

Political affairs

SEPTEMBER 1952 • 25 CENTS



WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

[1] Peace—Today's Central Issue

PETTIS PERRY

[6] Perspectives in the 1952 Elections

FRANK BREWSTER
and
PETER COLTON

[21] On the Question of Sectarianism in
Our Peace Activity

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

[33] The Formation of the Communist
Party (1919-1921)

GEORGE BLAKE
and
ROBERT APTHEKER

[48] "Flesh and bone of the working
class . . ."—On Foster's *History of
the Communist Party*

ALVIN S. HERWITZ

[57] Pavlov's Teachings in Psychology
and Physiology

A GREAT BOOK... BY A GREAT AMERICAN!

IN BATTLE FOR PEACE

By W. E. B. Du Bois

With Commentary by **SHIRLEY GRAHAM**

"In this volume, Dr. W.E.B. Du Bois and his wife, Shirley Graham, have given readers an exceedingly rewarding vantage point from which to view the world struggle for peace.

"Here is personal reporting practiced as an art, full of charm, charged with deep emotional feeling, put down in prose that sings, and is guided by the discipline of the trained but imaginative social scientist. . . .

"Anyone reading this book cannot escape experiencing the thrill of sharing an intimacy with one of the world's truly great personalities. We share with him his disillusionment with his former belief that the 'Talented Tenth' would furnish the leadership for American Negroes, and the birth of the realization that leadership would come from the working class. . . .

"*In Battle for Peace* is reporting at its best, by a dean of American letters in collaboration with his wife, both of whom are peace partisans eloquently defending the right of Americans to advocate peace. They have used as their arguments a meaningful slice of their lives. It's a must!"

—ABNER W. BERRY in *The Worker*, Sept. 28, 1952

A Masses & Mainstream Book

At All Bookstores

Price \$1.00

Distributed by

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3

Re-entered as second class matter January 4, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by New Century Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y., to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: \$2.50 a year; \$1.25 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$3.00 a year. Single copies 25 cents.

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

Peace—Today's Central Issue

By William Z. Foster

(Opening remarks to the National Election Conference of the Communist Party, held in New York City, September 6, 1952.)

COMRADES:

In a way this gathering is quite historic. You no doubt will be remembering this in years to come. The Government has been trying to destroy our Party for full four years now. It is over four years in fact since the first indictments were leveled against the Party. Well, here we are and here we will continue to be after these phony governors, judges, prosecutors and perjurers and the rest of them that are trying to break up our Party are gone and forgotten.

* * *

My remarks in opening this conference in no sense constitute a rounded-out election program. That will come later in the Draft Election Program, and also in the reports and speeches of Comrade Perry and others. What I am undertaking to do now is to focus our attention upon the main task confronting us in this election

campaign; the central task to which all others are coordinated and subordinated, namely the fight for world peace. To put it more precisely, I want to deal with the very heart of our Party's peace program at present—the fight for an immediate ceasefire in Korea.

In the election campaign we must, as our draft program indicates, fight militantly against the rapid sinking of the living standards of the workers, against the intensified attacks upon the rights of the Negro people, and against the attempt of the government to jail our leaders, to drive our Party underground, and to destroy it. We must fight to roll up the biggest possible election vote for the Progressive Party. We must fight to record a smashing vote for our own Communist candidates wherever they are running for office.

The objective and subjective situa-

tion is increasingly favorable for the development of these co-related struggles. The workers, under the pressure of the mounting cost-of-living, are showing a new militancy and fighting spirit, as has been indicated by the national steel strike and by various other big strikes. The Negro people, outraged at the betrayal of the civil rights program at the Republican and Democratic Conventions, are also in a ready mood for aggressive political action. And by the same token, the rising spirit of struggle among the masses offers our Party a more favorable opportunity to defend itself from the government's ceaseless attacks, and to fight for amnesty for our imprisoned comrades.

Irresistibly all these mass struggles must, by united front actions, be focused towards strengthening our general fight for peace. Peace is the all-decisive issue in this campaign. All other issues center around and depend upon this key all-determining question. This basic fact we must keep clearly in mind throughout the election campaign and allow no other question, no matter how important, to divert our attention from the central question of peace.

In the direct fight against the war danger, with its related threat of fascism, our general task is complex and many-sided. We must show the people the direct relationship between the soaring cost of living and the attacks upon popular freedoms, especially the attack upon the rights of the Negro people, with the war preparations and the drive of Wall Street imperialism for world conquest. We

must penetrate the thick fog of imperialist war ideology and bring home to the American masses the fundamental truth that the current hysterical armaments race by the United States is not for the defense of national security and world peace, as is claimed, but for the eventual launching of a third world war, when the reactionary warmongers deem the time ripe for such a murderous adventure.

Especially, during the campaign, we must make clear to the workers, and to other democratic strata, the essential political unity of the two big capitalist parties. They are both war parties, and they are proving this against each other in the election debate. Every brand of reformist will be pointing to Stevenson as the champion of peace and as such calling upon the workers to vote for him. But these peace pretensions are a lie. The two parties may vary in their type of demagoguery—the Republican being the more outspokenly militarist and reactionary and the Democrats the more tricky in their mass deception—but their hoped-for objective is the same—an eventual all-out war of destruction against the U.S.S.R., People's China, and the European Peoples' Democracies.

What General Eisenhower did in his notorious recent speech to the American Legion convention in New York was not to lay down a new policy for the government in his warlike threats that the United States was out to overthrow the Peoples' Democracies and the U.S.S.R.; he merely tore the demagogic mask off

the pro
capital.
rainm
cloth
Truma
Eisenh
demag
vest un
In th
plicate
which
vention
an im
with t
prison
tinued
sively
upon i
binds
our e
of the
keep i
tion o
Korea.
To a
would
the peo
have v
Ameri
to hav
though
militar
stoppe
Korea
theless
is beca
lent p
ent wa
and fo
tarizat
They
will e
with v

the present policy of American big capital. The Truman so-called "containment" policy is cut from the same cloth as Eisenhower's policy. The Truman and Stevenson criticisms of Eisenhower's speech were purely demagogic and were designed to harvest unwary but peace-loving voters.

In the whole tremendous and complicated fight for peace, the issue which must focus our most urgent attention at this time is the demand for an immediate cease-fire in Korea, with the still undecided question of prisoner-of-war exchange to be continued in negotiation. This is a decisively important matter. Insistence upon it must be the cement which binds together the whole fabric of our entire peace fight. In every aspect of the struggle, therefore, we must keep in the very forefront the question of an immediate cease-fire in Korea.

To accomplish a cease-fire in Korea would be a tremendous victory for the people's forces of peace and would have world-wide repercussions. The American warmongers are striving to have the war in Korea go on. Although they have suffered a major military and prestige defeat by being stopped cold by the armies of North Korea and People's China, they nevertheless want the war continued. This is because it provides them an excellent pretext for continuing the present war hysteria against the U.S.S.R., and for the intensification of the militarization of the American people. They also hope that the Korean war will eventually prove the firebrand with which they can start a far bigger

conflagration in the East and throughout the world. If the warmongers have failed thus far to spread the war into China, and if they have gone as far as they have in the long-drawn-out peace negotiations at Panmunjom, this has been basically due, in addition to the factor of North Korea and People's China, as noted above, to the mass pressure of the peace-loving peoples of Europe and the Americas, to the strength of the peace camp headed by the Soviet Union.

Obviously, it would be a big defeat for the warmongers and a resounding victory for the peace forces if an immediate cease-fire could be secured in Korea. And, if properly and vigorously fought for, such a cease-fire is not impossible of achievement. As matters now stand, the negotiating forces have arrived at the main essentials of what could be a truce agreement. They have agreed on the boundary line between North and South Korea, and have established the demilitarized zones on either side of this boundary; the manner of supervision of the eventual truce has been settled and they have named the powers which will exercise this supervision; the number of airfields North Korea may build has been determined, etc. In fact, as all concede, only one question remains unsettled, that of the exchange of war prisoners.

This is both an important and a knotty question. But it is criminally stupid for the United States (the U.N.) to continue the war over it. Far more intelligent would it be to halt the war with a cease-fire, and to leave the prisoner-of-war issue to

further negotiations, to be conducted either by the present negotiating teams or by the eventual peace conference. Of course, the warmongers dictating American policy in Korea would never accept such reasoning, but the masses of the American people will, if the matter is put to them clearly and effectively. I have not the slightest doubt that, on the above-stated basis, the great majority would favor a cease-fire. The American people have always hated the Korean war and undoubtedly, if they could see their way clear to end it, they would force it to be brought to a conclusion.

The United States bears the full responsibility for continuing the war while the truce negotiations go on. From the outset it has insisted upon continuing hostilities during the truce talks. This is a definite sign that the United States has not wanted peace but war, for the reasons I have previously indicated. The United States now takes the initiative in continuing land action, air raids, and naval bombardments. If it alone were to cease fire, the hostilities would be at an end. Various American commanders have pointed out the demonstrated folly of trying to achieve with force and violence a settlement of the prisoner-of-war question. Undoubtedly, huge masses of the American people agree with them, or will, if they understand the practicability of halting the war on the basis of the truce agreement already arrived at.

It is the central peace task of our Party in this election campaign to emphasize the cease-fire in all our

peace fight, to make the American people understand it. To this end, we should push aggressively the National Referendum for a cease-fire in Korea. We should also support the sending of delegations to the President, to the Presidential nominees, and to all other election candidates. We should also strive to win A. F. of L., C.I.O. and independent unions for this campaign, and to induce the Left liberal press to support it. Undoubtedly we can make a powerful showing in these respects if we shall but undertake the job promptly and actively on a broad united front basis.

In this election campaign our Party is supporting the Presidential candidates of the Progressive Party, Hallinan and Bass. This we should do most vigorously with full concentration. For it is of great importance to the future success of the peace movement that the Progressive Party ticket poll the largest possible number of votes.

We must proceed with the cease-fire campaign with both speed and vigor, because the peace-negotiation situation in Korea is highly critical and may not brook delay. There is a sinister significance in the increased American air bombardments and the longer "vacations" in the peace talks during recent weeks at American insistence. These dangerous developments could well forecast a breaking off of the truce talks altogether. There are the gravest reasons to believe that the peace talks will be ended entirely, upon American initiative, after the election is over, or at least after a new President is in office. Then it

will be
Penta
somi
tiation
fied v
openi
The f
to wo
the a
under
our P
to pre
fighti
ate ce

In
word
muni
prove
four
been
Party
so-cal
had
frame
tionar
stool-
vergi
sente
to be
sive a
On th
again
Ger
tional
in pr
in F
acros
been
twen
Calif

will be much more convenient for the Pentagon warmongers to seize upon some thin pretext, end the truce negotiations, and embark upon an intensified war, which could become the opening stage of a third world war. The fact that such a war would lead to world disaster is no guarantee that the atom-bomb maniacs would not undertake it. It is the historic duty of our Party, therefore, to do all it can to prevent another murderous war by fighting energetically for an immediate cease-fire in Korea.

* * *

In conclusion, let me say a few words about the situation of the Communist Party. These are times that prove the mettle of Communists. For four years now the Government has been ruthlessly trying to smash our Party and to jail its leaders. In the so-called courts of justice, we have had to face the deadly routine of frame-up Federal prosecutions, reactionary judges, intimidated juries, stool-pigeon perjurers, stereotyped verdicts of guilty, and savage prison sentences. Nor have we any reason to believe that the end of this offensive against us is anywhere in sight. On the contrary, we must be on guard against fresh raids.

Gene Dennis and our other National Board members have now been in prison for over a year, scattered in Federal penitentiaries half way across the country. Steve Nelson has been jailed for the barbaric term of twenty years. And our comrades in California, railroaded to jail by a

kangaroo court, have been forced to put up an outrageous bail. Whatever this election conference does, it should resolve to step up greatly the amnesty campaign to free our imprisoned comrades.

This ruthless persecution, which tramples the Bill of Rights in the dirt and makes a mockery of all democratic judicial procedure, is a definite part of the war drive of Wall Street monopoly capital. It is an attempt to silence the voices of the Communists, the clearest and boldest defenders of peace. And the best way to defeat this attack against us, in addition to a militant defense in court of our Party's program, activities, and history, is precisely to make the most effective possible fight among the masses in defense of peace.

The more courageously and energetically we carry our peace program to the masses of the working class, the Negro people, and other democratic strata, the more they will rally to our Party and the more difficult it will be for the Government to persecute us. Which brings me back to the point with which I started, namely, that of advocating an immediate cease-fire in Korea. This, of all mass issues, if properly handled, will be the most effective in the building of a strong mass defense around our Party. The Government is persecuting our Party because of its resolute stand against the war; and the best defense against this attack and to secure the release of our imprisoned comrades is precisely to make an even more energetic and effective mass fight for peace.

Perspectives in the 1952 Elections

By Pettis Perry

(Report to the National Election Conference of the Communist Party, held in New York City, September 6, 1952.)

COMRADES:

It has been more than two months now since the conclusion of the three political conventions — those of the Republican Party, the Democratic Party and the Progressive Party. If there is any proof needed to show which of these three Parties stands for peace it has been amply demonstrated since the conclusion of these conventions. As Comrade Foster said in his opening remarks,* the two major parties are the twin parties of Wall Street. Both of these parties stand for war. Both of these parties stand for the destruction of civil rights and democratic rights, and only the Progressive Party emerged from its convention with a program of peace, economic security, civil rights and the protection of the Bill of Rights. Wall Street made sure this time that it would come out of the conventions with candidates and programs as closely identical as possible, because the imperialists do not care for any debate at the present time on

their essential orientation and perspective, namely, their all-out push for war and world domination.

In bringing forward the candidates of the two old parties, they tell us they are both "independents." In bringing forward Eisenhower, they argue that he is an independent and a man who is not a politician. In bringing forward Stevenson, they claim that he is both a liberal and an independent. Well, this is simply a fraud. Neither Eisenhower nor Stevenson is independent. Nor are they liberal. Stevenson is perhaps a little slicker than Eisenhower. Stevenson perhaps will show that he can be at least as demagogic, if not more demagogic, than Eisenhower.

Wall Street, at these two conventions, by the type of platforms they adopted, by the type of candidates they brought forward, hoped to take those steps that would drive the masses of this country towards the Right. Wall Street counted strongly on its fanfare of drum-beating, televising and glamorizing these conventions and the candidates. But Wall Street did not succeed in turning the American people to the Right. The American people are still for

* Published elsewhere in this issue—ed.

peace. The American people in their overwhelming majority are still for civil rights and the protection of the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of our country. The American working class is offering militant resistance to the wage-freeze and the Taft-Hartley regimentation of the unions.

Any examination of the two major party candidates and what they stand for will show that they are united on so-called "containment" policies in Korea. They are united on the so-called "containment-of-Communism" policies. When the "pro-peace" demagoguery in the speeches of Stevenson and Eisenhower is exposed for what it is, the essential fact stands out that both are war parties, that both pursue the pro-war cause of Wall Street, and of this, comrades, we must never lose sight.

Let me here call upon witnesses from their own camp. For example, James Reston writes in the *New York Times* on June 12:

The Republicans and Democrats may be trading insults about each other's foreign policies, but the fact remains that they are cooperating actively and effectively on the most exacting and revolutionary foreign policy adventure since World War II.

It would have been more correct for the writer to say "cooperating on a most exacting *counter-revolutionary* foreign policy," a policy aimed at smashing the liberation movements and democratic forces all over the world and particularly the colonial

and semi-colonial movements in Asia, Africa and the Near East.

Let us turn to another witness, W. H. Lawrence. Writing in the *New York Times* on July 26, he has this to say: "The selection of General Eisenhower and Governor Stevenson . . . largely eliminates the issue of foreign policy as a main point of choice for the voters." (Emphasis mine—P.P.)

Thus it becomes clear that the monopolists are jumping up in the air and rubbing their hands at the success they had in Chicago in bringing forward the type of candidates and platforms they wanted. But the bourgeoisie has not yet realized that it will not be the main determining voice in the final analysis. Yet it must be said that never before to our knowledge has there been such near-unanimous acclamation of both candidates. This reflects perhaps the fear of the bourgeoisie of any kind of independent ticket that may challenge its whole orientation.

After all of Eisenhower's sabre-rattling at the American Legion convention, still he was forced to pretend that he was liberal at least on some of the domestic issues. For example, he stated at this convention that he thought the people should not be guilty of racial prejudices, which he branded as stupid. But what Eisenhower did not explain was how it is that the Republican Party continues to insult the Negro people and how it is that at Chicago his party, like the Democratic Party, perpetrated the

greatest betrayal upon the Negro people and on labor that we have seen in some time. No, Eisenhower could not explain this any more than he could explain his speech in Georgia the other day when he called upon the South to "do something" about the problems of the Negro people amid Confederate rebel yells from his audience.

Stevenson, on the other hand, was a little bit more demagogic at the Legion Convention, especially with respect to the Negro people. There he spoke of the need for F.E.P.C., the need to do away with the filibuster, and said he would try to convince Congress to pass such legislation. Stevenson gave away the whole thing, however, when he urged that the question of F.E.P.C. and civil rights be referred to the states themselves. That would mean that the national government would wait for Mississippi to pass an anti-lynching bill, for Georgia to pass an anti-poll tax bill, for Alabama to pass an F.E.P.C. bill, and after all of the South had taken the path of guaranteeing civil rights for the Negro people, and after the North had either simultaneously or soon thereafter followed the South, then the national government would act. This is Stevenson's "program" for the Negro people—the Bourbon program of States' rights — just like the program of Eisenhower.

The reactionaries of the labor movement connived with, and participated in, these betrayals by the

lack of fight for an elementary program for labor, either prior to or during the conventions. And after the conventions Jack Kroll, who headed the C.I.O. delegation to the Democratic convention, could appear with Stevenson, hold a conference with him, and say that they had had an amicable discussion. What type of discussion was this, when nothing definite was raised, not even the demand for a forthright position from Stevenson for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act? This betrayal was participated in by leaders of dominant sections of the A.F. of L. and of the farm movement. It shows quite clearly the role that Social-Democracy and labor reformism will attempt to play in this election as a means of guaranteeing that the workers remain tied to one or the other of the two old parties. And I would say of the Democratic convention that there we saw, among the Dixiecrats, corrupt political bosses, and Wall Street tycoons, one of the largest gatherings of spokesmen of labor reformism, of Social-Democracy, and of Negro reformism.

