. First, we couldn't possibly add more pages to this issue. Second, the omitted letters raise points which are removed from the area of this issue's discussion, and demand detailed answers. We will reprint them in our next issue. Included will be one from M.C. in Brooklyn who ordered us to publish her letter on pain of denunciation. That's open discussion for you! In the following discussion we have omitted repetition of the points made in the article.

Remarks on the Letter from the Building Trades Club (Suspended)

The points on the raising of the perspective of a new American Communist Party and the false analogy with the situation in Yugoslavia are discussed in our article, The Crisis in Harrison George & Co., in this issue.

It seems that through the good offices of Harrison George we are asked to hold collective discussions. (This request has come from Seattle, Franklin's group, and I.A. also.) Among the grapevines, one hears more brazenly that there are bureaucrats in Turning Point. All material ever published as our opinion by Spark, Fore and Turning Point (including the SCS TO ALL COMMUNISTS in 1946) has been completely collective. There is no one's name that could or should be signed to most of our articles. We know of no reasons (especially since we have no "names" and build no "names") for anyone to suppose uncollective discussion on our part—especially comrades who know nothing about us. It has been our custom (because we do not think we have anyone deserving of the title of Communist leader) to publish in our material only collective ideas. For this reason no individual in our group has found it necessary or advisable to publish his biblical book; for this reason, we have even avoided an Editor-in-Chief. The important thing is, certainly, collective discussion, and we have stuck to it religiously.

There is one item, however, missing in the Building Trades Club letter, and that is simply: discussion. Or were we supposed to go (as we were forced to go) on the basis that the B.T. Club is simply endorsing George's writings. It is important that groups endorse those documents with which they agree, but endorsement should be indicated clearly (especially in the case of the conflicting documents of George) so that, in the absence of any discussion—as in this letter—we can feel familiar, nevertheless, with the general orientation of the criticism. The comrades in the B.T. Club show an unserious attitude towards discussion of our problems by writing such an offhand "open letter" without arguments, explanations, etc. A statement by a group of comrades agreeing or disagreeing with a political position should not read as mechanically as a good old American soap ad. A little thought should be expended in an "open letter".

We trust that the coldness of the B.T. Club's communication (without even a name to write to) is the fine non-factional work of Harrison George.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Remarks on the Letter from the Frontier Club (Suspended)

Here again, the points on the raising of the perspective of a new American CP, the analogy with Yugoslavia, and the calling of a CPUSA Convention are dealt with in our article. The idea of the Frontier Club that "we must guard against premature actions in setting up a national organization..." is well taken. Those premature and incorrect ideas are offered by George in an organizational letter for the discussion of the N.Y. groups, reprinted in part in this issue. George's letter and the answer the N.Y. groups sent underly the whole discussion in this issue. We ask the Frontier Club to judge carefully by political ideas and not by rumors. Read George's naked ideas in this letter and judge. Those ideas have since been dressed up a bit, but in essence are the same. After our criticism of George's ideas, he decided to rewrite—not to criticize himself. Worse, in a burst of anger, he attempts to attribute to us his premature rush. This maneuver is not a matter of mere subjective opinion; it is exposed by George himself—in his own hand.

We agree heartily with your Club's attitude that "there are many essentially good comrades who are still misled, but who will come around to our position providing we proceed correctly." This has always been our attitude. That's why we wrote "Comrade Perseus" in SPARK last year. How to proceed correctly is, of course, where we all have to put our heads together. In this connection, we would like to repeat what we say in this issue and TP's Declaration. Our idea of the raising of the perspective of a new American Communist Party is not part of what we consider—at this time—part of the 5 necessary basic points of agreement. We have indicated repeatedly on this and other questions that we can proceed together with other comrades despite many non-basic disagreements. And before any comrade decides casually what a basic point of agreement is let him think seriously, so that he won't end up either frittering all agreement or restricting all discussion. It is mainly George, who, incensed at our refusal to sponsor an unprincipled big operation, has quickly and carelessly picked a dividing point and worked it up to such a frazzle that his complete confusion must now be exposed. In his haste, he forgot page 122 of the Crisis where he speaks of the new and the old.

You think that perhaps we err on the new Party question in a way "comparable with the position of the German Leftists". We know that this forced analogy is making the rounds temporarily, but off the rails. What we should be doing with that analogy is making the following applicable point. The greatest crime committed by the CPUSA, the crime that proves politically its FBI control, the trade union crime greater than the non-interference resolution in the CIO, is the current CPUSA instructions to secede CIO locals. The error of boycotting the difficulties of work in reactionary trade unions was exposed for all time in the case of the German Communists. That the CPUSA leadership has suddenly become so brazen as to pull this stunt in the N.Y. department store locals—to say nothing of Local 65—means a new page in our CPUSA history. Let us spread the lesson of the German trade unions around to prevent the last step in the disintegration of the American trade unions.

