

*This book is dedicated to all of those sincere adherents of Marxism-Leninism whose generous assistance made its publication possible.*

AUTHOR

*"Rupture with opportunism is the first condition of true Communism."*

LENIN

# **Communism** *versus* **Opportunism**

*An Examination of the Revision  
of Marxism in the Communist  
Movement of Canada*

*By*  
**Fergus McKean**

Published by  
THE ORGANIZING COMMITTEE,  
COMMUNIST PARTY OF CANADA

*Printed in Vancouver, B.C. Canada, 1946*  
*Reprinted in the United States, 2012*  
[www.RedStarPublishers.org](http://www.RedStarPublishers.org)





**Fergus McKean**

The author, Fergus McKean, joined the Communist Party of Canada in 1932. He became B.C. Provisional Organizer of the party in 1936 and Provincial Secretary in 1938. In June, 1940, he was interned under the Defense of Canada Regulations. Following his release after two years and four months, in October, 1942, he was appointed B.C. Secretary of the Communist-Labor Total War Committee. Upon its formation in August, 1943, he was elected B.C. Provincial Leader of the Labor-Progressive Party. He resigned from the party at the National Committee Meeting on August 12, 1945, refusing to support policies which he considered to be against the best interests of the Canadian working class.

## **CONTENTS**

AUTHOR'S INTRODUCTION	5
I. THE REVISION OF MARXISM IN THE U.S.A.	12
II. THE TACTICS OF BLOCS WITH THE LIBERAL BOURGEOISIE	37
III. THE INTRODUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF REVISIONISM IN THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CANADA	91
IV. HOW THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IN CANADA REVISED IN THEORY OR PERVERTED IN PRACTICE EVERY FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE AND DOCTRINE OF MARXISM	127
V. THE ORGANIZATIONAL POLICIES WHICH FOSTERED REVISIONISM AND ITS EFFECTS	195
VI. WHAT IS TO BE DONE AND WHY	234



## INTRODUCTION

Marxism, "the science of the working class movement," is a subject of importance to all working people. It is of importance because, if the policies advocated and practiced by those entrusted with the leadership of the organizations of the working class are incorrect, are a revision of Marxism, it obviously follows that the economic and political interests of the working people will not be defended and further advanced. On the contrary, the pursuit of incorrect policies can only lead inevitably to the subordination of the economic and political interests of the working people to the interests of the dominant circles in our economic and political life, monopoly capital.

The modern proponents of Marxism in Canada hitherto have been the Communist Party and its successor, the Labor Progressive Party. In practically all countries of the world today the Communist Parties occupy a very influential if not dominant position in the labor movement. Hence, it follows that the policies they advocate can and do affect a large proportion of the working people in general and of the industrial working class, to a large extent organized in trade unions, in particular.

The science of Marxism, or Marxism-Leninism as it is often referred to, is based on the doctrines of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin and has been added to and enriched by testing its theories in practice, during the past century, by the working class movement of all countries. Hence, Marxism cannot be regarded as a system of abstract theories unrelated to real life but as a developed science verified and enriched by the acid test of experience.

It is utilized as a guide to action by large sections of the working class all over the world, in the capitalist countries generally and by the working class of the U.S.S.R. in particular, where it has achieved its greatest triumph in the successful realization of socialism on one-sixth of the globe.

The economic, philosophical and political theories on which Marxism is based and the tactics which have been developed and tested in practice have as their ultimate aim, the realization of the abolition of all forms of exploitation of man by man, of all forms of oppression and injustice, through the achievement of a socialist society.

Marxism holds that the leading force in transforming society from capitalism to socialism is that class which is itself a product of

capitalism, the working class or, as Marx more precisely defined it, the proletariat, i.e., wage workers who earn their livelihood through the sale of their labor power and have no other means of existence. However, although the working class, as the most politically developed, best organized and disciplined class is historically destined to transform society, as Marxism holds, it does not follow that this is to be achieved in opposition to all other classes but rather as the leader of all toilers, of all working people, and in alliance with them. By working people is meant all who work for a livelihood and do not exploit the labor of others; a category which includes a large section of the farming population and of the middle class of the cities.

Marxism, then, constitutes a “guide to action” for the working class to follow in the struggle to achieve political power and to build socialism. In order to realize that aim, however, Marxism must and does constitute a guide to action in defending and advancing the day to day interests of the working class; in realizing their immediate aims as well as their ultimate aims. And there is no conflict between their immediate and ultimate aims, as the ultimate aim of socialism can only be realized as a result of the experience, organization, unity and education gained in the struggle for immediate aims. Thus, Marxism serves both the immediate and ultimate interests of the working class. Marxism further maintains that the interests of the working class (the proletariat) and the interests of the capitalist class (the bourgeoisie) are irreconcilable and that therefore, the interests of the working class can not be served through collaboration or alliance with the capitalists but in opposition to them. From these conflicting interests of the two basic classes, bourgeoisie and proletariat, capitalists and workers, arises an antagonism, a struggle, between the two classes: the class struggle.

The class struggle is not an invention of the Marxists but something which has manifested its existence in all countries of the world without exception. What Marxism does do is recognize the class struggle as the motive force of history, as the means by which society moves forward and achieves higher forms of civilization. Consequently, the strategy and tactics of Marxism are also the strategy and tactics of the class struggle of the working class. To give direction and guidance to this struggle, which is essentially a political struggle, the working class must of necessity develop its own Marxist political party, apart from and independent of all other political parties. Hence, when revision of Marxism does occur, it usu-

ally develops within a political party of the working class which professes to be a Marxist Party.

Because of the fact that the theoretical foundation of Marxism is the doctrine of the class struggle, the revision of Marxism invariably takes the form of revising the doctrine of the class struggle; of teaching the identity of interests of antagonistic classes rather than their irreconcilability; to endeavor to reconcile the interests of the irreconcilable, of exploiter and exploited.

The revision of Marxism is not a new phenomenon in the history of the working class (or labor) movement. Prior to, or during the first world war, practically all professed Marxist parties of that time, which were called Socialist or Social Democratic Labor Parties, were guilty of revising Marxism, of “emasculating Marxism of its revolutionary content,” with the exception of the Social Democratic Labor Party of Russia, the Bolsheviks, led by the immortal Lenin. It was precisely because of the fact the Social Democratic Parties, affiliated to the Second International, had revised Marxism and had substituted the theory and practice of collaboration or co-operation between the two basic classes, workers and capitalists, for the theory and practice of the Marxian doctrine of the class struggle that the left wing groupings of these parties split away and formed Communist Parties and a third, Communist International in 1919.

The Communist Parties always condemned the Social Democratic Parties for their revision of Marxism which, they pointed out, resulted in subordinating the interests of the working class to the interests of the capitalist class. They correctly accused the Social Democrats of advocating reform of capitalism rather than the revolutionary transformation of society from capitalism to socialism. Therefore, they defined Social Democracy as “the theory and practice of class collaboration.”

The Communist International and its affiliated Parties in all countries regarded the Social Democratic Parties as the main obstacle to unity of the labor movement because, by following a policy of class collaboration, they brought a section of the working class under the ideological and political influence of the capitalists, thus splitting the unity of the working class.

The whole history of the Bolshevik Party in Russia, as expressed in the writings of Lenin, was a history of struggle against revisionist theories and tactics within the Party, which finally resulted in a complete organizational split in 1912. The revolutionary

wing, led by Lenin, from then on constituted a separate party, the Bolsheviks. The struggle against the former opportunist wing, the Mensheviks, continued right up to, and even after the seizure of power and the founding of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Because of the fact the Communists had always conducted a struggle against the opportunism of the Social Democrats, few people considered the possibility of some of the Communist Parties themselves revising Marxism and of advocating and practicing policies of opportunism, rather than Marxism, i.e., Communism. Hence, it came as something of a surprise when the French Communist leader, Jacques Duclos, denounced the basic line of the Communist movement in the United States as “a notorious revision of Marxism” and still more so when the overwhelming majority of the leading American Communists admitted that Duclos was correct and commenced to rectify their mistakes.

However, the discussion of revisionism was not confined to the United States. Many Canadian Communists who realized the similarity of the political line of the party of Canadian Communists, the Labor Progressive Party, followed the discussion of the American Communists with intense interest. Several L.P.P. members undertook a critical examination of the policies of the L.P.P. and some of them arrived at the conclusion that the revision of Marxism had been carried even further in Canada than in the United States and looked forward to an admission of the mistakes by the national leaders, as had been done in the U.S. Hence, the disappointment and disagreement when the National Executive of the L.P.P. announced in effect, that there was no revisionism in the Canadian Party.

The author was one of those who critically examined the policies of the L.P.P. and realized the seriousness of the revisionism of which the Party was guilty. However, against the opposition of the entire National Executive and of the B.C. Provincial Executive it was impossible to make any headway in securing a full discussion on revisionism and therefore of proceeding to correct the mistakes. Subsequent events have shown that the leadership placed their own position above the welfare of the Party and the working class. They refused to follow the advice of Lenin:

“The attitude of a political party towards its own mistakes is one of the most important and surest ways of judging how earnest the party is and how it in practice fulfills



its obligations towards its class and the toiling masses. Frankly admitting a mistake, ascertaining the reasons for it, analyzing the conditions which led to it, and thoroughly discussing the means of correcting it – that is the earmark of a serious party; that is the way it should perform its duties, that is the way it should educate and train the class, and then the masses.” – (*History of the CPSU*, p. 361.)

Although a considerable section of the membership entertained doubts as to the correctness of the Party’s policies they did not realize the serious consequences of a refusal to permit a full and free discussion on revisionism. They did not know that “All revolutionary parties, which have hitherto perished, did so because they grew conceited, failed to see where their strength lay, and feared to speak of their weaknesses.” – Lenin. (*Ibid.*)

The author’s attempt to point out the serious character of the revisionism of which the Party leadership was guilty was branded as “a brazen attempt at a conspiracy aimed at beheading and ultimately destroying the Marxist Party of the Canadian working class.” Subsequently, many of those who maintained that the Party’s policies were opportunist policies and against the best interests of the working class were accused of being part of the “conspiracy” and either expelled, threatened with expulsion or voluntarily dropped out of the Party.

Instead of a sincere attempt to decide whether the policies of the L.P.P. were correct or incorrect, whether the policies were Marxian policies or policies which constitute a revision of Marxism, the leadership of the L.P.P. made the “unity of the Party” the issue. Many sincere members who believed the policies were a revision of Marxism, were opportunism, were made to believe that the “unity of the Party” transcended all other questions and failed to realize that unity is only feasible providing it is based on ideological conviction and correct policies.

Therefore, the “accursed tradition of unity,” as the Bolsheviks called it, was utilized, as in the past, to justify opportunism. The false, non-Marxian theory that “mistakes would be corrected in time” providing unity was preserved, was advanced to justify the covering up of opportunist policies. The membership was not informed that:

“The theory of ‘overcoming’ opportunist elements by ideological struggle within the Party; the theory of ‘living down’ these elements within the confines of a single party are rotten and dangerous theories that threaten to reduce the party to paralysis and chronic infirmity, that threaten to abandon the Party to opportunism, that threaten to leave the proletariat without a revolutionary party, that threaten to deprive the proletariat of its main weapon in the fight against imperialism.” – Stalin (*Foundations of Leninism*, p. 121).

The membership did not realize the degree to which the Party leadership had succumbed to opportunism and therefore the absolute impossibility of overcoming opportunism “within the confines of a single Party.” Instead of encouraging a principled discussion on Marxian theory and practice in order to correct Party policies, the leadership substituted an unprincipled discussion of personalities designed to divert attention from consideration of Party policies. However, such tactics are a poor substitute for political debate and frank criticism of policies. For instance, the statement of the L.P.P. National Executive that the author “and his handful of degenerate cohorts are known to the workers of B.C. as men totally unfit to lead in the struggles of the people” or to denounce the author as “an unprincipled traitor and disruptionist” certainly does not convince anyone that the policies of the Party are correct. Slander cannot replace logic as a method of discussion in solving problems and arriving at correct conclusions; a subjective approach to questions cannot substitute for an objective examination.

To such lengths, however, did the leaders of the L.P.P. see fit to resort in order to discredit the critics of the Party’s policies and prevent the membership from hearing their viewpoint. It became very evident that there was no possibility of the L.P.P. admitting its mistakes and correcting its opportunistic policies. But the question of whether the labor movement should be guided by correct or incorrect policies is not a narrow question concerning the L.P.P. alone but a question that concerns the whole working class and all working people. Hence, the need of a written work that would adequately deal with the question of revisionism and which would make the issues involved the property of the entire labor movement.

Obviously, in order to intelligently treat a topic such as the revision of Marxism it is necessary to refer at length to the works of the authorities and creators of Marxism. Exhaustive quotations, of course, tend to make the text cumbersome and do not make popular reading. However, in order to decide what is revisionism and what is not, frequent and sometimes lengthy quotations are unavoidable.

The subject matter herein dealt with is divided into six chapters. Chapter I presents the opinions of Jacques Duclos and several of the leading American Communists on the revision of Marxism in the United States with very little comment by the author. Chapter II deals with the question of whether or not the American Communists have fully overcome their basic revisionist line and adopted policies of a correct, Marxist character.

The two chapters on the revision of Marxism in the U.S. were included in the present work because of the close similarity of the theoretical propositions, tactics and organizational methods advanced and practiced by the Communist movements in the two countries. In fact, the National leaders of the L.P.P. in Canada defended their policies as correct, in many instances, because they coincided with those of the American movement. Furthermore, a knowledge of the recognized revisionist concepts and tactics practiced in the U.S.A. makes it easier to recognize revisionism in the Canadian movement when its policies are examined.

The four chapters dealing with the revision of Marxism in the Communist movement in Canada trace its gradual development, the results, and deal with some of the factors which facilitated its introduction and spread. Chapter V also deals with some of the international aspects of the question. Chapter VI treats with some of the basic questions which must be dealt with by a bona fide Marxist Party and the need of such a party.

