

TURNING POINT

POINT

for

PEACE - DEMOCRACY - SOCIALISM

Vol. II, No. 4 May 1949

Editorial Board: Ralph Burt, Ellwood Griest, Martha Samuel
Ted Seemin, and Louis Julia

Published by: P.R. Club, Communist Party (Expelled) and SPARK, Maritime
Committee for a Communist Party and FORE 'N' AFT

TURNING POINT on sale at newsstand S.W. corner of 42nd Street and Sixth Ave.
Mailing address: P.O. Box 24, Times Square Station, New
York 18, N. Y. Checks or money orders to: Ellwood Griest,
Secretary

Contents

Hurrah for Eisler!	Page 1
American Communists on Trial Before the World:	
Part IV Worse Than Bookburning.	3
Franklin's Socialism Through Constitutional Amendment.	10
Strike Two! at CCNY. A Letter from a Student.	14
The Truth About The Daily Worker Diplomats	18
A Letter from Paul Palazzi, CPUSA Waterfront Leader.	19
Turning Point's Reply to Palazzi	21
Reprint: Engels on Force and Violence.	23

HURRAH FOR EISLER!

Gerhart Eisler was framed by the U.S. Gov't. as an atom spy, charged by Congress with contempt, and after a period of imprisonment on Ellis Island, indefinitely kept legal prisoner here on a bond of \$23,000. Since Eisler had Communist work to do in Germany, the U.S. Gov't. hoped it was killing two birds with one stone by not allowing him to leave, and by using him as a war-hysteria scapegoat. Aside from collecting money and a motley crew of lawyers, the CPUSA did little to fight for him. But he fought for himself and the American people. He carried his fight to a logical development when he flaunted America's "legal" fascism and escaped "illegally".

We say -- hurrah for Eisler! He thought and fought as a Communist, not as a lawyer. This, of course, was a great shock to many American CP'ers as well as to his own left lawyer, Carol King, who commented: "This leaves Eisler in an absurd light." Apparently this shyster believed that Eisler was merely a vehicle with which to swell the glory of Carol King's legal career. As for many CP members, they gasped: "He jumped bail! That's not legal! It's not keeping faith!" Didn't Eisler have faith in the capacity of the CPUSA to conduct an effective struggle? Wasn't there some way of safeguarding the \$23,000? He told Richard Yaffe that this money and more would have been wasted on futile appeals.

Eisler rightly believed that the legal aspects of his case were only a farce and that all the appeals in the world could not free him without a mass political struggle,

a struggle the CPUSA evidently could not afford. So he fought the American imperialists himself. It is to be hoped that the speed and energy with which the British Communist Party and people sprang to his defense will be rewarded by his victory and ours against the American imperialists.

As for the CPUSA, it "liberally" pointed out that he was being unjustly persecuted. The only thing it forgot to editorialize was its stand on his action. This it cleverly evaded, but no one reading the editorial "The Persecution of Eisler" (D.W. May 16) could say that the CP approved and applauded Eisler's escape. They were, of course, careful to separate themselves from it. Joseph Starobin in D.W. (May 18) wrote: "as for Eisler's associates, he had none. He had many friends, whom he did not take into his confidence evidently because he did not want to complicate their own problems." It is wonderful how well the psychological jargon befits the CPUSA whose "problems" are so disconnected from Eisler's.

And while the British Party holds demonstrations outside of Eisler's jail, the CPUSA has still to hold one. Why? They are afraid "to complicate their own problems", they are staying on the Right side of the LAW, (as well as on the Right side of Marxism-Leninism), and they really think Eisler did "complicate" their "problems." Evidently the CPUSA believes such actions as Eisler's should be limited to the movies.

Certainly the CPUSA finds it embarrassing that some Communists lack faith in money, fund drives, lawyers, and legalities as the solution to the class struggle. Eisler's action was not only "a supreme criticism of American life today" as Starobin wrote, but also of the CPUSA. It is because he broke bourgeois legal limits that the CP dared not laud his escape, but confined itself to restating the fact that he was being politically persecuted.

In the first issue of Spark, April 1947, we wrote: "The case of Gerhart Eisler was the prologue to an American tragedy. The absence of a real fight to free Eisler signaled the U.S. Gov't. that the curtain could rise--the play begin." In this article, "Free Eisler--Defend the Legality of the CPUSA", we pointed out that the CP had not fought for Eisler, that it was afraid to bring it up in trade unions for "fear of splitting the trade unions..." When the members of the P.R. Club (Expelled) organized the first Eisler Defense Meeting in the country, the CP did its best to sabotage that meeting and was able to prevent Mrs. Eisler from speaking as planned. Two years later, the Party still does not attempt any mass action on Eisler's behalf.

Eisler has had to fight alone, but even alone, he has dealt a critical blow to any illusions that still exist in the other nations about our "democracy". His "recapture" makes a farce of the Truman Gov't's. postulate of "democracy vs. dictatorship." With Eisler we say: Down with the American gendarmerie and its British stooges.

HURRAH FOR EISLER!

* * *

2 New Anti-Opportunist Publications Received

THE KEY: P.O. Box 283, Radio City Sta., New York 19, N.Y. 2 issues.

CLARITY: P.O. Box 132, Wm. Penn Annex, Philadelphia 7, Pa. 2 issues.

(To be reviewed in Turning Point)

COMMUNISTS ON TRIAL BEFORE THE WORLD

IV - Worse Than Book-Burning

The CPUSA has characterized the trial of its National Board as a book-burning. It declares that ideas are on trial. This is true. The prosecution has used the mere citing of Marxist-Leninist classics as its main weapon against the C.P. As the C.P. itself contends, no overt actions have been offered as evidence that it would "overthrow the government." Basically, then, the U.S. government is trying to outlaw Marxism-Leninism as such. The wording of the indictment says as much. Therefore, the most important factor in this trial should have been the utilization of these works by the CPUSA in order to explain to all Americans what the ideas are which already govern half the world, and are held by men and women in every continent, in every corner of the earth.

The CPUSA should have hammered away at one main point: the government has no right to prosecute ideas, and therefore, this trial violates one of the most basic rights of all humanity. And it should have stuck by the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. In this way, it would not only have fought a real battle against the outlawing of Marxism-Leninism, but it would have defended the most elementary democratic principles which most Americans hold. But the CPUSA intends to prove (quite honestly) that it is innocent of the charges. It cannot repudiate Marxism-Leninism as such for fear of exposing itself for what it really is, (CPUSA, Second International), so instead, it distorts it, "antiquates" it, relegates it to "past history". Book-burning will never be effective against the ideas of Communism; but the filthy distortions of the CPUSA have already corrupted too many honest rank and file members of the party who should be the leaders of the working class, and if continued as in the past, will leave the American working class without a Socialist theory, without a vanguard party.

Only twenty months ago William Z. Foster, in an article in P. A. (Sept. 1947) on "Marxism and American Exceptionalism," wrote: "... the leaders of the labor unions and the progressive movement in this country could do nothing better, in order to secure a reliable guide to their policy in these difficult days, than to study carefully the scientific principles laid down by Marx and Engels a century ago in the famous Communist Manifesto. (p. 812)

But now the C.P. defense lawyers try to prove that Engels himself called the Communist Manifesto "antiquated" especially on the question of the "forcible overthrow of existing social conditions" (Daily Worker, April 8, 1949, p.11) "These are the ideas of Karl Marx expressed 100 years ago, a defense lawyer remarks..." (Daily Worker, "The Book-Burning at Foley Sq. Courthouse" by Harry Raymond, Apr. 8, p.11)

Raymond continues: "The prosecutor's claim that the Communist party's program today is based on a principle of 'revolutionary force and violence' dictated by the Manifesto is exposed as false in Engels' preface."

"Crockett reads on from the preface much to the embarrassment of the prosecutor and the police agent:

"The practical application of the principles will depend, as the Manifesto itself states, everywhere and at all times, on the historical conditions for the time being existing, and, for that reason, no special stress is laid on the revolutionary measures proposed in Section II." (Our emphasis)

Max Gordon in another article on the same day declares that Engels "also emphasized that parts of the Manifesto 'are antiquated'..."