We agree with your quote—but in context. Communists must certainly never get abstract about their material. Our material for winning a CP is basically in the Party and the expelled movement. Later we will begin to find the long lost and disillusioned far outside our present party circles. Unlike most other groups, we are working to keep conscious comrades in the CPUSA, fighting under illegal conditions. We condemn the mechanical rush towards quick expulsions for the sake of a small explosion. We are striving toward methodical, continuous linking up of comrades in the CP and out. The question of whether one can restore the CP is separate from the question of working with the CP'ers for an obvious reason. Whether or not a comrade

thinks that he can restore the CP, he has to work for a foundation of a real CP with expelled comrades and CP'ers. The fact that we will convince numbers of them does not mean that they can take over the CP apparatus. We think your analogy with Germany is wrong because while we do have to work with CP'ers, we do not have to restrict our necessity for a monolithic Marxist-Leninist Party to the framework of the fake CPUSA. A trade union is not based on democratic centralism or Scientific Marxism. It houses all kinds of ideas. In our direction of main efforts towards the unions, we stick with the workers wherever they are, and we don't go off by ourselves in a sect. But, the problem of a vanguard Party is different. Here, we have to avoid a nondescript stew of Marxism, Opportunism, and the FBI. The important thing about a CP is first its quality, the unity of its Marxist thought and action in leadership of the working class. When Communists don't have their own party, they have to build one. In the U.S., two years ago, it was important not to jump to conclusions without a serious investigation of the facts. Today, we feel that it is impossible to restore the CP, and the other alternative must be accepted as the only possible one—a new American Communist Party.

Of course, we will never countenance the calling for a new Party until we're ready with the material, ideologically and physically. This not only applies to our own concept of a new Party, but also to the Franklin-Flood-George new Party. We work with comrades in the Party who disagree with us on many things, although not so much on this. A discussion of perspectives does not interfere with our work. And we refuse to kowtow to the double-bookkeeping system of Franklin who used to say privately, "I'm sure I'm for the new Party—as much as you—but you can't admit that to Party members. Why can't we admit what we stand for to Party members? Are we continuing the art of the N.C. within the anti-opportunist movement? Many comrades have not made a decision on the question of the new Party. That's perfectly logical. Let every comrade study the situation and decide seriously what organization it will take in the most complicated mess in the world to wrest a real CP from the mirages of CPUSA (2nd International).

There is no reason why, therefore, any comrade should get hysterical at the mention of a new American Communist Party. Expelled comrades and those with us within the CP should remember what came from close-mindedness in the Party. A Communist who considers any problem mechanically is a class A danger. And our Party has been a slot-machine outfit, as far as independent thinking went. The expelled movement hasn't shown too much of a breakaway from that trend yet.

We are told, there is only one CP. True. At the moment we have, with George's proof no (0) CP. So is it too illogical that we should, after breaching two alternatives in early 1947, now make a decision as to perspective. One reason why George's, The Party (Historical Forces) USA, is so rushed, is that there has been no perspective involved.

Remarks on the Letter from Arline Flood, July 27, 1948

We think that the thinking in the two letters from Seattle is unhealthy—to put it mildly. What a vicious tone, Comrade Flood. Sort of like—well, like William Weinstone and Al Lannon (the "sinister") berating Fore 'N' Aft at a waterfront meeting. Instead of a straightforward discussion indicating our errors, we have a snide insinuating tone. Since such an attitude comes from comrades who are supposed to be assuming responsibility in the expelled movement, we thought it important to get

permission to reprint them in this issue. We think Flood's idea of sending her letter to other groups as an open letter is a good idea, and we are merely extending that idea by making it public for the benefit of all interested comrades. As a matter of fact, all political discussion should be single standard, not one for the closed meeting or confidential letter and one for publication—as has been the case with so much politics in the expelled movement. We would like to suggest to George, Flood, and Franklin that all attacks made on TP and SPARK and FORE 'N' AFT be made public—even the unmentionable ones.

Comrade Flood, speaking for the N.W. Dist., understood that the TP groups were aware of the "imminent possibility of a major number of the left-wing groups getting together", etc. The implication is that we pulled a fast one. What are the facts? We know that George and Franklin had hatched a plan to shove out a manifesto over a few key names, including one of ours (we don't own any), a plan for a top-down procedure, a premature and unprincipled basis for getting what amounts to a motley new Party started. We refused to go along with these ideas. We want a national center, but not a national center composed of a mutual-admiration circle composed of 6 or 7 self-picked comrades obsessed with their ability to get a CP through a few personal documents.