Now, during this election campaign we shall be confronted increasingly, and I would say even more than during the Truman campaign of 1948, with tremendous demagoguery from reactionary Social-Democratic and A.D.A. leaders, from the labor reformists and the Negro reformists, aimed at palming off Stevenson as the continuer of Roosevelt. Thus, the *New York Post*, a few days after the

Democr
is necess
nominat
Post w
with tho
every sm
the Sout
ward a l
a small
reformis
Stevens
ately try
America
once in
to be a l
voted de
made in
game of
ers is to
cratic P
ers and

THE "I

One c
tions th
in this e
Democr
party,"
which t
people
Democr
man's
New D
Rooseve
that par
of Wa
Bourbo
we have
year in
campai

Democratic Party convention, found it necessary to attack the critics of the nomination of a Sparkman. And the *Post* went on to express impatience with those liberals who get excited at every small concession that is made to the South. (Of course, bringing forward a Dixiecrat is for the *Post* "just a small concession"!) The labor reformist leaders, who have jumped on Stevenson's bandwagon, are desperately trying to sell a Sparkman to the American people as a man who was once in the Roosevelt camp and used to be a liberal. (A Dixiecrat who has voted down the line with reaction is made into a "liberal"!) The sordid game of the labor reformist misleaders is to present Wall Street's Democratic Party as the party of the workers and the common people.

THE "POOR MAN'S PARTY"

One of the main ideological questions that will have to be overcome in this election is the theory that the Democratic Party is the "poor man's party," that it is the only party to which the workers and the Negro people can turn. For one thing, the Democratic Party never was a poor man's party, not even during the New Deal period of Roosevelt. But Roosevelt today is not the head of that party. At its head are the moguls of Wall Street and the Southern Bourbons. We must recognize that we have before us a difficult task this year in exposing to the masses the campaign demagoguery, particularly in

respect to this, because of widespread illusions carried over from the Roosevelt period when the masses found it possible to fight and to win some concession through the Democratic Party. A labor-Negro alliance joined with the New Deal section of the Democratic Party. That loose democratic coalition was responsible for breaking through and winning concessions for the workers, the farmers, the unemployed, the Negro people. It succeeded, too, in developing some cooperation and friendly relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. This is the basis for the continuing illusions. The reformists understand this, and it is this they will exploit in order to keep the masses tied to the Democratic Party.

The masses also see before them a militarist, Eisenhower, with a running mate, Nixon, who came to notoriety by one of the greatest "crusades" against Communism, who spearheaded the original Mundt-Nixon Bill which is now the McCarran Act. This will further feed the illusions that the Democratic Party is not only the "lesser evil" but is the party of the poor and of the working class. And we should realistically face the fact that Stevenson, in his last few speeches, particularly his speech before the American Legion and his several Labor Day speeches in Michigan, has already begun to have such an effect among great sections of the population, including sections in and around the Progressive Party itself.

It should be quite clear that, in this

election campaign, achieving a real extensive peace vote for the only peace ticket in the country — the ticket of the Progressive Party—requires an all-out fight to break through the demagogy of the two major parties, especially the hoax of the Democratic Party as the “poor man’s party” or as the “lesser evil.” It is our job to do whatever we can to influence the masses against support of either of the two old parties.

BUILDING REAL PEACE VOTE

In the fight to build a large vote for the Progressive Party, several tactical questions confront the Left and progressive forces. First, it is essential to keep in the forefront the central task of building the largest possible vote and movement around the national ticket of the Progressive Party. Secondly, in a number of states the Progressive Party is not on the ballot. In these states all efforts are needed to build coalitions around specific candidates in every district where this is possible. In some cases, such support will, of course, have to be of a qualified nature. There will be instances, however, few I admit, of the sort that obtained in the 22nd Senatorial District in New York, where the incumbent senator elected on the Republican ticket in the last election found the local Republican machine “ganged up” against him in the primaries because of his pro-labor role. His supporters, including the American Labor Party, had to win

Republican voters to vote for him in the Republican primaries. Or there may be instances where a candidate will support certain aspects of the struggle for peace. Let me stress, comrades, a basic question determining the support of candidates running on the ticket of either major party is how they stand on the issue of peace.

Now, a third tactical question which is key to the success of the Progressive Party itself is to try to develop in all instances the broadest possible coalition with labor, the farmers, the Negro people, the city middle class, irrespective of party lines or party allegiance, establishing independent committees on behalf of the Hallinan-Bass ticket. For example, you will find a whole number of cases where people, because of the national set-up, will vote for the national ticket of the Progressive Party but will vote for a local Republican or Democrat. Well, we have to take this into account. You will find among the masses, on the other hand, not a small group who will say, “Well, we will boycott the national tickets and we will confine ourselves to the local candidates.” This is Congressman Powell’s orientation. We have to unite with these masses, try to convince them that there is a positive alternative in the national and local fields and that it is the Progressive Party.

Then, of course, there is a fourth question which is even more fundamental, and that is the question of

develop
tion a
Our P
every c
have a
that th
election
whethe
is on t
and apr
should
of force
should
congres
to stim
shops,
activity
izing c
candida
their pe
Taft-H
whole l
We s
election
fore us.
port to
vote fo
small v
this ye
for the
ocratic
general
approac
particul
New Y
Progress
followi
effort, I
all stat
Pennsy
setts, I

developing the broadest possible coalition around issues in the campaign. Our Party must activate itself in every congressional district where we have a Communist organization so that there be no "sitting out" of the election campaign, regardless of whether or not the Progressive Party is on the ballot. Whatever attitude and approach we take to candidates should be based upon the relationship of forces in specific districts; but there should be Communist activity in all congressional districts. It is necessary to stimulate in the communities, shops, and trade unions all types of activity around the key issues, organizing delegations to go to various candidates to demand that they state their position on peace, on repeal of Taft-Hartley, on civil rights and a whole host of such issues.

We should see, comrades, in this election, two or three key tasks before us. First, to give the utmost support to secure the biggest possible vote for the Progressive Party. A small vote for the Progressive Party this year will have dire consequences for the whole people and for the democratic and progressive movement generally. There must be no routine approach to this question anywhere, particularly in those key states, like New York and California, where the Progressive Party has a substantial following and can, with an all-out effort, build up a large vote. But in all states, particularly in Michigan, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Indiana, and Washington, no

stone is to be left unturned to win mass support for the Hallinan-Bass ticket. This is all the more necessary, comrades, since in two important industrial states — Illinois and Ohio — the Progressive Party will not be on the ballot.

Secondly, we must help crystallize a broad coalition in the course of this campaign, which will conduct a continuous and more effective fight for the demands of the people once Congress convenes.

Thirdly, let us at this conference resolve to overcome a perennial sickness in our ranks with regard to election campaigns. And what is that? Election year after year, we approach the question as though we were uncertain whether or not there will be another election next year, and so in a particular election we adopt a sort of fire brigade technique and no preparations are made for any other elections. Then the next election comes along — another fire brigade. Let us cease this method of work. Let us approach this election campaign so that we have in mind what we are going to do with regard to the local elections in the coming year throughout our country. In addition, we should not start thinking, in August 1954, about which congressional candidates we intend supporting that year. We should begin now to think of forces that can come forward in the 1954 elections. In other words, let us understand that unless there is complete fascism, we will have elections next year, and there will be elec-

tions in 1954. Therefore, let us get rid of these fire-brigade methods!

In considering the 1953 municipal elections, the greatest amount of attention should be given to bringing forward candidates, and not merely candidates that the Communists alone support, as important as that is. Local elections frequently are less partisan than national elections. Therefore, it becomes more readily possible to develop various types of coalitions around candidates and issues, and thereby influence the outcome of such elections and the complexion of local legislatures. I want to stress this very much because, as I have said, there is a routine feeling about this and a lackadaisical attitude.

I want to emphasize this a great deal, comrades, because if we think, as we must, of moving the American people into a broad peace and democratic coalition, we know that that cannot be done without considering how best to help millions of American people break with the Democratic and Republican parties. Can we achieve this kind of broad coalition without having this as a perspective? And can we have this as a perspective without having at the same time the perspective of developing year in and year out a broad movement on issues involving voters from all political parties? This whole perspective fits in with the emphasis that the Party has been placing for the past few years on the need to devote major attention to Right-led organizations and unions, where the broad masses

of the people are.

I am afraid, however, that some comrades are drawing wrong conclusions from this, because there is growing up a feeling that this means we want nothing to do with progressive-led organizations, that we want nothing to do with Left-led unions, but that all we are going to do is concern ourselves with Right-led groups. No, comrades, that is not what we are saying. We are saying that the overwhelming majority of the people are in the Right-led organizations and we have to find ways to establish close ties with these masses and to unite with them for progressive activity. This in no sense means lessening the importance of work in the progressive and Left-led organizations to help assure their proper place in this whole coalition movement. Remember, in the Progressive unions there are over 600,000 members, who, together with their families, make up a significant segment of the working people of our country. If these organizations would pursue an independent course, they could contribute immeasurably to the development of an anti-fascist, anti-war, anti-monopolist people's movement.

"SITTING OUT" THE ELECTIONS

Now, there are certain ideas that we must combat in these elections. One, the notion of "sitting out" the election, *i.e.*, a growing anti-parliamentarist tendency. This is expressed

in a w
"What
both v
such m
can on
Have
farmers
that the
Of cou
on such
number
channe
old par
gressive
from th
certain
ing sus
ing ma
sention
evidenc
"Well,
my loc
therefo
"My un
off pol
Party.
done."
Is it
nothing
ditions
not pos
tion of
ions ar
Progres
dividua
ers of t
cided t
ticket?
rallies
of all
Progres

in a whole number of ways, such as "What's the use," or, "a plague on both your houses." We must combat such moods as infantile Leftism that can only isolate us from the masses.

Have the masses—the workers, the farmers, the Negro people—decided that they would boycott the election? Of course not. Nor will they decide on such action. This is not to say that numbers of workers, still unable to channelize their disgust with the two old parties in the direction of the Progressive Party, will not stay away from the polls. But we speak here of certain advanced elements who, lacking sustained confidence in the working masses, lapse into moods of abstinence. Such attitudes are often evidenced in such expressions as: "Well, my International, my district, my local has endorsed Stevenson; therefore, nothing can be done." Or: "My union has decided on a hands-off policy towards the Progressive Party. Therefore, nothing can be done."

Is it really to be assumed that nothing can be done under such conditions except "sitting it out"? Is it not possible to stimulate the formation of independent committees in unions and in shops in support of the Progressive Party ticket? Cannot individual leaders explain to the workers of their union why they have decided to support the Hallinan-Bass ticket? Is it not possible for election rallies to be held at which candidates of all parties, including those of the Progressive Party, could be heard,

rallies at which issues could be clarified and workers helped to make up their minds. Certainly, such necessary steps can be undertaken with expectation of considerable positive results. I would refer only to one fact. A few years ago when our Party began to raise sharply the slogan of the fight against U.M.T., not a few of our people argued that U.M.T. was so essential to the ruling class that it could not permit its defeat, and that therefore nothing could be done about it. But what happened in the last session of Congress? The workers and the farmers—and without too much participation from us—exerted so much pressure on that reactionary Congress that U.M.T. was not passed. Will the ruling class try to bring it up again? Of course it will, but should we not mobilize the masses again to defeat it? Of course we should. This fact but reaffirms the truth that lack of confidence in the American people is entirely unwarranted.

THE FIGHT FOR NEGRO REPRESENTATION

Now I should like to turn to a very important aspect of our election work, the fight for Negro representation. I want to say, comrades, at the beginning, that when we look at the developments here, we must say that our Party has been second to none in fighting over the years for this and for Negro rights generally. Our Party, in the past years, by running

Negro candidates, had made a historic contribution to this whole development, giving great inspiration to the Negro people. When Benjamin J. Davis was elected in 1943 to the City Council in New York, this reverberated around the country, because here, a Negro, a Communist, was elected to the City Council in the largest city in the United States. In the past few years we have even intensified this whole fight.

In 1952, in practically every state in the union, Negroes began to challenge the two major parties in the primaries. In Michigan fourteen Negroes filed in the Republican and Democratic primaries. Six of them won, and I hope the comrades from Michigan will speak on that. In New York, for the first time in history, the voters of Manhattan, in the 21st A.D., broke through in the primaries with a Negro running for office. He will be on the Democratic Party ticket. And if you look through the files of the Negro press you will see that from 1943 to the present time we have had a continued upswing of Negro people running for office. And in a number of Southern states — North Carolina, Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee—Negroes have succeeded in winning seats in City Councils or in state legislatures. And this year has seen a marked, a *qualitative* advance in the struggle for Negro representation in all areas of the country.

This development demands from the white progressive forces an inten-

sified support to help assure the election of Negro candidates who have come through the primaries. In this way great advance will be registered in the momentous struggle for Negro representation as well as for the whole labor-Negro alliance so vital in the present fight for peace, democracy, economic security and Negro liberation.

There can, of course, be no earnest discussion of advancing the fight for Negro representation without recognizing the necessity of ceaseless struggle against every manifestation of white chauvinism in all areas, including our own ranks. It is a primary responsibility of white Communists and white progressives to lead in combating the white chauvinist virus which hinders the development of the indispensable broad unity of Negro and white masses for Negro representation and Negro rights generally.

In our whole approach to this question we must give serious attention to the closely related task of stepping up the fight on behalf of the interests of the Mexican people, particularly in the Southwest, where they have their greatest concentration. Likewise, we must step up the fight on behalf of the interests of the Puerto Rican people, to whom the working class of the United States owes a special responsibility to support their struggle for complete independence. The growing population centers of Puerto Rican people in the United States bring before the working-class movement of

our cou
an end
and of
the Pu

THE F
REA

ANOT

dwell

Foster

relation

And th

and th

in this

of the

bourge

sault o

seen th

Foley S

Comm

and H

the Mo

sage of

1952, th

of the S

sentenc

It we a

ror of

Negro

ly that

to take

to fasci

rear at

conque

To t

must d

movem

have n

cated t

Rights.

our country the task of fighting to put an end to the vicious discriminatory and oppressive practices directed at the Puerto Rican masses.

THE FIGHT AGAINST REACTION

Another question I should like to dwell on is the one that Comrade Foster mentioned, especially in its relationship with the fight for peace. And that is the fight against reaction and the growing pro-fascist danger in this country. Events in the country of the past few years show that the bourgeoisie has staged an all-out assault on the Bill of Rights. We have seen the conviction of the Eleven in Foley Square, the arrest of some sixty Communists in the United States and Hawaii in 1951, the passage of the McCarran Act in 1950, the passage of the McCarran-Walters Act in 1952, the application in Pennsylvania of the Sedition Act and the vindictive sentencing of Comrade Steve Nelson. If we add to this the stepped-up terror of the ruling class against the Negro people, we can see quite clearly that the aim of the bourgeoisie is to take our country down the road to fascism. Wall Street needs a secure rear at home for its drive for world conquest.

To this we must call a halt. We must develop in our country a broad movement, of such dimensions as have never been seen before, dedicated to the defense of the Bill of Rights. And I want to say that after

the elections, if not sooner, the bourgeoisie may attempt new blows against us. It may be preparing new arrests under the Smith Act. It may intensify its persecutions under the McCarran Act. In the face of attacks we must take the offensive. Therefore, comrades, the question before us is how to develop a broad movement around the question of amnesty for our comrades already in prison; how to develop a broad movement around the demand for the repeal of the Smith Act; how to develop a broad movement around all Smith Act cases; and how to develop a real movement to repeal the McCarran Act and the McCarran-Walters Act.

In December, the McCarran-Walters Act, providing for denaturalization of foreign-born citizens, for concentration camps, and for the granting or withholding of bail at the discretion of the Attorney General to foreign-born workers held for deportation, goes into effect. This Act spells new dangers to the democratic rights of foreign-born citizens and non-citizens.

The McCarran-Walters Act brings the menace of new blows against the Negro people in this country. The Negro people, until the arrest and attempted deportation of Comrade Claudia Jones and the actual deportation of Ferdinand Smith, somehow felt that they were immune from deportation. But with this Act, 500,000 West Indian people in this country are threatened with denaturalization. The emigration to this country of

West Indian people and other Negro people from British or French possessions will be drastically reduced because of the quota system contained in this repressive measure. On this front, then, there is the greatest possibility of developing unity between the Negro people and other sections of the population on the question of deportation and protection of the foreign-born.

We should see this attack against the foreign-born as a real menace to the entire labor movement. Where are most of the foreign-born situated in this country? You can't think about the steel industry without thinking about the Polish people. It is impossible to think about mining without the Slavic and Yugoslav people. It is impossible to think of the needle trades without thinking of the Jewish and Italian peoples. The attack on the foreign born, then, is a real menace to the labor movement, and the labor movement has to be aroused to see the struggle against the deportation and denaturalization drive as a means of self-preservation.

THE PARTY'S OWN CANDIDATES

In these elections our Party is putting forward a number of its own candidates. Last night the comrades heard the speeches of some of them—Comrade Greenfield, running for governor of Ohio on a write-in, Comrade Otis Hood, running for Congress, in Massachusetts, Comrade Si

Gerson, running for Congress in Brooklyn, and Comrade Jesse Grey, speaking in behalf of the candidacy of Comrade Ben Davis. We must say, comrades, very self-critically, that we have not given sufficient attention to the putting forward of Communist candidates and to the independent role of the Communist Party in this election campaign. Thus, at this late date we have to admit that in a number of important districts where the possibility has existed for advancing Communist candidates, none were placed on the ballot. The fact that this year, as in 1948, and 1944, our Party has no Presidential ticket, in no wise means that we have no independent role to play in this election campaign. On the contrary, we have the responsibility to guarantee that we conduct the most intense campaign around our own candidates, that we present to the broad masses the position of our Party on the major issues and candidates, that we speak to the people over the radio, at mass meetings and through the widest distribution of our platform to be adopted here today. We are not a political machine like the Republican and Democratic parties. We are a party active 365 days a year. But we *are* a political party—the party of the American working class.

