

### FRANCIS FRANKLIN TURNS RAT

Francis Franklin has denounced all Communists--both CP members and expelled--who have fought the opportunism of the CPUSA leadership.

Francis Franklin is suddenly "most decisively opposed to any unification" of expelled comrades. To Francis Franklin, expelled comrades are now: "professional enemy agents"; "cold and calculating anti-Party conspirators"; "every variety of anti-Party adventurer"; "very decidedly worse than the present leadership of the C.P.U.S.A."; "thoroughly opportunist themselves, in many cases absolutely unprincipled, and even in some cases completely anti-working class"; "carcerists of one variety or another"

With sudden Budenzical revelation, F.F. discovers that expelled comrades: "bring grist to the mill of enemies of the Party who wish to create a rival organization competing with the Party in order to confuse and split the class conscious workers"; "obstruct the healthy developments" in the CPUSA; "strengthen the grip of opportunism"

and bureaucracy"; "serve objectively as a diversion, as an obstacle retarding the process of normal internal Party development"; etc. etc.

On top of all this, expelled comrades (who are guilty of "infantile and anti-working class phrasemongering") "are really quite unimportant"!

Into what we might term an omnibus cubby-hole of his past, F.F. shoves the following (via implication or designation): Trotskyites, MCP, N.Y. Notes, Harrison George, the "West Coast Committee to Restore the Revolutionary Principles and Build the CPUSA", Max Bedacht, Manhattan Communist Bulletin, The Key, Turning Point, and endless other "certain" comrades and groups in L.A., Frisco, etc. etc. With one eye peering into this motley cubby-hole and the other scanning Jefferson School for vacancy possibilities, F.F. intones: "We cannot emphasize too strongly that the basic character of all these little groups is either opportunist or reactionary".

The eye scanning Jefferson School turns in a hopeful report, and F.F. unsleeves his trump card: "Any Party member who participates in any way with the activity of any such organization or who meets with any so called 'Communist' organization outside of the Party should be expelled from the Party (our emphasis) unless he publicly repudiates his errors and discontinues such practices."

How do those CP members who have contacted F.F. since his "Open Letter" feel? Is there any doubt that F.F. has turned rat!

F.F. has given the wink to the CPUSA leadership that he is now ready for a deal. He has lists, he has correspondence with expelled and CP members, and he attempts systematically to indicate that he has an overall knowledge of the active personnel of the expelled movement. F.F. has evaluated his virtues, and he now poses the question to the CPUSA leadership: WHAT AM I OFFERED? He has put in his bid to become the National Committee's "finger man", or possibly its McGohey prosecuting the expelled movement and those CP members who may have written F.F. encouragement after his "Open Letter". A deal will be made. It is only necessary, first, for a few technical preparations to be made revolving about the contacting of our profound, professorial prostitute by one of the very political pimps attacked in his "Open Letter".

In its May issue (Vol.II, No. 4), Turning Point rang a warning bell on F.F.'s switch to "Socialism Through Constitutional Amendment". Before we consider F.F.'s next movements, we should note his 3 justifications for turning informer: (1) His "work" has been accomplished"; (2) "The best way, therefore, for us to demonstrate our firm opposition" to the idea "that some new organization operating outside of the Party or seeking to form a factional grouping inside the Party can solve the problems of the Party" "is to dissolve, to cease publication, and to renounce completely any endeavor to intervene, even by advice, in the internal affairs of the Communist Party"; and (3) this action will "help the Party".

F.F. insists that he can do this now because the CPUSA leadership has changed for the better, and the American working class is now under correct leadership: (1) "complete capitulations...have not recently been occurring and are now generally recognized as errors"; (2) "The mobilization of the masses for active struggle" in defense of democracy "has been decidedly improving"; and (3) "resistance to the right-wing agents of the employers...is definitely increasing".

F.F. fails to remind us that while the CP leadership does on rare occasion refer to certain capitulations as errors, blame for these is laid on unnamed "left-wing progressives" (usually termed "they"). The National Committee has not owned up to

such capitulations as the CIO redbaiting resolution, the anti-Soviet veto resolution, Marshall Plan support (at the Boston CIO Convention and in supporting for Congress the Cellars, Douglasses, Hollifields) etc. It is not that F.F. does not recognize the National Committee's hypocrisy; it is simply that F.F., himself, has been inducted into the regal order of hypocrites.

Since when have the capitulations ceased? It is true that conditions in the U.S. are forcing the American working class, rank and file CPUSA members, and even CP trade union leaders to fight for dear life, but the CP leadership

gets no credit for this. Even at this late date, CP union leaders have to break Party discipline and buck the instructions of the N. C. in order not to betray the workers.

Have capitulations on the T.H. affidavits ceased? Haven't the UOMWA and the UE followed the affidavit procession? The N.C. advised such leaders as Henderson, Perlow and Travis to resign from the Party in order to sign the T.H. affidavits. Its supreme hypocrisy in this case was its refusal, despite the pleas of derelict trade union leaders who look to the N.C. for leadership, to offer specific advice regarding the T.H. affidavits.

What greater capitulation can there be than the Dennis-Foster butchery of Marxism-Leninism at the Foley Square trial? But F.F. agrees with this so it is not butchery. If the theory of peaceful institution of Socialism does not register with F.F. as capitulation to the bourgeoisie, then, we are sure, very little will. But in this case, F.F. should not imply that the CPUSA leadership has changed. He should state that he was wrong about them until now.

Does F.F. think that a correct fight is being conducted for the freeing of the CPUSA leaders and their lawyers, for the legality of the CPUSA, and for democracy. Is he satisfied with wires and postcards at a time when Washington is implanting a deadly fear into the American people and strong examples are needed to develop the potential militancy of the American working class. Doesn't F.F. know that if the rank and file CPUSA comrades were not held back by their leaders that they could work up a real militant and telling fight for the smashing of the Foley Square outrage?

The main point is this. Exactly because the American workers are being forced into militancy by their everyday problems, exactly because the indictments are revolting to the American people as a whole, it is important for us to continue our fight for a real party. What a time to give up--with reasons!

Before, says FF, the CP leadership supported Marshall Plan candidates. But doesn't it do that today? Where does Caddy stand? The real reason that the ALP is endorsing fewer capitalist candidates this year isn't because CP leaders are more principled or less willing to sell out. It is simply because the red-baiting hysteria has reached such a pitch that most Democrat and Republican candidates now refuse ALP endorsements.

"At that time", FF finds that there was bureaucracy and opportunism; no channels for democratic discussion. "At that time", FF finds that "Discussion and criticism, however, were driven out of the Party. Hence certain aspects of normal Party life have been necessarily conducted, although to a very limited extent, outside of the Party." Can FF tell us seriously, even from the respectable side of the fence, that discussion and criticism have been welcomed back into the CP, and if not, what has happened to those "aspects of Party life...conducted outside". No, FF has not admitted the real reasons for his switch.

FF recounts his former criticisms of the Party leadership and then states: "In this situation, it was and is our considered judgment that it was absolutely necessary that comrades voice their criticisms even at the risk of expulsion." Absolutely necessary! And yet it is obvious that the situation in the CPUSA is the same today. So why isn't it still absolutely necessary for Franklin to voice his criticisms instead of avoiding intervention in the affairs of the CP, instead of advocating the expulsion of those CP comrades who are still fighting within the C.P.

Now, let us see what F.F. is worth. Let us assess his Communist Morality (see FF. on Communist morality). Why did F.F. suddenly decide to throw in his career with the anti-opportunist movement, and why did he, as suddenly, decide to sell out? After all, F.F. is a very timid man. Hence, why the ring of resolve in his overture and the squeal of Reisel in his finale?

It is very simple. F.F. watched the anti-opportunist movement for some time quietly, attempting to gauge its strength. While he watched, he prepared his long "Open Letter". Noticing the rising ferment around him, noticing that other leaders were throwing in their lot with the expelled comrades--and having finished his "Open Letter"--F.F. contacted the P.R. Club, CPUSA (Expelled) in haste. He announced his intention to take part in the fight for a real Party and asked that his "Open Letter" be spread. He read the letter to a member of the P.R. Club, and despite some disagreement, we decided to help turn it out and circulate it. It turned out later that F.F. had omitted certain bad sections in that reading. In this first step, F.F. considered that he was moving with the tide. We will skip the involved finagling of F.F. in the expelled movement. (See some discussion of this in Turning Point, Vol. No. 2, "The Crisis in Harrison George & Co.")

We have already witnessed several leaders who burst on the scene with a document, waited for the acclamation of disciples, and when these didn't materialize automatically in the quantity and with the dispatch desired, reconsidered their original resolutions. To these characters, the life-breathing axiom is "Leaders must have Followers--if I don't find them in heaven, I'll find them in hell." So F.F., as he fanned his original heat with a copy of the "Open Letter", waited impatiently to be acclaimed. He waited for the objective forces of U.S. history (in the "disciple" season of 1948-49) to respond to the subjective impulse of F.F. And when the building of a real CP went along its slow, tiresome way, F.F. began to reconsider his tactics in pursuit of prestige, followers, respectability within the Communist movement, and a job at Jefferson School.

Again he prepared--this time his exit. He found his reason in the trial at Foley Square. F.F. began to mutter "unityunityunityunity". After a period of "unityunity" muttering, F.F. rared back and formulated: anyone who dares criticize the leadership of the CPUSA destroys unity and is an enemy agent. (The reader will remember that this all-purpose formula was leveled at F.F. himself at the time of his expulsion.)

It occurred to F.F. without too much heavy thought that his activities within the expelled movement could be transformed from liabilities into assets. Wouldn't he be acceptable to the CP leadership if he proved to be unstingy with any information he had on the expelled movement? He was sure everything would be worked out somehow. And if necessary, until the political pimp made contact with him and arranged the wages of virtue, he could relax while he prepared a new course of study for his return to Jefferson School.

So F.F. again prepared a document, this time rather brief (because a word to Max Weiss is sufficient--in the switching of philosophical horses), and in the issue #13



(Oct. 10, 1949) of his Bulletin, "Towards Socialism" announced "we are discontinuing publication and our club is dissolving."

Why did F.F. turn rat at this point. He turned rat on the occasion of the Foley Square Trial when it became a little dangerous to continue to be a revolutionary Communist. Faced with a hysterical America seemingly in the hands of McGohey, Medina & Co., F.F. decided that it would indeed be an excellent idea to renounce revolution and force and violence. But how does one do this without exposing one's cowardice?

F.F. reasoned thus: (1) in the light of the Smith Act and its current application, I renounce the revolutionary theories of Marxism-Leninism; (2) I must also make my personal fortress more secure against any FBI encroachments; (3) I can do this either by reentering the CPUSA for added protection of numbers or by completely disaffiliating myself from all formal organizational Communist groups, Parties, or societies while establishing some understanding of aid or at least neutrality with the CPUSA leadership; (4) either of these two alternatives necessitates a denunciation of the expelled movement.

Notice that F.F., who renounces the expelled movement and hollers three cheers for the CPUSA leadership, does nevertheless, not openly state his desire to rejoin the CPUSA. He only makes it quite clear that a wonderful deal of sorts could be consummated. What is the opportunist logic in this position.

F.F. warmly adopts the label "non-Party Communist" (meaning, he takes great pains to make clear, completely unaffiliated Communist). He advises all non-Party Communists to turn to new work, "to the general mass movement and not to further efforts to intervene in inner-Party development", to "develop mass struggles" as individuals, to "the general advance of the working class", etc. etc. F.F. pants that we should as liberal individuals, believing generally in Socialism, turn to the immediate problems of the workers and work in unions and mass organizations as non-Communists. In the light of the Smith Act, this is certainly a safer perch than the one expelled or Party comrades have been sitting on. (Doesn't F.F. know that the CP leadership does everything possible to prevent any work by expelled comrades in the mass organizations? Doesn't he know that during this election campaign, the CP leadership has been expelling comrades from the CP and forcing them out of the ALP for objections to bureaucracy and opportunism?)

Having rid himself of subversive affiliation with revolutionary expelled groups, he now has the choice of remaining completely unaffiliated or returning on an unprincipled basis to the CPUSA. F.F. has decided that, depending on which position (in or out of the CPUSA) is more secure in these trying times, and depending on how much prestige the CPUSA might offer in a little collective bargaining, he can determine his route without (supposedly) exposing his cowardice on one simple basis. If at any point, F.F. wishes to return to the CPUSA on an unprincipled basis, he can frame his appeal so that he will readily be accepted as a "finger man". If at any point, F.F. feels that he prefers to be rejected, he can frame his appeal on an unacceptable basis, but then, nevertheless, establish at least pleasant relations with the Party by means of a little information on the expelled movement.

In other words, F.F. has arrived at the highway of his new route. To the north, he can travel clear of the FBI; to the south, he can retrace his steps to the CPUSA--if enough is offered him or if hysteria lets up a little. Either direction is controlled precisely by his approach to the CPUSA leadership. Whether F.F. ends up in the CPUSA or merely in quiet contact with its leadership, he has volunteered as "informer".

Let us pose our attitude against F.F.'s. The PR Club comrades are quite willing to rejoin the CPUSA. We never left it; we were thrown out for defending Marxism-Leninism. Any time the leadership (hypothetically) agrees to reverse our expulsion, we will be glad to return--but without forsaking one iota of our principles and without ceasing the fight for a real CPUSA committed to the principles of Marxism-Leninism. Of course we realize that we will not be accepted back on such terms so we do not confuse people by purely hypothetical mutterings about eagerness to rejoin the CPUSA. On the other hand, we pose the problem for F.F.: considering what you have to say, you should have openly appealed for reinstatement. Also, considering that you say the leadership has changed, you should be reinstated without changing any of your principles, and the CP leadership should acknowledge its errors in expelling you. But, alas, you have already traded your principles for those of the Dennis-Foster clique.

There is another less focal but interesting aspect to F.F.'s defection, as we indicated generally in our "Open Letter to Stalin." (August TP) F.F. could denounce Jack Bering's approval of the heroes leading the CPUSA in private conversation, but he could not work up the steam to admit it openly. Therefore he could not reconcile what he was doing with confusing articles in the CIB organ on the CPUSA. He could not set aside the one important weakness of the CIB organ on the CPUSA and recognize the overall importance of the paper in our work. F.F. had to play it safe, so he simply adopted the attitude of Bering.

F.F. is through with his discussion: "It should be recalled of course that it is never the practice of Communist Parties to continue discussions indefinitely." Well, F.F. probably was indulging in a discussion. We were and are fighting opportunism for a real CP--and there are no limits to that.

It should be recalled too that F.F. published only a "Pre-Convention Bulletin", even though it is now one year past the convention. F.F. could justify his remarks only as pre-convention discussion (and therefore legal). Now that F.F. has closed his own discussion and ordered all other comrades to follow suit on pain of being considered enemy agents, we must raise an important point with F.F. Since this is the end, why didn't FF merely print his farewell speech and quit; why did he have to conclude all his serial articles after his self-set time was up. Why, if FF is through with advice and independent thinking, did he pompously have to "intervene" in Party thought with the last installments of his articles on Communist Morality, the Trade Unions, and 3 others. Isn't he firing past his own cease fire deadline? We are also amused or confused by the fact that FF still gives the PO Box for CP members to contact him?

It seems that TP was correct in severely attacking FF for the recent signs of his impending sellout in the article, "Some Legal Advice and Thoughts on Legal Rights". Contrasted with a poor but better article in #4 of Towards Socialism, it was obvious that FF had found it profitable to switch. It didn't take long for the proof to materialize.

A comrade has remarked that the Franklin "back to work for Foster movement" is depressing. But is this really so? We feel it is a healthy sign. Let all the rats show their tails now, the sooner the better. When a real CP does emerge in the U.S., there will be very few "sleepers" trying to usurp leadership without the danger of exposure. Many American Communists who are currently arguing bitterly (but with a lot of sincerity) will end up in the same CP and with mutual trust and respect. But in the hard work of preparing for this CP, we will witness the exposing and the self-exposure of the phonies. We have watched some ex-Party people turn rat, some simply succumb from combat fatigue. But the real CP will be built visibly on the consistent work of honest comrades who have no alternative but to get a real CP via a bulldog grip on "the recognition of necessity".

"Requiescat in Pace." From the Browderite bowels of revisionism did he come; to the more open brothels of political prostitution goes he now.