The very clear substance of this episode can be seen from a reading of the letter from George to Franklin and the answer of a N.Y. meeting of representatives of 4 groups. (These are reprinted in this issue.) This episode takes its place alongside similar ill-conceived plans of Dunne, Darcy, and Keith; Minton-McKenney; Dowling; Sutta, etc.

It seems that according to George, Franklin, and Flood, we had no right to issue TP because it had a program, and we were obliged to wait for the stamp of the big operators before issuing another in a series of local manifestoes. We tried to get 4 groups to issue this Declaration in N.Y.C.—but all we got from Franklin was obstructionism. So, we went ahead with 3 groups. As TP pointed out, it was a local publication, and we hoped to lay the groundwork—along with other groups in other communities—for something national, by gradually giving up our own little publications and consolidating locally on the basis of a program. We urged other comrades around the country to do likewise. We urged Flood in Seattle—with no success. We urged George in LA—but George was concerned with "George" publications. We succeeded with Franklin, and he got out Towards Socialism. We urged the N.C. comrades; they got out a good statement, but went berserk over Yugoslavia. (A discussion of this will appear in the next issue of TP.) Instead of having a few comrades join our group, we urged them to form what became a Trade Union Group and Vanguard. But some of the best plans, we can't mention at this point. In the light of this, and all our activity for about 2 years, we really wonder at the accusation of opportunism directed at us. Let's knock this in the head right now—with undiplomatic talk—and with answers expected from Flood. Were we wrong in issuing the SOS in 1946 as a Party branch. That was a program! (But of course, it didn't get the help of George, Franklin, and Flood.) Were we wrong in issuing the first Spark which carried a program—without the support of George, Franklin, and Flood? Must all programs have the stamp of G, F, & F before they can be released. Were we wrong in issuing in Fore 'N' Aft a program for Communists in our union, the NNU.

While we have always welcomed the literature of other groups and individuals, we have also made quite a historical list of the gangup attempts in the expelled movement—all the bureaucratic attempts to prevent material from coming out, or getting around.

Flood cannot imagine how TP could be in the printer while we suggested that all groups draw up drafts to be compared for a national manifesto. Flood forgets that

this was a program on which local groups came together. We presented our ideas, and we asked all comrades to take their stand. Our insistence on the statement of policy on the part of all groups was certainly a vigilant one, because—with a little anger—some queer things have come out of the G,F,&F policies, and only in the course of this discussion.

When 4 groups planned our publication, we held everyone to secrecy because we didn't want our dearly paid for literature lost to the N.C. of the CPUSA through leaks. (And we have had such experience.) When Franklin withdrew, we held the 3 groups to secrecy—and not even Franklin knew, let alone the rest. Before a common manifesto is issued in this country, it will still have to be prepared by the comparison of the drafts of all involved groups. TP's Declaration is the expression of our opinion concerning program, attitude, and organizational problems. The current mess will, in the long run, promote the open discussion of ideas and kill a few illusions about the get-a-leadership-quick idea. Right now, more ideas are in the open than we've had for a while. True, some of them don't look good, but better in the open where a few can die from exposure to fresh air.

G,F,&F want us to reconsider how to work collectively. We have answered this in our Remarks on the Letter from the Building Trades Club.

Flood thinks that the issuing of TP was indicative of the "locked-door-committee type of disunity". This strikes us as rather an arbitrary statement. Why doesn't Flood recount whatever savory stories she has constructed. All suspicions should be extracted from the G,F,&F grapevine and openly published for the benefit of all the comrades. Such an opening of the gangrene is bound to do some good. Either TP will be so exposed that we will cease publication as ordered by Flood or Flood will henceforth become allergic to grapevines. Obviously, there is a lot of "funny stuff" going on, the likes of which we've not seen in the expelled movement. Instead of fighting hypothetical, off-the-record rumors, TP is content to be patient and consider them as they hit the fresh air.

Here's one that hit the open air. TP is opportunist because it published before the CPUSA convention, where the major miracles of Magician George were going to restore the Party. This we cannot take too seriously, because G,F,&F knew that SPARK and FORE 'N' AFT opposed the whole orientation of "wait for the Convention". It's interesting to remember at this point that Franklin was also going to publish before the convention until he had a disagreement. So, at least with Franklin, the problem of when are we allowed to publish is simply solved—and has nothing to do with conventions: one may publish when in complete agreement with Franklin. We wonder if Comrade Flood believes that all the stuff published for about 2 years before this convention is taboo. This isn't so simple as it looks because Flood has to decide to what degree George's theory of the legal year of 1945 negates certain opposition literature. If the convention of 1945 was legal, etc., the RR Club certainly committed crimes.