From the above, the jury and the American people are supposed to infer that Engels repudiated "revolutionary force and violence" since this principle "is exposed as false in the Engels preface". We do agree that the CPUSA does not base itself on this principle, but let us see what was actually said in Engels' preface.

In the first place, Engels wrote "no special stress is laid on the revolutionary measures proposed at the end of Section II" --not "proposed in Section II" as quoted in the D.W. To continue with the preface where the D.W. left off:

"That passage would, in many respects, be very differently worded today. In view of the gigantic strides of modern industry since 1848, and of the accompanying improved and extended organization of the working class, in view of the practical experience gained, first in the February Revolution, and then, still more, in the Paris Commune, where the proletariat for the first time held political power for two whole months, this program has in some details become antiquated. One thing especially was proved by the Commune, viz, that 'the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery, and wield it for its own purposes.' (See The Civil War in France...where this point is further developed)." (Manifesto of the Communist Party, Marx and Engels, Moscow, 1948, p. 23)

The end of Section II ("this program has in some details become antiquated") lists 10 "measures" which will enable the proletariat to abolish capitalism and establish Socialism after it has been raised "to the position of the ruling class" (Ibid, p. 70). Included are such measures as abolition of property in land, of the right to inheritance, confiscation of property of all counter-revolutionaries, heavy progressive tax, and equal liability of all to work. (Ibid, p. 71). This is the program which Engels declares has become antiquated in some details. In other words the passage quoted in the D.W. refers to "revolutionary measures" which are to take place after the working class achieves state power, when "by means of a revolution, it makes itself the ruling class, and, as such, sweeps away by force the old conditions of production" (Ibid, p. 72) And in passing, it should be obvious that this program has become antiquated not in the sense that these measures were too "revolutionary" but because they could be far surpassed for the reasons Engels states in the preface.

Furthermore the other "parts of the Manifesto" which Engels "emphasized 'are antiquated'" (see Max Gordon) refer to:

"...the remarks on the relation of the Communists to the various opposition parties (Section IV), although in principle still correct, yet in practice are antiquated, because the political situation has been entirely changed, and the progress of history has swept from off the earth the greater portion of the political parties there enumerated." (Ibid. p. 24)

This certainly limits the "antiquated" parts not in basic principle but in application under specific historical conditions. The Communists of today can hardly oppose parties which do not exist, but they can oppose similar parties of the same principles outlined in the Manifesto,

Far worse than these attempted distortions is the fact that this section was read in order to prove that Engels did not believe in the forceful smashing of the bourgeois state machine. It seems that in the history of opportunism, no new distortions are possible, but simply a repetition of the very same ones that Lenin

destroyed word for word. In State and Revolution (Moscow 1947) Lenin prophetically tears into the National Board of the CPUSA:

"The only 'correction' Marx thought it necessary to make in The Communist Manifesto, he made on the basis of the revolutionary experience of the Paris Communards ... Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, say that the program of the Communist Manifesto 'has in some detail become antiquated' now, and they go on to say:

"One thing especially was proved by the Commune, viz., that 'the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery and wield it for its own purposes.' ...

"It is extremely characteristic that it is precisely this vital correction that has been distorted by the opportunists, and its meaning, probably, is not known to nine-tenths, if not ninety-nine hundredths, of the readers of The Communist Manifesto. We shall deal with this distortion more fully further on, in a chapter devoted specially to distortions. Here it will be sufficient to note that the current vulgar 'interpretation' of Marx's famous utterance just quoted is that Marx here emphasizes the idea of gradual development in contradistinction to the seizure of power, and so on.

"As a matter of fact, exactly the opposite is the case. Marx's idea is that the working class must break up, smash the 'ready-made state machinery,' and not confine itself merely to laying hold of it." ...

"The words, 'to smash the bureaucratic-military state machine,' briefly express the principal lesson of Marxism on the tasks of the proletariat in relation to the state during a revolution. And it is precisely this lesson that has been not only completely forgotten, but positively distorted, in the prevailing Kautskyan 'interpretation' of Marxism." (p. 46-47) (original emphasis)

Far from proving that the principle of "revolutionary force and violence" is false, the Engels preface, makes its only "correction" on the necessity for the forceful and violent smashing of the state machine. Lenin deals with this same opportunist distortion again: when he writes:

"This utterance 'pleased' Bernstein so much that he repeats it no less than three times in his book--interpreting it in the most distorted opportunist sense.

"As we have seen, Marx meant that the working class must smash, break, shatter (Sprengung - explode, the expression used by Engels) the whole state machine. But according to Bernstein it would appear as though Marx in these words warned the working class against excessive zeal when seizing power.

"A cruder and more hideous distortion of Marx's idea cannot be imagined." (Ibid. p. 126-127)

And again in attacking Kautsky he writes: "Throughout the pamphlet the author (Kautsky) speaks of the conquest of state power - and nothing else; that is he chooses a formula which makes a concession to the opportunists, inasmuch as it admits the possibility of power being seized without destroying the state machine. The very thing which Marx, in 1872, declared to be 'obsolete' in the program of The Communist Manifesto is revived by Kautsky in 1902." (original emphasis) (Ibid. p. 128,

Before the CPUSA blasphemes these great fighters by trying to put their own cowardly opportunist antics into the Communist Manifesto, they should check their research, and read the pamphlet which they are constantly trying to have removed from the "record".

The Conspiracy to Equate Revolutionary Force and Violence with Conspiracy

David Goldway and Milton Howard have been assigned the job of discrediting revolutionary force and violence and the necessity for smashing the bourgeois state machine by building up a straw man and then knocking it down with the arguments of "prevailing official Social-Democracy" (Lenin, State and Revolution). On April 10, Goldway wrote a full page article on Marx's teachings to prove that Communists do not believe in the "conspiratorial organization of force and violence." Along the same lines, Howard, that erstwhile exponent of Second International Socialism, in his regular column "As We See It", inveighs against "conspiracies" and "let's-seize-the-government Anarchists."

This has become the "Magic Word" of these ideological Houdinis. Goldway writes that Marx "was not an anarchist. Not only did he not advocate the overthrow of governments by a conspiracy of force and violence, he actively fought throughout his life against those who did." "Marx fought against the anarchist Bakunin". "Engels continued the fight against terrorist methods." "And, after Engels, Lenin fought the same battle." Then Goldway asks, "If Revolutions do not take place by the conspiratorial organization of force and violence then how in Marx's opinion do they take place?" Goldway answers that the people "exercise their democratic will to accomplish a change."

In his column on April 24th, entitled "A Revolutionary Party Opposes 'Force and Violence' Conspiracies", Milton Howard goes through the same routine with some variations. He writes:

"Can there, therefore, be a revolutionary party for Socialism which does not 'conspire to advocate and teach the overthrow of the government by force and violence'? The answer to this one is that it is impossible for any genuine Marxist-Leninist party to teach that the decision to change from capitalism to Socialism can be made by any political party at its own sweet will. The very heart and essence of Marxian Socialism (later developed and expanded by V.I.Lenin) is that social changes are not the product of whims, private wishes, minority conspiracies or political intrigues.

"On the contrary, Marxian Socialism rejected Utopian Socialism and the 'let's-seize-the-government Anarchists' just because it insisted that social changes, abolition of systems and governments, are always the result of objective social and economic forces..."

And then he asks and answers another question:

"Can such a transition take place peacefully? It would be highly desirable if it does. No one would prefer such a peaceful transition more than the Communists. Such a transition has always been envisaged in the theories of Marxian Socialism, including the writings of Lenin and Stalin."

The above arguments constitute the basis of a hoax which is being put over primarily on the CP member. By grafting the words "conspiratorial", "anarchist", and "terrorist" on the Marxist concept of revolutionary force and violence, these ideological wizards hope to discredit this concept. The U.S. Government hopes to outlaw these ideas, but the CPUSA wants to ridicule them permanently into a respectable oblivion in which they already exist for most party members.

Marxism fights the advocacy of anarchism, conspiratorialism, and terrorism as such for specific reasons, but to sow the illusion that a peaceful transition is even a remote possibility, let alone probable in the U.S., was certainly not intended by Lenin and Stalin. The exact opposite is the case.

"...the law of violent proletarian revolution, the law of the smashing of the bourgeois state machine as a preliminary condition for such a revolution, is an inevitable law of the revolutionary movement in the imperialist countries of the world.