I think also, comrades, in bringing forward all issues we must be, as we have never been before, the real driving force in generating united front movements. We must do this on all

issues
as the
repeal
the eco
ican pe
as this
prices,
tion of
the rig
If w
go a lo
a broad
countr
the w
to fasc
which
its ne
velop
will h
ing cla
ty, in
Amer

CO

Com
enthu
At th
few r
in the
Firs
media
est m
seen
NOW
barbar
of th
upon
who
tional

issues confronting the people, such as the demand for cease-fire in Korea, repeal of Taft-Hartley, protection of the economic well-being of the American people, the fight against inflation as this shows itself in high rent, high prices, high taxes, or in a combination of these, and a united front for the rights of the Negro people.

If we do all this, comrades, we can go a long way in helping to develop a broad, democratic movement in this country. Such a movement can halt the warmakers, can halt the drivers to fascism. Such a peace coalition, in which the working class will assume its necessary, leading role, can develop into a broad people's front that will help clear the road for our working class, led by the Communist Party, in the direction of a Socialist America.

• •

CONCLUDING REMARKS (Selections)

Comrades, this has been a rich, enthusiastic, and fighting conference. At this time I wish only to make a few remarks on some points raised in the discussion.

First, the central task, the most immediate task is to develop the broadest movement this country has ever seen around the issue of cease-fire NOW. The ending of the senseless, barbarous war in Korea on the basis of the truce-points already agreed upon must become the slogan of all who earnestly desire peace. The national peace referendum Comrade

Claudia Jones referred to in her remarks should receive the widest support from every section of the population that can be reached. In the past, when we raised the question of developing a broad movement around the cease-fire demand, some comrades felt that this was just propaganda talk but not a realizable demand. This is a fundamental error. If you go to any part of the country, pick up any newspaper, in either urban or rural centers, and see what is said on this question of Korea, you find a widespread reaction on the part of the American people from every walk of life in favor of ending the war.

Let me cite an example. Not so long ago one person, a merchant in Arkansas, got a million signatures on a petition asking for an end to the Korean war and the return of our men. How did he do this? His son was a war prisoner in Korea. The father drew up a simple petition to President Truman and sent a copy to the family of each American war prisoner, asking that they, and their friends, sign it and return it to him. As a result, a million Americans signed the cease-fire petition initiated by this Arkansas resident!

This in itself is a clear expression of the wide peace sentiment in this country. Just think how many millions of mothers, sisters, wives, fathers, and sweethearts feel just as this father in Arkansas feels. He wasn't bothered by Red-baiting, although in Arkansas he was in danger of being

tarred and feathered. He took the initiative boldly. The results were seen. If we grasp this fact, comrades, we can see the great possibilities of developing quickly during this election campaign a tremendous movement around the issue of a cease-fire NOW. And that's how we want to put the question.

Further, as to the peace question, stress has to be placed on the important issue of trade with the Soviet Union, People's China and the New Democracies. On this score, certainly, we have done very little. We have not sufficiently answered the workers in the shops, who ask: "What if we stop getting war orders, how would we replace them?" We should have answered that opening up trade with the 450,000,000 people of New China, and the 200,000,000 people of the Soviet Union, and the 100,000,000 of the Peoples' Democracies would bring about a tremendous number of peacetime jobs. These millions and millions of people want locomotives and machines; they want many things that will go into useful production. And we should have explained what a terrific tax burden would be lifted from the shoulders of the American masses if this program, instead of Truman's war program, were followed.

But we have not fought constantly and sharply enough for this kind of program. We have put forth efforts in the campaign for the Five-Power Peace Pact. But if we compare what we have done here — and I know

many of our people have really knocked themselves out in this campaign—but if we compare what we have done here with what has been done in other parts of the world, we shall see that it is not very much. A central reason for this, comrades, is a lack of boldness on our part, a lack of determination, to mobilize the entire Left and progressive movement. We still have a situation where this work is carried on by a handful of progressives and Communists. This must be changed. We are not taking the mass sentiment for peace in Right-led organizations and harnessing it in the direction of a broad peace movement in this country. I think that is the answer. And a correction has to come from this recognition.

* * *

Second, there is the "lesser evil" theory which many comrades discussed here today. How do we combat the "lesser evil" theory? How do we combat the whole role of Social-Democracy? For one thing, we cannot fight Social-Democracy, reformism or the "lesser evil" demagoguery in isolation; they must be fought out among the masses. Concretely, it means getting every local union or local union committee to write to President Truman demanding cease-fire in Korea. It means getting delegations to go to every Congressman to press for a commitment on this demand — delegations comprising voters of every political persuasion. It means getting delegations and in-

dividu
that h
he g
asking
enson
on th
regar
crowd
comba
the m
In
masse
men t
session
Hartle
this A
also E
and S
where
They
men t
place
cial se
through
rights-
ocratic
Negro
to brin
ask S
their
this q
the "le
it is fi
from
for so
it is fi
ticular
rectly
among

A p

dividuals to visit Truman demanding that he end the Korean war before he gets out of Washington. It means asking Stevenson and some of Stevenson's supporters where they stand on this vital issue. And the same as regards some of the Eisenhower crowd. This is how we can begin to combat the "lesser evil" theory among the masses.

In this connection, further, the masses can begin to press Congressmen to demand of Truman a special session of Congress to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act through the action of this Administration. They can ask also Eisenhower and his supporters, and Stevenson and his supporters, where they stand on this question. They can demand of their Congressmen that they appeal to Truman to place on the agenda of such a special session the question of carrying through the 1948 promises for civil rights—broken promises of the Democratic and Republican parties. The Negro people especially will respond to bring such pressure to bear. Let us ask Stevenson and Eisenhower and their supporters where they stand on this question. This is how we expose the "lesser evil" theory. And I think it is fitting for the progressive forces from top to bottom to begin to ask for something like this. I think that it is fitting that our candidates in particular begin to take these issues directly to the politicians and broadly among the masses.

* * *

A point in regard to exposing So-

cial-Democracy. Let us learn a lesson from the very serious mistake we have persisted in, since 1947, when Truman announced his spurious civil rights program, to the present day. In 1947 we rightly said of Truman's civil rights program, "This is demagoguery." We were correct in exposing as demagogic the support to Truman's civil rights program on the part of the C.I.O. and A.F. of L. leadership, on the part of certain leaders of the Jewish masses and of the Negro people. But why shouldn't we have linked ourselves with these demands, even though demagogically put forward by Truman with reformist and Social-Democratic aid, and become the greatest fighters for these demands. This is how to expose Social-Democracy, concretely—not by name-calling or abstract accusations.

The same is true as regards the Negro reformists, how best to bring out our criticism of them. Take, for instance, the question of Congressman Powell. I think we should be very self-critical of the manner in which we criticized the weaknesses in Powell's position on the betrayal of the Negro people by the two major parties. Let's ask ourselves, where were we that we didn't raise an outcry at this betrayal of the Negro people by the two old parties? I think that we have to say here that what happened was that while Powell sounded the outcry, we began to speculate on how firm he would be. What prevented us from joining forces around the demands raised by

Powell and working for a broad coalition to fight against the betrayal by the two old parties? Had we done this, we should have bound ourselves more closely to the overwhelming majority of the Negro people. Most importantly, we must learn from this experience to initiate promptly programs of our own to meet the needs of changes in the situation, and always with a view to developing broad mass actions.

* * *

Finally, I would just like to dwell on one fact briefly, but strongly: Sometimes when we go into election campaigns the first thing we forget about is ourselves. In a whole number of areas the Party is minimized and, of course, building the Party hardly enters anybody's mind. This is fundamentally wrong. Our Party should be built during this period, during all periods, and the best time to build the Party is when the masses are in motion. That is the best time to build our press; and yet I have known comrades to lead struggles involving hundreds and sometimes thousands of workers and they are asked: "How many recruits did we get from this struggle?" And the answer is: "I was too busy leading the strike." That means, comrades, being too busy to recruit the masses.

If we take the program and platform adopted here, and begin to develop our work among the masses in an energetic and broad way, we can get tremendous results. Think, comrades, what it means when the Left and progressive forces in Massachusetts get 82,000 people to put the Progressive Party on the ballot. This is a peace party, and the people knew that that was what they were placing on the ballot. In Indiana, 11,000 signatures were gotten to put the Progressive Party on the ballot, thus opening the way for a real broad peace movement in that state. If we take these signs that are developing among the masses and estimate them for what they are—signs of new moods and a desire for struggle on the part of the masses, signs of ever-widening and deep-going peace sentiment among the masses—if we understand and link ourselves with these masses and carry on a ruthless war against sectarianism, defeatism and Right opportunism, we can come out of this election with a truly broad movement. And that movement can express itself in the 1953 period in the form of broad legislative movements, broad non-partisan movements of all kinds, that will greatly advance the struggle along the road to progress, peace and happiness.

By I

THE
the c
elect
ening
peace

Th
slaug
into
stubb
Ache
spoke
to he
for a

Th
throu
of the
arm
the N
again
same
Europ
to the
opinie
their

Wa
struct
steps
crush
mover
to be
Demo
suppo

On the Question of Sectarianism in Our Peace Activity

By Frank Brewster and Peter Colton

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE are entering the decisive phase of the Presidential elections in an atmosphere of sharpening struggle on the central issue of peace and war.

The Korean war, with its brutal slaughter and devastation, has passed into its third year—because of the stubborn refusal of the Truman-Acheson - Eisenhower bi-partisan spokesmen of American imperialism to heed the overwhelming sentiment for an immediate truce.

The bi-partisan spokesmen railroad through the U.S. Senate ratification of the war-breeding agreement to rearm Western Germany, as part of the N.A.T.O. alliance of aggression against the Soviet Union. At the same time, the masses of Western Europe demonstrate their opposition to these agreements, and sections of opinion in our country begin to voice their alarm.

Wall Street, to bolster the tottering structure of imperialist colonialism, steps up its desperate attempts to crush the mighty colonial-liberation movements. It rushes more weapons to be used against the Viet Nameese Democratic Republic, it gives new support to the French and British

imperialists against the peoples of Malaya and Tunisia; it intervenes against the peoples of the Middle East and Africa. U.S. imperialism's genocidal warfare against the colonial peoples has aroused world-wide indignation and protests.

More and more, the question of peace is seen as the decisive issue in our land; and the problem of how better to organize and fight for peace becomes the ever greater concern of all progressives and peace advocates.

To begin with, American partisans of peace cannot solve the problem of developing an effective peace movement unless they have a sound estimate of the international situation and the relationship of forces between the camps of peace and of war. Key to a correct estimate is the fact that never before in world history have instigators of war been confronted with such a phalanx of strength in defense of peace.*

The result is that while there is a rapid acceleration of war preparations on the part of American imperialism and its supporters, the war

* On this see, in particular, Joseph Rockman, "Tasks in Broadening the Fight for Peace," *Political Affairs*, June, 1952.

camp at the same time experiences growing setbacks, defeats and international conflicts. These latter reflect the already powerful and ever expanding resistance to war offered by the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic, and the countries of People's Democracy, and by the masses in the colonial countries, in Western Europe, and in the Americas.

For the first time in world history, the relationship of forces so favors the peace camp that the proposition *war is not inevitable* can be validated in life by the peoples' struggle for peace. This estimate has no room for fatalistic moods which arise from an underestimation of the strength of the peace camp.

While combating fatalism, it is necessary at the same time to be on guard against tendencies to underestimate the danger of war. It would be profoundly wrong to exaggerate the difficulties of the imperialists into either hopelessness or helplessness. This is far from the case. Nor would it be right to view the will for peace of the masses as already constituting a conscious peace force immune to the lying propaganda of the war-makers.

Rejecting all moods of fatalism, as well as of complacency, in the struggle for peace, relying on the principle that mass struggle alone will decide the most crucial issue of our times, the world peace front is ever developing new confidence, born of greater ideological clarity and organized strength.

And the peace forces in the United

States, who have much experience with tendencies toward fatalism and complacency, must constantly seek to equip themselves more fully with the kind of understanding and estimate of the international situation that will enable them to overcome such tendencies.

KEY IMPORTANCE OF PEACE STRUGGLE IN U.S.

United States peace forces, secondly, will not be able to build a mighty peace movement unless they recognize more fully that *the struggle for peace in the United States is a key link in the world struggle for peace*. This recognition does not always exist.

It is, of course, true that the peace movement in our country is considerably weaker than the movements in the capitalist countries of Europe. This is undoubtedly due, in part, to certain objective, historical factors—and, in part to other factors.

First, the American peace forces are in the special situation that it is the policies of their home government—reflecting Wall Street's aim of world conquest—which constitute the source of the danger of a third World War. Further, while the American imperialist colossus has already begun to reveal its feet of clay, it is still able to maneuver through a combination of concessions, increasing violence and ideological deception to conceal from the people its corrupt and parasitic character.

Secondly, the American people have not experienced invasions, mass

destru
people
two
while
people
with t
same f

This
class h
ern E
workin
the lea
In lar
workin
the int
Social-
ment.
the str
or less
a unific
action.

These
accoun
movem
country
world
their c
peace r
as the
world.
peace c
Americ
into c
level o
workin
tical ap
method

A m
from th
peace n
that co
stitutes
ward a

destruction and misery such as the peoples of Europe suffered in the two World Wars. Unfortunately, while overwhelmingly for peace, our people do not express this sentiment with the same immediacy and in the same form as in Europe.

Thirdly, the American working class has not matured as in the Western European countries, where the working class consciously assumes the leadership of the peace movement. In large measure the American working class is still restrained by the influence of the reformists and Social-Democrats in the labor movement. As a result, it participates in the struggle against war in a more or less piecemeal fashion, neither with a unified program nor with concerted action.

These factors must be taken into account in evaluating the U.S. peace movement. The peace forces in our country have much to learn from the world struggle. They must extend their cooperation with the world peace movement in such campaigns as the Big Five Peace Pact and in world, hemispheric, and continental peace conferences. At the same time, American peace forces must take into consideration differences in level of experience and maturity in working out programmatic and tactical approaches, as well as forms and methods of struggle.

A main conclusion to be drawn from these factors is the need for the peace movement—situated as it is in that country whose ruling class constitutes the central force driving toward a third World War—to under-

stand more fully its national and world responsibility. Unfortunately, this is not always the conclusion drawn. On the contrary, sometimes ideas arise, not always bluntly expressed, which see the role of the U.S. peace movement as being not particularly decisive in the present world relationship of forces. These ideas minimize the role of this peace movement, discount the possibility and necessity of the important contribution it can make and is making to the world peace front, and complacently put almost sole reliance on the peace forces outside of the United States.

Such ideas inevitably lead to passivity and capitulation in the struggle for peace. Basically, they express a lack of confidence in the ability of our working class to surmount the ideological obstacles placed in its path by the monopolists, aided by the labor reformists and reactionary Social-Democrats; a failure to see the willingness of the masses to struggle for peace; and an overestimation of the strength of imperialism. Monopoly capital in the United States, prime source of the war danger, is far from achieving its domestic aim—mass acquiescence in, if not support of, its war policies. The American peace movement, though relatively weak, continues to make, in increasing measure, an important contribution to the struggle for peace.

The task of progressives is not to argue away the need for, or minimize the extent of, this contribution, but to search out the ways and means of rapidly extending it.

GROWING MILITANCY OF THE MASSES

Living and working as they do in the very citadel of world capitalism, *American peace forces nevertheless today face certain favorable conditions for bringing about a major advance in peace organization and thus helping to close the great gap which now exists between the mass peace sentiment and its organized expression.* For this gap does not exist because the people are unwilling to struggle. On the contrary, there is evident today throughout the land a rising mood of struggle against many of the main consequences of the war drive.

In the first place, major sections of the working class are becoming ever more aroused against the effects of the ruinous war economy—the wage-freeze, heavy taxes, inflation prices, unemployment. Masses of workers have been engaged in a series of struggles, climaxed by the steel strike. More battles are shaping up in the meatpacking, coal, electrical and other industries.

These are not ordinary struggles. They are being waged not only against increased exploitation but in defiance of the so-called "defense emergency," intended to condition workers to a war psychology and to hoodwink them into accepting lowered living standards while monopoly capital grabs off huge "defense" profits. While these are elementary economic struggles, they have a deep significance for the peace movement as an index of the attitude of the

workers toward the war drive. In the course of these struggles, many workers begin to see certain myths and lies for what they are. When the wolf-pack of monopoly capital says, in the course of its arrogant refusal to meet the demands of the steel workers, that "there are worse things than a strike" (during its own so-called "defense emergency") sections of workers begin to wonder how the "threat of Soviet aggression" can appear and disappear as suits the convenience of the monopolists!

The growing militancy and understanding of the workers have had significant echo, in one form or another, in the spring conventions of Right-led unions, such as the Steelworkers union, Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the Packinghouse and Textile workers unions. The main emphasis in these conventions (steel, clothing) was on labor's economic demands rather than on Red-baiting. Events themselves and the moods of the workers determined this emphasis.

In the second place, there is a growing resistance to the war-inspired attacks on the rights of labor, the Negro people, the Communists and other progressives. There is a growing opposition to Wall Street's threatened anti-labor legislation, and renewed demands for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. There is the mass right-to-vote movement of the Negro people in the South, the spreading movement for Negro representation, elective and appointive, and the struggle on the job and in the political arena for Fair Employment

Practi
mand
repeat
Acts,
can A
are be
the vi
Duc
strugg
dire c
omy a
of fas
mover
in its
consci
This
streng
rect se
stands
but gro
ness. I
showed
favored
the Sov
ment a
preced
And v
the pea
assume
to adm
camp, a
conditi
vance i
peace n
must b
riority o
industri
the forc
op into
peace n
mover
ever bro
Negro p

Practices. There is the growing demand in labor and other circles for repeal of the Smith and McCarran Acts, and abolition of the Un-American Activities Committee. Voices are being raised for the freedom of the victims of the Smith Act.

