

FOREIN AFT

Maritime Committee for a Communist Party

March 1948

No. 3

In July 1945 Wm. Z Foster asserted in his report to the Special Convention of the CPUSA that: "He (Browder) has also profoundly lowered our party's prestige among other Communist Parties."

What is the opinion of the foreign Parties today?

What do they think of the American Party leadership today?

Why is it that in the publications of the Communist Parties throughout the world in which the correct activity of other Parties is discussed, the American Party (which exists in the leading imperialist country - the instigator of the infamous Marshall Plan) is rarely, if ever mentioned or its activities ever discussed?

* * *

Foster further stated:

"It was a great weakness that our leadership was not capable of theoretically unmasking Browder's opportunism and thus saving the Party from the ensuing ravages in its work, its prestige, and its membership."

Has the leadership overcome this weakness?

Is it doing so now? How?

* * *

He further stated:

"Political mistakes are serious matters and cannot be lightly passed over...Leaders who make such mistakes must, therefore, be held strictly responsible...The Party must provide the best guarantees it can in its leadership that such a disastrous mistake shall not take place again."

How did the leadership provide these guarantees?

How did it hold the notorious revisionists accountable?

By reshuffling the failures?

By shifting several thoroughly bankrupt ones to new areas?

By kicking some upstairs?

By removing a few minor officials as scapegoats to appease the aroused membership?

By adding a few innocuous individuals to the National Committee and creating a facade to deceive the membership?

* * *

And still further:

"Centralism we had, super centralism in fact, but very little democracy...His (Browder's) policies and writings finally were accepted almost uncritically by the leaders and the general membership."

How are the policies and the writings of the leadership accepted today?

Are there any criticisms in the Party press of the writings and speeches of the national leaders or have there been since the last Convention?

What happens to comrades who in their branches criticize statements or actions of the national leaders? How long do they remain in the Party?

Do we have super-centralism, bureaucracy or democracy in the Party today?

Aren't the critics and opponents of red-baiting resolutions, of anti-Soviet resolutions or pro-Marshall Plan resolutions as well as critics of the uncritical and unqualified Party support for Wallace

denounced today as "Trotskyite," "left sectarian," "opportunist," "semi-Trotskyite," "obstructionist," "doctrinaire," "fink," "stool pigeon," "foreign agent," "F.B.I. agent," ad infinitum?

Is it not true that whenever a criticism is raised or a question asked more than once by the same comrade at a branch meeting that the leadership reaction is usually: "That character should be watched." This comrade is then invited to a private session with the leadership at which time any refusal to accept "clarification" is followed by an "investigation," threat of expulsion, followed by expulsion to the accompaniment of a campaign of character assassination.

Further: "How far was Browder prepared to go to prevent political discussion was shown by the way he suppressed my letter of January, 1944, to the National Committee. The only way I could have gotten this letter to the membership was by facing expulsion and sure split in the Party. Even then my letter would not have really come before the Party for the issue would have been the 'unity of the Party', and anyone who attempted to discuss my letter would have been denounced as a Trotskyite by Browder."

How many letters have been suppressed by the National Leadership since July 1945?

How many critics of the "former" revisionists and opportunists have been expelled or forced out of the Party?

Isn't "unity of the Party" used by the Party leadership today to shield themselves from exposure of their practices and mistakes, and to further protect the incompetents, bureaucrats and "pie card" careerists in their factional and bureaucratic apparatus?

How many expulsions for right opportunism have taken place in the Party under the present leadership since the Convention of 1945? One hears of numerous expulsions for so-called "leftism" but there is a conspicuous absence of expulsions for right opportunism. Why?

Foster's explanation for keeping his letter secret from the membership was that in doing so he maintained the unity of the Party and further, prevented his expulsion. Was Foster's decision determined by Marxist principle or by political cowardice and opportunism? Many comrades today are privately disagreeing with practices and policies of the present leadership but, following this "example," withhold their criticisms at Party branch meetings so that this same "unity" may be preserved and their expulsions may be avoided. Whom are they helping? Are they helping the Party and assisting the class struggle, or are they permitting the bureaucrats and opportunists to further entrench themselves in the factional leadership of the Party?

* * *

Discussion before and during the 1945 Convention and the writings of the Party leadership since then carefully avoid the history of opportunism in the American Party. In particular are Stalin's "Three Speeches on the American Party" (delivered before the Executive Committee of the Communist International 1929) never referred to. Does the leadership believe that the Party membership has nothing to learn from a study of Stalin's analysis of opportunism in the American Party in 1929? Or is the leadership attempting to conceal from the Party Membership Stalin's exposure of the "unprincipled factionalism" practiced by the leaders of both the majority and minority groups (led respectively by Lovestone and Foster) and their "rotten diplomacy" and "diplomatic intrigue"? Why has the leadership suppressed even the mention of Stalin's speeches? Is it because Foster and others of the present leadership have such a rich and varied background of opportunism, factionalism and bureaucracy that Stalin's speeches might give us an insight into their political behavior?

In response to numerous requests concerning the excerpts from the Soviet review of James S. Allen's recent book distributed by FORE'N AFT, the editors of FORE'N AFT wish to state the source and date as being the Number 20 issue of THE BOLSHEVIK (Official Theoretical Organ of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union) published 30th October 1948.