But now, Flood leaves personal recriminations and advances to a high political level—but first, threatening us with the get-tough pronouncement: "We did not quibble over small words and phrases, although that could easily have been done also." (Our underlining.) This is a threat which we suppose is as often as not carried out. There is nothing like quibbling to threaten a political discussion with. However, Flood wins her point; she did frighten us. To read such drivel (over the word "comradely," too) frightens us into one of two alternatives: (1) we had better find or invent a "key" name in a hurry for prestige, so that we can then command a Marxist understanding—automatically; (2) we had better get rid of the sadistic

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY



attitude which threatens one with a few Dowlingisms. Unfortunately, Flood breaks her promise not to easily destroy us with quibbles--in the same letter. But now for the politics.

Flood's first political point. TP is accused of ignorance and egotism for addressing a letter to the C.I.B. regarding Comrade Bering's article in the C.I.B. organ. We can dispose of this quickly. Our attitude toward the C.I.B. is one--not of fear (as in the case of G, F, & F) --but of confidence, complete confidence. We know that the C.I.B. cannot object to receiving the problems of Comrades anywhere in the world. The C.I.B. will yet clear up the matter of the Bering article; it will one day have its say on the American situation. Franklin posed the awestruck question to us: certainly the Bering article isn't good, but suppose the C.I.B. blasts you (or words to that effect)? That's a bad question. If we're wrong, it's also important that the C.I.B. should express itself--to expose our error. Even if the C.I.B. were to give us advice that we consider incorrect (which we don't seriously expect will happen), our attitude would be very simple. Although there is no real C.P. in our country to which we give allegiance, we are part of an international Communist movement, whose center, is the C.I.B. in Bucharest, and whose ideological leader is the CPSU(B)--and Stalin. Towards the leadership of the C.I.B. and especially, the CPSU(B) we maintain a voluntary discipline. We are members, by virtue of being Communists (even if our Party has been destroyed temporarily), of an international Party. Whatever advice the C.I.B. were to give us, we would immediately proceed to implement. Even if we thought a particular directive were incorrect (and we repeat that we don't expect this to happen), we would accept it as part of a unified international Communist movement. Whatever might be incorrect would stand the greatest chance for correction exactly through a recognition of the importance of preserving the unity of the world Communist movement. Where is the egotism and ignorance in this? Comrade Flood, are you seriously hinting in CPUSA style: do the comrades of TP dare criticize their leaders!!!!!!

One would suppose that Flood waited for and welcomed the Bering article. No, Flood has slipped into a tender position. She forgets that on July 16, 1948 she wrote us, "On the Jack Bering article in the CIB organ. Like you, I rubbed my eyes and wondered what the hell 'gave' when I first read it. I reread it and let's do a retake on it." Was it that Flood felt egotistical and arrogant the first time she read it? Or did she simply read it for what it was? In the latter case, Flood should stop acting. Or, if only Flood's second reactions are genuine, she should have indicated whether her letters to us are first or second reactions. We suspect they were Flood's first reactions--"egotistical", etc. (on her own logic). Since Flood read English the first time and mumbo-jumbo the second time, we cannot be influenced by her handspring on reconsideration that her record might suffer if we broached the matter to the Cominform.

Flood dishonestly surges on: why didn't we at least hold it down to an inquiry? First, Flood's eye-rub didn't produce even an inquiry, so why substitute for us? Second, we reject Flood's lessons in subtle diplomacy. An inquiry would have been a pseudo-naive, sly maneuver to avoid a blunt posing of the problem and to avoid the possibility of criticism by the C.I.B. But, if we are wrong (and can Flood say we are--on the

degeneration of the CPUSA leadership), the best that can happen for the American working class is that we are corrected soon. We have noticed Flood's reactions in other people. She is afraid of the CIB because she has no understanding of problems of the international movement. She thinks that the CIB is a high organ to stay on the good side of--a philistine concept. Franklin, who originally offered to write the Open Letter to the C.I.B., quivered himself all over with fear--although he thinks the article was bad. And George indulges in rationalizations.

How far polemic can get out of line is illustrated by Flood's objection to our misuse of the quote on discussion from the ISKRA Declaration (p.2, TP Declaration). Flood states that we used the quote out of context because Lenin's line of demarcation was Marxism, a point on which all the groups in our discussion agree. "So," no line of demarcation is called for", says Flood. In the first place, suppose this were true; would our quote be out of context? We don't think so. In any case, although it might be superfluous, it would not be out of context. But the fact of the matter is that we have had experience with enough Dowlings and Suttas to need a Marxist line of demarcation. Flood still misses the essence of the quote--for us: the need for a knock-down open discussion to prevent fictitious unity. That is not out of context, certainly. But nasty Flood suddenly loses control and insinuates: "The 'line of demarcation' implied by 'Turning Point' seems to be relative to other matters...such as the building of a 'new' Party, etc."