This book is probably the first Marxist work of a polemical character published in Canada. It is the author's sincere hope that it will contribute towards overcoming the confusion and controversy from which the Canadian labor movement now suffers as a result of the revision of Marxism.

MARCH 15, 1946

## **CHAPTER I:**

### **THE REVISION OF MARXISM IN THE U.S.A.**

The question of whether or not the tactical line and, following from it, the policies of the Communist Political Association of the U.S.A. and also of the Labor Progressive Party, constituted a revision of Marxism, first arose as a result of the publication in the New York *Worker* of May 27, 1945, of the now famous article *On the dissolution of the Communist Party of the United States* by Jacques Duclos, one of the outstanding leaders of the Communist Party of France. It was subsequently reported that Earl Browder, President of the Communist Political Association, only consented to the publication of the Duclos article, which was first published in French in the theoretical organ of the CP. of France *Cahiers du Communisme*, when it became known that it was the intention of the publishers of the *New York Times* to present it to the public through the columns of their paper.

In the foreword to the article Browder nevertheless stated, "Within the framework of the C.P.A. organization, and according to the rules, the discussion initiated by the publication of the Duclos' article will be free in the fullest sense. Members of the National Board and the National Committee will participate in the discussion as individuals and not as members of these leading bodies bound to speak for common conclusions already reached before the broadest discussion."

For the following two full months the fullest and freest discussion on revisionism got underway throughout all of the clubs and leading committees of the C.P.A. and through the columns of *The Daily Worker* and *The Worker*, official organs of the C.P.A.

#### **DUCLOS' ESTIMATE OF AMERICAN REVISIONISM**

Duclos, in his article, condemned the policies formulated by Browder and adopted by the American Communists as a "notorious revision of Marxism." Duclos was reported to have made a special trip to New York on behalf of the CP. of France to investigate the dissolution of the CP. of U.S.A. and the substitution for it of the Communist Political Association and to have secured all of the authoritative documents pertaining to the dissolution. In his opinion:

“The Teheran Conference served as Browder’s point of departure from which to develop his conceptions favorable to a change of course of the American CP. However, while justly stressing the importance of the Teheran Conference for victory in the war against Germany, Earl Browder drew from the Conference decisions erroneous conclusions in no wise flowing from a Marxist analysis of the situation; Earl Browder made himself the protagonist of a false concept of the ways of social evolution in general, and in the first place, the social evolution of the U.S.

“Earl Browder declared, in effect, that at Teheran capitalism and socialism had begun to find the means of peaceful co-existence and collaboration in the framework of one and the same world; he added that the Teheran accords regarding common policy similarly presupposed common efforts with a view to reducing to a minimum or completely suppressing methods of struggle and opposition of force to force in the solution of internal problems of each country.

“‘That (the Teheran Declaration) is the only hope of a continuance of civilization in our time. That is why I can accept and support and believe in the Declaration of Teheran and make it the starting point for all my thinking about all the problems of our country and the world.’ – (Address at Bridgeport, Conn., Dec. 12, 1943.)

Starting from the decision of the Teheran Conference, Earl Browder drew political conclusions regarding the problems of the world, and above all the internal situation in the United States. Some of these conclusions claim that the principal problems of internal political problems of the United States must in the future be solved exclusively by means of reforms for the “expectation of unlimited inner conflict threatens also the perspective of international unity held forth at Teheran.” – (*Teheran and America*, pp. 16-17.)

The Teheran agreements mean to Earl Browder that the greatest part of Europe, west of the Soviet Union, will probably be reconstituted on a bourgeois democratic basis and not on a fascist-capitalist or Soviet basis.

“But it will be a Capitalist basis which is conditioned by the principle of complete democratic self-determination for each nation, allowing full expression within each nation of all progressive and constructive forces and setting up no obstacles to the development of democracy and social progress in accordance with the varying desires of the peoples. It means a perspective for Europe minimizing, and to a great extent eliminating altogether, the threat of civil war after the international war.” – (Bridgeport speech, *Communist*, January, 1944, p. 7.)

And Earl Browder adds: “Whatever may be the situation in other lands, in the United States this means a perspective in the immediate postwar period of expanded production and employment and the strengthening of democracy within the framework of the present system – and not a perspective of the transition to socialism.” – (pp. 656-657 *Political Affairs*, July 1945.)

Duclos then quoted that portion of Browder’s speech which, at the time, aroused vehement disagreement:

“We shall have to be prepared to break with anyone that refuses to support and fight for the realization of the Teheran agreement and the Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition. We must be prepared to give the hand of co-operation and fellowship to everyone who fights for the realization of this coalition. If J. P. Morgan supports this coalition and goes down the line for it, I as a Communist am prepared to clasp his hand on that and join with him to realize it. Class divisions or political groupings have no significance now except as they reflect one side or other of this issue.” – (Bridgeport speech, January, 1944, *The Communist*, p. 8.) (Ibid., 658.)

Browder’s almost complete disavowal of the Marxian doctrine of the class struggle, of the reactionary character of imperialism, of socialism, and his drive towards the complete liquidation of the Communist Party and of the very ideology of Communism were brought to fruition in a speech delivered on Sept. 25, 1944, from which Duclos quoted the following excerpt:

“Every group, however small, just as every individual, has the supreme duty to make its complete and unconditional contribution to victory. We must give not only our lives, but we must be ready also to sacrifice our prejudices, our ideologies, and our special interests. We American Communists have applied this rule first of all to ourselves.

“We know that Hitler and the Mikado calculated to split the United Nations on the issue of Communism and anti-Communism; we know that the enemy calculated to split America on this issue in the current elections, and thus prepare our country for withdrawal from the war and a compromise peace. We therefore set ourselves, as the supreme task, to remove the Communists and Communism from this election campaign as in any way an issue, directly or indirectly.

“To this end we unhesitatingly sacrificed our electoral rights in this campaign, by refraining from putting forward our own candidates; we went to the length of dissolving the Communist Party itself for an indefinite period in the future; we declared our readiness to loyally support the existing system of private enterprise which is accepted by the overwhelming majority of Americans and to raise no proposals for any fundamental changes which could in any way endanger the National unity; we went out in the trade unions and the masses of the people straightforwardly and frankly using all our influences to firmly establish this policy of national unity; we helped with all our strength to restrain all impulses toward strike movements among the workers, and to prepare the workers for a continuation of national unity after the war...

“As spokesman for the American Communists I can say for our small group that we completely identify ourselves with our nation, its interests and the majority of its people in this support for Roosevelt and Truman for President and Vice-President.

“We know quite well that the America that Roosevelt leads is a capitalist America, and that it is the mission of Roosevelt, among other things, to keep it so. We know that only great disasters for our country could change this perspective of our country from that of capitalism to that of

socialism, in the foreseeable future. Only failure to carry the war to victory, or a botching of the peace and failure to organize it, or the plunging of our country into another economic catastrophe like that of the Hoover era, could turn the American people to socialism.

“We do not want disaster for America, even though it results in socialism. If we did, we would support Dewey and Hoover and Bricker and their company. We want victory in the war, with the Axis powers and all their friends eliminated from the world.

“We want our country’s economy fully at work, supplying a greatly multiplied market to heal the wounds of the world, a greatly expanded home market reflecting rising standards of living here, and an orderly, co-operative and democratic working out of our domestic and class relationships, within a continuing national unity that will reduce and eventually eliminate large domestic struggles.” (Ibid., pp. 667, 668.)

For the first time Duclos made known to the membership and the public that Wm. Z. Foster, national chairman of the CP. of U.S.A., had violently opposed the interpretation which Browder had placed upon the Teheran accord and the proposals which he advanced based upon his interpretation.

Browder’s “new political course” was also violently opposed by Darcy, member of the Central Committee and secretary of the Party for Eastern Pennsylvania. In the interests of maintaining Party unity during the most critical period of the war and because of the nearness of the American presidential elections, Foster agreed not to make his differences known outside the Central Committee.

Consequently his letter to members of the Central Committee of January 20, 1944, was not made the property of the membership. Darcy, however, decided to appeal against Browder’s “new course” and was expelled,

“because, as the decision says, by sending to Party members a letter containing slanderous declarations on Party leaders, he attempted to create a fraction within the Party, and because he submitted the letter in question to the bourgeois press.” – (Ibid., p. 665.)



Duclos quoted at some length from Foster's letter to the Central Committee of the CP. of U.S.A., including the following excerpts:

"In his report Comrade Browder, in attempting to apply the Teheran decisions to the United States, drew a perspective of a smoothly working national unity, including the decisive sections of American Finance capital, not only during the war but also in the postwar; a unity which (with him quoting approvingly from *Victory and After*), would lead to a 'rapid healing of the terrible wounds of war' and would extend indefinitely, in an all class peaceful collaboration, for a 'long term of years.' In this picture, American Imperialism virtually disappears, there remains hardly a trace of the class struggle, and socialism plays practically no role whatever. (Ibid., p. 661.)

"It seems to me that Comrade Browder's rather rosy outlook for capitalism is based upon two errors. The first of these is an under-estimation of the deepening crisis of world capitalism caused by the war. When questioned directly in Political Bureau discussion, Comrade Browder agreed that capitalism has been seriously weakened by the war, but his report would tend to give the opposite implication. The impression is left that capitalism has somehow been rejuvenated and is now entering into a new period of expansion and growth. (Ibid., p. 661.)

"The class nature of Imperialistic capitalism, Foster asserted is reactionary. That is why national unity with it is impossible. The attack of these circles against the democratic Roosevelt government – does this not supply a convincing proof? Can one doubt, after that, that the monopolist sections in the U.S. are enemies and not friends of the Teheran decisions as Earl Browder thinks?

"The danger in this whole point of view is that, in our eagerness to secure support of Teheran, we may walk into the trap of trying to co-operate with the enemies of Teheran, or even of falling under their influence. Trailing after the big bourgeoisie is the historic error of social democracy, and we must be vigilantly on guard against it. (Ibid., pp. 661, 662.)

“In my opinion it would be a catastrophe for the labor movement if it accepted such a plan or such an idea even if only provisionally. Starting from a notoriously erroneous conception, that U.S. monopoly capitalism can play a progressive role, Comrade Browder looks askance at all suggestions tending to subdue the monopolies, whereas the CP. can accept only one policy, that of tending to master these big capitalists now and after the war. In calling for the collaboration of classes, Browder sows wrong illusions of tailism in the minds of Trade Union members. Whereas the job of the trade unions is to elaborate their policy and dictate it to the big employers. (Ibid., p. 62.)

“So far as the bulk of Finance capital is concerned, starting out with a prewar record of appeasement, it has, all through the war, followed a course of rank profiteering and often outright sabotage of both the domestic and foreign phases of the nation’s war program, especially the former. While these elements obviously do not want the U.S. to lose the war, they are certainly very poor defenders of the policy of unconditional surrender. In the main, their idea of a satisfactory outcome of the war would be some sort of negotiated peace with German reactionary forces, and generally to achieve a situation that would put a wet blanket on all democratic governments in Europe.” (Ibid., p. 662.)

After critically reviewing the policies of Browder and the opposing arguments of Foster, Duclos arrived at the following conclusions:

“1. The course applied under Browder’s leadership ended in practice in liquidation of the independent political party of the working class in the U.S.

2. Despite declarations regarding recognition of the principles of Marxism, one is witnessing a notorious revision of Marxism on the part of Browder and his supporters, a revision which is expressed in the concept of a long-term class peace in the United States, of the possibility of the suppression of the class struggle in the postwar period and of establishment of harmony between labor and capital.

3. By transforming the Teheran declaration of the Allied governments, which is a document of a diplomatic

character, into a political platform of class peace in the United States in the postwar period, the American Communists are deforming in a radical way the meaning of the Teheran declaration and are sowing dangerous opportunist illusions which will exercise a negative influence on the American labor movement if they are not met with the necessary reply.

4. According to what is known up to now, the Communist Parties (for example that of the Union of South Africa and that of Australia) have come out openly against this position, while the Communist Parties of several South American countries (Cuba, Colombia) regarded the position of the American Communists as correct and in general followed the same path.” – (Ibid., p. 670.)

Castigating the false theories of Browder that a certain section of monopoly capital constitute “progressive capitalists” who should become allies of labor in its struggle against the “reactionary capitalists,” Duclos informed his readers:

“We too, in France, are resolute partisans of national unity and we show that in our daily activity, but our anxiety for unity does not make us lose sight for a single moment of the necessity of arraying ourselves against the men of the trusts.” – (Ibid., p. 671.)

Duclos reiterated:

“It is scarcely necessary to recall that the material bases for fascism reside in the trusts, and the great objective of this war, the annihilation of fascism, can only be obtained to the extent in which the forces of democracy and progress do not shut their eyes to the economic and political circumstances which engendered fascism.” – (Ibid., p. 672.)

Duclos concluded his historic document as follows:

“The former Vice-President of the U.S., Henry Wallace, present secretary of Commerce, said rightly that one cannot fight fascism abroad and tolerate at home the activity of powerful groups which intend to make peace ‘with a simple breathing spell between the death of an old tyranny and the birth of a new.’

“The Yalta decisions thwart these plans, but the enemies of liberty will not disarm of their free will. They will only retreat before the acting coalition of all the forces of democracy and progress.

“And it is clear that if Comrade Earl Browder had seen, as a Marxist-Leninist, this important aspect of the problems facing liberty loving peoples in this moment in their history, he would have arrived at a conclusion quite other than the dissolution of the Communist Party of the United States.” – (Ibid., p. 672.)

### **HOW LEADING AMERICAN COMMUNISTS VIEWED BROWDER’S REVISIONISM**

Following the publication of the Duclos article, the National Board of the Communist Political Association adopted a draft resolution entitled, *The Present Situation and Next Tasks*, which condemned the opportunist and revisionist errors of which the C.P.A. had been guilty. In evaluating the reasons which made possible such gross opportunism the draft resolution of the C.P.A. attributed it to the following:

“These errors were facilitated by non-labor, bourgeois influences which unconsciously affected some of our policies as we participated and functioned ever more actively in the broad camp of national unity. And these opportunist deviations were accentuated by our reluctance to constantly analyze and re-examine our policies and mass work in the spirit of Marxist self criticism, especially the failure to draw our full membership into the discussion and determination of basic policy.”