Due recognition of the growing struggles of the people against the dire consequences of the war economy and against the growing process of fascization can imbue the peace movement with a strong confidence in its ability to win the masses for a conscious struggle for peace.

This confidence should be further strengthened by the fact that the direct sentiment for peace not only stands up against war propaganda but grows in extent, depth and firmness. Last December the Gallup Poll showed that 70 percent of the people favored top-level negotiations with the Soviet Union. The popular sentiment against the Korean war is unprecedented in the nation's history. And what is especially important, the peace sentiment, on occasion, can assume such organized expression as to administer defeats to the war camp, as in the case of U.M.T. Thus, conditions are ripening for a big advance in the building of an American peace movement. *Such a movement must base itself on winning the majority of labor, especially in the basic industries and Right-led unions, as the force which in time must develop into the conscious leader of the peace movement.* Likewise, such a movement must win the support of ever broader masses, especially of the Negro people, as well as enlist farm-

ers, women, youth and city middle-class groups.

THE DANGER OF SECTARIANISM

We Communists must see that, apart from the many objective difficulties which impede the further development of the American peace movement, there are certain obstacles that have their source in our thinking, methods of work, programmatic and tactical approaches in our peace activity. Generally, these obstacles reflect various ideological weaknesses, Right and "Left" opportunism capitulation and complacency, flowing from theories and moods that either overestimate or underestimate the strength of the war camp in relation to the peace camp.

Special attention at this time, we feel, should be directed to the question of sectarianism. In saying this, we do not intend to minimize the need to combat the constant danger of Right opportunism in our peace activity, which for this entire historical period looms as the main danger. However, in the struggle against Right opportunism, in the struggle to speed the development of a mass peace movement of the American people, sectarianism is a major immediate obstacle.

This is so because sectarianism today is deep-seated, because it has affected the thinking and action of many Communists and because in the specific circumstances of the national scene, sectarian, mechanical and formal approaches to the problems of building the peace movement

constitute one of the major barriers to closing the gap between peace sentiment and organization.

How does this sectarianism show itself in our peace activity? Involved here are not simply some scattered examples of a program containing elements too advanced for a given coalition of forces or a method of struggle not broadly acceptable in a given situation. What is involved is an over-all sectarian approach and outlook which in the past period has been characterized by two chief features.

First, we have in practice tended to confine our political attention and activity to the advanced type of peace centers. This has prevented us from giving our main attention to those decisive sections of labor, Negro and other peace forces who in the main are not prepared to express their sentiment for peace through channels provided by these centers.

Second, in addition our implementation of the programs of the advanced peace centers have sometimes tended to narrow these centers to the Left alone. This has been so in relation to program, forms of organization and struggle and methods of work.

The advanced peace centers, such as the American Peace Crusade, the Labor Peace Conference, the American Women for Peace, American Youth for Peace, and the like, are an indispensable force in the anti-war struggle. They advance a minimum united front program centering around peace through major-power negotiations, an end to the war in

Korea, four-power agreement for a peaceful, democratic, united Germany, freedom for the colonial peoples, cuts in war budgets and taxes, East-West trade, etc. They do not limit themselves to forces that admit the basic responsibility of American imperialism for the war danger and fully understand the peace policies and role of the Soviet Union. They seek unity on the basis of a broad policy in support of peaceful co-existence and negotiations as the road to peace. They seek to give expression to the grass roots, the rank and file, with a primary emphasis on Labor and Negro participation. They seek, in a flexible way, without stressing formal affiliation, to stimulate the organization of neighborhood and shop committees. They organize timely and militant forms of mass peace action, including pilgrimages, conferences, and demonstrations.

A key characteristic of these centers is that they unite both Left and non-Left, Communist and non-Communist in the struggle for peace. In this respect, as in others, they perform an essential, irreplaceable role in the American peace movement.

But where, in practice, these centers are viewed as the only forms of peace organizations, the result inevitably is a sectarian condition of isolation from the main masses of labor in the Right-led unions, and from the main masses of the Negro people in the Negro churches, fraternal orders, and the like. For, to see these centers as the only peace front, is to approach the masses exclusively from outside their organizations and in

ways to
they ar
It is
the ma
peace a
organiz
people,
groups,
It is n
building
such fo
whether
freedom
tions fo
stead o
around
jobs, et
nomic i
labor n
One
count s
servativ
movem
the imp
—as dis
action—
peace b
press i
with th
For c
against
mass str
million
oped p
church,
tions. E
with so
the you
munitie
struggle
leadersh
approac
and-file

ways to which, for the most part, they are not prepared to respond.

It is necessary, rather, to place the main emphasis on developing peace activity in the existing mass organizations of labor, the Negro people, the farmers, the national groups, the women, and the youth.

It is necessary to see the need of building united movements among such forces around a single issue, whether it be disarmament, or the freedom of Lt. Gilbert, or appropriations for milk for school children instead of for war—and especially around such specific issues as taxes, jobs, etc., growing out of the economic impact of the war drive on the labor movement.

One must be sure to take into account sufficiently the role of the conservative-led peace organizations and movements and to evaluate properly the importance of the parallel action—as distinguished from united-front action—of those sectors who are for peace but are not yet ready to express themselves in collaboration with the Left.

For example, the successful fight against U.M.T. was a tremendous mass struggle which literally involved millions. The struggle was developed primarily by conservative-led church, women and youth organizations. But the advanced peace forces, with some notable exceptions among the youth and in some scattered communities, by and large, ignored the struggle. So pronounced in certain leadership levels was the sectarian approach that where certain rank-and-file peace forces in the Mid-

West did participate in the U.M.T. fight they were at first made to feel that they were doing something wrong, as if this activity were in conflict with their work on the petitions for a Five-Power Peace pact.

Or, take the key question of labor peace activity. The formation of the Labor Peace Conference was a correct and necessary step at the time, and such an organization or committee will continue to play, in one form or another, a necessary role today and in the future. However, labor today is beginning to speak up for peace from within its own organizations. Over the past year, there have been significant reflections of the growing peace sentiments of the workers in a number of statements by leaders of Right-led unions, editorials in labor papers and, in a few instances, conferences and movements growing out of economic struggles, as in Ansonia, Connecticut, which have formulated the elements of specific peace programs.

But what has been the reaction from the Left? It must be said, by and large, that Left forces have mostly ignored these expressions, have not seen them as opportunities to advance peace actions among the workers within the main unions. At times, Left-labor peace forces have sought mechanically to attach these new labor expressions to the advanced type of peace centers rather than encourage these forces to find channels within the labor movement to develop further peace action.

So deeply ingrained is this sectarian outlook that the existing gap

between peace sentiment and peace organization is construed to mean the gap between that sentiment and organization *as confined to the advanced peace centers*. The problem so posed of closing the gap becomes impossible of solution, — and vast peace expressions, as in the case of the U.M.T. fight, go unnoticed by eyes that cannot see through sectarian blinders.

OVERCOMING SECTARIANISM

Sectarianism becomes even worse in instances where some Communists, active in these advanced peace centers, at times proceed to work in such a way as to make it difficult for all but the most advanced to participate.

It is necessary to guard against the danger of narrowing the broad united front program which these peace movement strive to develop. This is not always understood. The shortcoming is evident when, in speeches and other peace activities, Communists tend to advance a full Party program as a substitute for the united-front program and fail to differentiate between the two.

Then, too, methods of work play a big role. It is always necessary, in united-front efforts, as new issues arise to consult sufficiently with all elements to find the best common approach. No pressure of work excuses the failure to do this. The necessary principle of Communist and Left participation demands correctness of practice, which will afford the enemies of peace and the people's unity no semblance of any basis for their

divisive demagoguery of "Left domination."

This is not only a matter of relationships with top forces in the united front. It is basically a matter of relationships with important sections of the masses, who as a result of sectarian methods of work, are sometimes repelled from participating in these centers.

The fact of the matter is that these centers have made many signal contributions to the struggle for peace — actions like the Chicago Peace Conference, the Big Five petition campaign, etc. Nonetheless, under the barrage of pro-war propaganda, and handicapped by certain results of sectarianism, the advanced centers are too often narrowed down to the Left alone. This status is in some areas even accepted as "inevitable."

It is all the more necessary at this time to direct attention to sectarian formal and mechanical errors, for two reasons. First, some Left forces, in various fields of mass work, instead of searching for a way out of their relative isolation, have tended to develop theories to justify their isolation. These theories lead in the direction of accepting as correct the policy of working exclusively in the advanced centers. These theories come down to the notion of waiting for the masses to "awaken," rather than actively seeking out, joining with, and winning the broad masses. Such theories and practices would develop no mass movement. In reality a broad conscious movement of the masses will develop from within the main unions and organizations.

Seco
ourselv
tion,
in a p
portun
tion of
"Left"
fetish!
proble
Wh
main a
peace
organi
helpin
our w
center
these
Amer

FACT
TO

Wh
which
under
ship
have
in our
To
tain
years
tion.
Street
"get
Plan,
faced
with
and I
"patr
anti-
of the
but I
labor

Second, some of us, after having ourselves contributed to this isolation, suddenly see the problem—and in a panicky way, fall into Right opportunism, or, rather, into a condition of rapid alternation of Right and “Left” errors. Breadth becomes a fetish! This completely distorts the problem.

What is necessary is to direct our main attention to the development of peace action in the existing Right-led organizations, while at the same time helping to eliminate sectarianism in our work in the advanced type of centers and thus helping strengthen these centers as key factors in the American peace movement.

FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO SECTARIANISM

What are some of the factors which, in addition to a basic lack of understanding of the real relationship of forces in the world today, have contributed to this sectarianism in our peace activity?

To begin with, it is clear that certain major events of the past few years have contributed to this situation. The development of Wall Street's war drive, marked by the “get tough” policy, the Marshall Plan, the attack on civil liberties, etc., faced the labor and liberal leaders with two paths: either defend peace and labor's rights or, in the name of “patriotism,” surrender them to the anti-Communist war hysteria. Most of the top leaders took the latter path, but by no means the whole of the labor movement. But the Left forces

too often tended to confuse the top leaders with the masses and lower leadership.

The expulsion of the Left-led unions from the C.I.O., as well as some aspects of the '48 elections, contributed to a certain isolation—and led to “Left” theories that sought to justify this isolation. The 1950 Convention of the Communist Party rejected these theories and set forth a *policy of centering trade-union work in the Right-led unions, without underestimating the important role of the Left-led unions*. The Party is now beginning to grapple more fully with the problems of work in the Right-led unions.*

In addition, the Smith Act attacks on the Party, although they did not succeed in generally diverting the Party from mass work, did in some sectors produce both “Left” and Right moods of withdrawal from struggle, thus leading further to sectarian isolation.

These attacks on the Party did affect our policies in this important regard. Where especially sectarian conditions had developed in these advanced peace centers, problems multiplied quickly under the changed conditions of Party activity following the Supreme Court decision on the Smith Act. Pressures resulted that tended to confine our attention to these centers.

In turn, Communists at times made proposals (however correct in the abstract) in these centers that re-

* See the articles by John Swift, “Some Problems of Work in Right-Led Unions” in *Political Affairs*, April and May, 1952.

quired a level of mass activity beyond the capacity of such centers. As a result, the burden of carrying through these activities often fell disproportionately on the shoulders of Communists. In this way tendencies to confine attention to the advanced centers, as well as to work in them in a narrow and sectarian manner, became accentuated in the past period.

The roots of sectarianism, of course, go far beyond these considerations and a more extended examination of this question is needed. In any event, it is clear that a continuous struggle must be conducted against all notions and moods which justify and feed sectarian tendencies.

COMMUNISTS MUST WORK AMONG THE MASSES

To achieve a decisive break with sectarianism, we should undertake a basic review of our mass work in the peace field as well as in other fields. In such a review, certain elementary points govern the approach.

First, our tactics—and hence the distribution of forces, time and other resources—must be based on the simple principle that Communists must work where the masses are, especially the working class and the Negro people.

Second, the plain facts are that, organizationally speaking, the decisive sections of labor are in the Right-led unions of the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O., and the decisive sections of the Negro people are in the N.A.A.C.P., the Churches and the

fraternal orders. Similar conditions prevail with regard to women, and the youth. *It therefore follows that the main attention of Communists and the Left must be devoted to helping move into peace action the masses in these organizations.*

In so doing, the effort must be to move these masses within and in terms appropriate to—and not out of—their organizations. Special stress must be laid on the development of parallel action for peace even by forces who not only will not work for peace jointly with Communists, but may even express hostility to Communism as they understand it—always provided they do in fact favor and further the struggle for cease-fire in Korea, for peaceful co-existence and a policy of negotiation for peace.

Here, too, it is not simply a question of top leaders, but of masses who, deeply desirous of peace, are influenced by leaders who couple their demands for peace with criticism of the Soviet Union and opposition to communism.

We must find effective ways of combating such criticism, while at the same time maintaining ties with the masses in these groupings. Where such movements on the whole make a positive contribution to peace, it is this that must be seen. At the same time, we must realize that a fuller understanding of the role of the Soviet Union as the great bulwark of world peace must be fought for in the course of the struggle for peace, although it cannot be made a pre-condition to it.

In t
proach
they st
activities
the G
dom, a
object
help s
tive ex
labor,
and of
Peace

Tha
by res
of com
unions
What
around
tiation
and of
a majo
icy of
ready
by th
condu
center

For
deep-
ists to
the v
icy of
with
nists
the n
mood

It
Natio
Fire
hostil
negot
of-wa
receiv

In the light of this general approach, *Left peace forces, wherever they work, in addition to immediate activities around the Korean War, the German question, colonial freedom, etc., should make it their prime objective in the coming period to help secure in a planned way the active expression of support by major labor, farm, Negro, women, youth and other groups for the principle of Peace by Negotiation Now!*

That this is quite possible is shown by resolutions passed by a number of conventions, state and national, of unions and women's organizations. What is needed is to develop actions around this principle of peace negotiations in these and other unions, and organizations, so as to constitute *a major people's mandate for the policy of negotiations*—a mandate already expressed in an important form by the Big Five petition campaign conducted by the advanced peace centers.

For there can be no doubt that a deep-going mood of questioning exists today—a mood of re-examining the whole course of the foreign policy of the Administration. Breaking with stereotyped forms, we Communists in our peace activity must help the masses give expression to these moods of questioning and resistance.

It is imperative that the present National Referendum for a Cease-Fire Now, calling for cessation of hostilities on the basis of already negotiated points, with the prisoner-of-war issue left for later settlement, receive the widest and most vigorous

support from all strata of the labor and progressive movements.

ROLE OF ADVANCED PEACE CENTERS

The role of the advanced peace centers, viewed in relation to the central tasks of the peace movement, will be appraised first and foremost from the standpoint of how effectively they contribute to moving the main organized masses of labor and the Negro people. Their contribution will be made in increasing measure by the clear programmatic lead which they give, as well as by their independent mass activities. It will take the form of direct united-front activities with other peace forces where the specific conditions are favorable, and also the form of stimulating, both by independent example as well as by informal contacts, parallel action on many peace questions.

Is there a perspective of growth for the advanced peace centers? Clearly, yes. Where a correct united-front policy is followed and as the rising struggles develop, many workers, Negro people, and others will seek the collaboration of the Left and the Communists and many will join these centers. This has already been seen in many areas in excellent examples of mass work by these centers among the women and the youth.

Therefore, while combating the sectarian policy of exclusive concern with these centers, we Communists must warn most sharply against the opposite tendency to underestimate

their role and significance. Also, it must be understood, this tendency will be aggravated by any one-sidedness in the fight against sectarianism. On the other hand, as this fight is correctly advanced, it will be all the more possible for these centers to play a new and greater role, both in relation to influencing major sections of labor and in relation to broadening and strengthening their own independent activities.

PEACE AND THE ELECTIONS

The period of the Presidential elections offers exceptional opportunities to all sectors of the peace movement to project the peace struggle into the political arena. An important form in which peace sentiment will register itself will be the campaign for the Peace Ticket of Vincent Hallinan and Charlotta Bass put forward by the Progressive Party. Many peace forces, including those beyond the ranks of the Progressive Party, will agree that this ticket offers the only genuine peace alternative in '52 and will support it.

At the same time, major sections of labor, Negro and other peace forces will undoubtedly still express their peace sentiment within the two old parties. Many will bring pressure to bear upon the old party Presidential candidates for positive action for peace, such as an immediate truce in Korea. Likewise they will seek to influence the character of the Senatorial and Congressional campaigns of these parties.

Thus, the Left forces must under-

stand that the movement for peace, while it will express itself electorally in part through support of the Peace Ticket, is by no means identical with that particular coalition of forces. On the contrary, the growing many-sided American peace movement must be seen as embracing forces from all parties and no party, contributing to and influencing — but not identical with—the electoral forms which the pro-peace political realignment may assume today or in the near future.

The Communist Party has made major contributions to the struggle for peace. Today, under conditions of sharp attack, the Party is seeking to extend and deepen these contributions. Communists, in particular, will take the lead in the struggle against sectarianism, but at the same time they must constantly be alert to the need for combating Right opportunist errors that likewise seriously impede the struggle for peace.

In giving political leadership to the peace forces, the Communist Party will keep uppermost in mind the building of a broad peace coalition, embracing the basic sections of labor and the Negro people, and the extension within this coalition of a real understanding and appreciation of the peace policies of the Soviet Union.

In their activity in this field, as elsewhere, Communists will at all times seek to advance the need for a basic political realignment, for a new mass party of labor and the people, for a people's government of peace and democracy.

By W

On

muni-

larly

Histo-

by In

The

monu-

it set.

1919.

but s

enorm

mem

At

to spr

to th

the n

move

shoul

ple, t

Amer

nist l

as ev

This

demo

prin

Th

Its e

fram

conse

Party

of A

* P

volum

The Formation of the Communist Party (1919-1921)

By William Z. Foster

On the occasion of the thirty-third anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of the United States of America, Political Affairs is particularly happy to be able to bring to its readers a chapter from Comrade Foster's History of the Communist Party of the U.S., which has just been published by International Publishers.