"Of course, in the remote future, if the proletariat is victorious in the most important capitalist countries, and if the present capitalist encirclement is replaced by a socialist encirclement, a 'peaceful' path of development is quite possible for certain capitalist countries, whose capitalists, in view of the 'unfavourable' international situation, will consider it expedient 'voluntarily' to make substantial concessions to the proletariat. But this supposition applies only to a remote and possible future." (Foundations of Leninism, Stalin, Int'l Publishers, 1939, p.56)

If there is an important imperialist country in the world, to say that the U.S. is it, is putting it mildly. Stalin's passage on the possibility of "peaceful" paths obviously refers to a time when the proletarian revolution has already taken place in the U.S. But of the "possibility" or rather, in Stalin's words, the "inevitability" of violent revolution in the most important imperialist country in the world, Howard has nothing to say.

Howard and Goldway were not the first to vulgarize the Marxist opposition to anarchism. Did Marx and Lenin fight anarchism because it was "let's-seize-the-government anarchism", because it was for the forceful overthrow of capitalism as opposed to the "major social change from one social system to another social system" as Howard puts it? This is another trick Lenin discredited in State and Revolution.

"Marx agreed with Proudhon on the necessity of 'smashing' the present state machine. Neither the opportunists nor the Kautskyans wish to see this similarity between Marxism and anarchism (both Proudhon and Bakunin) because on this point they have departed from Marxism". (p. 64)

"...The opportunists of present-day Social-Democracy accepted the bourgeois political forms of the parliamentary democratic state as the unsurpassable limit; they battered their foreheads praying before this 'idol' and denounced every attempt to smash these as anarchism." (p. 66) (original emphasis)

Could anything more aptly describe the CPUSA and its spokesmen who insist that the peaceful establishment of Socialism is possible? What then were the differences between Marxism and anarchism. Marx "opposed" the proposition that the workers should renounce the use of arms, of organized force, that is, the state, which was to serve to 'crush the resistance of the bourgeoisie'...

"...Marx chooses the sharpest and clearest way of stating his position against the anarchists: after overthrowing the yoke of the capitalists, should the workers lay down their arms', or use them against the capitalists in order to crush their resistance." (Lenin, State and Revolution, p. 72)

"The anarchist idea of the abolition of the state is muddled and non-revolutionary - that is how Engels put it. It is precisely the revolution in its rise and development, with its specific tasks in relation to violence, authority, power, the state, that the anarchists do not wish to see." (Ibid. p. 75)

Marx ridiculed the anarchists for accusing the workers of "the terrible crime of violating principles for in order to satisfy their wretched, vulgar, everyday needs, in order to crush the resistance of the bourgeoisie, instead of laying down their arms and abolishing the state, they give the state a revolutionary and transitory form..." (quoted by Lenin in State and Revolution, p. 72)

It was the Anarchists, then, who accused the Marxists of using force and violence excessively because they could not understand the nature of the state, and therefore the nature of its relation to violence and the class struggle. The mistaken position of the Anarchists led to their repudiation of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Nothing could be more confusing than to characterize them as "let's-seize-the-government Anarchists" when they wanted "simply" to abolish the state in a utopian way. Marx, Engels and Lenin concluded that the Communists are more revolutionary than the Anarchists because the Anarchists in their petty bourgeois rejection of the use of force by the proletariat constituted as the state power, actually rejected the only way to really smash the bourgeois dictatorship.

But to read the D.W. one would believe that it was Anarchists who advocate the forceful smashing of the state machine, whereas Marxism-Leninism fights against this advocacy. The D.W., like the bourgeois press, pigeonholes the forceful overthrow of capitalism under Anarchism. Goldway and Howard use an "anarchist-scare" to prove how legal the CPUSA is. Their attitude toward anarchism is a typical bourgeois caricature: "Bomb-throwers", "Conspirators", "Terrorists"--and they imply: we are none of these.

Marx, Engels and Lenin fought anarchism, terrorism and conspiratorialism because these limited the revolutionary struggle in a non-revolutionary way, not because these ideas stood for illegality or force and violence. Lenin writes in "Where To Begin" (Collected Works, Vol. IV, Int'l Publishers, 1929, p. 110-111):

"We have never rejected terror on principle, nor can we ever do so. Terror is a form of military operations that may be usefully applied, or may even be essential in certain moments of the battle...The point is however, that terror is now advocated, not as one of the operations the army in the field must carry out in close contact with the main body and in harmony with the whole plan of battle, but as an individual attack, completely isolated from any army whatever."

The truth of this should have been obvious during the war when the national underground movements of all the European countries conducted systematic terror against the Nazis. At the present time, the people of Spain are conducting organized terror, force and violence against the Franco fascists. The D.W. carries many dispatches about the executions of individual fascists by the Spanish people.

Lenin attacked terrorism and conspiratorialism because they grew from the same petty bourgeois and opportunist roots as Economism. In that great classic in the fight against opportunism, What Is To Be Done (Int'l Publishers 1929) Lenin wrote:

"The Economists and the modern terrorists spring from a common root, namely, subservience to spontaneity... The Economists and terrorists merely bow to different poles of spontaneity: The Economists bow to the spontaneity of the 'pure and simple' labour movement while the terrorists bow to the spontaneity of the passionate indignation of the intellectuals, who are either incapable of linking up the revolutionary struggle with the labour movement, or lack the opportunity to do so." (p.73)

Continuing on the same subject, he writes: "Calls for terror, and calls to give the economic struggle itself a political character are merely two different forms of evading the most pressing duty that now rests upon Russian revolutionaries, namely, to organise an all-sided political agitation... This proves precisely that both the terrorists and the Economists underestimate the revolutionary activity of the masses..." (p.75) (All emphasis in the original)

In discussing the Narodovolists and their adherence to "conspirative" organization (Lenin's quotes), he writes:

"Their mistake was that they relied on a theory which in substance was not a revolutionary theory at all, and they either did not know how, or circumstances did not permit them, to link up their movement inseparably with the class struggle that went on within developing capitalist society."

On the other hand, he writes, many "misunderstand the polemics that Social-Democrats have always waged against the 'conspiratorial' view on the political struggle. We have always protested, and will, of course continue to protest against restricting the political struggle to conspiracies. But this does not mean that we deny the necessity of a strong revolutionary organization...so strong as to be able to resort to 'rebellion' and to 'every other form of attack' in order to deliver a smashing blow against absolutism." (p. 126)

Thus we see that conspiracy and terror are attacked by Marxism-Leninism because they limit the revolutionary struggle which must be conducted on both a legal and illegal basis, and not limited to either, because they are based on spontaneity (lack of confidence in the masses), and on lack of a really revolutionary (Socialist) ideology. The CPUSA can be attacked on the very same basis, for it "bows" to the other--the Economist--"pole of spontaneity"--tailing of the masses and of "objective conditions". Whenever Lenin discussed conspiracy and terrorism, he always indicated that he was not against them "on principle". To damn "force and violence or terrorism"(CPUSA Constitution) as such is typical bourgeois "classless" phrasemongering, which forever poses such questions as "democracy (bourgeois) vs dictatorship (proletarian)".

What, essentially, is the dictatorship of the proletariat? What is meant by force and violence in the Marxist sense? Stalin writes in Foundations of Leninism :

"Briefly: the dictatorship of the proletariat is the rule - unrestricted by law and based on force - of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, a rule enjoying the sympathy and support of the labouring and exploited masses." (P. 53)

"The dictatorship of the proletariat cannot arise as the result of the peaceful development of bourgeois society and of bourgeois democracy; it can arise only as the result of the smashing of the bourgeois state machine, the bourgeois army, the bourgeois bureaucratic machine, the bourgeois police." (P. 54)

Thus the repudiation of anarchism, conspiracy and terror is not a repudiation of force and violence. By simply tacking these words on to "force and violence", the CPUSA cannot make a peaceful parliamentary "social change" out of revolution.

Milton Howard writes: "The hoax in the case of the Truman Gov't against the 12 leaders of the C.P. is this: it implies that since the Communist Party is a Marxist-Leninist party for Socialism that therefore it must be a party which advocates private conspiracies of 'bands of workers' (as one stoolpigeon witness put it last week) to 'seize control' of the Government."