In order to avoid any repetition of the bureaucratic practices which facilitated the infiltration of opportunist policies in the communist movement the C.P.A. resolution stated categorically:

“We must establish genuine inner democracy and self criticism throughout our organization.”

It should be noted the above statement definitely infers that genuine inner democracy and self criticism had not previously existed, at least during the recent period, in the C.P.A.

Following the meeting of the National Board which adopted the resolution, with only Browder voting against, a meeting of the full National Committee of fifty-five members was held June 18-20, when the resolution was revised and adopted as a revised draft for further discussion, pending final adoption at the National Convention of the CPA. scheduled for July 26-28. At this meeting, again Browder was the only one who voted against the resolution.

In his report to the National Committee meeting, Gene Dennis (later elected to the four-man secretariat which now heads the Communist Party of the U.S.A. and which also includes Wm. Z. Foster, national chairman, John Williamson and Robert Thompson), further elaborated on the question of the lack of inner Party democracy and bureaucratic methods of work as follows:

“Lastly, though not to exhaust the subject, our errors arose because in our leading committees and methods of work we have not yet established genuine democracy and collective work. We have tended to fall into the trap of formal democracy and self-adulation. We have confused the forging of firm, unbreakable Communist unity with the creation of synthetic unity which curtailed criticism and self criticism, which separated the leadership from the membership, and failed to draw most of our trade union cadres and the entire membership into the fullest formulating and executing of policies. This has played no small role in feeding and prolonging opportunism and bureaucratic methods of leadership and work.” – (*The Worker*, July 1, 1945.)

In order to correct these evils Dennis proposed that:

“It is essential to institute everywhere, full inner Party democracy, based upon the principle of democratic centralism. For one thing it is necessary to put an end to that practice where new and major policies are suddenly and without consultation thrust upon our membership and often upon the national committee and the board, as the line and settled decisions of our Association. For another, it is necessary to convert the National Committee, as well as each State Committee, into a functioning and responsible policy making and leading body.”

In order to correct and strengthen the composition of the national and state leadership, Dennis recommended that:

“It is essential to refresh and strengthen our national and state leadership with the most tested working class cadres, with the most devoted and competent Marxists. This will require a bold policy of promotion, as well as the amalgamation of the healthiest Marxist core of the existing leadership with a new and large circle of loyal and able proletarian cadres. This will require the establishment of far closer ties between our entire leadership, the membership, and the masses. This will also require that our entire leadership and all leading committees exercise the greatest political vigilance and judge each and every leader and member not alone by his or her vote or political declaration, but by deeds, by performances.” (Ibid.)

In an article on the C.P.A. Convention, Foster exposed how dangerously close Browder came to succeeding in completely liquidating the Communist movement of the American working class. He stated:

“Following logically the heavy blow it dealt to Browder’s revisionism, the national convention decided by unanimous vote to change back from the status of the Communist Political Association to that of the Communist Party of the United States. In the earlier stages of the Party discussion there was some feeling that this change back to CP. should be delayed somewhat. But this would have been an error, as it would have created confusion in the Party. Fortunately, however, the convention seized the bull by the horns, so to speak, and made the necessary change at once.

“In both the National Convention and the various State Conventions there was much indignation among the delegates over the dissolution of the party in the South. And there was a tendency to consider this as a sort of isolated mistake. But this trend was wrong. The liquidation of the Party in the South followed naturally from Browder’s whole line. Indeed, it was only by a very narrow vote in the National Board that the Party escaped the same fate nationally as befell it in the South. In going back from C.P.A. to

CP. one of the first tasks that must be undertaken is precisely the re-establishment of the Communist Party in the Southern States.” – (*The Worker*, Aug. 5, 1945, p. 3.)

Browder clung to his revisionist line to the very end. According to Foster:

“Comrade Browder, although he pledged himself to abide by the Convention decisions, made no admission of political error and uttered no words of self criticism. Browder based his political argument upon a statement that the Communist Parties of the rest of the world are following his rejected revisionist line and that he is being victimized by us.” (Ibid.)

The leadership of the American Communists dealt with Browder as he deserved:

“The Convention, by refusing to elect Comrade Browder to the National Committee and Executive Board, took the only course open to it. Browder, who stubbornly refused to the very end to correct his grossly bourgeois revisionism, made himself incapable of exercising leading functions in the application of the Party line and left the convention no alternative but to reduce him to the ranks, which it did by unanimous vote.” (Ibid.)

The Convention removed seven of the thirteen former members of the National Board and even removed a number of them from the National Committee. The new National Committee of fifty-five is representative of nineteen states, “sixteen trade unionists, seven shop workers, nine Negroes, four veterans of this war, seven women, four Communist leaders still in the armed forces and one farmer.” (Ibid.)

The Convention also elected a National Board of eleven members including a secretariat of four members to replace the system of one-man leadership which prevailed during the Browder regime.

In estimating the basis for Browder’s revisionism, Foster stated:

“Comrade Browder’s revisionism has the same class roots and goes in the same direction as the traditional revisionism of Social Democracy. The essence of Social Democratic revisionism is the belief that capitalism is funda-

mentally progressive and that the big bourgeoisie may, therefore, be relied upon to lead the nation to peace and prosperity. The practical effects of this false conception are to throw the workers under the reactionary influence of the big capitalists and blunt their progressive and revolutionary initiative. Where these policies lead to, if persisted in, is indicated in the tragic debacle of German Social Democracy. Such revisionism is a reflection in the workers' ranks of the class interests of the big bourgeoisie." – (*The Worker*, June 10, 1945, p. 7.)

And further:

"Comrade Browder's faith in the progressivism of present day capitalism and its ruling bourgeoisie had its ultimate expression in his curt dismissal of the whole question of Socialism in our country, not only as an immediate political issue (in which he was correct), but also in the sense of mass education (in which he was wrong). He even abandoned all criticism of capitalism as a system of exploitation of the workers. All this, too, is logical in Comrade Browder's revisionist thinking. For, if it were true that the capitalist world, rejuvenated by the war and by its contact with the U.S.S.R., was going, under the leadership of a progressive bourgeoisie, into a new period of prodigious expansion that would bring 'generations of prosperity' to the peoples of the world, then, indeed, Socialism for the U.S.A. would become a matter of only very remote and abstract interest." (Ibid. p. 8.)

In his speech to the Convention which reconstituted the Communist Party of the U.S.A. Foster charged that the "chronic tailism" (accepting leadership of liberal capitalist politicians), which developed under the leadership of Browder resulted in "hiding the Party's face and avoidance of mass struggle." (*The Worker*, July 29, 1945.) Foster further claimed that the revisionist theories of Browder were devoted to fastening a "system of right wing bourgeois liberalism upon our Party; a liberalism so conservative that on many questions it put us far to the right of Roosevelt." (Ibid.)



Morris Childs, National Committee member, characterized Browder's revisionism in a similar way and even went so far as to state:

"We completely revised Marxism-Leninism. I underline completely because we departed from every basic tenet of Marxism. How?"

In his book *Teheran: Our Path in War and Peace*, Comrade Browder said:

"Teheran represents a firm and growing *common interest* between the leaders who gathered there, their *governments*, the *ruling classes* they represent, and the *peoples of the world*." (The words "common interest" were italicized in the original, other italics mine. – M.C.)

"This is a departure from the materialist, objective analysis of the relationship of all classes in our society. Teheran was an expression of a historical progressive aim agreed to by the coalition under the given circumstances; yet it did not erase class relationship on a world wide scale (the coalition is made up of governments representing two different social systems – Capitalist and Socialist), nor was the declaration of Teheran the incarnation of the identity of interests of rulers and peoples. We know now as a result of experience that the class aims of the signers of Teheran were not identical." (*Political Affairs*, July 1945, p. 600.)

And further:

"Our Party, by accepting and practicing Comrade Browder's policy, substituted the Marxian-Leninist theory with a bourgeois-liberal one, we denied the class antagonisms and preached class peace. We carried this 'peaceful' relation of classes into the postwar period. To make it plausible, we violated every material economic concept of Marxism and even worked out an economic program for the bourgeoisie. Instead of basing our policy upon the existence of exploiter and exploited, we envisaged and urged class co-operation. The capitalists were turned into big-hearted philanthropists who, while allowed a profit (we were not going to disturb their monopolist profits), would

nevertheless use their profits for ‘the good of humanity’ at home and abroad. Everything was ‘planned.’ If our common sense and Marxian ABC says that this planning is impossible under capitalism—particularly under imperialism, decaying capitalism, ‘capitalism on its deathbed’ – we regenerated capitalism to order by replacing the Leninist theory of imperialism with that of Kautsky. Yes, that is what we did when we proved that imperialism is “capable” of all things we suggested. We did not even behave like a bourgeois opposition; we accepted responsibility for the acts of the bourgeoisie and its state, and urged ‘compliance’; and we were not, for all of that, even invited into the ‘government,’ but kicked around.” (Ibid., pp. 600-601.)

### **GILBERT GREEN’S ESTIMATE OF THE LIBERAL BOURGEOISIE**

Gilbert Green, another National Committee member, also dealt at length with the extent to which bourgeois liberalism, in the sphere of foreign policy, had influenced the concepts of the American Party. Said Green:

“In Comrade Browder’s remarks rejecting the resolution of the National Board, he makes much of the point that there is a ‘coincidence of interests’ between Capitalist America and the Soviet Union. This is undeniably true. But apparently what Comrade Browder does not also see is that side by side with this coincidence of interests there also exists a basic antagonism. Both of these – the coincidence of interest and the antagonism – have been and continue to be reflected in the foreign policy of our government, and which is uppermost at any given moment is determined, not alone by the class interests of the bourgeoisie, but by the class struggle – by the struggle of the overwhelming majority of the American people against the most reactionary, most predatory and chauvinist elements of finance capital.

“Comrade Browder in his June statement says that the only alternative that the American bourgeoisie has to collaboration with the Soviet Union is either that of immediate war, or that of a period of armed peace including features of diplomatic and economic warfare. These alternatives Comrade Browder characterizes as suicidal for the bour-

geoisie, thereby leaving the course of collaboration as the only tenable one open for it.

“I’m afraid the actual picture is far more complicated than this. The fact remains that the foreign policy of London and Washington has not been and is not today a pure policy that can fit into one or the other of Comrade Browder’s neatly constructed compartments. This policy reflects both the coincidence of interests as well as antagonism, which means it includes both the elements of collaboration as well as those of the carrot and club policy. The fact that Comrade Browder, and we with him, failed to see this two-sided character of British and American policy explains the many gyrations in our own estimates—one week, Vandenberg had taken over the delegation at San Francisco; the next week, Hull had it back under control again; the third week things generally were going to the devil, and the fourth, everything was well again. Had we seen the twofold character of American foreign policy, even under Roosevelt, it would have helped us to fight more consistently against vacillations, hesitations and even double-bookkeeping. The two-fold character of our foreign policy is best illustrated in the personage of Stettinius, who flew directly from Yalta to Mexico City and there organized the conspiracy to undermine the Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta agreements on the world security organization as well as to seat fascist Argentina. Certainly there was no shift of class forces that took place between the flight from Yalta to Chapultepec; it was the same actor playing his double role – and, remember, with the agreement and under the leadership of Roosevelt. Of course, while military victory in Europe was still in question, the carrot and club aspect of American policy was not so evident as now when German imperialism has been defeated and a new fear – the fear of a truly anti-fascist and democratic Europe, of a stronger labor movement at home, and of a more powerful and influential Soviet Union – dominates the mind of the bourgeoisie.

“There will be more meetings of the big three and more agreements through compromise, but once and for all we must discard the strange concept that compromise represents the opposite of struggle, and likewise we must stop the petty-bourgeois practice of worshipping at the shrine of

compromise. In many compromises that take place, we are in the peoples' corner, fighting with them to wring the most concessions possible from imperialism. Certainly the Greek armed conflict was brought to a halt through compromise, but can we forget for a single moment that this 'compromise' was forced on the people of Greece by British bayonets?—or that the Yugoslav troops were forced to withdraw from Trieste instead of those of Britain and America?

“If we constantly see the two-fold character of American policy we will never again repeat the error of giving a blank cheque to the foreign policy of even a Roosevelt, for even the Roosevelt policy was far from being the clear-cut anti-fascist policy that must be ours. This will keep us from veering from one extreme to another in our estimates, and if things do not go so well we shall not draw the conclusion that a new war is already here, or when the things are going relatively well that a new millennium has arrived. Above all, it will help us maintain our vigilance at sharp edge, for with the European war over, the tendency is toward a general sharpening of all contradictions, the next point I want to speak about.” — (*Political Affairs*, July, 1945, pp. 593-4.)

After referring to his own writings regarding economic perspectives for the postwar, Green continued:

“But there is one cold, stark fact that I evaded in all my writings and that cannot be dodged, for it is the nub of the whole question— namely, that even if post-war production were to remain at wartime peak (something highly improbable), even if there were to be the wildest expansion of foreign trade, another cyclical economic crisis is inevitable. In fact, the tremendous expansion of productive plants in the country during the war and the creation of a number of new industries, only intensifies the problem of finding post-war markets large enough to keep our industries operating at anything like maximum capacity. Aggravating the problem even further is the fact that during the war there has taken place a tremendous increase in labor productivity which has brought about a marked increase in the rate of exploitation. Also, even if the country were to achieve foreign markets on a scale unheard of before, this could not eliminate crisis; it

could only postpone the ultimate day of reckoning, guaranteeing that when it finally came the crash would shake the entire capitalist world and American society to its depth.

“As long as we have capitalism we shall have cyclical economic crises. This was even true of American capitalism in the nineteenth century when it was young and virile and still had a whole continent to develop. It certainly is even more true of capitalism today in the period of its general crisis, there is bound to be considerable chronic unemployment even in the years of relative prosperity. This does not, of course, mean that the fight for full employment is a utopian one. This fight, the fight for the right to work, is going to be one of the most bitterly fought battles in American history. The bourgeoisie is going to fight with every weapon at its command to keep this right from being written into the laws of the land and realized.