The chapter here reprinted—which is one of thirty-eight chapters in this monumental work—is especially appropriate for the present occasion, since it sets forth the events surrounding the birth of the Communist Party in 1919. A review of the volume as a whole appears elsewhere in this issue, but this one chapter alone will give the reader some comprehension of the enormous scope of this work, and the necessity for its mastery by the entire membership of the Party.*

At the same time, the most serious and concerted efforts should be made to spread this book as widely as possible, especially into the homes of workers, to the scores of thousands of trade unionists, Negro and white, to whom the name of Foster is known for his outstanding contributions to the labor movement, to the fight for Negro liberation, and to the cause of peace. It should be brought to the Negro and Puerto Rican peoples, the Mexican people, the women and youth of our country. The book must be taken to the American people; for within its two covers is the truth about the Communist Party, its life and work, from its deepest roots to the present moment, as evaluated by the outstanding and most authoritative leader of the Party. This book blasts the falsifications and distortions of the enemies of peace, democracy, and Socialism with regard to the Communist Party, its aims, principles and struggles.

This book not only records history; its appearance is an historical event. Its effectiveness in the present critical period of persecution and Smith Act frame-up trials and jailings, depends, to a very large extent, upon how conscientiously those who best understand its value—the members of the Party and all class-conscious workers—get this book into the mainstream of American life—the Editor.

* Prior to the book's appearance, *Political Affairs* published (May, 1952) another chapter from this volume, entitled "The Communists and the La Follette Movement, (1922-1929)."

THE SOCIALIST PARTY convention opened on August 30, 1919, in Machinist' Hall, 113 South Ashland Boulevard, Chicago. The Hillquit clique had complete control of the Party apparatus, and from the outset they used this control drastically. Their Contest Committee, passing on challenged credentials, refused seats to delegates of the Left wing from a dozen states. When John Reed and other Left-wingers nevertheless tried to take their seats, Executive Secretary Germer called in the police to expel them. At this outrage the Left-wing delegates walked out. The long-brewing division between the Right and Left wings had now reached the final stage of an open, organizational split.¹

THE TWO COMMUNIST CONVENTIONS

Meanwhile, the two Communist groups went ahead with organizing their separate conventions. Sharp criticisms were flying back and forth between the factions. The Reed-Wagenknecht group, after their expulsion from the S.P. convention, at first claimed to be the legitimate S.P., but on the day following, August 31st, they went to the I.W.W. hall, 129 Throop Street, and formed themselves into the Communist Labor Party of America. A day later, on September 1st, at 1221 Blue Island Avenue, the Michigan-federations

group organized the Communist Party of America.²

The C.P., containing the federations, was much the larger of the two new parties. It had 128 regular and fraternal delegates and claimed a membership of 58,000. The C.L.P. had 92 delegates at its convention. It issued no figures as to membership, which was mainly American-born, but it was obviously very much smaller than the C.P. The C.P. asserted that the C.L.P. had about 10,000 members. Efforts were made to unite the two conventions, especially by Ruthenberg, but without success. The C.P. criticized the C.L.P. as centrist, and declared that if the latter wanted unity the C.L.P. delegates could come over to the C.P. convention and participate there as eration leaders and refused to vote for the C.P. program. This group was expelled on December 2nd, after which, in June 1920, they organized themselves as the Proletarian Party, a wisp of a party which still exists. Ruthenberg was elected executive secretary of the C.P. and Wagenknecht was chosen for the same position in the C.L.P. *The Communist* became the organ of the C.P. and *The Toiler* (formerly the *Socialist News*) the journal of the C.L.P. The C.P. set up its headquarters in Chicago and the C.L.P. moved to Cleveland. The C.P. had 12 publications in its "language" federations.

Both U.S. Communist Parties ex-

² In Canada, the Communist Party was also born in two sections at the same general time and for the same general reasons.

¹ *The Communist*, Sept. 27, 1919.

tende
ada-
group
nist
grou
Cana
1922.
ada v
Labo

THE

Th
were
stren
of th
whic
we a
ter
cally
tion
state
taria
appl
to th
In th
main
secta

Th
dual
ties.
pose
indu
brac
pene

1 T
muni
1952
2Fo
ed. 2
414-1
3 S
tional

tended their organization into Canada. In June 1921, however, the two groups were fused into one Communist Party, which was born "underground."¹ The Workers Party of Canada was founded in February 1922. In June 1943 the C.P. of Canada was reorganized into the present Labor-Progressive Party.

THE COMMUNIST PROGRAMS

The programs of the two parties were essentially the same.² Their strengths and weaknesses were those of the Left Wing Manifesto, upon which they were based and which we analyzed in the preceding chapter. That is, they developed a basically correct Marxist-Leninist position on such general questions as the state, imperialism, the war, and proletarian dictatorship; but they failed in applying Marxist-Leninist principles to the concrete American situation. In the latter respect, they largely remained clamped in the traditional sectarianism and "Leftism."

Thus, on the trade union question, dualism expressed itself in both parties. The C.P., for example, proposed the formation of a "general industrial union organization" embracing the I.W.W., W.I.I.U.,³ independent and secession unions, mili-

the unorganized workers, on the basis of the revolutionary class struggle of the A. F. of L., and the C.L.P. also took a dual union line.

The C.L.P. did not mention the Negro question at all, and the C.P. outlined the incorrect, but generally-held opinion in the word-for-word De Leonite formula that "The racial expression of the Negro is simply the expression of his economic bondage and oppression, each intensifying the other. This complicates the Negro problem, but does not alter its proletarian character."⁴

Both parties proposed to have nothing to do with partial, immediate political demands. The C.P. said that its parliamentary representatives "shall not introduce or support reform measures," and the C.L.P. declared that its platform "can contain only one demand: the establishment of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat." Parliamentary action was thus reduced to a question of agitation of revolutionary formulas.

The parties' platforms were also incorrect in their approach to the question of the workers' potential united front allies in the class struggle. For example, said the C.P.: "The Communist Party, accordingly, in campaigns and elections, and in all its other activities, shall not cooperate with groups or parties not committed to the revolutionary class struggle, such as the Socialist Party,

¹ Alexander Trachtenberg, ed., *American Labor Year Book*, 1919-1920, p. 419.

² Tim Buck, *30 Years, the Story of the Communist Movement in Canada*, pp. 21-23, Toronto, 1952.

³ For both programs, see Alexander Trachtenberg, ed., *American Labor Year Book*, 1919-1920, pp. 414-19.

⁴ Socialist Labor Party, *The Workers International Industrial Union*.

Labor Party, Non-Partisan League, People's Council, Municipal Leaguers, etc." The C.L.P. was no less "Leftist."

Both parties declared for affiliation to the Communist International. Both also stressed the leading role of the Party, but this they did in an abstract manner, failing to realize that the Party had to be the leader not only in periods of revolutionary struggle but also in every day-to-day issue of the working class, no matter how small.

The political basis of the "Leftism" that prevailed in both parties was a wrong estimate of the general political situation in the United States. The tacit assumption of both parties was that the country was approaching a revolutionary crisis. Thus, the C.L.P. program "realizes that the time for parleying and compromise has passed; and that now it is only the question whether all power remains in the hands of the capitalists or is taken by the working class." The C.P. program expressed a similar spirit of revolutionary urgency. Little analysis was developed at the time of this key proposition, however.

Much of Europe then was in a revolutionary situation. Moreover, the revolution in Germany, had it not been betrayed by the Social-Democrats, could have spread widely, thereby directly affecting the United States. It was therefore quite correct for the American Communist Parties to have a general Socialist perspective. Their mistake was in conceiv-

ing this in an altogether too immediate sense and in a mechanical fashion. They failed to make a clear distinction between a Europe devastated by the war and the scene of active revolutionary struggle, and a capitalist America enriched by the war and by no means ready for socialism. This faulty analysis contributed directly to the young Communist parties' underestimation and neglect of the daily struggles of the workers for partial demands. Raising the slogan of Soviets for the United States was a serious political error, indicating the political immaturity of the Party.

The two conventions, between them, laid the organizational and political foundations for the eventual Communist Party of the United States. But many urgent tasks confronted this young and split movement. The first and most important of these was to bring about unity between the two Communist parties. There were also very many Left-wing elements still to be assembled, including sections remaining in the S.P., the more advanced I.W.W. members, the militants in the A. F. of L., and other groupings moving toward Marxist socialism. Above all, there was the necessity of securing a better grasp upon the great theoretical principles of Marxism-Leninism so newly come to the knowledge of the American Left wing. But before these urgent tasks could be done the movement was to undergo its first test by fire.

THE
T
Unit
of sh
gles,
Russ
ahead
the
tion
tral
with
Unit
ing
moo
coun
sive.
nipe
in m
a t
worl
shop
In t
of t
pres
and
T
thes
begi
fens
bitte
had
arbi
the
righ
fens
with
mer
O
poli
quar
the

THE PALMER RAIDS

The Communist Party of the United States was born in the midst of sharp economic and political struggles, both abroad and at home. The Russian Revolution was surging ahead, smashing the armies of the counter-revolutionary interventionists, and Germany and all of central and eastern Europe were stirring with revolutionary spirit. In the United States the workers, reflecting something of the revolutionary mood of the working class in many countries, were fighting on the offensive. The historic Seattle and Winnipeg general strikes were still fresh in memory, and the great steel strike, a thrust by over a third of a million workers at the very heart of the open-shop industries, was just beginning. In this situation came the formation of the Party, the most advanced expression of the workers' militancy and fighting spirit.

The capitalists, frightened at all these threatening developments, were beginning their intense post-war offensive to give the workers another bitter taste of the "democracy" they had saved by winning the war. They arbitrarily used the state power for the illegal suppression of the people's rights. This growing employers' offensive hit the Communist parties with full force in the infamous Palmer raids at the end of 1919.

On October 16th of that year the police pushed into the C.L.P. headquarters in Cleveland and arrested the Party leadership, and on Novem-

ber 8th, in New York, 700 police invaded mass meetings celebrating the anniversary of the Russian Revolution, seizing several hundred workers. But these raids were only dress rehearsals for the big outrages yet to come. Suddenly, during the night of January 2, 1920, the Department of Justice struck nationally in 70 cities, dragging workers from their homes, slugging them, and throwing them into crowded jails, often without proper food and toilet facilities. These monstrous raids, authorized by the "liberal" President Wilson, were carried out by Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer and his hatchet man, J. Edgar Hoover. Allegedly, the country was on the brink of a revolution and this was the way to save it, regardless of law and constitutional rights.

An estimated 10,000 were arrested.¹ Most of the two Communist parties' leaders were in jail, 39 of the officials of the C.L.P. being indicted. Eventually, Ruthenberg, Larkin, Winitsky, Whitney, and others, arrested during the period of the raids, were sentenced to long terms in the penitentiary. The government struck hardest at the foreign-born workers, whom it considered the most dangerously revolutionary. Under the Wartime Deportation Act over 500 aliens were summarily deported. On the steamer *Burford*, sailing from New York, there were 249 deportees, including Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman. In the prevailing hysteria Vic-

¹ Senator T. J. Walsh in *Congressional Record*, 67th Congress, Fourth Session, p. 3005.

tor Berger, although regularly elected, was refused a seat in the House of Representatives, and five Socialist Assemblymen were denied their places in the New York State Legislature.¹

This terrorist attack, accompanied by rulings of the Department of Labor that foreign-born members of the Communist movement were deportable as such, deprived the two Communist Parties of their basic rights of free speech and free assembly. It forced them to close their national headquarters and to take other elementary steps to protect their members, branches, press and leading committees from arbitrary raids and terrorist victimization. That is, faced by illegal attacks designed to outlaw the Communist movement and to drive it underground, the two Parties reacted as various other labor and progressive movements before them had done in American history when facing similar persecution. They adopted protective measures and pursued their legitimate activities as best they could under the circumstances. No constructive political movement will allow itself to be destroyed by police persecution.

The term "underground," in relation to the Parties' position during these years of persecution, was greatly exaggerated and distorted in the press. The fact was, however, that A. Mitchell Palmer, J. Edgar Hoover, and the others carrying out the offen-

sive against the Communists did not succeed in stopping completely the open and public activities of the Communist movement, which persisted in spite of the government's efforts to drive it underground. Despite violence, threats of violence, vigilante action, and similar illegal policies, either practiced directly or condoned by the authorities, the Parties openly published various journals, such as *The Toiler* of the U.C.P. and *Der Kampf*, the first Jewish Communist paper in the United States. Books and pamphlets were also sold openly, and the "language federations," for the most part, managed to operate their "homes" and keep their papers going. The Workers Council also functioned openly and published its paper.

The term "illegal," as applied to the status of the two Parties during this period, was a misnomer. In reality, the advocacy of the Parties' programs and the practice of their general activities were legal, in that they were entirely within the Constitution, but because of the prevailing violent and illegal suppression the Party was unable to exercise these democratic rights openly. Proof of the correctness of this analysis was to be seen in the fact that once the Palmer terror was over and the Communist Parties had succeeded in practice in establishing their democratic rights, the legal status of the Communist Party was not challenged by the national government for 25 years; that is, until a new

¹ Robert W. Dunn, ed., *The Palmer Raids*, N. Y., 1948.

governmental terrorism was launched as an integral part of Wall Street's present drive to master the world.

During the following months the Communist Parties, both of which had moved to New York, were busily occupied reorganizing themselves—their branches, papers, and leading committees—in accordance with the new situation. When, later on, in their 1920 conventions the parties took stock of their membership, they found that they had held together only about 10,000 out of the approximately 60,000 who had earlier flocked to the standard of the Left wing. The Palmer raids had seriously weakened the parties' numerical strength, but had by no means broken their backs. They were now reduced to the hard core of resolute Communist fighters. Their reduction in size after the government's ruthless onslaught was not surprising. During the terror following the 1905 Revolution in Russia, for example, the Bolshevik Party was greatly reduced in numbers. Similar shrinking in size, but not in revolutionary spirit, was later to be observed of the Communist Party of China under Chiang Kai-shek's terror, and also of the parties in many European countries under the ruthless fascist regimes. The 50,000 or so of erstwhile members who dropped out of the Communist parties in the United States under the Palmer terror generally became non-member supporters and sympathizers of the Party.

FORMATION OF THE UNITED COMMUNIST PARTY

Obviously, Party unity in the United States was a burning necessity. The leaders of the Communist Labor Party, from the time of the conventions, pressed for a consolidation of the two parties; but the federation leaders in the Communist Party were reluctant. Their unity proposition to the C.L.P. was, in substance, that the latter should join up with the C.P. as individuals and locals. "Unity with the C.L.P. as a party of centrists," said they, "was impossible."¹ The federation leaders raised two definite issues, which stood in the way of unity. First, they charged that the C.L.P. leaders were opportunists, holding that their own members, mostly foreign-born, were imbued with a more revolutionary spirit than the predominantly American-born C.L.P. membership. Second, they feared that the C.L.P. leaders, underestimating the role of the foreign-born generally in the class struggle, would destroy the "language federations," not realizing what a powerful means these were for organizing the foreign-born workers of the respective national groups, most of whom at that time did not speak English. A further general bar to unity was the fact that, since they were in the process of grasping the great body of Marxist-Leninist thought, there was a tendency in both parties to magnify the impor-

¹ *The Communist*, Aug. 1, 1920.

tance of every detail of difference, to dispute over minor points with rigidity, and to apply Marxism-Leninism to the United States in a blueprint fashion, rather than upon the basis of actual American conditions. This sectarian attitude led to secondary splits in the parties during this formative period.

Notwithstanding these differences the two parties, early in 1920, began unity negotiations.¹ Ruthenberg, executive secretary of the C.P., was an ardent advocate of Party unity in that body. Despite these efforts, the unity proceedings dragged on without any results, with each side voting down the proposals of the other. Finally, the C.P. itself split over the unity question, with a large section of that organization, led by Ruthenberg, joining up with the C.L.P. Segments broke off from several of the federations, and the bulk of the Jewish Federation, led by Alexander Bittelman, disaffiliated from the C.P. and joined the C.L.P. A unity convention was held at Bridgman, Michigan, in May 1920. As a result, the United Communist Party of America was born. Ruthenberg was elected executive secretary, and the new Central Executive Committee was made up of five members from the C.P. and five from the C.L.P.

The U.C.P. made no important changes in political policy from that of the C.L.P. and C.P. The big ques-

tion at issue in the convention was the role of the federations. The C.P. was practically a "federation of federations"; these bodies had a high degree of autonomy, holding their own conventions, electing their officials, and having the power (used upon occasion), if they saw fit, to withdraw from the Party. The U.C.P., on the other hand, was opposed to this loose system. While authorizing federations, the U.C.P. declared that these would hold national conferences, not conventions, and that their decisions, activities, officials, and journals were all to be under the direct control of the Central Executive Committee. The basic Party unit was set by the convention at not more than ten or less than five members.

The C.P., in turn, held its convention of 34 delegates (also "underground") in July 1920, in New York City. There was much bitterness over the recent "unity" proceedings, which had split the C.P., and the new U.C.P. was dubbed the "United Centrist Party." No important programmatic changes were made by the C.P. Incorrectly, however, the U.C.P. was accused of giving undue prominence to the Negro question in its convention by considering it as a separate item. Reports to the C.P. convention showed that whereas the total dues payments of the C.P. for the last three months of 1919 averaged 23,744 per month, the number was down to 5,584 for the first four months of 1920. The estimated membership at

¹ *Communist Labor* (official organ of the C.L.P.), May 15, 1920.

conver
ported
ship
the
Dirba
of the

THE
CO

Four
intern
gress
tionin
twent
nist m
uable
exper
of the
Comm
States
becau
practi
wing
death

The
made
comm
all ov
ocratic
fact,
had e
rived
discus
rectly
Demo
that t
orders
were

¹ Joh
congres

convention time was 8,500. It was reported that 18 percent of the membership had been lost to the U.C.P. in the "unity" proceedings. Charles Dirba was elected executive secretary of the C.P.

THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Founded in March 1919, the Comintern, by the time of its second congress in July 1920,¹ was actively functioning. Henceforth, during the next twenty years, the American Communist movement was to have the invaluable advantage of the advice and experience of the Marxist-Leninist of the world in the development of Communist policy in the United States. This was of great importance because the American Left had been practically isolated from the Left wing in other countries since the death of Engels in 1895.