May we calmly avoid a nasty word and point out that this is not in accordance with the facts. Notice, Comrade Flood: On page 2, directly under the quote referred to are our 5 points of basic agreement. These do not include the new Party question. Therefore, that question couldn't be "implied" by TP as a line of demarcation. Now, Flood, turn to the actual section on the new Party, page 13: "Therefore, although we consider it our responsibility to raise a definite perspective at this point, we cannot ignore the actual thinking in the CP." (Emphasis in original.) Now, turn to page 14: "To all Comrades in the CP, we say, stay in and work with us for the building of a real CP. Insofar as you disagree with us, test the Party program and judge by your own experience. Certainly, comrades who disagree with our perspective at this time must admit that within our attitude there is a basis for the best methods of work to prove themselves."

So, Comrade Flood, we obviously did the opposite of what you insinuate; we made sure that no one could possibly imply that we made a line of demarcation of the new Party perspective. (Was this one of threatened quibble points?) There is more than meets the eye here. Doesn't Flood remember that this quote was supposed to be included in the George-Franklin-Flood manifesto? It was! Franklin agreed with that very pertinent quote until the first disagreement. Then, he said that he would agree with its inclusion only after the first issue--with the disagreement not allowed in the first issue. We wanted both viewpoints on the new Party stated in the first issue of TP, ours for and Franklin's against the perspective of a new Party, especially since this question was not included in the 5 points of basic agreement. Franklin refused to countenance an open discussion on this--bad for the Party members. (And remember that at this point, Franklin was privately for a new Party.) So much for the second political point. The third political point, on the new party question

is dealt with in the main article. We might merely remind Flood that correspondence from Seattle not so long ago was talking about a "Communist Party (Bolshevik)" after the convention--A PRESUMPTUOUS IDEA, but still a new Party! As we say in the article, in the absence of a photographic memory, consistency demands principle.

Between points 3 and 4, Flood sandwiches in one of those taboo (but threatened) quibbles. She says our use of the phrase "emergence of a real CP" is "a goodly remnant of Dowlingism". This indicates to Flood that we leave the Party "to the tender mercies of Foster and Co. and this we refuse to concede". This quibble is really tender, merciful, infantile baloney. What can we say to this? Should we say stolidly: after a collective discussion of the very comradely sophistry of Comrade Flood for the N.W. Dist., we also refuse to concede the Party to the tender mercies, etc.? Or should we be understanding and conjecture: Flood's O.K...not snide--only poetic? Or should we very dully stick to an outline and ask: On the transitional point between political point 3 and political point 4 are we offered a diversion in the above threatened quibbling? In any case, Comrade Flood, if you refer to this quote in your own letter, you will see that we speak of "insure the emergence". Certainly, one might be daring enough to insist that if CP spoke about "insuring" the emergence of a real CP, it wasn't leaving anything to the tender mercies of inevitability.

Fourth political point. Flood disagrees that our objectives of Peace, Democracy, Security, and Socialism must be tackled simultaneously. She may not realize it, but G' F&F are back to Dunne's original pamphlet--in many ways. We agree that work for a CP is primary, but it can only be done by working in the other fields mentioned--not in a vacuum or via grapevine correspondence to convince a handful of people to start a new Party. Flood misses the distinction between primary and simultaneous. The first deals with focal importance; the second with timing or order. If the building of a real CP is so important, that is exactly why the other work is so important. And, Comrade Flood, we don't think that you should speak of any part of this movement as Bolshevik--not for a while. To do so, betrays a Dowlingst gross exaggeration and immodesty. If there were anything near a small corps of Bolsheviks in America today, there wouldn't be so much wreckage to clear away. Don't devalue that word so casually.

We are getting buried in George's hoax of the 1945 "legal" convention when we start talking of restoring the CPUSA to its former "Bolshevik" condition. The CPUSA was never anything approaching a Bolshevik Party and the application of this term to it by American Communists is completely unthinking.

It is sheer irresponsibility for LOFTY Communists to say "There are plenty of trade unionists etc. to be active in peace work etc"--while we handle that isolated, abstract problem: the Revolution? Here again, we're back to Dunne's parachutist approach to the CP. Flood rather inaccurately speaks of our point as if we recommended dropping of our efforts for a real CP in order to dabble in other fields. It would be slander to imply that we want anyone to drop the work of getting a CP--especially now, when many comrades like George, Franklin, and Flood are getting into the fight, and the conscious forces of anti-opportunism are growing.