“If American Capitalism is going to face a sharpening of the contradiction between its increased productive powers and its diminishing market possibilities, then it is quite obvious that over the years, especially after the first post-war years, we are going to witness a sharpening of all inner and outer contradictions of American capitalism; an intensification of the class conflict at home; a growing scramble between Britain and the U.S.A. for each other’s markets and sources of raw materials; a sharper struggle between the colonial peoples and the imperialist powers and an intensification of the contradictions between the two world systems.

“All these contradictions will reach their most acute forms when this country approaches its first post-war economic crisis, although even before then, more and more circles of finance capital will seek a solution to their problems by trying to crush the popular and democratic movement at home and by moving in the direction of aggression and conquest abroad.

“The masses must be prepared for such a sharpening of the struggle. This does not mean that we shall not have a period of post-war boom; but it does mean that we shall shortly witness the first offensives and onslaughts on the living standards and rights of labor and that we do not have too much time to prepare to meet these attacks.

“If this is the perspective ahead, we can all the more appreciate the danger confronting our country if Labor and the Communists are nothing more than the tail end to the kite of the bourgeoisie. Even when we support certain reform measures advanced or supported by the liberal-bourgeois forces, we are duty-bound to make perfectly clear to the workers and the people that these measures are inadequate, that they cannot fully meet the problems, and we must point to a program aimed at drastically curbing the powers and reducing the profits of the trusts while propagating Socialism as the ultimate answer to the threat of exploitation, insecurity and war.

“Any policy of trailing after the liberal bourgeoisie, of failing to bring forward an independent policy and program, can very well create the objective conditions in which demagogic fascist leaders can create a mass base for themselves, not only from the discontented middle classes but also from the ranks of the returned veterans, from the ranks of the Negro people, the youth and even sections of backward workers. Only if the masses see clearly a different alternative; only if the Marxists and left forces generally work in such a way so that they merit the due credit for the positive gains won, but do not lay themselves open to implications of responsibility for the shortcomings and failures of the government and the liberal bourgeoisie can fascist demagoguery be defeated, the ranks of the working class and progressive masses united and the path to fascism and war blocked.

“Let us recall that at the height of the New Deal reform, Roosevelt could not prevent a new economic crisis from breaking forth in 1938, and that this new crisis reflected itself in a swing away from Roosevelt in the November, 1938, elections. Thomas Dewey, reactionary demagogue that he is, yet had a kernel of truth when he charged last November that Roosevelt had failed to solve the problem of unemployment and that only the war had solved this for him.

“The next years ahead will be decisive for the whole future of our country and the world. If the masses are not organized and united around a militant program in defense of

their interests, then there is a grave danger that the country may take the path toward fascism and war, replacing Nazi Germany as the threat to the peace and freedom of the world. That is what must be avoided at all costs. This cannot be achieved by a narrow sectarian policy, but only by the broadest mass policy. This does not mean that we should refuse to work together with liberal bourgeois forces. It only means that we must constantly remember that the program of even the liberal bourgeoisie cannot offer the way out, that the bourgeoisie cannot be relied upon, that the working class must learn to think as a class, must depend in the first place upon its own strength and on its unity with its natural allies and above all, that there must be a Communist vanguard which firmly, without vacillation and without illusions, points the way to victory over reaction and fascism.” – (*Political Affairs*, July, 1945, pp. 595-6-7.)

A. B. Magil, associate editor of *New Masses*, offered a similar opinion, regarding revisionism as “a tendency to rely on the leadership of the liberal bourgeoisie.” (*Pol. Aff.*, Aug., 1945, p. 721.)

Magil also believed the revisionism of Browder was deep rooted when he wrote: “The roots of our recent revisionism need to be traced through at least the past ten years.” (*Ibid*)

Foster expressed a similar viewpoint: “This liquidatory tendency which he (Browder) had been developing for at least ten years reached its climax in the dissolution of the Communist Party altogether and its reconstitution on a lower level as the Communist Political Association.” (*The Worker*, Aug. 5, 1945.)

Foster did not conclude that all of the revisionism which had permeated the American Party had been eliminated, as, in the same article quoted above, he wrote: “The worst mistake we could make, however, would be to conclude from this that the fight against Browder’s revisionism has been fully won and that we can proceed unconcernedly with our daily tasks.”

### **SHOULD THE PROLETARIAT WORK TOGETHER WITH THE LIBERAL BOURGEOISIE?**

While many of the American Communists agreed that Browder’s revisionism goes back “at least ten years,” few of them made any attempt to uncover the “roots,” or beginnings, of the introduc-

tion of revisionism into the American Party by Browder.

One of the few American Communists who made an attempt to uncover the beginning of Browder's basic revisionist line, during the course of the two months' discussion on the draft resolution, was Jane Wilson of Los Angeles who wrote:

"The tentative conclusion to which I came is that between 1935 and 1944 the American Communists gradually gave up the strategy and tactics of the people's front.

"In November, 1935, Browder placed a Farmer-Labor Party as the American form of the People's Front. In December, 1936, he analyzed the Republican election defeat as a vote along class lines, as hastening the disintegration of the two party system and widening the split in the Democratic Party. He concluded that 'these things improve and broaden the prospect for the building of a People's Front.'

"In June, 1937, Browder stated: 'Many are puzzled by an apparent contradiction between the clearly established growth of the People's Front sentiment in the United States and the slowing up of the organizational realization of a National Farmer-Labor Party.' Referring to a Pennsylvania steel strike which was supported by the Democratic state administration, he said: 'We will be utterly unrealistic if we expect a Farmer-Labor Party of serious consequence in Pennsylvania until the CIO is convinced that such a party will immediately exert as much political power as the CIO already exerts through the Democratic Party.' Further, legal obstacles to launching new parties and the democratic possibilities of the primary system were cited as operating against the organization of the Farmer-Labor Party. Mass trade unions and progressive groups should be encouraged 'to systematic and organized activity within the Democratic Party (in some places the Republican Party)...'

"Browder's conclusions on labor's 'political power' in Pennsylvania with similar examples throughout the country, makes me seriously wonder if unconsciously he were not accepting labor's political backwardness and beginning to rationalize for the 'easier' path through Democratic Party channels.



“In Browder’s article in the 1937 *Communist*, the formulation ‘Democratic Camp’ has already replaced that of the Farmer-Labor Party. He defines this as ‘America’s equivalent of the People’s Front’ and as ‘now materialized in the organized labor movement, first of all the great movement of the Committee for Industrial Organization, and the progressive movements led by middle class figures within the old parties.’ He foresees ‘two entirely new political parties’ corresponding to Tory reaction based on finance capital and to this democratic camp. In 1938 this formulation changes to ‘democratic front.’

“By 1939 the words ‘People’s Front’ and ‘Farmer-Labor Party’ have been entirely discarded by Browder. So has the concept, it seems to me. In the May Plenum, he denies the opposition to the ‘Hoover-Dewey-Taft Republican Party’ as follows: ‘The Progressive and democratic majority is a coalition between the Democratic Party and the independent radical one-third of the electorate. President Roosevelt has embodied that coalition, and by his leadership has consolidated and strengthened it’.” – (*The Worker*, July 15, 1945.)

Jane Wilson concludes by asking:

“Even before the war and before the ‘new period’ theory, *did we give up working for the American equivalent of the American People’s Front?* – (J.W.’s italics). Did we give in and ‘tail’ the politically immature labor movement? Did we offer up as sacrifice the leadership of labor in the ‘coalition.’ Didn’t we let the potential ‘People’s Front’ drift into the Democratic Party and accept bourgeois leadership, and then in 1944 jump in after it?” – (*Ibid.*)

To date the basic and vital questions raised by Jane Wilson have remained unanswered by the leadership of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. The question of whether or not the American Communists “let the potential ‘People’s Front’ drift into the Democratic Party and accept bourgeois leadership” and whether, or not, if that were the case, the necessary measures have been adopted to correct it, is a question of the utmost importance to the labor movement. While Foster, Childs and Green, who have been quoted at

considerable length, stress the degree to which Marxism was revised and the degree to which the American Communists, under Browder's leadership, followed a policy of class collaboration, there nevertheless appears to be some contradictory propositions advanced in their statements.

Foster stated that, "The class nature of Imperialistic Capitalism is reactionary" and warned that "Trailing after the big bourgeoisie is the historic error of Social Democracy and we must be vigilantly on guard against it."

Morris Childs stated that, "Instead of basing our policy upon the existence of exploiter and exploited, we envisaged and urged 'class co-operation'." Childs then went on to say that "we accepted responsibility for the acts of the bourgeoisie and its state." However, he then advances what appears to be a complaint: "and we were not, for all of that, even invited into the government, but kicked around." Childs, first of all, recognizes the existence of "exploiter and exploited," criticizes the fact that the Party urged "class co-operation," refers to the state as the state of the bourgeoisie, of the exploiters, but then proceeds to raise the question of not being "invited into the government."

Clearly, if, as Childs claims, the state is the state of the exploiters, there is no reason why a party, if it really represented the interests of the exploited, should be invited to join the government of that state and still less reason why such a party should even consider the possibility of being invited to join it.

The mistakes which Childs refers to and the attitude of the government towards the American Communists, in spite of their attitude of "accepting responsibility," is strikingly similar to the policies practiced by the Mensheviks in 1906 in spite of the different historic period and setting. Lenin, in an article entitled, *Blocs With the Cadets*, scathingly denounced Plekhanov and the Mensheviks for advocating blocs with the party of the liberal bourgeoisie, the Constitutional Democrats (Cadets). Lenin wrote:

"What does all this mean? It means that whether we like it or not, that in spite of the wishes of the best of the Mensheviks, political life absorbs their cadet deeds and rejects their revolutionary phrases.

“The Cadet coolly accepts the help of the Mensheviks, slaps Plekhanov on the back for his advocacy of blocs and at the same time shouts contemptuously and coarsely, like a merchant who has grown fat on ill-gotten gains: Not enough, my dear Mensheviks! We must also have an ideological rapprochement! Not enough, my dear Mensheviks, you must also stop, or at any rate change your polemics!...

“Poor Mensheviks, poor Plekhanov! Their love letters to the Cadets were read with satisfaction, but so far they are not being admitted further than the antechamber.” – (Lenin’s *Selected Works*, Vol. III, pp. 411-12.)

Gil Green stated that, “with the agreement and under the leadership of Roosevelt,” Stettinius flew from Yalta to Mexico City “and there organized the conspiracy to undermine the Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta agreements.” He then added that “the bourgeoisie is going to fight with every weapon at its command to keep the right” of full employment “from being written into the laws of the country.” Green then warns of the danger “if labor and the Communists are nothing more than the tail end to the kite of the bourgeoisie,” and adds, that “any policy of trailing after the liberal bourgeoisie could create the ‘objective conditions’ in which fascism could secure a ‘mass base.’”

Green further warns against policies that would lay the Party and the left forces “open to implications of responsibility for the shortcomings and failures of the government” and the liberal bourgeoisie. But having said all that, he then states, that “This does not mean that we should refuse to work together with liberal bourgeois forces,” and adds, that “it only means... that the bourgeoisie cannot be relied upon, that the working class must learn to think as a class...”

Obviously, to work with “liberal bourgeois forces” means to work with the liberal bourgeoisie whom he admits “cannot be relied upon,” who were responsible, through their spokesman Roosevelt, for undermining the “Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta agreements.”

The question arises: Can the working class “learn to think as a class,” can they avoid “being nothing more than the tail end to the kite of the bourgeoisie” if they are going to “work together with liberal bourgeois forces” whom Green admits “cannot be relied upon?” Would not such a policy lead to the very situation which

Green himself warns against, of “laying themselves open to implications of responsibility for the shortcomings and failures of the government and the liberal bourgeoisie?”

In order to answer this question, which is one of vital importance to the labor movement, and also the question raised by Jane Wilson of whether or not the American Communists “let the potential ‘People’s Front’ drift into the Democratic Party and accept bourgeois leadership,” will require a critical examination of the tactical line of the American Communists over a considerable period, in the light of the teachings of the great authorities on the science of Marxism. To make such an examination is the purpose of the next chapter.

## CHAPTER II:

### THE TACTIC OF BLOCS WITH THE LIBERAL BOURGEOISIE

In order to be able to pass judgment on what constitutes revisionism it is necessary to refer to the writings of the founders and most authoritative exponents of Marxism-Leninism. Lenin gave the following definition of revisionism:

“The principle tactical difference in the present labor movement of Europe and America reduce themselves to a struggle against two big trends that are departing from Marxism, which has in fact become the dominant theory in this movement. These two trends are revisionism (opportunism, reformism) and anarchism (anarcho-syndicalism, anarcho-socialism). Both these departures from the Marxist Theory that is dominant in the Labor Movement, and from Marxist tactics, were to be observed in various forms and in various shades in all civilized countries during the course of the more than half century of history of the mass labor movement.” (Lenin’s *Selected Works*, Vol. XI, p. 739.)

It should be noted that Lenin here, and in other writings, uses the terms revisionism, opportunism and reformism interchangeably as different terms basically meaning one and the same thing. As regards the outlook of the proponents of these two trends Lenin stated:

“The revisionists regard as mere phrasemongering all reflections on ‘leaps’ (revolutions, F.M.) and on the fundamental antithesis between the Labor Movement and the whole of society. They regard reforms as a partial realization of Socialism. The anarcho-syndicalist rejects ‘petty work’ especially the utilization of the parliamentary platform. As a matter of fact, these latter tactics amount to waiting for the ‘great days’ and to an inability to muster the forces which create great events. Both hinder the most important and most essential thing, namely, the concentration of the workers into big, powerful and properly functioning organizations, capable of functioning properly under all circumstances, permeated with the spirit of class struggle,

clearly realizing their aims and trained in the true Marxist world conception.” (Ibid., p. 740.)