The Communist International, made up in its congresses and leading committees of worker delegates from all over the world, was a highly democratic organization—far more so, in fact, than the Second International had ever been. No decisions were arrived at without the most thorough discussions with the delegations directly concerned. Charges by Social-Democrats and other capitalist agents that the Comintern issued arbitrary orders and directives to its affiliates were only so many examples of the

current anti-Communist slander campaign. Stalin, years ago, answered this calumny: "The assumption that the American Communists work under orders from Moscow is absolutely untrue. There are no Communists in the world who would agree to work 'under orders' from outside against their own convictions and will and contrary to the requirements of the situation. Even if there were such Communists they would not be worth a cent."² The Comintern was a disciplined organization, and international capitalism dreaded its decisive action; but its Leninist discipline was based upon a profound democracy throughout its entire structure.

Enemies of communism also made many fantastic charges about the Comintern sending its "agents" to various countries, including the United States. These delegates were painted in an especially sinister fashion. In reality, however, with respect to its representatives traveling to various countries, the Comintern functioned much like any other international labor body. Such representatives, members of brother Communist parties, simply undertook to give the parties concerned the benefit of their own particular experience in the light of the general policies and decisions of the Comintern.

Stupid and baseless also was the charge that the existence of the Communist International (and now of

¹ John Reed, a delegate, died shortly after this congress, on October 11th, in Moscow.

² Joseph Stalin, *Interview with the First American Trade Union Delegation to Russia*, N. Y., 1927.

the respective Communist parties, since the Comintern was liquidated) constituted interference by the Soviet Union in the internal affairs of other countries. The Comintern was a movement, based on the Communist parties of all the major countries in the world and growing out of the Socialist movement, which had been developing for at least 75 years before the U.S.S.R. was born.

Among its many general decisions, the second congress of the Comintern, in July 1920, formulated three of special importance. These were the well-known "21 points," the colonial resolution, and the development of the policies laid down in Lenin's famous pamphlet, *"Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder*.

The "21 points" laid down the working principles of the Communist movement, both on a national and international scale, in the intense revolutionary situation then existing. The points provided for a revolutionary Party—in regard to its membership, leadership, policy, press, and discipline. Their primary purpose was to establish what a Communist Party should be in order to lead the masses in the revolutionary struggle then rapidly developing in Europe. The "points" were guides, not inflexible rules. In the practice of the various Communist parties they were widely varied. At this time the two American Communist Parties were only in fraternal affiliation with the Comintern, and the Communist movement of the United States, after

its eventual unity, never officially endorsed the 21 points.

If the "21 points" were a devastating blow against the right, Lenin's *"Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder* was no less sharp an attack against the "ultra-Left." It was a slashing assault upon sectarianism among Communists, in all its forms. In this great booklet Lenin especially demolished the illusion of dual Socialist unionism, using among other illustrations the experience in this matter in the United States. Lenin also cracked down on such virulent forms of "Leftism" as non-participation in bourgeois parliaments, refusal to fight for partial demands, failure to develop fighting alliances with labor's small farmer and other allies, tendencies to try to apply the Russian experience mechanically in other countries, and the like.

The colonial resolution, written by Lenin, was of major importance. It explained the relations between the struggle of the working class in the imperialist countries and those of the colonial peoples fighting for national independence. It clearly forecast the immense revolutionary struggles now shaking the whole colonial world.

PARTY UNITY ACHIEVED

Despite the failure of the U.C.P. convention of May 1920 to establish Party unity, strong rank-and-file pressure continued in that direction. The U.C.P. leadership also redoubled

its u
Unite
and
U.C.P.
both
diate
the C
C.P.
the st
Com
were
U.C.P.
along
over
the p
C.P.
for th
that t
revolu
ventio
and
(both
ity) g
ment
negot
to un
place
York.
Eac
deleg
two
5,700
group
report
of 6,
Party
two n
the p
The

¹ For
time of

its unity agitation. A Communist Unity Committee, headed by Alexander Bittelman, member of the U.C.P., criticized the leadership of both parties and insisted upon immediate Party unification. Moreover, the Comintern lent its influence. The C.P. federation leaders yielded under the strong unity urge in the Party.

Consequently, unity negotiations were begun shortly after the first U.C.P. convention, but they dragged along slowly, deadlocks occurring over the matter of representation at the proposed unity convention. The C.P. also insisted upon autonomy for the federations, asserting besides that the U.C.P. was "not sufficiently revolutionary." The separate conventions of the U.C.P. in January, and of the C.P. in February 1921 (both held without any open publicity) gave new strength to the movement for unity. Finally, after much negotiation, the general convention to unify the C.P. and U.C.P. took place in May, at Woodstock, New York.¹

Each Party was represented by 30 delegates. The convention lasted for two weeks. The U.C.P. reported 5,700 members, organized into 667 groups, and 35 publications. The C.P. reported a dues-paying membership of 6,328 and 19 newspapers. Each Party stated that it had issued some two million copies of leaflets during the past few months.

The debates at the convention, al-

though heated, brought forth no important political differences between the two groups. The main discussions turned around questions of tactics, especially on how to break the parties' isolation and how to apply the principles of Marxism-Leninism in the sharp class struggles then going on. On this question the influence of Lenin's writings, particularly his "*Left-Wing*" *Communism, an Infantile Disorder*, was in evidence. The most important change in policy adopted by the convention was the abandonment of the historic Left-wing policy of dual unionism. In this respect, the convention declared that "The policy of the I.W.W. and similar organizations of artificially creating new industrial unions has been shown by experience to be mistaken." And "The Communist Party condemns the policy of the revolutionary elements leaving the existing unions."

This stand against dual unionism constituted a heavy blow against sectarianism. But the Party was not yet prepared to draw the full implications from its new tactical line, particularly as expressed in Lenin's pamphlet against Leftism. While endorsing the principle of partial demands, it developed no program of such demands. The Party also, in its Unity Convention, while speaking for co-operation with the exploited rural masses, worked out no practical united front policies for so doing. Nor was it, as yet, prepared to endorse the labor party movement. And as for the Negro question, little

¹ For convention proceedings, see the July 1921 issue of *The Communist*.

or no progress was made on this. The matter was not included in the Party's program, but was referred to the manifesto. Despite these many shortcomings, however, the convention's proceedings, above all in the abandonment of dual unionism, went far toward the elaboration of a sound Marxist-Leninist mass policy for the United States.

A serious dispute at the U.C.P.-C.P. Unity Convention took place over Party structure. The role of the federations was the principal bone of contention. Finally, a compromise was arrived at which held the federations under general Party control, while allowing them considerable autonomy. Henceforth, the federations would hold conferences, not conventions; they would be subject to general supervision of the Central Executive Committee; and their members would have to pay their dues directly to the Party. The fused organization was called the Communist Party of America, and its headquarters was established in New York. Ruthenberg was elected executive secretary. The Central Executive Committee, instead of the proposed nine members, had to be enlarged to ten—five from each constituent party.

It was a joyous delegation that completed the arduous work of this long and decisive convention. Amid the general enthusiasm of the convention, "Party lines melted away. Comrades, who had been separated for years, embraced each other; hands clasped hands; the delegates sang the

International with as much energy as could be mustered after the trying 48-hour continuous sessions."¹

CONCENTRATING THE COMMUNIST FORCES

Meanwhile, as the former Left-wing of the Socialist Party, now crystallized into the Communist Party, went ahead unifying itself and developing an American Marxist-Leninist program, it was also absorbing strength from other militant currents. First, there was the I.W.W. From the outset, the Communists exerted great effort to win over members of this fighting organization. In January 1920, the Comintern addressed a special letter to the I.W.W., polemizing against its syndicalist illusions and offering it "the hand of brotherhood." Many of its outstanding leaders turned to the Party, including William D. Haywood, George Hardy, Art Shields, and Roy Brown, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, who joined the Party some years later, also came from the I.W.W. Haywood declared, "As soon as the consolidation of the Communist Party in the United States was effected, I became a member."² He died in Moscow in 1928, where, a sick man, he had gone to avoid a 20-year prison sentence for his anti-war stand.

In 1920 the I.W.W. General Executive Board formally endorsed the Communist International. However, because most of the I.W.W. leaders

¹ *The Communist*, July 1921.

² J. G. Gamba, *The Decline of the I.W.W.*, p. 75, Denver, Colo., 1932.

were nevertheless opposed to communism, they finally succeeded in driving a wedge between the I.W.W. and the Communist Party. In the spring of 1921 the I.W.W. sent a delegate to the first congress of the Red International of Labor Unions in Moscow. But upon receiving an unfavorable (highly biased) report from its delegate, George Williams, on what had happened there, the I.W.W. decided not to affiliate to the new labor international. Like a number of other syndicalist organizations in Europe and Latin America, the I.W.W. oriented toward the so-called Berlin syndicalist international, which was being organized at the time. Despite the I.W.W.'s strong syndicalist trend, however, considerable numbers of its members became Communists. Gamsb says, "Possibly the I.W.W. have lost as many as 2,000 members to the Communist Party."¹

The Socialist Labor Party furnished but few members to the Communist Party—Boris Reinstein, Caleb Harrison, and some others. The S.L.P., immersed in the sectarian dogmas of De Leon, was totally unable to understand the Russian Revolution and its profound implications for the world labor movement. It condemned the Revolution as "premature" and ridiculed the C.I. as "only a circus stunt."² The S.L.P. soon degenerated into a frenzied Red-baiting and Soviet-baiting sect.

An important development of this period, signaling the beginning of one of the—eventually—most important of all the membership sources of the Communist Party, was the growth of the Communist movement among the Negroes, in New York. This took place chiefly around the journal, *The Messenger*. This paper, of which we shall have more to say in a later chapter, was established in 1917 by a group of Negro intellectuals and trade unionists, including A. Philip Randolph, Chandler Owen, Richard B. Moore, and Cyril Briggs.

The Messenger, which had the backing of many Socialist-led trade unions, followed an essentially Left line. It opposed the war, supported the Russian Revolution, and was in favor of an active fighting policy for labor and the Negro people. During the period of the S.P. 1919 split, the editorial board of *The Messenger* was divided, the Lefts, Briggs and Moore, resigning. Randolph, hanging onto the paper, transformed it into a typical Right-wing Socialist journal. Eventually, in 1925, it became the official organ of the newly-organized Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters. Out of *The Messenger* group came several pioneer Communists.

The youth were also a source of strength for the gathering Communist forces. The profound events which had resulted in the split in the

¹ Gamsb, *The Decline of the I.W.W.*, p. 89.

² *The S.L.P. and the Third International*, N. Y. 1926.

Socialist Party and the organization of the Communist Party naturally had its repercussions among the Socialist young people. The S.P., in April 1913, after several years of preliminary work of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, had constituted the Young People's Socialist League. The Y.P.S.L. in 1916 consisted of 150 clubs and 4,000 members. It published *The Young Socialist* and carried on educational and social work.¹ During the war the organization, Leftward-inclined, held many anti-war meetings and made much agitation against conscription.

The treacherous attitude of the Social-Democratic leaders of the Second International, toward the Russian Revolution and the war, produced profound repercussions in the Y.P.S.L., as in other sections of the American Socialist movement. At the Y.P.S.L.'s first national convention, held in May 1919, this Left spirit in the organization found expression. The convention passed resolutions condemning the Second International and supporting the Third International. In December 1919, after the Socialist Party had split in September, the Y.P.S.L. held a special convention, in response to Left-wing demands. It thus set itself up as an independent organization, declaring for the Young Socialist International, which was then in the process of transforming itself into the Young Communist International. When the

Palmer raids against the labor and Communist movement took place, the independent Y.P.S.L. disintegrated as a national organization, although some of its sections remained in existence. Wm. F. Kruse, the head of the Y.P.S.L., joined the Workers Party at its formation in December 1921, and many former Y.P.S.L. members also took part in forming the Young Communist League. The Y.C.L. came into existence, at a convention in April 1922, in "underground" conditions. The Young Workers League was organized in May, 1922,² out of the numerous youth groups then existing. Among its leaders were Harry Gannes and John Williamson.

In the breakdown of the Socialist Party and the formation of the Communist Party in 1919, women Socialist fighters also played an important role. Most of them went over to the new party, or became active sympathizers. At the founding convention of the C.P. and C.L.P., there were several women delegates. Among the most outstanding of the pioneer women Communists may be mentioned Ella Reeve Bloor, Anita Whitney, Margaret Prevey, Kate Sadler Greenhalgh, Rose Pastor Stokes, Hortense Allison, Sadie Van Veen, Jeannette Pearl, Rose Wortis, Margaret Krumbain, Rose Baron, Becky Buhay, Dora Lifshitz, Clara Bodian.

Another important source of re-

¹ Trachtenberg, ed., *American Labor Year Book*, 1916.

² Helen Allison and Carl Winter, unpublished manuscript.

recruits for the Communist Party was the Trade Union Educational League. The T.U.E.L., the successor to the old Syndicalist League and International Trade Union Educational League, was founded in Chicago, in November 1920. After the loss of the big national steel strike, the group of Chicago militants who were behind that movement more than ever felt the need to organize the "militant minority" in the trade unions. The organization also included trade unionists in Canada.

The T.U.E.L. was not so definitely syndicalist as its predecessors, the S.L.N.A. and I.T.U.E.L., had been. Its members and leaders were decisively influenced by the lessons of the great Russian Revolution and by the writings of Lenin. The Chicago syndicalist group was a revolt not only against Gompersism in trade unionism, but also against the Right opportunism of the Socialist Party; hence the works of Lenin had a tremendous impact upon it, even as upon all other sections of militant workers. The group's anti-politicalism was breaking down, and it had played an important part in the labor party movement which centered nationally in Chicago. It was rapidly moving toward Marxism-Lenin-

ism. In 1920 the chief remaining barrier between the T.U.E.L. militants and the Communist Party was their difference over the trade union question, the T.U.E.L. being unshakably opposed to dual unionism, which the Communists still supported. This obstacle, however, was removed when Lenin's pamphlet, "*Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder*, appeared in the United States in January 1921. From then on dual unionism was finished as Communist policy. William Z. Foster, the head of the T.U.E.L., whose thinking had been revolutionized by Lenin, was invited to come to Moscow for the first congress of the Red International of Labor Unions, held on July 3, 1921. There the R.I.L.U. definitely repudiated dual unionism. In the summer of 1921 Foster and other T.U.E.L. militants joined the Party. This brought in a considerable group of active and experienced trade unionists, among them Jack Johnstone, Jay Fox, Joseph Manley, David Coutts, Sam Hammersmark, and many others. The T.U.E.L., however, remained an independent, broad united front organization, made up of Left-wingers and progressives generally.

"Flesh and Bone of the Working Class..." —On Foster's "History of the Communist Party"

By George Blake
and
Herbert Aptheker

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER, Chairman of the Communist Party of the U.S.A., epitomizes the best in American life and in the Communist Party. In his selflessness, courage, honesty, clear-sightedness and passionate class-consciousness are embodied the working-class leader's prime attributes.

With all this, plus half a century's experience in the center of working-class life and history, plus two years of concentrated effort conducted in his characteristically collective, critical way, Comrade Foster has produced the *History of the Communist Party of the United States*.^{*} This is the National Chairman's gift to the Party on its thirty-third anniversary—a gift worthy of the giver and of the recipient—and one which the recipient truly created and the giver as truly receives.

Reading this book one knows that he is reading that which will be studied and pondered by our children's children. That it was written and published now, in the face of the assaults leveled against the Party,

^{*} International Publishers, N. Y., 600 pages, \$6.

against the author, personally (and—as a mark of the times—against the book's publisher, personally, too) is reflective of the indestructible quality of the Party whose history it records and illuminates. Indeed, the book does not simply reflect this indestructibility; it is no passive thing of printer's ink and paper. The book is a tool to help guarantee this indestructibility, for here is the truth with which to demolish the Big Lie. Here, between two covers, is the living body of the Communist Party of the United States, its grand, yet simple, story, its noble past and present and the sure prevision of its nobler future. Here is the central truth of our time and place—the truth, bearing peace and freedom.

* * *

Towards the close of this book, Comrade Foster writes: "The Communist Party is not an intruder among the toiling masses, as the Department of Justice alleges, seeking to thrust an alien program upon them. Instead, the Party is flesh and

bone of the working class" (p. 551).

"Flesh and bone of the working class." — Comrade Foster's book — as his life—demonstrates the indigenous nature of the Party and its appearance and growth out of the needs of the American working class. The preamble to the Party's Constitution says that the Party is the inheritor and continuer of "the democratic traditions of Jefferson, Paine, Lincoln and Frederick Douglass, and the great working-class traditions of Sylvius, Debs and Ruthenberg." The government's stoolpigeons in the Smith Act frame-up trials, faced with this assertion in so basic a Party document, "overcome" the obstacle it represents to their efforts at distortion by dismissing the phrase as "window-dressing" or "double-talk." Foster's book refutes this informer's concoction by demonstrating the essence of these democratic and working-class traditions, by showing their organic interconnection and by demonstrating how inevitably their entire meaning coalesced into the Communist Party of the United States. Never have the native roots of our Party been so persuasively, and yet so succinctly presented as in the first eleven chapters of this book, tracing the main epochs in United States history from the adoption of the Constitution to the founding of the Communist Party.

* * *

It is only this indigenous nature and the social necessity of its appear-

ance that can explain the vitality and influence of Marxist thinking and activity, in the face of repressions and vilifications during the past century. And while Foster's book possesses a fitting and characteristic modesty, it is permeated, too, with a dignified sense of pride in the great influence for progress which Communists have exerted through the decades.

It is very important that this record be brought forward and set straight, particularly at this moment of intensifying attacks upon Communists. For the record will imbue Communists, and their friends, with that complete confidence in the people's victory which is the secret of Foster's indomitability. And the record will refute the vile caricaturings of Marxism in the slanders of the reactionaries. It will also refute the wishful thinking of the faint-hearted liberals who like to believe that the Communists have been and are without real significance in American history and life, and that therefore their elimination from American life will be not only salutary but easy. It will refute, too, the idea that defense of the Communists is sectarian, is a luxury, a nuisance — an idea which serves some weaklings and opportunists as a rationalization for inactivity, and acquiescence in reaction.

Foster's book shows that no effort to enhance the rights and conditions of the masses and no effort to resist inroads upon those rights and conditions by the ruling class have been without the wholehearted and power-

ful support of the Communists.

Here is told the story of the key importance of the Communists, and of Marxism, in the pre-Civil War labor movement and the struggle against slavery. Described, also, are the Communists' role in the rise of the new progressive Republican Party, their characteristic concern to unite all who objectively opposed reaction, their central importance during the Civil War, and the personal contributions of Marx and Engels ideologically, agitational, and organizationally during that war. Foster brings forth the crowning achievement of Marx and Engels in that regard—their leadership, through the First International, of the European working class in supporting the cause of Lincoln. As Marx wrote: "It was not the wisdom of the ruling class, but the heroic resistance to their criminal folly by the working classes of England that saved the west of Europe from plunging headlong into an infamous crusade for the perpetuation and propagation of slavery on the other side of the Atlantic," a resistance which Abraham Lincoln characterized, while thanking the First International, as "an instance of sublime Christian heroism which has not been surpassed in any age in any country."

From the 1870's on, leadership in fighting for the needs of the unemployed has come from Communists. This heritage was developed in effective programmatic form by the Communist Party to serve the interests of

the working class in this epoch. With the outbreak of the Great Economic Crisis in 1929, it was the Communist Party that took the lead in organizing millions of the unemployed to resist being driven down to the level of pauperism and to compel the ruling class to provide for the needs of the unemployed. Some Communists gave their lives and some—like William Z. Foster—their liberty, in leading heroic struggles of the unemployed. But concessions — including the "impossible" demand, unemployment insurance—were finally won, and it was the Communists who made this gain possible.

* * *

Foremost have been the Communists' efforts in the labor movement. The whole struggle for industrial unionism, to organize the unorganized and to develop a united, militant trade-union movement witnessed Communist inspiration and leadership, epitomized, personally, in the career of William Z. Foster. His book tells this story in a masterful and dramatic way, as only he could tell it. This, alone, establishes the Communist Party as a great indigent, democratic force, a true vanguard party of the working class. On the latest phase of this movement, the founding and building of the C.I.O., Comrade Foster writes: "In this historic movement the Communist Party played a vital and indispensable role" (p. 340). And he adds: "The Communist Party may well be

prom
build
ioniz
tries
A
the
and
Part
stre
mov
labor
tion
ther
the
nect
in t
of th
mun
gani
dust
thes
cond
tire
In
effor
book
unio
tancy
polit
ation
of t
Leag
Co
role
not
dent
trade
fight
labor
speak
"real

proud of the role it played in the building of the C.I.O. and the unionization of the trustified industries" (p. 355).

A study of this book makes clear the historic significance of the role and contributions of the Communist Party in building the organized strength of the American labor movement, in striving to direct the labor movement along lines of action for its class interests, which thereby serves the best interests of the whole people. It is in this connection, too, that there stands out in this volume the basic meaning of the forefront struggle of the Communist Party to organize the unorganized in the mass production industries—that the organization of these workers is the essential precondition for the advance of the entire working class.

In the present period, the Party's effort continues, as Comrade Foster's book shows, to develop in the trade-union movement, labor unity, militancy, and working-class independent political action. Here is the continuation, in our time, of the struggles of the Trade Union Educational League, led by Foster, in the 1920's.

Comrade Foster emphasizes the role of the Left in trade-union life—not only of the progressive, independent unions, but within the entire trade-union movement—"to lead the fight for a general unity of the whole labor movement." And when Foster speaks of unity he means, of course, "real trade union unity [which]

must be based upon a fundamental labor program for peace and the workers' well-being and must rest upon a genuine trade-union democracy" (pp. 504-05).

The highlights of the influence and leadership of Communists in the epic struggles of the Negro people are in this book, from the murder of Ralph Gray while he was organizing Alabama sharecroppers in 1931 to the jailing of Benjamin J. Davis while he was fighting for peace and liberation, twenty years later; from the Scottsboro and Herndon struggles to the Martinsville and McGee battles.

The whole development of the appreciation, in life, of the Marxist axiom that, "Labor with a white skin cannot emancipate itself where labor with a black skin is branded," is traced in this volume. Here a reader may grasp how the Communist Party—the Party of the working class—becomes also the champion of the Negro people. The organic tie between the Negro liberation movement and the struggle for the emancipation of the working class runs through the volume as one of its central themes.

* * *

The *History of the Communist Party of the United States* confirms the principle enunciated in the *Communist Manifesto*, of consistent opposition to reaction and support to all democratic and progressive efforts. This traditional practice of Communism culminates in our time in the

leadership offered by the Communist Party to the struggle against fascism and imperialist war. With the advent of Hitlerism to power, the Communist Party strove to mobilize the working class and all anti-fascist forces into a broad, democratic coalition to stem the tide of fascization and to halt the pro-fascist instigators of war.

A dramatic chapter in the entire account of the leading role of the Communists in this struggle is the organization of the Lincoln Brigade. In this connection deserved and glowing tribute is paid by Comrade Foster to the Brigade for its heroic role in the defense of the Spanish Republic—led by men like John Gates, Robert Thompson, Steve Nelson. "It constituted," he writes, "the most glorious event in the entire life of the Party" (p. 373).

The great patriotic contribution of the Communist Party to the prosecution of the war against the fascist Axis stands out in the book as an important chapter in the Party's history. Today the struggle for the consolidation of the victory over facism on the field of battle, is the struggle to halt the new threat of war which comes from Wall Street, the struggle to restore U.S.-U.S.S.R. friendly relations as the cornerstone of the world peace structure. It is the struggle to hold the dikes against fascism in our own country.

Foster's volume brings out conclusively the imperialist essence and role of the United States, refuting

the demagogues and apologists who seek to present Wall Street as the temple of democracy and the "world's redeemer." Foster exposes this imperialist role especially in relation to the super-exploitation of the Negro people and to the oppression of Latin-America. Here is presented a lucid explanation of the whole question of the organic connection between the national-liberation struggles of our epoch and the struggle of the working class. Finally, in this connection, the book analyzes in a masterly manner the historic role of the working class, in our present era, as the savior of the nation.

The Party stands out in the book in its true role of vanguard—the political party of the working class from whom it springs and to whom it is indispensable in the day-to-day struggles to eventual emancipation from capitalist exploitation. The Party's very coming into being thirty-three years ago represented a great step forward by the working class of our country, evidencing its growing maturity, its awakening to recognition of its class position. The Communist Party, from the first, strove to extend its ties with the working masses and to win their confidence and establish its political leadership in the course of daily struggles. It is this concern, derived from the origin and character of our Party, which explains a basic tenet of Party work—to cement our ties with the masses, to learn from, be of, and teach and lead the working class.

No one in the United States has better demonstrated this truth, in life, than our Chairman, Comrade Foster. His history of our Party shows that the Party, conscious of its historic vanguard task in the struggles of the working class, was faced from the outset with the necessity of battling on two fronts—against Leftist sectarianism and Right opportunism—twin obstacles to winning the working class of this country for independent political action and the development of mass class consciousness. This two-front struggle, Comrade Foster teaches, necessitates the mastery of the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism in their application to specific conditions of development in the United States.

Comrade Foster details at considerable length the Party's struggle on two fronts, from its inception, through the struggle against Trotskyism, leading to the expulsion of the Cannon group; through the struggle against Lovestone's pro-imperialist thesis of "American exceptionalism" which culminated in the expulsion of Lovestone and his clique; and finally through the struggle against Browder's revisionism which led to his expulsion from the Party in February, 1946.

The central figure in the struggle against both Lovestone's "American exceptionalism" and Browder's revisionism has been Comrade Foster. And, with a directness and mastery that cannot be surpassed, he subjects to a devastating critique the anti-

working class essence of these revisionist "theories." Of special importance is Foster's detailed tracing of the Browderite infection and its excision (especially pages 415-438) culminating, under his own personal and courageous leadership, in the Emergency (13th) Convention reconstituting the Communist Party (July, 1945).

Here is Foster's summary of the line adopted by that Convention:

The main resolution [published in *Political Affairs*, September, 1945] made a realistic survey of the world situation—the war with Japan being not yet concluded at the time. It repudiated all the Browder nonsense about the "progressive" role of American imperialism and pointed out the sinister dangers in the international policies being followed by Wall Street and the Truman government. The resolution declared that "the most aggressive circles of American imperialism are endeavoring to secure for themselves political and economic domination of the world." It also stated that "if the reactionary policies and forces of monopoly capital are not checked and defeated, America and the world will be confronted with new aggressions and war and the growth of reaction and fascism in the United States." This incisive Marxist-Leninist analysis gave a clear picture of the international situation and made a forecast of the course of events which remains completely valid today.

In the domestic sphere the resolution broke completely with Browder's class collaborationism. It rejected the post-war no-strike line, incentive wage, subservience to the two-party system, and

"organized capitalism" of Browder, and it outlined a program of class struggle. It outlined a militant win-the-war program; urged the workers to prepare for the difficult struggles of the postwar period; retained the sound Communist policy of building the Roosevelt coalition and set out to strengthen it in a Leninist sense. The resolution sharply criticized Truman, who had been president for only a few months, and declared, "It is of central importance to build systematically the political strength of labor, the Negro people, and all true democratic forces within the general coalition for the struggle against imperialist reaction, for combating and checking all tendencies and groupings in the coalition willing to make concessions to reaction. The camp of reaction must not be appeased. It must be isolated and routed." The resolution restated a correct policy on the Negro question. The Party had reasserted its Communist quality (pp. 436-37).

This position, it is worth repeating, was adopted in July, 1945, prior to the end of World War II. It marks the first warning of the danger of a drive toward fascism and world war on the part of American imperialism bent on world domination. It was Foster who was the first to signalize this new danger to the peace of the world.

* * *

This *History of the Communist Party of the United States* is filled

with a passionate hatred for the anti-working class, white chauvinist, war-mongering monopolists and an equally passionate love for the working class, the toiling farmers, the Negro people—the exploited and oppressed masses—"with their wonderful fighting spirit and solidarity." This volume chronicles that fighting spirit and solidarity. Here are a thousand stirring tales of great hunger marches, "bonus" armies, sit-down strikes, farmers' battles, women's struggles and youth's efforts. Graphically the book confirms the words of Frederick Douglass, "Where there is no struggle, there is no progress."

And the tactics of a hundred struggles are here unfolded, by a master tactician, with, again, deep concern for mass unity and independent political action of the working class and its allies. And everywhere, in trade unions, in politics, in the struggles of the Negro people, the supreme need and thus the supreme effort of the Party, has been to bring clarity and understanding to the working people, to elevate the working class to the position of leadership in the struggles of the people for peace and democracy, and in the course of these struggles to develop among the workers the consciousness of Socialism.

Comrade Foster's work is infused with unshakable confidence in the inevitable triumph of the working class in alliance with all the oppressed. "The present government

atta
nist
repl
mov
pos
for
wor
tive
call
ism
is th
ism
"
pro
velo
adv
mar
wit
from
uni
Soc
mu
are
wor
bee
tali
upo
try
cap
In t
mu
thin
lead
C
Par
and
sup
jori
556
mu
the

attacks cannot destroy the Communist Party," he writes. "The Party represents far too fundamental a movement and program to be disposed of by this brutality. The need for Communist leadership in the workers' daily struggles is imperative, and socialism, which is historically destined to supersede capitalism, is inevitable. Indestructible, too, is the political organization of socialism, the Communist Party" (p. 522).

"The near future," he adds, "will produce an ever swifter political development of the working class. More advanced economic and political demands, a great independent party with labor as its base, a broad people's front movement, a progressive trade-union leadership, and the growth of Socialist ideology and a mass Communist Party—these developments are also inevitable for the American working class, even as they have been for the workers in other capitalist countries. They will arrive upon the political scene in this country far sooner than the power-drunk capitalist ruling class now dreams. In these vital developments, the Communist Party, in the very nature of things, will be more and more of a leading factor" (p. 549).

Comrade Foster shows that the Party "always strives for a peaceful and democratic course to socialism, supported at all times by a huge majority of the American people" (p. 556). He makes clear that "Communists are the chief fighters against the two major threats of violence in

modern society — imperialist international war and fascist civil war — both of which emanate from the capitalists" (p. 551). He leaves the reader with no illusions as to how desperately the American bourgeoisie, historically doomed, will strive to maintain itself in power. However, he presents a bold view of the new possibilities of smothering the violence of the bourgeoisie and averting civil war.

In developing his view of the "American Road to Socialism" through the successive phases of the people's front and the people's democracy, Comrade Foster writes:

The Communist Party's orientation for a possible peaceful transition to socialism in the United States is based upon four elementary considerations: first, the fight of the working class for its immediate demands is the very substance of democracy, it strengthens basically the democratic forces in our country, and by the eventual establishment of socialism it raises democracy qualitatively to a new high level; second, the working class, led by the Communist Party, harmonizes its methods with its ends by fighting for both its immediate and ultimate objectives with the most peaceful and democratic means possible; third, the workers and their allies, constituting the vast majority of the people and possessing immense organizations, now have the potential power to restrain, and make ineffective whatever violence the capitalists may undertake in their attempt to balk the will of the people and to prevent the establishment of socialism; and fourth, in

recent years, on the international scale, there has been an enormous growth of power in the camp of democracy and socialism (p. 522).

But the main task of the present period, Comrade Foster stresses, is the building of the anti-fascist, anti-war, anti-monopoly people's coalition. The prime question of peace runs through the entire volume. Comrade Foster describes and weighs the history of the peace struggles of the post-World War II period. He declares that while they "have not been able to force the government to drop its general war policy . . . they have nevertheless been of real service in shaping American public opinion, in halting the use of the A-bomb in Korea, and in letting some rays of truth and humanity through the thick fog of imperialist war propaganda and brutality which now envelop this country." He sees as their central weakness the fact "that they have not yet secured solid mass trade union support." And he concludes, as the Party, under his leadership, has insisted: "The fight for peace is the central, all-embracing task for the present period. The future of our nation, the welfare of our people, depends on the outcome of this struggle" (pp. 474, 476).

It is indeed fitting that this historic work by Comrade Foster appears on the occasion of the thirty-third anniversary of the Party's founding. At this time, when the class enemy directs his cumulative attacks upon our Party with the intent of destroying its connections with the working class and the toiling people, the *History of the C.P.U.S.A.* is ours to study and draw strength from. This book is a milestone in the extensive political and theoretical writings of the leader of our Party. Mastery of this volume will deepen the appreciation of the Party's vital contributions in the cause of the working class and the Negro people. It will strengthen confidence in the role that the working class must and will play in leading the people's front of struggle around the vital issues of peace, democracy, economic security, and the elimination of jim crow. It will redouble the faith in the ability of the Party to unfold the revolutionary capacities of the American working class, even though today our class has not yet attained the level of mass socialist consciousness. Mastery of this volume will equip the membership of the Party with a firmer grasp of Marxism-Leninism as a living guide to action in the changing political developments in our country.

By

As o
activ
long
in-u
renc
U.S.
ship
fast
the
to t
disc
Uni
riers
theo
oper
the
mer
A
Uni
U.S.
mis
a sci
sen
inve
the
wri
ever
for
enc
B
part
crea

Pavlov's Teachings in Psychology and Physiology

By Alvin S. Herwitz

AS ONE OF THE ASPECTS of its cold war activities, the State Department has long ago organized its intellectuals-in-uniform to declaim over the "horrendous" state of science in the U.S.S.R. "groaning under dictatorship"—and to prophesy its actual or fast approaching extinction. This was the inverted picture they presented to the American people of the great discussion on genetics in the Soviet Union, which broke through the barriers of bureaucratic conservatism and theoretical distortion in its field, opening up a new glorious era for the biological sciences in the development of the legacy of Michurin.

As for dictatorship, it was from the University of Oregon (U.S.A.—not U.S.S.R.) that a professor was dismissed merely for writing a letter to a scientific journal suggesting that Lysenko's work was at least worthy of investigation. This letter showed, said the University president, that its writer was no real scientist, because everybody knows there is no freedom for science in the U.S.S.R. where science is extinct.

But the difficulties for the State Department's intellectuals-in-uniform increased in connection with the cele-

brated work of Stalin on linguistics and the discussion which accompanied it. For in this work Stalin, besides clarifying the basic problems of linguistics, personally took up the cudgels against authoritarianism and laid down the fundamental principle of the correct conditions for scientific progress: "It is generally recognized that no science can develop and flourish without a battle of opinions, without freedom of criticism."

THE FOUNDATION OF PAVLOV'S WORK

It was this principle which guided the extensive discussion on physiology and the teachings of Pavlov, which took place in the Soviet Union in the summer of 1950. The leading physiologists of the country participated in this week-long scientific conference and grappled in an atmosphere of full freedom of criticism with fundamental problems of physiology, psychology and medicine. The discussion showed, in the words of the resolution adopted:

In the main, the practical and theoretical results of the work of developing

Pavlov's legacy, and in particular, of investigating the higher nervous activity, fall far short of what was expected from the disciples and followers of the great scientist, and are altogether incommensurate with the facilities provided for this work by the Soviet government and the Party. The work of developing Pavlov's scientific legacy has in many respects not followed the broad highway of Pavlov's ideas.¹

This was a matter of grave concern. For, as Academician K. M. Bykov put it:

The belief that all Pavlov did was to make a contribution to physiology or add another chapter to that science must be condemned as fallacious. It would be far more correct to divide physiology into two stages—the pre-Pavlov stage and the Pavlov stage. The history of psychology may be divided in a similar manner. The pre-Pavlov psychology is based on the idealist outlook; Pavlov's psychology is essentially materialistic (p. 23).

The foundation of Pavlov's work lies in the conception that the human organism is a *system in integral unity* with surrounding nature; not a machine, but a single entity; not a *simple* whole, but an *integral* whole.