Fifth political point. Flood thinks that we were a little naive in falling for the good program of the third party before the convention was held. Perhaps Flood judges too much by such formalities as conventions. Now, that the convention has been held, and now that our naivete has been proven correct about the good program, can we expect a correction from Flood? No, we can expect a listing of all of the many faults in the P.P. The program declared non-existent by Flood was unaccountably adopted in Philadelphia. Flood's hopes regarding the CPUSA convention were ridiculous on the positive side; her hopes regarding the P.P. convention were ridiculous on the negative side. What is left out of this completely wrong approach is the ascertainable fact of how people think currently about problems. It will matter little to G, F & F that their predictions about the third party are wrong. They will stick by their a priori predictions. (The rest of the third party problem is dealt with in detail in the article.)

Flood is afraid that by coming out before the convention of the CP we have brought up new problems that now have to be solved before we can move ahead to George's new Party. The truth is, that until now, many of these problems were not openly discussed; they were part of personal restricted correspondence--and sometimes more hidden than that. Despite our urging, we couldn't get the open positions of vocal comrades on many important problems--like the third party. Now, we have a rounded out discussion, and more to come. Until now, there were dignified secrets for the handling only by "leaders". As for open steps, Flood wanted us to wait...wait for the CPUSA Convention...wait for the third party convention...wait for the Messiah. Don't write about Bering...Don't jump the gun on anything!

Now we come to an ill-conceived statement, made either by a perfect fool or an unscrupulous provocateur. Flood has stated that the appearance of TP "coming out just 'prior' to the convention, and revealing an imminent concrete unity of the Left Wing, undoubtedly gave impetus to the FBI arrests of Foster and the others". So we are responsible for this? CPUSA, please take notice; this is certainly for your attention, offered by Flood for use against the PR Club, Fore 'N' Aft, and TP. We will not answer this accusation. But, there can be no trust between us and Flood until this accusation is explained, criticized, and removed. notice what slander does to political points. The PR Club tried to warn that the CP would arrest itself to enforce unity at the convention, and it did arrest itself on the queer charge of Marxism-Leninism, although many of the victims are innocent of the trick perpetrated by a few "special" members of the CP. This whole point is lost in the process of assassinating TP with slander.

On a "constructive" note, Flood ends by ordering us to cease publication. We wish we knew who Flood was so that we could gasp in reverence. TP will not consider Flood's tentative plan until she finds it possible to remove the slander regarding the arrest of Foster. Flood smirks that TP "will be hearing from the rest of the left wing as to their agreements and disagreements". Yes, Flood is a little more brazen than Franklin and George in that she bristles, while they softsoap. Yes, we have heard from George's Left Wing, but we hope that these comrades do

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

not constitute the wondrous group of disciples that George imagines. We hope they remember their CPUSA experience, and tackle ideas as ideas and not as loyalties to groups or individuals.

So, Comrade Flood, your criticism is not friendly. More honestly than you, we have to answer that our reactions cannot possibly be friendly--in the light of your insinuations and open accusations. Your "criticism" reminds us too much of the insinuations and threats that precede open gangup at a party expulsion. That makes us shudder. That isn't at all comradely.

Most of Flood's letter of July 30th is answered in the article. Just one point: Flood does not know of anyone calling for a convention shortly after the national convention. We think she does. We refer her memory to the letter from George to Franklin published here in part.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Remarks on the Letter from An L.A. Comrade

Most of this letter need not be answered since it consists of bitter cracks which we offer for what they are worth in exposing the attitude that wrote them. Most of the points made are those made in the other letters and the Supplement. There is an interesting twist to this letter. It is signed, in the original, with a new name, unknown to us. This is strange, since this comrade has written us before under another name. In SPARK of August 1947 (#5), this comrade wrote under another name a letter which we printed over the initial E. Comrade E. saw fit to pull a fast one now, and write new style under new authorship. We prefer the former style. We hope that the comrade is as pleasantly amused as we are disgusted over this ruse.

E says, "I do wonder if your declaration goes beyond these 5 points why you do not state how far beyond they do go". He finds here a "smell of bureaucracy". Answer: all material in TP's Declaration not covered by the 5 points is obviously that part which goes beyond it.

He wonders at our deception. Did we conceal our views on a new Party before this? No, the first issue of SPARK, in its program (also issued without the permission of G,F,&F) stated:

"...The developing movement for a Marxist party can mature successfully in one of two ways. If the C.P. rank and file awakens soon enough and reacts correctly to the sharp struggles ahead for the working class, there can be a 'rescue' of the CPUSA. This may easily never happen because degeneracy has a long entrenchment in the CPUSA...