Lenin further declared:

“The revisionists declare the doctrine of the class struggle to be ‘antiquated,’ or begin to conduct a policy which in fact amounts to a renunciation of the class struggle”. – (Ibid., p. 742.)

And again:

“In the domain of politics, revisionism tried to revise the very foundation of Marxism, namely, the doctrine of the class struggle”. (Ibid., p. 708.)

Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin all devote a considerable proportion of their writings to the struggle against revisionism (opportunism). Lenin in particular, during his entire lifetime in the revolutionary movement, conducted a relentless struggle against the opportunism of the Social Democratic Parties affiliated to the Second International including the opportunist (Menshevik) wing of his own party. Both Lenin and Stalin accused the theoreticians of the parties of the Second International of “emasculating Marxism of its revolutionary content.” Since the doctrine of the class struggle constitutes the “very foundation of Marxism,” as Lenin put it, the “Philistines” of the Second International gave particular attention to substituting the theory and practice of “reforming capitalism,” of cooperating with their own capitalist class, of “class collaboration,” for the theory and practice of the class struggle.

The doctrine of the class struggle was not an abstract idea conjured up in the mind of Karl Marx but a recognition and an understanding of a phenomenon that has existed in all societies with class divisions. As Marx put it, in the *Communist Manifesto*:

“The history of all hitherto existing societies is the history of class struggles (Engels added, with the exception of the classless society of primitive communism).

“Free man and slave, patrician and plebian, lord and serf, guild master and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended, either in a revolutionary recon-

stitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes.”

As regards modern capitalist (bourgeois) society, Marx stated:

“The modern bourgeois society that has sprouted from the ruins of feudal society, has not done away with class antagonisms. It has but established new classes, new conditions of oppression, new forms of struggle in place of the old ones.” – (*Communist Manifesto*, p. 13.)

“According to Marx,” Lenin stated, “the state is an organ of class domination, an organ of oppression of one class by another; its aim is the creation of order which legalizes and perpetuates this oppression by moderating the collisions between the classes.” (*State and Revolution*, p. 9.)

### LIBERALISM AND REVISIONISM

It has been amply established and explained by the authorities of Marxism-Leninism that the modern “State” is an “organ,” an “apparatus” for the domination and oppression of the proletariat (the working class) by the bourgeoisie (the capitalist class). What has not been so amply established and explained is the methods used by the bourgeoisie to carry out their domination and to maintain their “class rule.”

In dealing with this vitally important question in an article entitled, *Differences in the European Labor Movement*, written in 1910, Lenin wrote:

“If the tactics of the bourgeois were always uniform, or at least homogeneous, the working class would rapidly learn to reply to them by tactics also uniform or homogeneous. But as a matter of fact, in every country the bourgeoisie inevitably works out two systems of rule, two methods of fighting for its interests and of retaining its rule, and these methods at times succeed each other and at times are interwoven with each other in various combinations. They are, firstly, the method of force, the method which rejects all concessions to the labor movement, the method of supporting all the old and obsolete institutions, the method of irreconcilably rejecting reforms. Such is the nature of the Conservative policy which in Western Europe is becoming

less and less a policy of the agrarian classes and more and more one of the varieties of bourgeois policy in general. The second method is the method of ‘liberalism’ which takes steps toward the development of political rights, towards reforms, concessions and so forth.” – (Ibid., p. 742).

According to Lenin, the so-called “liberalism” or “progressiveness” of the liberal bourgeoisie, policies of introducing reforms and concessions, is one of their “two systems of rule.” Lenin continued:

“The bourgeoisie passes from one method to the other, not in accordance with the malicious design of individuals, and not fortuitously, but owing to the fundamental contradictions of its own position. Normal capitalist society cannot develop successfully without a consolidated representative system and without the enjoyment of certain political rights by the population, which is bound to be distinguished by its relatively high ‘cultural’ demands. This demand for a certain minimum of culture is created by the conditions of the capitalist mode of production itself, with its high technique, complexity, flexibility, mobility, rapidity of development of world competition, and so forth. The oscillations in the tactics of the bourgeoisie, the passage from the system of force to the system of apparent concessions, are, consequently, peculiar to the history of all European countries during the last half-century, while at the same time, various countries chiefly develop the application of one method or the other at definite periods. For instance, England in the ‘sixties’ and ‘seventies’ was a classical country of ‘liberal’ bourgeois policy. Germany in the ‘seventies’ and ‘eighties’ adhered to the method of force and so on. When this method prevailed in Germany, a one-sided echo of this system, one of the systems of bourgeois government, was the growth of anarcho-syndicalism, or anarchism as it was then called, in the labor movement (the ‘young’ at the beginning of the ‘nineties,’ Johann Most at the beginning of the ‘eighties’). When in 1890 the change toward concessions took place, this change, as is always the case, proved to be even more dangerous to the labor movement, and gave rise to an equally one-sided echo of bourgeois ‘reformism’: opportunism in the Labor Movement.



“‘The positive and real aim of the liberal policy of the bourgeoisie,’ Pannekoek says, ‘is to mislead the workers, to cause a split in their ranks, to transform their policy into an impotent adjunct of an impotent and ephemeral, sham reformism.’

“Not infrequently, the bourgeoisie for a certain time achieves its object by a ‘liberal’ policy, which as Pannekoek justly remarks, is a ‘more crafty’ policy. A part of the workers and a part of their representatives at times allow themselves to be deceived by sham concessions. The revisionists declare the doctrine of the class struggle to be ‘antiquated,’ or begin to conduct a policy which in fact amounts to a renunciation of the class struggle. The zigzags of bourgeois tactics intensify revisionism within the labor movement and not infrequently exacerbate the differences within the labor movement to the pitch of a direct split.

“All causes of the kind indicated give rise to differences on questions of tactics within the labor movement and with the proletarian ranks. But there is not and cannot be a Chinese wall between the proletariat and the strata of the petty bourgeoisie contiguous to it, including the peasantry. It is clear that the passing of certain individuals, groups and strata of the petty bourgeoisie into the ranks of the proletariat is bound, in its turn, to give rise to vacillations in the tactics of the latter.

“The experience of the labor movement of various countries helps us to understand from the example of concrete practical questions the nature of Marxist tactics; it helps the younger countries to distinguish more clearly the true class significance of the departures from Marxism and to combat these departures more successfully.” – (Ibid., pp. 741-42-43.)

Lenin established the following important points:

1. The passage from “the system of force” to the “system of apparent concessions” is peculiar to the history of all European countries for the past half century as two methods of bourgeois rule. Further, the bourgeoisie passes from one method to the other because of the “fundamental contradictions of its own position,” although at times both methods are interwoven.

2. During a period when the bourgeoisie of a given country resorted to the “method of force,” a one-sided echo of this method was the growth of anarcho-syndicalism in the labor movement. When the method of “concessions” was in operation, the one-sided echo was “opportunism in the labor movement.”

3. The method of concessions is, for the labor movement, “even more dangerous” than the method of force because it is a more “crafty policy” by which a number of the workers’ “representatives” allow themselves to be deceived by “sham concessions.”

4. The experience of the labor movement of various countries helps other countries to “distinguish more clearly the true class significance” of the revision of Marxism. This revisionism Lenin attributes to the class influence of the big bourgeoisie through the “passing of certain individuals, groups and strata of the petty bourgeoisie” (their ideology is essentially bourgeois) into the ranks of the proletariat.

In Lenin’s preface to *Letters to Kugelmann*, he writes:

“The Marxian doctrine has bound the theory and practice of the class struggle into one inseparable whole. And whoever distorts a theory which soberly presents the objective situation into a justification of the existing order and goes to the length of striving to adapt himself as quickly as possible to every temporary decline in the revolution, to discard ‘revolutionary illusions’ as quickly as possible and to turn to ‘realistic’ tinkering, is no Marxist.” – (Lenin’s *Selected Works*, Vol. XI, p. 716.)

The revision of Marxism, then, almost invariably takes the form of revising the “very foundation” of Marxism, the doctrine of the class struggle, of concentrating on the winning of reforms “as a partial realization of socialism.” And this is the logical outcome of revisionism. In view of the fact that Marxism is the science of the working class movement and its foundation is the doctrine of the class struggle, it therefore follows that revisionism would almost of necessity take the form of either theoretically revising that doctrine or of conducting policies which, in fact, would amount to the “renunciation of the class struggle.” Theoretically and in practice to “renounce the class struggle” would mean to advocate or follow policies which, instead of recognizing the conflict of interests of the two basic classes, of their irreconcilability, would substitute the

identity of interests of the two classes; in other words, to advocate and practice class co-operation or class collaboration.

The danger of revisionism entering the working class movement, Lenin pointed out, is greatest during a period when the government follows a policy of liberalism, a policy of appearing progressive through granting certain reforms and concessions to the working class, which, however, are designed to “mislead the workers” and “cause a split in their ranks.”

Capitalism developed in the U.S. and also in Canada under historic conditions very different from those of the European countries. The fact that feudalism had never been widely established in North America, the availability of free land, mass emigration to both countries, democratic traditions established in early years, particularly following the American Revolution of 1776 and the Civil War of 1861-65 in the U.S.A. and the rebellion of 1837 in Canada, these all served to further strengthen democratic forms. Largely because of these factors and the economic power of American and British Imperialism, the Labor movement in North America was much slower in developing Independent political action and organizing political parties than was the case in the European countries, where class lines were much more sharply drawn. In fact, Marxism was brought to the United States by German emigrants, and although a Marxist Party was formed in the “seventies,” it took a considerable period before it exerted any degree of influence.

However, because of the important position the U.S.A. occupies in the system of world imperialism, it is important to study the advice given to the American Marxists, on the question of developing an independent working class political movement, by the founders of Marxism-Leninism.

### **THE ADVICE OF THE AUTHORITIES OF MARXISM TO THE AMERICAN LABOR MOVEMENT**

Frederick Engels in writing to Sorge, Nov. 29, 1886, pointed out:

“The American masses had to seek out their own way and seem to have found it for the time being in the K(nights) of L(abor), whose confused principles and ludicrous organization appear to correspond to their own confusion. But according to all I hear the K. of L. are a real

power, especially in New England and the West, and are becoming more so every day owing to the brutal opposition of the capitalists.” – (*Selected Correspondence of Marx & Engels*, p. 450.)

Engels continued:

“The first great step of importance for every country newly entering into the movement is always the *organization of the workers as an independent political party*, no matter how, so long as it is a *distinct workers party*. And this step has been taken, far more rapidly than we had a right to hope, and that is the main thing. That the first program of this party is still confused and highly deficient, that it has set up the banner of Henry George, these are inevitable evils but also only transitory ones. The masses must have time and opportunity to develop and they can only have the opportunity when they have *their own movement* – no matter in what form so long as it is only *their own* (Engels’ italics) movement – in which they are driven further by their own mistakes and learn wisdom by hurting themselves.” – (*Ibid.*, p. 450.)

Engels concluded as follows:

“*From good historical reasons*, the Americans are *worlds behind in all theoretical things*, and while they did not bring over any medieval institutions from Europe they did bring over masses of *medieval traditions*, religion, English common (feudal) law, superstition, spiritualism, in short, every kind of imbecility which was not directly harmful to business and which is now very serviceable *for making the masses stupid*. And if there are people at hand whose minds are theoretically clear, who can tell them the consequences of their own mistakes beforehand and make it clear to them that every movement which does not keep the *destruction of the wage system* in view *the whole time* as its final aim is *bound to go astray and fail* – then many a piece of nonsense may be avoided and the process considerably shortened. But it must take place in the English way, *the specific German character must be cut out* and for that the gentlemen of the

*Sozialist* have hardly the qualification, while those of the *Volkzeitung* are only more intelligent where *business* (Engels' italics) is concerned." (Ibid., p. 451.)

In this letter written 59 years ago, Engels, with penetrating clarity, outlined the most important political tasks of the American working class and the reasons for them are as follows:

1. That for "historical reasons" the Americans were "worlds behind" in their understanding and utilization of revolutionary theory as a weapon in the hands of the labor movement, and the American bourgeoisie, also "worlds behind" in "theoretical things," nevertheless, were utilizing "medieval traditions," in short, "every kind of imbecility" for "making the masses stupid."

2. Because of the fact the American working class lacked a revolutionary theory (in the opening part of his letter, Engels pointed out the emigrant German Socialists in the U.S.A. were unable to impart Marxism to the American workers because they regarded Marxism as a dogma, a credo, rather than "a guide to action," and hence did not understand it themselves) they "had to seek out their own way" and appeared to have found the path through the medium of the Knights of Labour. But because of their own theoretical unclarity the "principles" and "organization" of their movement reflected this unclarity and confusion.

3. Engels further points out that the new American labor movement would have to learn from its own experience and mistakes, to "learn wisdom by hurting themselves." This could only be accomplished, however, providing they had their own movement so long as it was only their own.

4. If there were people at hand who were "theoretically clear" (Marxists, F.M.) and could point out the consequences of mistakes beforehand, "many a piece of nonsense could be avoided" and the "process" (the achievement of socialism, F.M.) "considerably shortened."

5. "Every movement which does not keep the destruction of the wage system in view the whole time as its final aim is bound to go astray and fail; i.e., the aim of achieving socialism.

6. "The organization of the workers as an independent political party, no matter how, so long as it is a distinct workers' party, is always the first great step of importance for every country newly entering the movement."

It is quite clear that Engels in his letter to Sorge is not referring to the organization of a relatively small revolutionary party, a Marxian Party, but to a broad all-inclusive “distinct workers’ party” because there already was in existence in the U.S.A. a professed Marxian Party, a Socialist Labour Party. In other words, Engels was stressing the need of organizing an independent mass third party movement based on the American working class.

In his letter to Florence Kelley Wischnewetsky, two months later, Engels returned to the same theme in concluding his letter as follows:

“Had we, from 1864 to 1873, insisted on working together only with those who openly adopted our platform where should we be today? I think that all our practice has shown that it is possible to work along with the general movement of the working class at every one of its stages without giving up or hiding our own distinct position and even organization, and I am afraid that if the German Americans choose a different platform they will commit a great mistake.” – (*Selected Correspondence of Marx & Engels*, p. 445.)

In an earlier letter, written December 28, 1886, Engels stressed the need of a mass workers’ party as follows:

“A million or two of workingman’s votes next November for a bona fide workingman’s party is worth infinitely more at present than a hundred thousand votes for a doctrinally perfect platform.” – (*Selected Correspondence of Marx & Engels*, p. 454.)

In 1892 Engels again returns to the need of and prospects for an independent political movement of the working class, this time with regard to England:

“In fact in England too, the working people have begun to move again. They are, no doubt, shackled by traditions of various kinds. Bourgeois traditions, such as the widespread belief that there can be but two parties, Conservatives and Liberals, and that the working class must work out its salvation by and through the great Liberal Party. If the sons of the old Chartists, for reasons explained above,

were not quite up to the mark, the grandsons bid fair to be worthy of their forefathers.” – (*Socialism Utopian & Scientific*, p. 29.)

Fifteen years later, April, 1907, Lenin, in commenting on Engels’ letters regarding the tactics to be followed by American Socialists, points out that the fundamental features of the British and American Labor movements are:

“The absence of any at all big, nation-wide democratic problems, facing the proletariat; the complete subjection of the proletariat to bourgeois politics; the sectarian isolation of groups, handfuls of Socialists from the proletariat; not the slightest success of the Socialists at the elections among the working masses, etc.” – (Vol. XI, Lenin’s *Selected Works*, p. 724.)

Lenin explains further:

“Engels lays so much stress on the economic organizations of the workers in such conditions because he is dealing with the most firmly established democratic systems, which confront the proletariat with purely Socialist tasks. (By ‘purely Socialist tasks,’ Lenin here is referring to the fact that the democratic tasks of abolishing remnants of feudalism had been largely completed. – F.M.)

“Engels stresses the importance of an independent workers’ party, even though with a bad program, because he is dealing with countries where hitherto there had not been even a hint of political independence of the workers, where in politics, the workers most of all dragged, and still drag, after the bourgeoisie.” – (Ibid., p. 725.)

And again:

“And now we very clearly perceive the two lines of Engels’ (and Marx’s) recommendations, directions, corrections, threats and exhortations. They most insistently called upon the British and American Socialists to merge with the Labor Movement and to eradicate the narrow and hidebound sectarian spirit from their organizations.” (Ibid., p. 731.)

Lenin further explained why it was essential for the British and American Socialists to “merge with the labor movement” by the following:

“In countries where there are no Social Democratic workers parties, no Social Democratic members in parliament, no systematic and consistent Social Democratic policy either at elections or in the press, etc., Marx and Engels taught that the Socialists must at all costs rid themselves of narrow sectarianism and join with the labor movement so as to shake up the proletariat politically, for in the last third of the nineteenth century the proletariat displayed almost no political independence either in England or America. In these countries – where bourgeois-democratic historical tasks were almost entirely absent – the political arena was wholly filled by the triumphant and self-complacent bourgeoisie, which, in the art of deceiving, corrupting, and bribing the workers has no equal anywhere in the world.” – (Ibid., p. 723.)

Thirteen years later, at the second Congress of the Communist International, July 23, 1920, Lenin noted with satisfaction the existence of an independent, working class, mass political party in England and insisted that the British Communists affiliate to it on the conditions then prevailing, under which each affiliated group retained its independence and the right of freedom of criticism. In castigating those Communists who opposed the affiliation, on the grounds such affiliation would constitute class collaboration, Lenin stated:

“... I declare that there will be no class collaboration in this... But in regard to the British Labor Party, it is only a matter of the advanced minority of the British working class collaborating with the overwhelming majority.... What we get here is collaboration between the vanguard of the working class and the backward workers – the rear-guard. This collaboration is so important for the whole labor movement that we categorically demand that the British Communists should serve as a connecting link between the Party, i.e., the minority of the working class, and all the rest of the workers. If the minority is unable to lead the masses,



to link up closely with them, then it is not a Party and is worthless, no matter whether it calls itself a Party or the National Committee of Shop Stewards Committees – as far as I know the Shop Stewards Committees in England have their National Committee. Until the opposite is proved we can say that the British Labor Party consists of proletarians and that by being in the ranks we can secure collaboration between the vanguard of the working class and the backward workers. If this collaboration is not carried out systematically, then the Communist Party will be worthless and then there can be no talk of the dictatorship of the proletariat.” – (Vol. X, Lenin’s *Selected Works*, p. 216-217.)

At the fourth Congress of the C.I. (Communist International), held in November, 1922, a resolution was adopted on the question of a “workers’ and peasants’ government” from which the following excerpts are taken:

“The slogan of ‘Workers’ and Peasants’ Government,’ as the old slogan of Workers’ Government, by no means takes the place of, or shifts into the background, our agitation for the proletarian dictatorship, which is the cornerstone of Communist tactics... Correct interpretation of the slogan of ‘workers’ and peasants’ government’ will enable the Communists not only to mobilize the proletarian masses in the towns, but also to establish for themselves reliable points of support in the villages and thus pave the way for the conquest of power. – (Proceedings of the 5th Congress of the C.I., pp. 117-118.)

“As a general agitational slogan, the workers’ government (or the workers’ and peasants’ government) can be applied everywhere. – (Ibid., p. 110.)

“Of course, the agitation under the slogan of ‘workers’ and peasants’ government’ must be concretely adapted to the circumstance of every particular country. For instance, in America, it must deal with the problem of the toiling farmers... (Ibid., p.118.)

“In the specific conditions that existed in America at that time when no Labor or Farmer parties, national in scope, existed, the slogan, ‘A Workers’ and Peasants’ Government,’ was apparently replaced with the slogan, ‘A

Farmer-Labor Party.' Speaking at the fifth Congress of the C.I. June 24, 1924, delegate Dunne of the American Party, reported the Party's object: '...In carrying on the manoeuvres for the formation of the Farmer-Labor Party was to drive a wedge between the exploited farmers and workers and the capitalist parties. Some wished to base it upon the industrial workers, but the minority tended to overemphasize the importance of the agricultural workers.'" (Proceedings of the fifth Congress of the C.I., p. 73.)

Delegate Amter's contribution to the discussion was reported in part as follows:

"The official pamphlet of the American Party dealing with the growth of the Labor Party, stated that it would be a mistake of the greatest magnitude to exclude the working farmers from the Labor Party. The co-operation of the farmers and workers had become traditional in America. Comrade Amter quoted figures to show that in many States the Farmer-Labor Party contained large groups of industrial workers which held the Party completely under their Control. There were other States in which the membership was predominantly farmers, notably the State of Montana." – (Ibid., p. 94.)

It would appear from the above statements that some headway had finally been made by the American Labor movement in creating an independent third party movement in the U.S.A.; to create a party that would politically break the masses away from "trailing behind the bourgeoisie." This was 48 years after Engels had first exhorted the American Socialists to proceed with the building of a Party of the working people which, he said, was the "first great step" for every country newly entering the movement, "the organization of the workers as an independent political party." However, ten years later it would appear that little real progress had been made in building a mass third party movement of the working people.

#### **THE TACTIC OF THE UNITED FRONT AND OF THE PEOPLE'S FRONT**

At the 7th Congress of the C.I. the general secretary of the International, Georgi Dimitroff, made his historic report in which he

warned the working people of the world that international imperialism was driving towards the establishment of fascist dictatorships in all countries for the purpose of placing the “whole burden of the crisis on the backs of the toilers,” in order to “solve the problems of markets by enslaving the weak nations, by intensifying colonial oppression and repartitioning the world anew by means of war,” and finally that “they are striving to forestall the growth of the forces of revolution by smashing the revolutionary movement of the workers and peasants and by undertaking a military attack against the Soviet Union – the bulwark of the world proletariat.” (*The United Front*, p. 9.)

Fascism in power, Dimitroff defined as “The open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic and most imperialist elements of finance capital” (*Ibid.*, p. 10.)

“Fascism was able to come to power,” stated Dimitroff, “primarily because the working class, owing to the policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie pursued by the Social-Democratic leaders, proved to be split, politically and organizationally disarmed, in face of the onslaught of the bourgeoisie. And the Communist Parties, on the other hand, apart from and in opposition to the Social-Democrats, were not strong enough to rouse the masses and to lead them in a decisive struggle against fascism.” (*Ibid.*, p. 19.)

In answer to the question, “How can fascism be prevented from coming to power and how can fascism be overthrown after it has been victorious,” Dimitroff answered:

“To this the Communist International replies: The first thing that must be done, the thing with which to begin, is to form a united front, to establish unity of action of the workers in every factory, in every district, in every region, in every country, all over the world. Unity of action of the proletariat on a national scale is the mighty weapon which renders the working class capable not only of successful defense but also of successful counter-attack against fascism, against the class enemy.” – (*Ibid.*, p. 30.)

This exhortation of Dimitroff would appear to be fairly simple and understandable. In order to prevent fascism from coming to power, then, the workers must, first of all, be united in action. Secondly,

this unity in action must begin at the point of production “in every factory” and be extended to cover whole regions and countries.

Dimitroff further defined the character of this united action and its effects as follows:

“Yes, Comrades, the road in the way of fascism can be blocked. It is quite possible. It depends on ourselves – on the workers, the peasants, and all working people.” – (Ibid., p. 25.)

This statement makes it clear that the blocking of fascism depends on the workers, peasants (or farmers) and all working people.

The type of action to be taken Dimitroff outlined as follows:

“Whether the victory of fascism can be prevented depends first and foremost on the militant activity of the working class itself, on whether its forces are welded into a single militant army combating the offensive of capitalism and fascism. By establishing its fighting unity, the proletariat would paralyze the influence of fascism over the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie of the towns, the youth and the intelligentsia, and would be able to neutralize one section of them and win over another.” – (Ibid., p. 25.)

These statements are also quite simple and understandable. According to Dimitroff, victory over fascism is dependent on the militant activity of the working class itself. Such a “fighting unity,” he said,

“would win over one section of the middle class and the farmers to the side of the workers and render neutral another section, thus paralyzing the influence of fascism over the only sections of the population among which fascism could hope to secure a mass base.”

The success of the United Front of the working class in the struggle against fascism and war, Dimitroff pointed out, largely depended on the workers who followed the leadership of the Social Democratic politicians and trade union leaders, deserting the policy of class collaboration and adopting a policy of class struggle. Dimitroff continued:

“A process of differentiation is taking place in all the Social Democratic Parties. Within their ranks two principal camps are forming: side by side with the existing camp of reactionary elements, who are trying in every way to preserve the bloc between the Social Democrats and the bourgeoisie, and who rabidly reject a united front with the Communists, there is beginning to form a camp of revolutionary elements who entertain doubts as to the correctness of the policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, who are in favor of the creation of a united front with the Communists, and who are increasingly coming to adopt the position of the revolutionary class struggle.” – (Ibid., p. 30.)

This meant, that in addition to a united front of the working class, based on “militant activity,” being essential in order to defeat fascism, that as a result of the division among the followers of the Social Democratic parties a united front was now possible and realizable.

In answer to the question, “What is and ought to be the basic content of the United Front at the present stage?” Dimitroff answered:

“The defense of the immediate economic and political interests of the working class, the defense of the working class against fascism, must form the starting point and main content of the united front in all capitalist countries.” – (Ibid., pp. 35-36.)

In order to further the efforts of the working class to “paralyze the influence of fascism over the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie of the towns, the youth and the intelligentsia” and to “neutralize one section of them and win over another,” Dimitroff proposed further that the working class form a united front with these middle class elements in the struggle against fascism. This united front of the working class with sections of the farmers and the middle class Dimitroff termed the Anti-Fascist People’s Front. He explained the need of such a people’s front as follows:

“In mobilizing the mass of working people for the struggle against fascism, the formation of a wide, popular anti-fascist front on the basis of the proletarian united front is a particularly important task. The success of the whole struggle of the proletariat is closely bound up with estab-

lishing a fighting alliance between the proletariat on the one hand, and the toiling peasantry and basic mass of the urban petty bourgeoisie, who together form the majority of the population even in industrially developed countries, on the other.” – (Ibid., p. 39.)

However, while stressing the need of the working class winning allies for the struggle against fascism Dimitroff warns that the working class must play the decisive role. He states:

“The fundamental, the most decisive thing in establishing the anti-fascist People’s Front is resolute action of the revolutionary proletariat in defense of the demands of these sections of the people, particularly the working peasantry – demands in line with the basic interests of the proletariat – and in the process of struggle combining the demands of the working class with these demands.” – (Ibid., p. 40.)

Dimitroff is here pointing out that, in order to secure allies from the ranks of the farmers and the middle class the working class must advance their demands and combine them with their own. In other words, the working class must fight for the interests of the farmers and the urban middle class as well as for their own demands in order to build the People’s Front.

Dimitroff then proceeds to deal with the question of how the working class should proceed to approach the farmers and the middle class through their economic and political organizations in order to achieve united action and build the People’s Front. He states:

“In the Capitalist countries the majority of these parties and organizations, political as well as economic, are still under the influence of the bourgeoisie and follow it. The social composition of these parties and organizations is heterogeneous. They include big kulaks (rich peasants) side by side with landless peasants, big business men alongside petty shopkeepers; but control is in the hands of the former, the agents of big capital. This obliges us to approach the different organizations in different ways, taking into consideration that not infrequently the bulk of the membership does not know anything about the real political character of its leadership. Under certain conditions, we can and must try to draw these parties and organizations or certain sec-

tions of them to the side of the anti-fascist People's Front, despite their bourgeois leadership..." (Ibid., p. 40.)