The way to expose such a hoax is not by perpetrating the further hoax on the American working class that it is possible to attain Socialism by any but forceful means. Browder, "brilliantly," put Socialism so far off, he didn't have to deal with such problems. The present National Board distorts it so that any worker reading these books can only believe that the CPUSA is hiding something. Along this line, an expected slander has reached us concerning our last issue. We are accused of giving ammunition to the prosecution via our quotes from Marx, Lenin, Stalin and Manuilsky. This would imply that we are dragging a skeleton out of the CPUSA's closet -- in this case, the skeleton being Marxism-Leninism. We admit that we are

trying to liberate this skeleton and put some flesh and blood on it. We admit that there has been an underground connection between this CPUSA skeleton and the anti-opportunist movement. However, the works of Marxism-Leninism are still available to all who wish to read them, even our class enemies. It hardly befits the CPUSA to whimper that the revolutionary doctrines of Marx and Lenin are being used as weapons against them. If the C.P. fought on the basis of these ideas, instead of "closeting" them, it would defend the constitutional and the revolutionary rights of the American working class far more than it does by insisting that it believes in strictly "constitutional" revolutions. Rather than fighting for its legality, as it maintains it is doing, the CPUSA is in actuality illegalizing Marxism-Leninism by refutation, distortion and among its own members by simple boycott.

It is for these reasons that we quote so extensively, to break this boycott, to fight for the right to advocate "orthodox" Socialism instead of Browder's new version, or the constitutional version which Dennis would like the most vicious and powerful imperialist class in the world to find wholesome, harmless and reasonable.

If it knows it has nothing to fear, especially in terms of revolution from the CPUSA, why does the American bourgeoisie put Marxism Leninism on trial. It does this because it fears the exposure of the American people to the great and ever-growing power of world Communism. It hopes to illegalize Socialism because of its enormous potential among the American people. If the CPUSA openly embraced the revolutionary ideas of Marxism Leninism, and explained to the working class why the whole world is turning to them, the potential of the American Communist movement would finally begin to materialize.

* * *

FRANKLIN'S SOCIALISM THROUGH CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Turning Point has had various disagreements of a non-basic character with Comrade Francis Franklin. However, in the current issue of Towards Socialism, Franklin has introduced a basic revision of Marxism-Leninism.

In the article, "Some Legal Advice and Thoughts on Legal Rights", Marxist revolutionary theory is treated with caution and super-legality and reduced to a theoretical vulgarization which is as revisionist as Dennis' current burlesque at Foley Square.

In our last issue, "Communists on Trial Before the World", we observed Dennis' "peaceful establishment of Socialism" and exposed it as revisionism by extended quoting from Marxist classics. That quoted material equally exposes Franklin. Towards Socialism declares:

"According to the Federal Constitution, the American people have the Constitutional right to change totally the entire present Governmental machinery, to substitute for it a Soviet type of Government, if they desire, whenever the majority should desire to exercise their Constitutional right to amend the Constitution... It is entirely legal to propose that the American people substitute for the present Government, through which Wall St. monopolists rule the country (i.e. a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie), a really democratic republic through which working people will rule (i.e. a dictatorship of the proletariat). The Federal Constitution makes this entirely legal--even though the present trial proves that capitalists do not intend to abide by their own law. Such a government, whose advocacy and formation are not contrary to law, is what Communists advocate. It is not a crime." (All emphasis in the original.)

Yes, it is entirely legal for Dennis or Franklin to argue such Kautskyite peaceful social evolutions. But it is not Marxist. It is a traditional perversion of Marxism which offers the revolutionary movement the crutches of "legal" protection and helps it limp away from the embarrassing original theories of Marxism. Franklin admits that the bourgeoisie does not allow such orderly social changes and reacts with ungentlemanly violence. But with this very admission, his constitutional soul outraged by the bourgeoisie's lack of attention to the rules of class struggle in polite society, Franklin submits: What Communists advocate is "not contrary to law... It is not a crime." Of course it's a crime, and Franklin will never convince the bourgeoisie that it is not a crime to overthrow the capitalist system by revolutionary violence. Franklin's advocacy of a-so to speak-socialist amended capitalism is a crime -- a crime against Marxism-Leninism and against the proletariat. (Early in his article, Franklin warned of FBI agents, "Do not try to educate them." We might add: Franklin, don't try to educate the bourgeoisie to your uncriminal and legal destruction of their system.)

Angela Calomiris, FBI stool who rose to leadership in the West side Section of the CPUSA, testified in court that Franklin taught the Marxist revolutionary doctrine at Jefferson School. With his theory of Socialism as amended capitalism, Franklin has clearly repudiated her charge -- and Marx's doctrine. To further clear and clarify himself, Franklin has taken precautions in another way:

"Comrades should also not allow the version of Marxism presented by government stoolpigeons and also by pseudo-'leftists' to hide the well known Leninist principle that other than the pathway of democracy there is no pathway to socialism. (Read Lenin's Two Tactics and 'Left Wing' Communism: An Infantile Disorder, and Dimitroff's Report to the 7th World Congress.)"

A very shrewd collection of evasions. We are not concerned here with the drive of FBI stools. But certain prosecution tactics must be faced squarely. For instance, in order to embarrass the "12" (and, inadvertently, Franklin), Prosecutor McGohey stated correctly the following basic Marxist concept undoubtedly prepared by his research staff: "Socialism cannot be established by peaceful evolution, but on the contrary can be established only by violent revolution, by smashing the machinery of the government, and by setting up in its stead a dictatorship of the proletariat."

"This smashing of the machinery of government and the setting up of the dictatorship of the proletariat can be accomplished only by the violent and forceful seizure of power by the proletariat under the leadership of the Communist Party."

Is this accurate or not? That is the question. We say it is, and that its accuracy should be shoved back down the throats of the McGohey's. Franklin has evaded this "version of Marxism" presented by the government. This "version of Marxism" does not "hide" any "well known Leninist principle": on the contrary, it is rarely stated so accurately in these days of CPUSA-bred philistinism to which Franklin succumbs. Marxism stated correctly by McGohey is still correct; Kautskyism paraphrased by Franklin is still Kautskyism.

Who are the unnamed "pseudo-'leftists'" who have hidden Franklin's "well known Leninist principles"? Undoubtedly, our insistence (T.P.'s April issue on the "12") on the Marxist-Leninist idea of the proletarian revolution as against evolutionary social change has provoked Franklin. He would have his readers believe that Turning Point and any others who quote Marx and Lenin in context to expose the opportunism of the CPUSA leaders aid the government stool pigeons. This is "guilt by association" with a revisionist vengeance.

Franklin, in the above quote, misrepresents Lenin's utilization of reforms and bourgeois democratic struggles in the march towards a socialist revolution. Franklin utilizes his fragmentary paraphrase of Lenin in the retreat towards evolutionary Socialism. To top it off, he refers the reader to what obviously are not the main sources for clarification against revisionism on the question of the proletarian revolution. We have repeatedly used the lessons of Two Tactics and Left Wing Communism and Dimitroff's Report to expose the revisionism of the CPUSA leadership; but the only use Franklin finds for these books, in his retreat from revolutionary violence, is to detour the reader from the "pseudo-leftist" sources of TP--Proletarian Revolution and Renegade Kautsky, State and Revolution, Maailsky's Report to the 7th World Congress, Foundations of Leninism, etc.

Franklin certainly wasn't making himself very clear when, having lumped together government stool-pigeons and us "pseudo-'leftists'", he then dismissed this unique combination with the charge of hiding "the well known Leninist principle that other than the pathway of democracy there is no pathway to Socialism." Is this the clearest Leninism Franklin could draw from "Two Tactics", "Left-Wing Communism", and Dimitroff's Report?