"The only alternative is a new Marxist Party. To work with the attitude of salvaging as much as possible is to prepare for either eventuality. To decide now which of the alternatives we will end with is forming the theory before the fact because the basic data has not yet shown itself. It will show very soon." (Emphasis in the original).

This is no secret to E who read SPARK then. In those days, E could endorse our ideas without being part of a blitz attempt. He knows that the only open discussion and opposition opinion has appeared in SPARK, FORE 'N' AFT--and in this issue. It would be a good habit for other comrades to develop in their publications.

Comrade E sets himself a rather mechanical rule: only at a convention will he endorse any views. This, undoubtedly indicates that TP had no right to ask for endorsement. However, E forgets himself and endorses George's ideas--and so explodes his own standard of no endorsement. Comrade E from L.A.'s position is very simple he is part of the small pressure force Flood threatened us with. His contribution is valuable. Everyone's position should be clear and in the open.

Remarks on "Appeal to TP" from "Towards Socialism"

A few facts: Four groups, including Franklin's Bill Haywood Club, were planning the issuing of Turning Point before the convention, July 1st, to be exact. So, according to the arguments of G,F,&F, The Bill Haywood Club was in on this opportunist blitz, putsch, etc. Franklin objects to what he calls our appeal to CP'ers to work with us in a factional manner. This is proven hypocrisy in the reprint of a small section of a Franklin letter--in this issue. Franklin doesn't really think that SPARK or Fore 'N' Aft are leaders of a faction. He wrote around the country TP's formulation of the bogey of factionalism after consultation with the PR Club--before TP was ever issued. That letter is reprinted here. Franklin takes a fit over rash, insolent, irresponsible TP which wrote the C.I.B. a letter. What Franklin omits is that he offered to help write it. He also agreed with us, off the record, that the Bering article wasn't good. "Wash't good!" What diplomacy. Franklin, too, is afraid of the C.I.B. as of something above the Communist movement--not part of it. If Franklin looks to the C.I.B. for leadership, as he should, he should find his tongue. The C.I.B. doesn't need mannikins.

Franklin wants criticism and self-criticism in the TP setup. So do we. That's why we insisted that Franklin should write his criticism of TP, and we would circulate it. Franklin refused. The crux of the problem here is why did Franklin pull out of TP with the B.H. Club. The draft of TP's Declaration embodied the rules governing the political control of TP. These were left out of the printed Declaration along with a lot of other material because of space limitations. Since the rules were not immediately necessary to the statement of our program, we reserved them for another time. We wish to include them here:

"Immediately following the Lenin quote on page 2, 1--All purely editorial material (i.e. unsigned) represents the unanimous agreement of the groups through the Editorial Board. As a solution of minor but pointed disagreements (involving tone or various types of emphasis) an article which is not completely agreeable to all the editors will be signed, thus having its editorial function lessened, but still generally representing the publication. Underlying this rule is our belief that majority-minority voting at this stage would be a misrepresentation on our part since we do not yet represent substantial groups of comrades, and a mere majority on our editorial board would not necessarily represent the correct position in any disagreement.

"2-The problem of raising a difference openly in the magazine will be discussed upon the request of an editor. If there is unanimous agreement that the difference is of minor importance and not a matter of timing or of immediate airing, the discussion may be delayed pending further discussion in the editorial board and in the groups represented. In the absence of a unanimous decision to delay, upon the request of an editor,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the publication will throw the question open to discussion with equal space given to each of the different ideas.

"3-- We look forward to help from Contributing Editors in different parts of the country. A Contributing Editor must identify himself with a group or publication so that his policy is clear and in the record, so that our basic agreement is clear. Contributing Editors will have full rights to participation in discussion. However, since this publication is a local one, representing local groups, final decisions on editorial policy will be made only by the local groups represented through the Editorial Board.

"4-- The paragraph following the Lenin quote on page 2 of TP's Declaration was taken--as a bridge in the cutting--from this point. We urge groups in New York and around the country to endorse our views so that the ideological and organizational unification we desire nationally can proceed systematically and visibly. For this purpose, we also, will endorse groups and publications with which we basically agree. Representation on our Editorial Board of other groups in New York City will proceed from the open statement of their policies, personal contact, and the unanimous agreement of the Editorial Board."