There should be no room here for misinterpretation of the tactics which Dimitroff is outlining for the working class to follow. In order to forestall any attempt of the fascist bourgeoisie to secure a mass base among the farmers or the middle class of the towns Dimitroff proposed that, in spite of the fact that control of the farmers' organizations, farmers' political parties and urban middle class political parties was in the hands of big capital, the working class should nevertheless strive to draw these organizations and parties, or sections of them, to the side of the People's Front. Obviously if the working class were successful in doing so it would mean winning them away from the influence and control of big capital and making them allies of the working class.

Dimitroff then proceeded to deal specifically with the organizations and political parties of the farmers and middle class of different countries which should be considered:

"Such for instance is today the situation in France with the Radical Party (at that time, 1935, in France a United Front on a national scale had already been effected between the Communist and Socialist parties. The Radical Socialist Party did later unite with them, thus forming the French Peoples Front or Popular Front as it was called in France. At the election which followed, the Popular Front won a victory at the polls and the Socialist and Radical Socialist Parties jointly formed the government under the premiership of Leon Blum, leader of the French Socialist Party. The Communist Party did not join the Government although they stated later they were prepared to do so if necessary. – F.M.), in the United States with various farmers' organizations, in Poland with the 'Stronnictwo Ludowe', in Yugoslavia with the Croatian Peasant Party, in Bulgaria with the Agrarian League, in Greece with the Agrarians, etc. But regardless of whether or not there is any chance of attracting these parties and organizations as a whole to the Peoples' Front, our tactics must under all circumstances be directed towards drawing the small peasants, artisans, handicraftsmen, etc., among their members into the antifascist peoples' front." – (Ibid., p. 40.)

In connection with the above quotation from Dimitroff's report it is significant to note that in practically every instance in referring to the organizations and parties that should be drawn into the People's Front he stipulates farmers' parties and organizations. In referring specifically to the United States he includes only "various farmers' organizations." This is quite consistent with his reference to the decisive thing in building the People's Front being resolute action on the part of: the working class in defense of the demands of these people, "particularly the working peasantry." He further makes the point that regardless of whether or not these organizations are won for the People's Front, that section of their membership which is made up of "peasants, artisans, handicraftsmen, etc.," must be won over.

### **A MASS WORKERS' AND FARMERS' PARTY IN THE U.S.A.**

In the section of his report entitled "Key Questions of the United Front in Individual Countries," significantly enough, Dimitroff begins by stating:

"Let us take, for example, so important a country in the capitalist world as the United States of America, where vast masses are beginning to abandon the bourgeois parties and are at present at the cross roads... In contradistinction to German fascism, which acts under anti-constitutional slogans, American fascism tries to portray itself as the custodian of the constitution and 'American Democracy'."

Dimitroff then warns that if American fascism "succeeds in penetrating to the wide masses who have become disillusioned with the old bourgeois parties it may become a serious menace in the very near future." – (*The United Front*, p. 42.)

After again dealing with the importance of the United States in the world scene and the necessity of organizing more than the class conscious vanguard, Dimitroff warns that "It is perfectly obvious that the interests of the American proletariat demand that all its forces dissociate themselves from the capitalist parties without delay." He continues, "It must find in good time ways and suitable forms to prevent fascism from winning the wide mass of discontented working people." (*Ibid.*)

Dimitroff then proposes:



“And here it must be said that under American conditions the creation of a mass party of working people, a ‘Workers’ and Farmers’ Party’ might serve as such a suitable form. Such a party would be a specific form of the Mass Peoples’ Front in America and should be put in opposition to the parties of the trusts and of the banks, and likewise to growing fascism. Such a party of course, will be, neither Socialist nor Communist. But it must not be an anti-Communist Party.” (Ibid.)

Dimitroff then proceeds to outline the program of the proposed party as follows:

“The program of this Party must be directed against the banks, trusts and monopolies, against the principal enemies of the people, who are gambling on the woes of the people. Such a party will correspond to its name only if it defends the urgent demands of the working class, only if it fights for genuine social legislation, for unemployment insurance; only if it fights for land for the black and white sharecroppers and for liberation from debt burdens; only if it tries to secure the cancellation of the farmers indebtedness; only if it fights for equal status for negroes; only if it defends the demands of the war veterans and the interests of members of the liberal professions, small business men and artisans. And so on.” (Ibid., pp. 42-43.)

And Dimitroff adds:

“It goes without saying that such a party will fight for the election of its own candidates to local government, to the state legislatures, to the House of Representatives and the Senate”. (Ibid., p. 43.)

Dimitroff then proceeds to explain the tactics to be followed in building such a mass “third party,” pointing out that the people themselves must be made to realize the need of such a party. He said:

“Our comrades in the United States acted rightly in taking the initiative for the creation of such a party. But they still have to take effective measures in order to make the creation of such a party the cause of the masses them-

selves. The question of forming a ‘Workers’ and Farmers’ Party,’ and its program, should be discussed at mass meetings of the people. We should develop the most widespread movement for the creation of such a party, and take the lead in it. In no case must the initiative of organizing the party be allowed to pass to elements desirous of utilizing the discontent of the millions who have become disillusioned in both the bourgeois parties, Democratic and Republican, in order to create a ‘third party’ in the United States, as an anti-Communist party, a party directed against the revolutionary movement.” (Ibid., p. 43.)

Recognizing the dangers which arise in applying the tactics of the United Front and the People’s Front, of the new “tactical orientation” of the world communist movement, Dimitroff warned:

“We want to intensify in every way the struggle against all concrete manifestations of Right opportunism, realizing that the danger from this side will increase precisely in the practice of carrying out our mass policy and struggle.” (Ibid., p. 93.)

Dimitroff went further and warned that the Communist Parties must guard against any penetration into their ranks of the ideology of compromise with the bourgeoisie. Said Dimitroff:

“We have combined and shall continue to combine our readiness to march jointly with the Social Democratic Parties and organizations to the struggle against Fascism with an irreconcilable struggle against Social Democracy as the ideology and practice of compromise with the bourgeoisie, and consequently also against any penetration of this ideology into our own ranks.” (Ibid., p.83.)

Dimitroff returned to the same theme and again warned against any dependency on the capitalist class: “The whole experience of the labor movement, particularly the experience of the fifteen years of coalition policy in Germany, has shown that the policy of class collaboration, the policy of dependence on the bourgeoisie, leads to the defeat of the working class and to the victory of fascism. And only the road of irreconcilable class struggle against the bourgeoisie,

the road of the Bolsheviks, is the true road to victory.”  
(Ibid., p. 88.)

The warning given here by Dimitroff, one would think, is perfectly clear and unequivocal: “The policy of dependence on the bourgeoisie leads to the defeat of the working class and the victory of fascism.” Furthermore, such a policy he denounces as “class collaboration” which he previously pointed out was the ideology of the Social Democratic parties which paved the way for fascism in a number of countries.

The stature of Dimitroff as one of the outstanding Marxists of the world was recognized by the delegates to the congress: “(In a lengthy ovation, Stalin and Dimitroff were greeted as the leaders of the world communist movement.)” (Ibid., p 141.)

On the basis of the statements of the most authoritative founders and proponents of Marxism, namely, Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Dimitroff, there has been established in the foregoing material the following important estimations, warnings and proposals, as to policies and tactics, to the labor movement generally and to the American labor movement in particular:

1. Revisionism, in practice, is basically the same as opportunism or reformism. Revisionism means to rob Marxism of its revolutionary content and particularly to revise the very foundation of Marxism, the doctrine of the class struggle. Revisionism means to substitute the theory and practice of co-operation with one’s own capitalist class, of dependence upon the bourgeoisie, of class collaboration, for “the theory and practice of the class struggle.”

The theory and practice of class collaboration has historically been the policy followed by the Social Democratic parties of all countries which resulted in disarming, dividing and defeating the working class movement and making possible the victory of fascism in several countries. “Leninism,” said Stalin, “grew and became strong in the clashes with the opportunism of the Second International, a struggle which was and remains an essential condition precedent to the success of the struggle against capitalism.” (*Foundations of Leninism*, p. 9.)

2. The bourgeoisie maintain their class rule through the medium of the State “which is an organ of oppression of one class by another” and in doing so resort to “two systems of rule” which “at times succeed each other and at times are interwoven with each other” These

two methods of rule are the “method of force” and the “method of liberalism” (reforms and concessions to the working class). Of the two methods, the method of liberalism is the most dangerous to the working class because of the danger of revision of Marxism, of opportunism arising during a period in which the method of liberalism was the method of rule used by the bourgeoisie. This opportunism in the labor movement Lenin attributed to the influence of the ideology of the capitalist class brought into the labor movement by “individuals, groups and strata of the petty bourgeoisie.”

3. Beginning with Engels 59 years ago the world’s leading authorities of Marxism stressed the need of establishing a third party movement in the United States based on the working class, an independent party. Lenin stressed the need of an independent workers’ party in the United States and Britain because “in politics the workers most of all dragged and still drag after the bourgeoisie.”

The British and American bourgeoisie, he said, “in the art of deceiving, corrupting and bribing the workers has no equal anywhere in the world.”

4. Beginning at the 4th Congress of the C.I. in November, 1922, the Communist International agreed that the “third party” movement in the U.S.A. should take the form of a “Farmer-Labor Party.” This was confirmed at the 5th Congress in July, 1924, where it was reported headway had been made in building a “Farmer-Labor Party.”

In August, 1935, the 7th Congress of the C.I., through its secretary, Georgi Dimitroff, proposed that in the United States the People’s Front take the form of a Workers’ and Farmers’ Party. The basis of the People’s Front, he said, was the united front of the working class, “unity of action of the workers in every factory.” The victory of fascism, he said, could be prevented by the “militant activity of the working class itself.”

The People’s Front, he explained, should be composed of workers, farmers and urban middle class people. In another section of his report he spoke of them as small farmers, artisans, handicraftsmen, etc., these being the natural allies of the workers.

As for the American working class, Dimitroff warned “that all its forces dissociate themselves from the capitalist parties without delay.” The Democratic and Republican parties he classified as bourgeois parties which the Workers’ and Farmers’ Party should oppose with its own candidates. He specifically warned against “the

ideology and practice of compromise with the bourgeoisie.” And again he said, “The policy of dependence on the bourgeoisie leads to the defeat of the working class....” In order that there should be no errors made regarding the class forces which the proletariat should secure as its allies, Dimitroff, in December, 1936, in an article entitled “The People’s Front” wrote:

“When the working class marching as a unit, begins to act together with the peasantry, the lower middle classes and all democratic elements, on the basis of the Peoples’ Front program, then the offensive of the fascist bourgeoisie is confronted with an insurmountable obstacle. – (*The United Front*, p. 199.) In case there might be any misunderstanding as to whom he was referring to as “democratic forces,” Dimitroff returns to the question: “The Peoples’ Front makes it possible for the lower middle classes, the peasantry and the democratic intelligentsia, not only to resist the tutelage and oppression of the clique of finance capital, but also to rise up against it in defense of their vital interests and rights, relying for support on the militant collaboration of the working class nationally and on an international scale.” (Ibid., p. 199.)

And again:

“The People’s Front helps the working class to avoid the political isolation towards which the bourgeoisie purposely impels it; it creates the most favorable conditions for the working class to accomplish its historic role, to head the struggle of their people against the small clique of financial magnates, big capitalists and landlords, to be in the vanguard in the uncompleted democratic revolution and in all movements for progress and culture. The class struggle between exploited and exploiters thus receives an immeasurably wider base and a mighty scope.” (Ibid., p. 199.)

Dimitroff here makes it clear that the tactic of the People’s Front was not a substitute for the class struggle but on the contrary provided the working class with a “wider base and a mighty scope” for more successfully conducting the class struggle.

Neither did Dimitroff in any way infer that the tactic of the “People’s Front against War and Fascism” constitute a compromise with the capitalist system as, in the very next paragraph, he stated:

“The unity of the proletarian ranks and the formation of the People’s Front... in the long run pave the way for the victory of labor over capital.” (Ibid., p. 200).

In dealing with the infantile leftism of the Left Social Democrats who do not or cannot understand the tactic of the People’s Front, Dimitroff again specifically outlined the class composition of the People’s Front. He said:

“They (the left Social Democrats – F.M.) make the mistake of identifying the People’s Front with the policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and demand a pure working class policy, declaring that the joint struggle of the working class and the democratic sections of the lower middle classes, the peasantry and intelligentsia against fascism constitutes a retreat from the position of the class struggle”. (Ibid., p. 200.)

It should be noted that Dimitroff here does not only not include any section of the bourgeoisie but does not even include all of the middle class but speaks of the lower “middle classes, the peasantry and intelligentsia.”

Consider now, how these exhortations, warnings and proposals of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Dimitroff for the formation of an independent mass third party were carried out by the American Communist movement.

### **HOW BROWDER APPLIED THE TACTIC OF THE PEOPLE’S FRONT**

Following the 7th Congress of the C.I., in August, 1935, Browder, in November, proposed the formation of a Farmer-Labor Party as the American form of the People’s Front. However, addressing the 9th Plenum of the Communist Party of Canada during the same month he stated:

“We are taking some concrete steps forward in the United States, especially in the great Youth Congress movement which is the biggest achievement of our move-

ment in the United States so far in the field of United Front Work.”

So, in November the biggest achievement of the American party, according to Browder, was not in the achievement of the United Front of the workers, beginning in “every factory,” nor of achieving trade union unity, nor of laying the foundation for the Farmer-Labor Party, but the Youth Congress movement, which was, to a large extent, composed of and led by middle class youth.

In December 1936, “he analyzed the Republican election defeat as a vote along class lines, as hastening the disintegration of the two party system and widening the split in the Democratic Party.” And Browder concluded that “these things improve and broaden the prospect for the building of a People’s Front.”

So! A year and a half after the 7th Congress of the C.I. had proposed the immediate formation of a Workers and Farmers Party (“We should develop the most widespread movement for the creation of such a party, and take the lead in it.” – Dimitroff.) it was, according to Browder, still only a “prospect.”

In June 1937, nearly two years after the American Party had supposedly taken on the task of building a “Workers and Farmers Party,” Browder stated that “mass trade unions and progressive groups” should be encouraged “to systematic and organized activity within the Democratic Party (in some places the Republican Party)...”