"Two Tactics" states: "We must not forget that there is not, nor can there be, at the present time, any other means of bringing Socialism nearer, than complete political liberty, than a democratic republic." Did this give Franklin inspiration for his Socialism via Constitutional amendment? "Two Tactics" can hardly be accused of underwriting legalistic illusions when it says:

"It is of greater advantage to the bourgeoisie if the necessary changes in the direction of bourgeois democracy take place more slowly, more gradually, more cautiously, less resolutely, by means of reforms and not by means of revolution... On the other hand, it is more advantageous for the working class if the necessary changes in the direction of bourgeois democracy take place by way of revolution and not by way of reform; for the way of reform is the way of delay, of procrastination, of the painfully slow decomposition of the putrid parts of the national organism." The context of Franklin's paraphrase is a negation of this. The "Short History of the CPSU(B)" states: "Lenin considered that the most effective means of overthrowing tsarism and achieving a democratic republic was a victorious armed uprising of the people. Referring to the slogans presented by Lenin in Two Tactics, the "Short History" says:

"First, the tactics of realizing in a revolutionary way the 8-hour day in the towns, and the democratic changes in the countryside, that is, a way which disregards the authorities, disregards the law, which ignores both the authorities and the law, breaks the existing laws and establishes a new order by unauthorized action, as an accomplished fact." (p.71)

What would Franklin say to this "pseudo-'leftist'" behavior? One can do better than erect Constitutional amendments on the lessons of Two Tactics. The Short History states: "While advocating the victory of the bourgeois revolution and the achievement of a democratic republic, Lenin had not the least intention of coming to a halt in the democratic stage and confining the scope of the revolutionary movement to the accomplishment of bourgeois-democratic tasks. On the contrary, Lenin maintained that following upon the accomplishment of the democratic tasks, the proletariat and the other exploited masses would have to begin a struggle, this time for the Socialist revolution." (p.73-74)

Certainly this means a little more than Franklin's fragment thrown into the midst of the CPUSA's Foley Square Memorial Service for Kautsky. To the question,

does Marxism-Leninism advocate revolutionary violence, Franklin answers: "Other than the pathway of democracy there is no pathway to Socialism." To the question, can Socialism come about as a result of the development of bourgeois democracy as Franklin implies, Stalin answers no. (See p. 9 of this issue.) Franklin's contribution is both evasive and confusing.

The secret to Franklin's confusion is given by Lenin in his article "Marxism and Revisionism".

"Whoever does not understand the inevitable inner dialectics of parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy--which tends to an even more acute decision of a dispute by mass violence than formerly--will never be able through parliamentarism to conduct propaganda and agitation that are consistent in principle and really prepare the working-class masses to take a victorious part in such disputes."

The argument might be given that Franklin offered nothing more than an article on legal aspects. The only legal advice Franklin offered was silence. For the rest, he suggested meeting the "situation according to circumstances"! Actually, Franklin was not offering legal advice; he was using his legal theme only as a vehicle in distilling the Marxist-Leninist theory of revolution into a Constitutional amendment.

A high point of class debauchery is the Franklinite justification for refusing to squeal on one's comrades. Notice that this advice though sedate in its legal form, is quite ridiculous in its class content:

"In reference to any request to inform on the membership of other people in the CP, it is important to observe that the C.P. is a legal political party and that Americans by law, have secrecy of the ballot."

According to Franklin's own justification, a Communist who belonged to an illegal Party would have to inform on his comrades (and he would be within his "legal" rights in so doing!) And while we fear that Franklin is now attaining the stature of a reviser of Marxism, we certainly don't think that he would counsel any type of squealing. Why, then, the spineless constitutional acrobatics? No, Franklin, a Communist refuses to squeal simply because he is a loyal member of one class in an irreconcilable struggle with another class, because he hates the bourgeoisie consciously and instinctively. If one has an angelic, Christian-mystical attitude towards his class enemies and needs constitutional reasons for not squealing, he should consciously try to indoctrinate himself with a little revolutionary hatred.

To the request, "Will you rat?" the answer is very simple--NO! Perhaps even this NO is excessive verbiage and is better replaced by jet-propelled saliva. The saliva in this case may not be constitutional but it has "class content".

Obsession with legality influences even those who choose the rough field of anti-opportunism, to switch to the well kept lawns of Socialism-via-Constitutional-amendment (part of the estate of amended Marxism). "Constitutional" Communists might do well to adopt a little more audacity in the class struggle and a little more caution in the drive to revise Marxism-Leninism.

The most important Leninist "legal advice" to Communists is not to succumb to legalisms. Communists should use the legal to further their revolutionary aims--not to emasculate them.

STRIKE TWO! AT CCNY -- A LETTER FROM A STUDENT

(This letter was written by the same correspondent who wrote "Still Stuck with Knickerbocker and Davis... a letter from a CCNY student" in the Jan. issue of TP. Knickerbocker and Davis have practised anti-Negro, anti-Semitic discrimination at CCNY, but have been continually whitewashed by the Board of Higher Education and the college administration. Last Oct., the students of CCNY struck to oust the two teachers but failed, due to the lack of militant leadership by Communists.)

Dear Comrades:

The resignation of Judge Delaney, chairman of the college Alumni committee to investigate Knickerbocker & Davis, reopened their cases. Delaney charged Pres. Wright with sabotage and interference in the investigation.

Beating progressives to the punch, the reactionary college newspaper "Campus" immediately called for a strike (a fake one) and soon Student Council wheels (the same who had broken our last strike) were echoing them. They did this in order to secure Student Council control of the strike if it occurred. Republicans, Trotskyites, and SDAs (the student section of A.D.A.) supported the strike call, preferring to initiate a strike they opposed, rather than see it under YPA leadership.

This action caught the left unprepared and SC was effective in tying it up in knots. Its unpreparedness was due to a wishy-washy attitude on the part of the CP towards any new strike since the end of the last one. Some party members said that a strike was only one facet of the struggle to oust Knickerbocker and Davis. We should try all facets. A real determined effort to work towards a strike as soon as possible was looked upon as "left" and YPA'ers were warned not to "isolate" themselves from the students. Therefore when Judge Delaney resigned, progressives were afraid to call for a strike and "isolate" themselves). They decided under the guidance of the "always be respectable" CP, to work through Student Council, a young facsimile of the U.S. Congress. A "B-R-O-A-D" coalition (more respectability) was formed. It was very broad and very empty, but its "UNITY" was tenderly safeguarded by CP'ers who vetoed a militant YPA leaflet exposing the phony strike call of Student Council Hacks.

The Student Council meeting came and the "B-R-O-A-D" coalition went. SC decided to submit a referendum to students on April 8 asking: 1) Do you want a strike? 2) Do you want a 1-day strike? 3) If no action is taken, as a result of a 1-day strike, do you want a sustained strike to start 3 weeks later?

A one-day strike would have been completely ineffective. Even Judge Delaney said so. The third question was simply a delaying tactic and this strike would never have come off.

After this, the problem of what to do seemed almost insoluble. Even if we exposed the referendum, students having no other alternative, would vote for it. But if we let the phony referendum go through--it would have meant the death of the strike. At first, some party members took a kind of "do-nothing" attitude, and opposed the idea of calling for an immediate strike. However, a few days later, the CP correctly lead a call for a sustained strike starting Monday, April 11th. How correct this action was, is proven by the frightened reaction of Student Council. The S.C. President called us a "fifth column". We fought it out on the tops of the lunchroom tables. Their fear of our offensive and our student support caused them to

keep changing the referendum and finally forced them to include our alternative--a strike starting the next Monday, April 11th and sustained until Knickerbocker and Davis were suspended pending open trials. We won! Of 4,400 who voted, 2,800 voted for a strike, and 1,600 of these for a sustained strike.

Student Council set up a Strike Committee to decide strike regulations. At first, this committee was going to prohibit picketing of the college, but progressives on the committee prevented this. They did prohibit the participation of student organizations as organizations. (Our YPA was the backbone of the strike and the reactionaries wished to hide this as much as possible.) During the strike, they rejected the offer of the Jewish Trade Union Council to put a line around the school that would shut it.

The strike started Monday, April 11th, and thousands of students witnessed the Gestapo brutality of the police, who gave the strike a militant send-off by attempting to remove the picket lines from entrances, swinging their clubs and fists at students and then arresting 18. However, the students were not intimidated, but fought back and joined the picket lines in droves after this "incident". Students who had formerly been neutral and indifferent sprang into action. Those who would have once looked with distaste upon such a "violent" method as a strike were marching on the picket lines.

Pres. Wright realized what a mistake this was and after this the cops were comparatively peaceful. About 65/75% stayed out Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday. Thursday, Friday, and Monday were Easter holidays. On Tuesday many students returned to classes. The next day the strike was called off.