These rules were accepted by Franklin and the B.H. Club, but only until the first disagreement occurred. Then He opposed the rules for the first issue--we could use them after that. Franklin told us that the CP members must not see our disagreements. We spit on that! After failing to agree on the question of the raising of the perspective of a new Party, the 3 groups suggested to Franklin that we use our fine rules and according to the 2nd rule, print a brief statement of both positions. This would be an indication of the seriousness and honesty of TP. But Franklin absolutely refused, and the TP of 4 groups died. We thought it over and went ahead with 3 groups. (See note below on the subsequent developments. This whole mess is indicative of a fault in the expelled movement. It hasn't learned to practice what it preaches. The wastefulness of this attitude of hiding problems is proven in the fact that the discussion is raging anyway--but under less orderly conditions.

\*\*\*\*

#### A Note on Vanguard

Vanguard is no longer part of Turning Point. Following the publication of TP's Declaration and its Letter to the C.I.B., a state of intrigue developed for which we hold Franklin directly responsible. The instrument of intrigue became Ross (an assumed name--no exposure here), Vanguard's representative on TP's Editorial Board. When secret meetings, gossip, etc. became unbearable, we insisted that Ross openly discuss his differences in TP--but cease his scandal and obstructionism. There was nothing we could object to in an open discussion of political differences. Ross, however, refused to state his disagreements in print, refused to permit work, and finally came out against TP's policy of open discussion. He even objected to a note to Flood requesting permission to reprint the 2 letters included in this issue. (This note could not be sent until after Ross's withdrawal.) When Ross reached the point of repeating (on the authority of George and Franklin) that TP was Trotskyite, we insisted on his withdrawal, to which he agreed. During this period, Ross did not maintain the functioning of his group, and --perhaps luckily--the other comrades in his group were not involved. Also, not consulted. We want to make it absolutely clear that we have no argument with any other member

of Vanguard. There is nothing of a constructive nature in further details. We are concerned with political questions--not with the personal schemes of Rosses. We therefore removed ourselves as quickly as possible from the orbit of the local intrigue. We can engage in political discussions, but not backroom finagling.

\*\*\*\*\*

George Dowls At Dowling  
(continued from page 34)

Let us direct the reader's attention to (pardon a special word for a special occasion) the apotheosis of hypocrisy. In Franklin's T.S.#7, he bleats that someone slipped the wrong info to George about Dowling. Franklin states that Dowling wasn't in the OWI, but in "Stars and Stripes" (What is earth-shaking in this revelation, we don't know.) F.F. then states: "We are glad to publish this correction on behalf of George, because, if there is anything we do not want to see, it is the dissemination of even the slightest inaccuracy about anyone. Comrade George is also anxious to correct any inaccuracy. We are not publishing the source of the misinformation because we wish to help in engendering no more heat over this regrettable incident."

Mysterious Franklin knows that the only source mentioned by George (without permission) in his Supplement is SPARK. So, of course SPARK wrote the "whodunit" letter of April 7th. F.F. threw in a date for spice. We wrote George--after great entreaties--meager info and repeatedly told him to stay clear of this manner of attack. Our old unimportant info came from the Dowling's mouth, and we, ourselves, indicated the inherent contradictions in what Dowling said. The important point to correct (attention, George and Franklin) is the double charge: spy and Trotskyite. Is Dowling or isn't he a spy and a Trotskyite? This must be answered. We are glad that George has suffered the consequences of his scandal, consequences so unnerving that he now seeks to do the impossible: stick TP with his excursion into slime. George is doing this in letters to various expelled publications.

\*\*\*\*\*

LOOKING FORWARD

It is obvious that the CPUSA has no monopoly on bad ideas and attitudes. The expelled movement has its share by virtue of its own former environment--in the CPUSA. We have been reared in the ideas we are fighting. We lost our CPUSA because we did not constitute a solid enough core of real Communists. We are only now trying to get such a hard core. The important angle is to understand our own obstacles and fight ruthlessly to expose them before all comrades. There is a powerful consolation in all this: In our movement, this is only the beginning, in which we are trying to lay a solid basis for a truly principled, unified Party which will have left behind once and for all opportunism and betrayal of the American working class. But doesn't all this "look bad"? Lenin said:

"One more word to the opponents of Social-Democracy. They gloat and grimace over our controversies; and, of course, they will try to pick isolated passages from my pamphlet, which deals with the defects and shortcomings of our Party, and to use them for their own ends. The Russian Social-Democrats are already steeled enough in battle not to be perturbed by these pinpricks and to continue, in spite of them, their work of self-criticism and ruthless exposure of their own shortcomings, which will unquestionably and inevitably be overcome as the working-class movement grows. As for our opponents, let them try to give us a picture of the true state of affairs in their own 'parties' even remotely approximating that given by minutes of our 2nd Congress."

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY