

REVISIONISM HAS A HISTORY

Approving the main line of the resolution as amended by the National Committee, I think that Part II, in speaking of mistakes, fails in correcting them, in that it does not identify their source, nor concede their development over a long period of years, nor scarcely admit the parallel growth of a bureaucracy which sheltered their opportunism—the invariable function of bureaucracy.

Instead, it defends bureaucracy by "praising it with faint damns" about "our reluctance" to self-criticism, and "failure" to consult the membership. This is over-gentle when one recalls the comrades driven into inactivity or even out of the organization, both before and after Teheran, by a bureaucracy which smothered independent thought and pursued a policy of liquidation long before Teheran.

What, for example, have we to brag about—disputing Comrade Duclos—because our "enrollment" increased 25 percent? Nothing, comrades, when membership in a Communist organization was open to anyone who believed in capitalism—"at least for many generations."

Rather take account of the liquidationist exclusion of foreign-born members (1940), of the Nisei (1941), of the members inducted into the services (since 1940), the dissolution of the party in Hawaii (1941)—all parts of the liquidation process which—after Teheran, dissolved the CPA in the South and was directly en route to dissolve the entire CPA by destroying its political identity.

It is inadequate, to the point of making a new error per se, to recognize mistakes "in the recent period" (whatever that means), and then emphasize "especially since January 1944," while not acknowledging them as originating in the socio-political environment of the New Deal, and developing in an increasing misconception of bourgeois reformism. So much so that even that term was not—and still is not—applied to it. And hence its class nature and class limitations were not understood.

Precisely in such period of bourgeois reformism is it necessary that leadership maintain Marxist firmness. That ours did not is proven by its final acceptance of bourgeois reformism as a substitute for independent proletarian organization and activity. But that process was well-advanced in January 1944.

For example, we gave great aid to Spain from 1936 to 1939. But can it be said that it was unaffected entirely by our growing reliance on Roosevelt? Certainly the same blighted vision which led Browder, in 1943, to read something into the diplomatic document of Teheran that wasn't there, had previously created a tendency which resulted in our being "surprised" in 1939, when the Soviet-German non-aggression agreement was signed; and "surprised" once more in 1941, when Hitler violated it. Yet Marxists should have been surprised in neither case.

Grave as are Browder's errors, and made far more grave by his refusal to admit them, the leadership left in charge when he went to Atlanta maintained an opportunist and bureaucratic inter-regnum he could scarcely excel, so far had the process already advanced long before Teheran.

Long before January 1944, monopoly was no longer to be criticized—except for flagrantly exposed treason. In 1942, Comrade Hudson, questioned directly by me, could give no adequate explanation why. In 1941, Comrade Minor was head of the party, and speaking in San Francisco endorsed Roosevelt's appeasement of Vichy and Pétain "to save the French fleet." Revisionism did not fall from heaven in January 1944.

Again, early in 1941, a spontaneous and most beneficial discussion on the role of woman—particularly the housewife—began in *The New Masses*—but was ordered cut off. Thereupon, I prepared a discussion article for *The Communist*—where discussion articles should always be in order—in April. But the bureaucracy in the center rejected it without one word of explanation; while the state bureaucracy, without so much as consulting me, forbade me writing on that subject elsewhere (incidentally admitting it knew nothing about the subject).

A bourgeois distortion of Marxism prepared six months later by Comrade Landy definitely crippled our work among women and furnished the apologetics for laying upon millions of women the double

burden of household drudge and war worker. That is my opinion. But certainly, whatever the worth or worthlessness of that policy, its determination was a model of bureaucratic arrogance and mis-handling.

However much Comrade Browder became the "chief architect" after January 1944, these evidences above, show that he had assistants, that revisionism has a history which is not mentioned in the resolution. Small wonder that after Teheran, his attempt to use the CPA as a "seeing-eye dog" to guide imperialist capital through the hazards of postwar traffic met such unanimous approval of the Board—with the noble exception of Comrade Foster.

Man born of woman—and notably the present writer—is "weak and full of sins"—but it didn't need a Duclos letter to tell us that there was something wrong with a "Teheran perspective" which Comrade Minor interpreted to a San Francisco audience a full year ago, to mean that there could be socialism ONLY "in one country," and if the peoples of Europe should decide otherwise, then American imperialism had the approval of American "Marxists" to prevent it. The center was told about this—but like the Three Monkeys—"heard no evil, saw no evil, smelled no evil."

These are among the reasons I hold that Part II of the resolution is so inadequate as to demand elaboration if future errors are to be avoided by understanding those of the past, and if bureaucracy is to be wiped out at all levels.

At the same time, there seems to be a weakness in Part I, in its failure to combat concretely Browder's postulates. It should give a better explanation as to WHY there are "capitalist groupings and elements" who "desire to promote democratic objectives," then merely to say they do so "for one or another reason." This is almost as bad as the metaphysics of Browder, who says they are "the far-sighted ones." Neither does the resolution explain WHY monopoly capital is "inherently" reactionary.

These "far-sighted ones" have economic interests opposed to monopoly, and hence to its Fascist political expression. That is why the "anti-trust" phase of our program is justified, to gain allies among the bourgeoisie—even though we are not "machine breakers."

Browder contends that the "men of the trusts" are not inherently reactionary; that they are so only for lack of "markets." The resolution does not answer him. Yet the problem of the market is NOT the decisive problem. Rather is it the decline in the rate of profit (independently of the rate of surplus value, which may even increase) resulting from the changed organic composition of capital. And finance capital is inherently reactionary because it can be nothing else and hope to restore its falling rate of profit—market or no market. It appears that somebody might well study Volume III of "Capital."

In his June 2 statement, Comrade Browder uses the "carrot and club" policy against the resolution. Either, he says, you will have America making war against the Soviet Union (immediately, or later) or you must accept his alternative "course of policy, Teheran and Yalta." (Marxism, of course, rejects the carrot and dodges the club by recalling the existence of another alternative—inter-imperialist rivalries.)

But to make the carrot seem attractive, to "protect" the Soviet Union, he offers economic inducements to imperialism—"markets" and "putting our vast sums of idle money to work" by "a series of giant industrial development corporations." It was "practically" proposed in topical articles that this meant a sharing of the world, and hence unity between British and American imperialisms.

And this, which is a recipe for war against the Soviet Union—was offered by Browder as a means of avoiding war against the Soviet Union! This, too, was offered with no consideration for the limitations on the self-expansion of capitalism which are set by its internal contradictions.

It is to these internal contradictions of capitalism that we must look to understand WHO are the enemies, and WHO are the friends, of democracy. And also how to attain an independent leadership of all democratic forces for the working class.

Harrison George, San Francisco