* * *

We lost the strike. Two weeks ago any progressive heard saying this was attacked. Perhaps now, many have changed their minds. The night before the strike was called off, progressives and Communists decided the "strike was ended", because the majority of students had returned to school. Therefore, they said, calling the strike off was a mere formality.

The next day at a flagpole rally, called by the Strike Committee to discuss "future action", they advocated an end to the strike and said:

"We have won many victories. We have brought our case to the attention of the country and world; we have displayed our unity. Our strike was one of the largest and most militant in the history of student strikes. The students have learned many lessons--about Pres. Wright and the college administration, about the police, about the press, who lied so blatantly. And our fight is not ended. We will carry it to the community, etc.

All this is true. The strike was very important; its lessons invaluable (if they would only be learned by its leaders) but the strike was not won - by any means. (Communists should tabulate victories on the basis of objective reality, and not for reasons of morale. Only in this way can we learn from our mistakes.)

Never were the students told that they had lost the demands of the strike, but rather were given the impression that we would win these demands soon, that the hearings scheduled to investigate Knickerbocker and Davis, were a partial victory and not "bones" as we had previously called them.

This time, progressives, under CP guidance, not the SC politicians--ended the strike. (The SC President wanted to continue it.)

Since (as even campus reactionaries have openly stated) only the left could rally the students, we were the only ones who could have kept the strike going, and kept students out of classes. This would have meant an all-out effort, which we had made before the strike to get it going--and won!

But it was said that this would not work, that students were returning to classes because of their cuts. (After a certain number of cuts, 6/8, a student may be dropped from a course if the teacher wishes.)

However, this situation was to be expected. SC opposed deepening the understanding of the issue and kept the strike "non-partisan" (you couldn't talk about anything but Knickerbocker and Davis) and peaceful. But our demand was strike until suspension pending open trials, and all "leaders" including SC promised, time and time again, to stick to this demand.

But what did we do to prevent students returning because of cuts? We never even demanded that cuts not be counted. There was no attempt made to protect students. At least, we should have only returned on the condition that cuts not be counted. Instead, students were simply told by the Strike Committee to get up before the class and defend themselves if they had any trouble with their teachers.

So not only didn't we win our demands but we went back more vulnerable as far as cuts were concerned. The result has been that students have been dropped from classes and one of the arrested students has been forced to take a "leave of absence" from the school.

On Tuesday night, during the discussion of whether or not to end the strike, some people said, "If the situation is better tomorrow we will not propose calling off the strike." But the decision the same night to advocate an end to the strike resulted in having about 10 pickets the next morning--because it was always YPA who had organized and manned the picket lines. Students entering school immediately took for granted the strike was over. So what could be expected of them at the rally that afternoon--that they should miraculously (after all the "good advice" their radical leaders had given them) demand the strike's continuance? It was YPA --organizing a strong picket line that made the strike successful the first day, and it was YPA who ended it--by, in effect, dissolving the picket line.

Instead of being the first to surrender, it should have been YPA's job to explain to students why they had to stay on strike, why Wright had expected a collapse from a Student Council he knew was made of putty, why the hearings were phony. We had to explain why the strike was not easily won--^{because} the headway fascism has made in this country, because Pres. Wright had so much to lose (his neck) by yielding and thus admitting that he had protected fascist teachers. For these reasons, it was absolutely necessary to get the whole city on our picket line and on Wright's neck--the trade unions, civil rights organizations, and the other colleges. Their financial support was not enough. All their money could not force Wright to give in. Wright's backers have more. Wright figured that he could hold out longer than CCNY students.

Even if we had not persuaded the students to stay out on strike, at least we should not have been top partners with SC in misleading them, in fostering the

illusion that victory was near, and that community petitions could force Knickerbocker and Davis' ouster. Certainly, it is true that students learned a great deal from the strike, especially about the college administration. It was up to us to utilize these lessons immediately after the strike when these lessons were still fresh in their minds. However, when students were dropped from classes and one student expelled (later given a leave of absence until next term) nothing was done. The college newspapers simply reported the incidents and not until SC elections; almost a month later, was it mentioned in a leaflet of the progressive slate.

The only really militant action was the distribution of an unauthorized leaflet (all student leaflets must be censored by SC and the administration) by YPA soon after the end of the strike. (Unauthorized leaflets had been distributed by all organizations during the strike.) This action was welcomed by a great many students. Courageously sticking to this would have won us real support. Not only did we have a good chance of smashing the censorship but this was our best opportunity to renew the attack on the administration with the goal of finally ousting Knickerbocker and Davis--and Pres. Wright for good measure.

What happened? YPA was suspended (this was expected) for two weeks and warned that any further violation of rules would mean permanent suspension.

And then the progressives ran, led by the best runner of them all, the CP. The Party spokesman (via National YPA) said that YPA was wrong to have done this--we "isolated" ourselves. YPA's course of action: We should be "good boys" for a while because we must not endanger the legal existence of our organization on the campus. Up to this time, not one peep of protest has come from anyone, including YPA, against its suspension! During SC elections, all slates came out for non-censorship of leaflets (due to YPA's original initiative in this issue.) But the progressive slate never once mentioned or defended YPA!

Now that YPA has agreed to obey the rules and permit censorship (and, incidentally, put the censorship fight on the old legal, respectable, hopeless basis) suspension can be invoked for almost anything. By this time, the progressives are isolated and out on a limb. We have thrown away all the opportunities we had during and after the strike and wasted the militancy of the students.

Where are the constant mass student demonstrations that were to be held to "continue the fight against Knickerbocker & Davis"? Where are the community protests? The campus has been dead since the end of the strike, and even more quiet than the dead have been progressives and communists. Their failure to protest against YPA's suspension has left the student body without leadership.

What has been the "vanguard" role of the CPUSA at CCNY? After the failure of the first strike, CP influence was against preparing a new strike; when the strike came, the CP failed to conduct the proper education to safeguard the strike; when the going got tough, the CP hollered quits; and after the strike was dropped, the CP hollered victory; and after retaliation set in, counseled no defense and no counter-attack.

The CCNY students have struck twice at campus fascism, and not quite connected. Let's hope that the students have studied their lessons well and that STRIKE THREE! will mean Knickerbocker and Davis are out!

Comradely,

A CCNY Student

"THE TRUTH ABOUT THE DAILY WORKER DIPLOMATS"
The D.W. Boycotts "New Times"

Editor, The Worker:

May 10, 1949

In your May 8, 1949 edition of the Worker Magazine on Page 10, you carry a Telepress article entitled "Inside Story of a Spy Network", a full page review of a book recently published in Moscow: "The Truth About American Diplomats" by Annabelle Bucar. On reading this review of a shocking expose of American diplomats in the Soviet Union by a former American embassy employee, one could not but wish that it were available in English for your readers.

It would seem that this was a vain wish. At least so it would seem from The Worker. But as a matter of fact, not only is this invaluable book available in English, it is possible to buy it at many newsstands and through other agencies right here in New York City, at the amazingly low price of 15¢ as the Supplement to the No. 11, March 9, 1949 issue of New Times. (This Soviet publication is available from the Four Continent Book Corp., 55 West 56th Street., Universal Distributors, 38 Union Square, Stechert Hafner Inc., 31 East 10th Street, N.Y.C. It is also available in small quantity at the Workers Bookshop and the Jefferson Bookshop, but this fact is never publicized in the columns of The Worker or the Daily Worker.)

On May 8, 1949 this issue of New Times was already available in N.Y.C. In fact the P.R. Club, Communist Party (Expelled) and the Maritime Committee for A Communist Party had already mailed it to various subscribers throughout the country.

Don't you think you are carrying your boycott of New Times just a little too far when you deny such valuable information as the above to the readers of the Worker in order to keep them innocent of the existence of the most important foreign affairs publication in the world? If you are really interested in counteracting the anti-Soviet poison gas that is suffocating the American people, certainly the intimate facts which Annabelle Bucar relates in her book would help. Or do you think that New Times is published in English for the use of the expelled groups only?

We are writing this in the hope that this letter will put you on the spot and force you to inform your readers that "The Truth About American Diplomats" is available in English in New Times.