According to Pavlov, says Professor Ivanov-Smolensky:

The organism is an integral whole because it is a system that functions as a single whole, a system, moreover, which is constantly and continuously inter-

acting with its external environment in a process of a mobile, fluent, ceaselessly fluctuating and unstable equilibrium between the organism and the surrounding world (p. 78).

CONDITIONED AND UNCONDITIONED REFLEXES

These concepts Pavlov developed on the basis of his fundamental scientific discovery of the conditioned reflex and its significance. Thus, Bykov stated:

One of the most important phenomena of the animal organism is the *reflex*. All processes, in their normal course, are effected with the aid of reflexes. A large number of reflexes inborn in man and animals were known before Pavlov. Pavlov discovered a new class of reflexes, reflexes that arise in the course of the life of the individual, and that before him had remained unnoticed and unappreciated. This class is infinitely vast and important; it embraces all the reactions of animals and man, from the primitive salivary reflex in response to a sight, odor or sound associated with food, to the pronouncing of words and the use of writing (p. 27).

It is through the ability of the brain, specifically the cerebral cortex, to form conditioned reflexes through temporary linkages, that the organism can constantly interact with its environment in a process of a mobile, fluent, ceaselessly fluctuating and unstable equilibrium. The basic Pavlovian concept is the principle of the formation of conditioned reflexes through temporary linkages. In the

¹ *Scientific Session on the Physiological Teachings of Academician I. P. Pavlov*, Moscow, 1951, Foreign Languages Publishing House, p. 165. This work contains, in English, the main reports and resolutions of the conference. All quotations and page citations in this article are from this source, unless otherwise stated.

words
logical
worki
is wha
flex, th
the in
ronme
with p
ganism
Pavl
proper
ing up
erties
inborn
proper
dition
centra
terial
tioned
ing to
means
safegu
organi
compl
insuffi
equilib
condit
"woul
ment
He ad
ment
same
uncon
perma
quate
diti
nectio
The
of the
I, p.
N. Y.,
I, p.
III, p. 5

words of Pavlov, "the central physiological phenomenon in the normal working of the cerebral hemisphere is what we term the conditioned reflex, that is, a temporary linkage of the *innumerable agents of the environment* surrounding the animal with particular activities of the organism."²

Pavlov delineated two classes of properties in the external objects acting upon the organism, that is: properties calling forth an unconditioned, inborn reaction in some organ, and properties acting temporarily, "conditionally." The lower parts of the central nervous system act as the material substratum of the unconditioned reflexes. Its function, according to Pavlov, is to provide "the first means of equilibrating, and hence, of safeguarding both the individual organism and its species." But in complex changing situations this is insufficient. Pavlov states that the equilibration achieved by these unconditioned, permanent reflexes, "would be perfect only if the environment remained absolutely constant." He adds: "Inasmuch as the environment is extremely varied and at the same time is continually fluctuating, unconditioned connections (being permanent connections) are inadequate and must be reinforced by conditioned reflexes or temporary connections."³

The chief role in the integration of the parts and functions of the or-

ganism is played by the nervous system, which links together all the organs, tissues, and cells. Pavlov established the central and decisive importance of the cerebral cortex in this integrative process. He demonstrated that the cerebral cortex is the organ determining the body's conditioned reflex connections with its environment. Pavlov demonstrated that through the medium of the cerebral cortex external factors influence *all* processes in the organism.

It is important to remember that the salivary gland and its secretions served Pavlov *only as examples*, by means of which he disclosed the *general* laws of conditioned reflex activity. Bourgeois psychologists, in their ignorance of Pavlov's formulations as to the nature of the relationship of the internal and external environments and the decisive role of the cortex, distorted Pavlov in their texts by reducing his contribution to the laws of salivary conditioning. The tremendous wealth of scientific experimental work in the Soviet Union in the field of Pavlovian physiology is practically unknown in this country.

For example, Bykov demonstrates how the laws of the conditioned reflex are universal for *all* internal organs. He states that the activity of every internal organ is connected with the formation of conditioned reflexes, and that the external environment is thus inseparably connected with the internal environment through the cerebral cortex. He states that the work of Soviet physiologists has substantiated Pavlov's thesis con-

²I. P. Pavlov, *The Experience of Twenty Years*, N. Y., 1920, p. 603.

³I. P. Pavlov, *Collected Works* (Russian edit.), III, p. 560.

cerning the dominant role of the cerebral cortex as regards the entire organism, and the general and specific laws governing the functioning of the entire system of internal organs.

The importance of this development for medicine was expressed by Bykov thus:

Investigation of reflexes (conditioned and unconditioned) from the internal environment of the body makes it possible for clinical medicine to diagnose more precisely and from the standpoint of natural science disturbances of the central nervous, vegetative, and hormonal systems caused by morbid processes in the internal organs (p. 33).

And:

The established dependence of systemic diseases on the central nervous system calls for treatment of these diseases based on their pathogenesis, namely, for the necessity of influencing the course of systemic diseases through the central nervous system (p. 72).

"PSYCHOSOMATIC MEDICINE"

This dialectical approach is in sharp contrast to the bourgeois theory of "psychosomatic medicine" which is gaining popularity in our country. Psychosomatic medicine seeks to relate the organism to the environment in a mechanical, dualistic fashion.

This "new" branch of medicine sets out ostensibly to repair the injury done by bourgeois philosophy, psychology and medical science in their forcible, idealistic and mechanistic separation of mind and body into

separate, dualistic categories—with separate mental and physical illnesses. But the "bridge" the American psychosomatic physicians are using mechanically to reunite mind and body is constructed out of Freudian theory which sees man as an instinct-ridden, innately aggressive creature, forced to repress these inborn instincts by a restrictive, continually frustrating environment. These repressed instinctual drives then allegedly lead to various physical disturbances or even illnesses. Thus, this "psychosomatic bridge" perpetuates the separation of mind and body within the framework of a subjective, idealist and reactionary theory. The importance of the cerebral cortex is minimized and the impact of social reality with its class structure on the individual's physiology and psychology is ignored. It is only through the work of Pavlov that the basis for a system of medicine can be developed which brings the mind and body together in dialectical unity as part of a single entity in constant interaction with its environment.

PAVLOV AND PSYCHOLOGY

The implications of the scientific conference on Pavlov's work for the development of a true science of psychology are fundamental. It was recognized that for a science of psychology to be based on dialectical materialism the concept of the nature of mental processes as a subjective reflection of objective reality must be regarded as essential. As Professor Petrushevsky points out "Pavlov con-

tinual
study
man
laws o
out se
physio
pheno
tivity
Pav
nifican
ence b
tivity
studie
ods he
Beacu
menta
jectiv
reject
those
cal on
nervo
formu
action
jectiv
theory
"Sens
the o
funda
mater
ist pl
that
and t
garde
ity."¹⁵
Lenin
conce
struct
integ
total,
are o
15.
Mosco
8 V.
dim. 2

tinually demanded that psychology study the inner subjective world of man on the basis of the psychological laws of higher nervous activity, without separating the psychical from the physiological, *i.e.*, that it base the phenomena of so-called psychical activity on physiological facts.¹⁴

Pavlov at no time denied the significance of subjective mental experience but rather regarded mental activity as higher nervous activity and studied it with the objective methods he had devised for that purpose. Because Pavlov saw what we call mental activity as a unity of the subjective and objective he emphatically rejected the mechanistic position of those who identified the psychological only with the subjective, and the nervous only with the objective. His formulation of the dialectical interaction of the subjective with the objective is consistent with the Leninist theory of reflection. To quote Lenin, "Sensation is a subjective image of the objective world." Also, "The fundamental distinction between the materialist and the adherent of idealist philosophy consists in the fact that the sensation, perception, idea, and the mind of man generally, is regarded as an image of objective reality."¹⁵ In his *Philosophical Notebooks* Lenin further remarks that "Human concepts are subjective in their abstractness, their isolation; but in their integrity, their process, their sum total, their trends, their source, they are objective." Pavlov's work on the

formation of conditioned reflexes through temporary linkages in the cerebral cortex in response to stimuli from the environment provides the physiological basis for the Leninist theory of reflection.

This physiological basis was further elaborated by Pavlov in his concepts of the "primary" and "secondary signalling systems." The "primary signalling system" in the cortex is concerned with the relationship of sensation to the surrounding world and was so named by Pavlov because it constitutes the first signals of reality in the brain. The "secondary signaling system" he described as specifically human, representing an abstraction of reality and permitting language and formation of ideas. The complexities of man's relationship to his surroundings are reflected in this "second signaling system." The first and second signaling systems develop together, both socially stimulated and socially determined. At present one of the main goals of Soviet research is the fuller elaboration of the mechanism of this uniquely human "second signaling system" and its relationship to the "first signaling system."

Pavlov thus conceived of the higher functioning of the brain as the means through which the individual achieves the unity of the subjective and objective. This he perceived not as a psycho-physical parallelism, but as a dialectical relationship, considering the two as constantly interpenetrating. Language, as an example, is, in its development, a reflection of

¹⁴ S. A. Petrushevsky in *Voks Bulletin* No. 65, Moscow, 1951.

¹⁵ V. I. Lenin, *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Moscow, 1947 (Eng. edit.), pp. 117, 274.

reality giving rise to specific cortical processes that have meaning in relationship to certain appropriate external situations. It is thus both physiological and social. Bykov states the prime significance of this when he says, "Pavlov's experimental researches enriched the Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge, which recognizes the existence outside of us and independent of our minds, of an objective world which is reflected in man's sensations and consciousness. Pavlov added much to our understanding of how the subjective image of the objective world is formed, showing it to be the effect of a complex reflex act, thus presuming the unity of the subjective and the objective, (of the mental and the physical" (p. 39).

FREUDIANISM AND BEHAVIORISM

Here we can see clearly the total impoverishment and reactionary basis of Freudian psychology, which is concerned, not with the reflection of external reality by the individual, but rather with the reflection of "unconscious processes." This is idealism in its most subjective and mystical form. Bourgeois psychology and psychiatry have long given pious lip-service to the need for objective research methodologies dealing with consciousness, thought, and other psychological processes. But it has long been obvious that objective scientific research is impossible within the framework of the present subjective

Freudian approach to psychology. Many bourgeois psychologists and psychiatrists, failing in their research efforts, have turned to the anti-scientific position that objective methods of research in psychology are impossible and unnecessary.

The chief bourgeois alternative to Freudianism in the United States has been behaviorism in its various forms. J. B. Watson, a main figure in the development of behaviorism, based much of his formulations on a distortion of Pavlov's findings. He placed the conditioned reflex within an abstract, mechanical framework, and ignored the basic Pavlovian concept of the organism functioning in integral unity with its environment. Early behaviorism attempted to discard consciousness and other so-called "subjective processes" and to deal only with the so-called "objective behavior," *i.e.*, that which could be observed and measured by others. However, with the growing influence of Freudian and neo-Freudian concepts such problems as consciousness had to be recognized by bourgeois psychologists.

The lack of the "subjective" in behaviorism and of the "objective" in Freudianism were "remedied" by a mechanical combination of the two theories. Psychological literature was flooded with "objective" studies of Freudian concepts, many of which used animals as experimental subjects in an attempt to obtain data relating to complex human behavior. This is seen in the attempts of such psychologists as Sears, Mowrer, and

Miller
conce
hostil
chieft
so-cal
tions
This
origin
He
of the
ing o
tive.
ing o
that
perim
are co
nalin
huma
and s
nalin
eraliz
lower
of m
cortex
as a
THE
MA
Ins
of m
erned
mater
tive
The
theor
the co
sonal
chang
throu
realit
So

Miller to study such psychoanalytic concepts as "basic conflict," "innate hostility," etc., through experiments chiefly on rats and birds, establishing so-called "objective" stimulus conditions and measuring the response. This is then used to substantiate the original psychoanalytic concepts.

Here we have another indication of the fallacy of the mechanical linking of the subjective and the objective. Pavlov, in his dialectical linking of the two, is clear on the point that generalization from animal experimentation is valid only when we are concerned with the primary signaling system. As regards complex human processes—language, ideas, and so forth—in the secondary signaling system, it is impossible to generalize to man from data obtained on lower animals. This is so because of man's highly developed cerebral cortex and the fact of his existence as a social being.

THE DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM OF PAVLOV

Instead, Pavlov gives an affirmation of man developing and being governed through the reflection on his material nervous system of the objective world and his practices in it. The Soviet emphasis on Pavlov's theory represents a reaffirmation of the concept that man—social and personal man—through his practice, can change his objective world, and through the reflection of this new reality, will change himself.

So we see in Pavlov's theory noth-

ing that is immutable, nothing that is static. It conceives of the physiology of the organism as in a constant process of flux in which objective relationships are internalized through the activity of the cerebral cortex. As to Pavlov's attitude toward psychology, what he opposed was *idealist* psychology, and what he respected was a materialist psychology based on the concept of reflection. His attitude is best expressed in his own words:

Psychology is a formulation of the phenomena of our subjective world—a completely legitimate matter — and it would be idle to quarrel with this. . . . Of course a psychological analysis must be regarded as insufficient in view of its fruitless efforts over thousands of years to study and analyze the nervous system. But psychology, as a study of the reflection of reality, as the subjective world, linked in a well-known manner, defined by general formulae—that is naturally, an unavoidable matter. Thanks to psychology I am able to imagine the complexity of data of a subjective nature.⁶

How different is the theory of Pavlov from the rags and tatters of his research found in American text books! There only the slightest mention is made of the method of conditioned reflexes, and the concepts underlying the method are not even considered. Pavlov, the great revolutionary physiologist, is made into a technician. This is not an accident; it stems from the very content of

⁶ Quoted by B. G. Ananiev in "Basic Tasks of Soviet Psychological Science," *Bulletin of Psychology, No. 5*, Society for Cultural Relations with the U.S.S.R., London, 1951, p. 8.

bourgeois physiology and psychology, conditioned by, and serving, a decaying social system.

On the other hand, the Pavlov discussion demonstrated again that Soviet science is in every sense a people's science. Lenin's statement that Marxism taught the working class "to substitute science for dreaming" is borne out fully in the life of the Soviet people. For the Soviet people base their lives and their hopes upon science.

The Soviet scientist recognizes in the first order his responsibility to the people. "Our people, and progressive humanity generally, will not forgive us if we do not put the wealth of Pavlov's legacy to proper use," declared S. I. Vavilov, President of the Academy of Sciences, in opening the conference. And the conference closed in the spirit of Pavlov's own declaration: "It is a matter of honor to justify the great hopes reposed in science by our country" (pp. 14, 153).

The American people also have always reposed the greatest hopes in science. No people in the world have shown a more avid interest in science and a greater belief in its possibilities. But so long as the science of Marxism-Leninism—the science of man, his environment and his social organization—remains sequestered, and belief in it proscribed and condemned, and men and women are imprisoned for "conspiring to teach" it, then the hopes which the Ameri-

can people repose in science are doomed to be frustrated.

Thus instead of benefiting by vast institutes devoted to research in medicine, hygiene and health, as in the Soviet Union, Americans have to listen on the radio to the endless begging for the heart fund, cancer fund, polio fund, etc. Instead of revolutionary scientific progress in increasing the food supply and reducing prices, Americans find among the powers-that-be no interest in increasing the food supply, and thus endangering profits.

Only in one field is science fully mobilized and the slogan is "money no object"—the field of war. Cancer may beg, polio may beg, but for war sciences there are *appropriations*—often without specification. And the effect of this destructive, anti-human control exercised by the war lords over science and the scientists is one of essential debasement, distortion and frustration. But the hopes the American people place in science will not be gratified by the development of a hydrogen bomb. Like other peoples all over the world, Americans expect from science peace, health, well-being, a new mastery over Nature and a deeper understanding of Life. And the road to the realization of these hopes lies in the common struggle for peace and friendly cultural interchange with all peoples the world over, for democratic advance and for Socialism.

Recent Publications

A LANTERN FOR JEREMY

by V. J. JEROME

Price \$2.50

"Reading *A Lantern for Jeremy* gave me one of my most cherished literary experiences. In content, *Jeremy* illuminates a fundamental political truth which guarantees the liberation of mankind from oppression—giving insight and inspiration which will surely strengthen ours and succeeding generations in the continuing struggle. In form, it is a work of superb craftsmanship, every sentence and paragraph and episode—and their interrelations—seemingly having been worked over with consummate care to the point of perfection. Here, obviously, is a novel which reflects a theoretical and political maturity that only a lifetime of struggle in the Marxist movement could possibly produce. It is a major cultural achievement."—*Doxey Wilkerson*



| | |
|--|--------|
| BROADEN THE FIGHT FOR PEACE AND DEMOCRACY <i>by Joseph Rockman</i> | \$.15 |
| THE TRUCKS ACT: MICHIGAN'S BLUEPRINT FOR A FASCIST STATE, <i>by William Albertson</i> | .10 |
| THE NATION'S BIGGEST RACKET, <i>by Adam Lapin</i> | .05 |
| REUTHER'S SEIZURE OF THE FORD LOCAL, <i>by John Swift</i> | .10 |
| PETTIS PERRY SPEAKS TO THE COURT | .10 |
| ELIZABETH GURLEY FLYNN SPEAKS TO THE COURT | .10 |

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 BROADWAY, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Now Available!

HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES

By William Z. Foster

Here is the first complete and authoritative history of the origin, struggles, experiences, growth of the Communist Party as vanguard of the American working class, and the profound and significant lessons of its struggles for all advanced workers. Vast in scope, all-embracing in the range of political and ideological activities and developments it covers, this long-awaited volume is at once a history of the trade union and labor movements, of the liberation struggles of the Negro people, of the working farmers and women's and youth movements, of the continuous struggle to steer a correct Marxist course that, avoiding the pitfalls of opportunism and sectarianism, would forge a broad front of all toiling people, led by the working class, for peace, democracy, Socialism.

As Alexander Bittelman wrote in *Political Affairs*: ". . . learn, study and popularize the *History of the Communist Party of the United States* and its great lessons for today and tomorrow."

Order It in Your Club or Local Progressive Bookshop

An International Book. Price \$6.00



NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3