Comradely yours,

Martha Samuels

for Turning Point

A LETTER FROM PAUL PALAZZI
CPUSA Waterfront Leader

We print below an interesting letter from the former NMU Port Agent of New York who was ousted from office in the last election and recently expelled from the NMU along with other Party members in the opening shot of the mad purge of Communists launched by the Curran Rank and File Caucus. By now, the redbaiting and purging have gone so far that even leading union officials have rebelled for self-protection, and Curran has suffered his first big setback. We will deal with this development in detail in another issue.

January 7th, 1949

Editorial Board: Turning Point

I've noticed in the last master-piece of analysis you sent to my mailbox you printed some letters allegedly written by readers. I doubt if this one will be published in your faultless TP.

You discussed the CIO convention and turned out some very brave criticism of those CIO delegates who constituted the minority--the fighting minority of progressives who fight on the battlefield and not behind desks like you do. You even took mighty and courageous pokes at Murray--from behind your desk--that no doubt will send Murray cringing with fear of you into ignoble oblivion. I am sure that you sincerely believe that your mighty fighting analysis will reverberate throughout the world and bring you the undying appreciation of the workers for such sincere and truly courageous analysis. I do not doubt your sincerity in believing this of yourselves, I just doubt that the workers will accord you the appreciation you believe your analysis warrants.

All through your analysis, this and past ones, you have been sacrificially brave in your criticisms of the right and left. You have been especially vituperative with the left---just an idle talent you have, no doubt, and with only the very purest of motives for the welfare of the working class, no doubt, too. Your wristslapping of such former working class heroes of yours, the Currans, Stones, Lawrensen, Duffy, Keith, and a host of others who unmentioned in names and deeds--especially deeds---constitute your fighting FORE AND AFT committee in maritime.

You'll say, "why hooting-tooting, man, you don't read our stuff very carefully. We always knock the crap out of Stone and Curran in our analysis of them." So let's talk about Keith, your former blue-eye boy in maritime. If you think we've forgotten how you waxed saliva-hot over this punk as a 'real Marxist on the waterfront' then you ought to wake up to the real facts of life. And the Drummonds, Robinsons, Rays, and a few more this type that formed the left-flank for Curran in his job of destroying the NMU. This group that teamed up with Trotskyites, the ACTU, the FBI and others. And so well did they perform their jobs, that the members of the NMU shall never forget them for this fine job they've done. What about them? Well, I don't blame you in trying to keep buried your fine words for these working class immortals.

You blasted those in the NMU who fought reaction on the battlefield and not in the safe confines of ideological struggles carried in the homes and gin-mills where your kind meet and build a mass basis among yourselves.

But your MARITIME COMMITTEE FOR THE COMMUNIST PARTY and FORE 'N AFT, what a fighting bunch they are. Just give me a few minutes to recover from the ecstasy of admiration I feel for them every time I see these titles, and I'll give you their fighting record in maritime.

On the MARSHALL PLAN: These worthies of yours, every time Curran gets up before the members, or writes in the Pilot, about what a swell thing this imperialist blue-print is for the workers, what do they do? Do they get up and take a position before the members, either at meetings, or in the Pilot, or through leaflets. Like hell they do. They're too busy handcuffing from the left those real people who fight Curran. Of course, once your worthies are safely out of reach from Curran, they get very indignant over drinks, and lard themselves with praise for their 'ideological correctness'. But who in hell ever heard of them in the union? This bunch of yours who work among the masses, as you say others are not, where the hell are they, looking for the masses?

Your gallants did sally forth into struggle once, properly plumed in the deepest of red feathers, so that they might not be mistaken for the "wrong kind of Communists. Those who fight, but who don't use the right tactics." So what did they do. They voiced their opposition to the T-H compliance referendum being conducted in their union. But not at meetings, or on ships, just one peep for the record to be used by reference for the next decade to show their "principled opposition" to Curran, their boss. But when it comes to helping Curran and his corrupt machine of stool-pigeons, provocateurs, lumpen-pros, renegades, etc. and etc. frame progressives and rank and filers who dared get up and criticize these degenerates, then your worthies were at their fighting best.

I'll let you in on a secret. Something that you might use for the hell of it among your battle-fatigued corps for stimulation. Your worthies on the Maritime Committee for a Communist Party are so distinguished for their fighting front, for their mass work, that I'll bet you a good powder-puff that as many as ten members know them. Make it nine, because I know some of them, and I don't count. Better make it eight, because Curran knows them, too. At that you better make it five, because Duffy and two others that don't qualify as being part of the masses know them too. So you can continue to make your contributions to the working class by your can (sic) of work that brings such heartening response from the masses.

On the other hand you might join some fine chess club and exercise that super brain of yours that way, and maybe you'll get a following that way. After all good chess players are nothing to sneeze at these days, with the cost of struggle being so high.

Paul Palazzi

P.S. Curran decided to expel me from the NMU because I didn't follow your "correct" line. Stack, McKenzie, Smith, and 382 others, too.

TURNING POINT'S ANSWER TO PAUL PALAZZI

Immediately, you raise an extremely interesting point. You doubt whether we will publish your letter. Actually, you knew it would appear, and you wanted it to appear despite possible repercussions against you in the Party. You are a careful reader of TP; you know that we publish the most savage attacks on us in the course of open discussion. You knew that we would certainly print your letter. Also, you were familiar with a decision of the National Board (following the 1948 elections and the subsequent appearance of new mimeographed material criticizing the Party's performance) that there must be no discussion promoted with expelled groups on any account. In writing to us, you consciously broke this Party decision. The fact that you attack us does not alter the "crime" of your consciously disregarding a National Board decision in promoting a discussion with us.

This is by far the most important--if subtle--point in your letter. If your conscience is rubbing you for all the expulsions you have countenanced, more power to you. We hope you find a way to assert yourself and help rebuild what you have helped ruin--the NMU and the CPUSA. But subtleties won't do it. What is needed is a forthright re-evaluation of the part you have played in the destruction of these two organizations. We know enough about you to know that you wrote a great many deliberate lies in your letter. What then are your mixed motives in writing? May we offer you two conflicting rumors about Palazzi? We are told that we should "watch out" for Palazzi because the Party has assigned him to infiltrate into the expelled movement and get the lowdown. We are also told that Palazzi has recently been critical of Party policy in the NMU. (The delay in publishing your letter and our answer is explained in part--i.e. aside from the problem of TP's space limits--by our desire to wait and see if what was brewing in Palazzi would boil.)

We know one important fact definitely. You are also responsible, having been NMU Port agent of New York and one of the main leaders of the Waterfront CP, for the Party's suicidal conduct in the NMU.

Now for the main lies. (It is unnecessary to go through them all.) Somehow you have misplaced us behind a desk. Strangely enough we do not control one desk among us. More clearly, we do not have any officials or big shots or key men or what have you. You say we are vituperative about the left. But we thought that we were vituperative about the right--the CP leadership. As for the heroes you ascribed to us--you know better! You name specifically; Curran, Stone, Lawrenson, Duffy, Keith, Drummond, Robinson, and Ray. But we say that there isn't anything better than a rat in that listing. They are all ex-Party Waterfront bigshots--your ex-company, the type of crew that still leads the CP. We didn't have anything to do with making Browderites of them, then kicking them out and lying about them--in some cases so wildly that the victims went nuts with anger. That's a ribbon for the chests of Palazzi, Stack, Meyers, McKenzie, Lannon, Watt, etc. etc. Don't embroider us with your handiwork. The CP School of Careerism taught countless seamen how to keep bad company--and "get ahead".

You become careless when you don't blame us for keeping buried our fine words about these heroes. Put up--with quotes--or shut up. We have only attacked these people. In the P.R. Club's "S.O.S. to All Communists" in 1946, we insisted that the first wave of expulsions were criminal. We stated: "Whatever these views are, we feel that basically the expulsions are due to clashes between democracy and bureaucracy, collective policy and Browderism, honest attempts at Marxism and degenerate Revisionism." Since then, most of the expelled leaders have degenerated. We

distribute the "S.O.S." with a sticker which says: "This 'S.O.S.'" was issued in October 1946 during the first big wave of expulsions. With the exception of Vern Smith, we have no connection with any of the names mentioned early in the appeal. Since that time, they have all, with the exception of Smith, brought discredit to the name Communist." And all this you know, so exactly what was the function of the deliberate lie of your letter? We will defer our speculations. You quote us on Charles Keith: "a real Marxist on the waterfront". Comrade Paul Palazzi, you are fabricating! You cannot offer the source of your quote. If we were of a CPUSA-legal mind, we would take you to court. Since we are not, we will only offer to print your proof in our next issue.

Next lie. No, we do not frequent the gin-mills--i.e. we have not had the pleasure of meeting you. Those gin-mills happen to be where you asked certain seamen if they belonged to FORE 'N AFT, but in every case you were wrong. The "interviewed" seamen get a kick out of relaying your travels to us in search of FORE 'N AFT'ers. The interesting part of this is that you inquire only of those individuals, unnamed in your letter, whom you respect--at least to a degree. Your whole tale of FORE 'N AFT is weakened by a glaring contradiction. Explain the obvious contradiction we offer. First, when you want to attack us politically, you tell us how powerful we are in numbers and positions, and you mention all the key names in Curran's Waterfront leadership. But then, when you want merely to hurt us "to the quick", you spit on us with your testimony that we are really infinitesimal--unseen and unheard. Well, which is it? Are we the leaders of the NMU or are we only known by ten? Two lies utilized separately often constitute a smooth hoax; when carelessly thrown together, they expose each other. You say FORE 'N AFT takes no open position. Obviously the big names you mention do take open positions--very bad ones--so you lie somewhere. If Jack Lawrenson is one of us (as you imply in your Taft-Hartley episode) then certainly he is known by more than ten.

No, the truth is that we are small, weak, and have little to our credit in the way of action. But why? Because the ex-Party people on the waterfront are so demoralized that they cannot stick to principle and continue Communist work. That is the job the Palazzis did on them.

The important thing about your letter Palazzi, is that it illustrates a slight crack in the Party leadership's cock-surety that it can go on blithely destroying everything within reach without harming itself. When the destruction reached "even unto Palazzi", he wrote TP, he interviewed the more honest guys on the waterfront, and he began to bang his head against the walls of his apartment. One thing is clear despite the snide remarks and the sarcasm. You think what TP has written is pretty accurate. But you don't think much of our accomplishments. We agree. We think our line is correct, but we don't think much of our accomplishments. At least we are frank about our limitations, our inability to convince comrades like Palazzi to come clean, and our inability to head off some comrades from the influence of the Keiths and the Dumes. You have angered the expelled comrades so terrifically that many of them today are not worth a damn and will never be resurrected. The good ones--those that stick by principle--will end up with groups like TP. Where will Palazzi end up?

SUBSCRIPTIONS: A yearly sub to Turning Point is \$1.50. TP will send you, @ \$1.00 per month, New Times, Soviet International affairs weekly; For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy, bi-monthly organ of the Communist Information Bureau in Bucharest; and TP.

May 4th New Times Supplement--55 pages of Materials on Paris-Prague Peace Congress.
May 8th New Times Supplement--Annabelle Bucar's "The Truth About American Diplomats."

ENCELS OF FORCE AND VIOLENCE

(Letter to Bebel, London, Nov. 18, 1884)

The whole of the Liberal philistines have gained such a respect for us that they are screaming with one accord: Yes, if the Social-Democrats will put themselves on a legal basis and abjure revolution then we are in favour of the immediate repeal of the Socialist Law.* There is no doubt, therefore, that this suggestion will at once be made to you in the Reichstag. The answer you give to it is important--not so much for Germany, where our gallant lads have given it in the elections, as for abroad. A tame answer would at once destroy the colossal impression produced by the elections.

In my opinion the case is like this:

Throughout the whole of Europe the existing political situation is the product of revolutions. The legal basis, historic right, legitimacy, have been everywhere riddled through and through a thousand times or entirely overthrown. But it is in the nature of all parties or classes which have come to power through revolution, to demand that the new basis of right created by the revolution should also be unconditionally recognised and regarded as holy. The right to revolution did exist--otherwise the present rulers would not be rightful--but from now onwards it is to exist no more.

In Germany the existing situation rests on the revolution which began in 1848 and ended in 1866. 1866 was a complete revolution. Just as Prussia only became anything by treachery and war against the German Empire, in alliance with foreign powers (1740, 1756, 1785),--so it only achieved the German-Prussian Empire by the forcible overthrow of the German Confederation and by civil war. Its assertion that the others broke the Confederation makes no difference. The others say the opposite. There has never been a revolution yet which lacked a legal pretext--as in France in 1830 when both the king and the bourgeoisie asserted they were in the right. Enough, Prussia provoked the civil war and with it the revolution. After its victory it overthrew three thrones "by God's grace" and annexed their territories, together with those of the former free city of Frankfort. If that was not revolutionary I do not know the meaning of the word. And as this was not enough it confiscated the private property of the princes who had been driven out. That this was unlawful, revolutionary therefore, it admitted by getting the action endorsed later by an assembly--the Reichstag--which had as little right to dispose of these funds as the government.

The German-Prussian Empire, as the completion of the North German Confederation which 1866 forcibly created, is a thoroughly revolutionary creation. I make no complaint about that. What I reproach the people who made it with is that they were only poor-spirited revolutionaries who did not go much further and at once annex the whole of Germany to Prussia. But those who operate with blood and iron, swallow up whole states, overthrow thrones and confiscate private property, should not condemn other people as revolutionaries. If the Party only retains the right to be no more and no less revolutionary than the Imperial Government has been, it has got all it needs.

Recently, it was officially stated that the Imperial Constitution was not a contract between the princes and the people but only one between the princes and free cities, which could at any time replace the constitution by another. The government organs which laid this down demanded, therefore, that the governments should have the right to overthrow the Imperial Constitution. No Exceptional Law was enacted

*Anti-Socialist Law was introduced by Bismarck in 1878 to suppress the Social-Democratic movement. Repealed in 1890./

against them, they were not persecuted. Very well, in the most extreme case we do not demand more for ourselves than is here demanded for the governments.

The Duke of Cumberland is the legitimate and unquestioned heir to the throne of Brunswick. The right claimed by Cumberland in Brunswick is no other than that by which the King of Prussia is seated in Berlin. Whatever else may be required of Cumberland can only be claimed after he has taken possession of his lawful and legitimate throne.

But the revolutionary German Imperial Government prevents him from doing so by force. A fresh revolutionary action.

What is the position of the parties?

In November 1848 the Conservative Party broke through the new legal basis created in March 1848 without a tremor. In any case it only recognises the constitutional position as a provisional one and would hail any feudal-absolutist coup d'etat with delight.

The Liberal Parties of all shades co-operated in the revolution of 1848-1866, nor would they deny themselves the right today to counter any forcible overthrow of the constitution by force.

The Centre recognises the church as the highest power, above the state, a power which might in a given case, therefore, make revolution a duty.

And these are the parties which demand from us that we, we alone of them all, should declare that in no circumstances will we resort to force and that we will submit to every oppression, to every act of violence, not only as soon as it is merely formally legal--legal according to the judgment of our adversaries--but also when it is directly illegal.

Indeed no party has renounced the right to armed resistance, in certain circumstances, without lying. None has ever been able to relinquish this ultimate right.

But once it comes to the question of discussing the circumstances for which a party reserves to itself this right, then the game is won. Then one can talk nineteen to the dozen. And especially a party which has been declared to have no rights, a party therefore, which has had revolution directly indicated to it from above. Such a declaration of outlawry can be daily repeated in the fashion it has once occurred. To require an unconditional declaration of this kind from such a party is sheer absurdity.

For the rest, the gentlemen can keep calm. With military conditions as they are at present we shall not start our attack so long as there is still an armed force against us. We can wait until the armed force itself ceases to be a force against us. Any earlier revolution, even if victorious, would not bring us to power, but the most radical of the bourgeoisie, and of the petty bourgeoisie.

Meanwhile the elections have shown that we have nothing to expect from yielding, i.e., from concessions to our adversaries. We have only won respect and become a power by defiant resistance. Only power is respected, and only so long as we are a power shall we be respected by the philistine. Anyone who makes him concessions can no longer be a power and is despised by him. The iron hand can make itself felt in a velvet glove but it must make itself felt. The German proletariat has become a mighty party; may its representatives be worthy of it.

Letter 192, "The Correspondence of Marx and Engels", Marxist Library Vol. XXIX, International Publishers, Printed in Great Britain.