By 1937, less than two years after Dimitroff had stressed that “the interests of the American proletariat demand that all its forces disassociate themselves from the capitalist parties without delay” and that a Workers and Farmers Party be formed, Browder tells the American working class the exact opposite: that the workers’ organizations “be encouraged” to activity within the Democratic and Republican Parties. Browder even drops the use of the Marxian term “People’s Front” whose class composition Dimitroff had defined several times and replaces it with the vague, nebulous and non-Marxian term “Democratic Camp” which he defined as “the American equivalent of the People’s Front.” Its class composition he described as “now materialized in the organized labor movement, first of all the great movement of the C.I.O. and the progressive movements led by middle class figures within the old parties.”

This definition of a supposed “Democratic Camp” in actual fact constitutes a revision of the Marxian doctrine of the class struggle. In practice such a policy only could and did result in subordinating the class interests of the working class to the class interests of the big bourgeoisie as it meant tying the working class to the support of the political parties of the bourgeoisie.

In 1938 the formulation “Democratic Camp” was replaced by that of “Democratic Front.” By 1939 all use of the terms People’s Front and Workers’ and Farmers’ Party had been completely discarded and so had any attempt at, or prospect of, achieving them. The working class had been encouraged to participate in what was classically described by Browder himself as: “The progressive and democratic majority is a coalition between the Democratic Party and the independent radical third of the electorate. President Roosevelt has embodied that coalition and by his leadership has consolidated and strengthened it.”

Well! Well! The American working class together with the Communist Party had now become part of an electoral coalition whose leader was none other than the leader of the American bourgeoisie, President Roosevelt himself. The People’s Front of struggle against the bourgeoisie had been perverted into an electoral coalition of labor with the liberal bourgeoisie and under the leadership of the liberal bourgeoisie.

And this in spite of the admonitions of Dimitroff in June 1937:

“When carrying out the policy of the Peoples’ Front against fascism and war, when participating in joint action with other parties and organizations of the working people against the common enemy, and fighting for the vital interests and democratic rights of the working people, and for peace and liberty, the communists do not lose sight of the historic need for the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, which has outlived its day, and for the establishment of socialism, which brings emancipation to the working class and the whole of mankind.” (*The United Front*, p. 236.)

And further:

“True sons of their class, defenders of the interests of their people, free from all connections with and dependence on the bourgeoisie, thoroughly consistent internationalists,



the communists will best of all be able to play the role of uniting link in the ranks of the proletariat itself and also among all the parties, organizations, and groups of the working people, democratic petty bourgeoisie, peasantry and intellectuals in the struggle against fascism and war.” (Ibid., p. 238.)

Dimitroff gives a further warning against subordinating working class interests to the interests of the bourgeoisie:

“What is required is that, in determining their policy, all working class organizations should make their starting point the defense of the interests of their own class, and should not act to the advantage of the interests of the bourgeoisie. By making their starting point their own class interests, the working class and its organizations thereby defend the interests of all the exploited, of the entire people. An end must be put to the policy of reconciling the interests of the exploited and the exploiters. One cannot be, at one and the same time, on the side of the financial magnates and on the side of the working people.” (Ibid., p. 231.)

In spite of the exhortations of Dimitroff to put an end to “the policy of reconciling the interests of the exploited and the exploiters,” to be “free from all connections with or dependence on the bourgeoisie,” under Browder’s influence the American Labor movement was taken into the bourgeois parties and accepted the leadership of the bourgeoisie.

The policy of encouraging “mass trade unions and progressive groups” to “systematic and organized activity within the Democratic Party” seemed to be most fully carried out in the State of Washington. There, an organization which embraced trade unions, old age pensioners, etc., was formed under the name of The Washington Commonwealth Federation, as an adjunct to the Democratic Party, with the avowed purpose of securing the election of New Deal supporters of Roosevelt’s domestic policies to Congress and the State Legislature. The fact that the State elected a full slate of New Deal Democrats, including some labor men, was considered to be a tremendous achievement. The objective appeared to be to utilize the Democratic Party apparatus for the labor movement. This was not

the first time that such attempts were made in the history of the labor movement. Writing on this very question in 1893 Engels said:

“The Fabians are an ambitious group here in London who have understanding enough to realize the inevitability of the social revolution but who could not possibly entrust this gigantic task to the rough proletariat alone and are therefore kind enough to set themselves at the head. Fear of the revolution is their fundamental principle. They are the educated par excellence. Their socialism is municipal socialism; not the nation but the Municipality is to become the owner of the means of production at any rate for the time being. This socialism of theirs is then represented as an extreme but inevitable consequence of bourgeois liberalism and hence follows their tactics of not decisively opposing the Liberals as adversaries, but of pushing them on towards socialist conclusions and therefore of intriguing with them, of permeating Liberalism with Socialism, of not putting up Socialist candidates against the Liberals, but of fastening them onto the Liberals forcing them upon them, or deceiving them into taking them. That in the course of this process they are either lied to and deceived themselves or else betray Socialism, they do not, of course, realize.” (Marx & Engels’ *Selected Correspondence*, pp. 505-06.)

Apparently it never occurred to those who advocated the policy of “systematic and organized activity within the Democratic Party” that in the process of doing so they would either “be lied to and deceived themselves or else betray socialism.” Apparently they never realized that instead of “permeating Liberalism with Socialism” inside the Democratic Party what would and did actually happen was the permeation of Socialism (Communism) with bourgeois liberalism.

Following the 1944 Presidential election the Washington Commonwealth Federation was dissolved. Apparently it was felt that the process of “socializing” the Democratic Party had been so successful that there was no longer any need of maintaining a separate labor wing of the Democratic Party, so what separate identity the labor elements had retained was abolished and they were completely submerged in the bourgeois ideology of the Democratic Party.

The one other State where the tactics of “systematic and organized activity within the Democratic Party (in some places the Re-

publican Party)...” seemed to have the greatest “success” was New York. In New York Communist candidates were not only endorsed by their own Party but secured the nomination and endorsement of the bourgeois parties and the Social Democratic, American Labor Party. For a Communist to be nominated or endorsed by the bourgeois parties was apparently considered to be a considerable achievement.

Following the arrest of Earl Browder in 1940, Wm. Z. Foster again raised the question of a Farmer-Labor Party:

“If the United States is to play a constructive democratic peace role internationally, it is necessary to break the hold of finance capital upon the American Government. To achieve this the masses of the workers, farmers and other toilers must organize themselves into a great peoples peace front, into a broad Farmer-Labor Party and thus bring into active play their potentially overwhelming power.” (*The Communist*, April, 1940, p. 319.)

In the same article Foster writes:

“The Roosevelt administration is putting into effect this war policy of Big Business. In doing so it is receiving in all major essentials, the support of the Republican leaders, as well as that of the dominant forces of Wall Street.” (*Ibid.*, p. 310.)

As regards the slogan “National Unity” Foster stated:

“The fourth basic aspect of Roosevelt’s (big capital’s) war policy is this country’s warlike attitude toward the Soviet Union. This is the heart of capitalist class unity in the U.S. which they call National Unity.” (*Ibid.*, p. 312.)

Foster concluded his estimate of the National Unity slogan of Roosevelt as follows:

“Altogether, the ‘National Unity’ scheme is a very dangerous trap for the workers and other forces.” (*Ibid.*, p. 316.)

In 1940, then, the Roosevelt Government was recognized, at least by Foster, to be putting into effect the “policy of Big Business,” of receiving the “support of the Republican leaders,” and the

“support of the dominant forces of Wall Street.” Roosevelt’s slogan of “National Unity” was characterized as a “very dangerous trap for the workers” and the need of “workers, farmers and other toilers” organizing into a broad “farmer-labor party” was recognized.

Four years later however, Browder, in estimating the results of the American Presidential election and the re-election of the Roosevelt administration informs us that the re-election of Roosevelt:

“Consolidates the pre-conditions, established at Teheran, for the world to begin to face and work out peaceful paths toward the liberation of the colonial world from its bondage, and the inclusion of those areas within the domain of democracy and increasing well being.

“It clears the way to a new era of full employment, to be extended systematically to more and more of the world, through the united leadership of Britain, the Soviet Union, and America, in an organized world family of nations.

“Only in such a world can America solve her domestic problems, and find the road to inner peace and democracy.

“We have turned the corner on the historic path to that bright future. What Stalingrad was to the Soviet Union, the definite turning of the tide against fascism, so was the Nov. 7th elections for the United States.” (*National Affairs Monthly*, Dec. 1944, pp. 261-62.)

Just consider! What had, in 1940, been an administration representing Wall Street and reactionary Big Business, four years later, when re-elected, according to Browder, “consolidates the pre-conditions” to “work out peaceful paths toward the liberation of the colonial world from bondage,” it “clears the way to a new era of full employment and expanding well being” and finally, the importance of the re-election of Roosevelt is placed on a par with “the definite turning of the tide against fascism,” at Stalingrad.

But not only had the Roosevelt Government been transformed into its opposite by Browder but Roosevelt’s slogan of “National Unity” also underwent a metamorphosis. Whereas, formerly the heart of “National Unity” was Roosevelt’s and the capitalist classes’ “warlike attitude toward the Soviet Union” and “a very dangerous trap for the workers.” Browder, in December 1944, interprets it as follows:

“The reactionary camp was defeated by the aroused intelligence of the masses, by the unity brought about among the most advanced sectors of all classes in support of Roosevelt and by the superb leadership of the president himself at the head of the camp of National Unity.” (Ibid., p. 259.)

Clearly, while it was correct to avoid disunity, which would disrupt the war effort after the war had become a just war, it was wrong to attribute progressive qualities to monopoly capital which it did not possess and to uncritically follow the leadership of the liberal bourgeoisie behind the bourgeois slogan “national unity.”

### **THE TACTIC OF COALITION WITH THE LIBERAL BOURGEOISIE**

However, the American Communists, following the publication of the Duclos article, made sincere efforts to eradicate revisionism from their ideology and practice. They adopted a resolution, after two months of discussion and the submission of 5,000 amendments, which outlined the policies and tactics for the American Communist movement to follow. However, Foster himself stated, following the convention at which the American Communist Party was reconstituted, that:

“The worst mistake we could make, however, would be to conclude from this that the fight against Browder’s revisionism has been won and that we can proceed unconcernedly with our daily tasks.” (*The Worker*, Aug. 5, 1945.)

The resolution adopted by the convention of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. includes the following:

“The dominant sections of American finance Capital supported the war against Nazi Germany not because of hatred of fascism or a desire to liberate suffering Europe from the heel of Nazi despotism, but because it recognized in Hitler Germany a dangerous imperialist rival determined to rule the world.”

Further on the resolution states:

“It is necessary, as never before, to strengthen decisively the democratic unity of the nation, to create that kind of national unity for the postwar period which will be able to facilitate the destruction of fascism and to prevent fascism

from coming to power in the United States. Therefore it is essential to weld together and consolidate the broadest coalition of all anti-fascist and democratic forces as well as all other supporters of Roosevelt's anti-axis policies."

In the first draft of the resolution it read: "including all supporters of Roosevelt's Anti-Axis policies." Apparently there must have been some objection to the formulation because in the final draft, the word "including" was changed to "as well as."

The previous section of the resolution pointed out that the war policies of Roosevelt, which were anti-Axis policies, were supported by the dominant sections of finance capital for their own imperialist aims. Therefore, to state that all "supporters of Roosevelt's anti-Axis policies" be included in the camp of national unity, in the democratic coalition, is to continue to link the labor movement to the big bourgeoisie.

#### **VULGARIZATION OF THE TERM SECTARIANISM**

A. B. Magil, writing in *Political Affairs*, warns against sectarianism as follows:

"One of the principal forms it takes is that of obscuring the differences within the bourgeoisie. In practice this means rejecting the Leninist policy of taking advantage of 'every antagonism of interest among the bourgeoisie of the various countries,' of utilizing 'even the smallest opportunity of gaining, a mass ally, even though this ally be temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable and conditional.' I feel that in this respect the resolution is still not satisfactory for it practically obliterates all conflicts of interest and policy among the monopolists. It is true that section 3 says that 'labor should cooperate with those capitalist groupings and elements who, for one or another reason, desire or endeavor to promote democratic objectives.' This, however, stands in contradiction to section 2, where, the present role of the bourgeoisie is described as if it were a homogeneous unit." (*Political Affairs*, Aug., 1945, p. 724.)

The above method of presentation of the question of taking advantage of antagonisms between various groups of the bourgeoisie constitutes a distortion of Marxism. Since similar viewpoints have

been advanced by other writers who professed to be Marxists it is necessary to deal with the implications and concepts contained in Magil's statement. First, he states that "one of the principal forms it (sectarianism) takes is that of obscuring the differences within the bourgeoisie."

Since when has this become one of the principal forms of sectarianism? Dimitroff defined sectarianism at the 7th Congress as that which "More than anything else impedes our struggle for the realization of the united front"; and Dimitroff explained: "satisfied with its divorce from the real life of the masses," "from the lessons of the labor movement." "Sectarianism," he stated, "finds expression particularly in overestimating the speed at which they are abandoning the positions of reformism." And further: "The necessity of stubborn struggle in the very midst of the masses themselves has been ignored, the struggle for the demands of the workers and work in the reformist trade unions and fascist mass organizations have been neglected." (*The United Front*, p. 85.)

Lenin stated it succinctly:

"We must not regard that which is obsolete for us as obsolete for the class, as obsolete for the masses... you, must soberly observe the actual state of class consciousness and preparedness of the whole class (not only of the Communist vanguard), of all the toiling masses (not only of its advanced elements)." (*Left Wing Communism*, p. 41.)

According to Lenin and Dimitroff, then, sectarianism expresses itself mainly and "particularly" as a vice which neglects practical work among the workers and of estimating the degree of class-consciousness of the masses; of the Party running ahead of the masses; refusing to learn from the labor movement and isolating itself from the working people.

The line of Magil's whole argumentation is, that one of the principal forms of sectarianism is that of obscuring the differences within the bourgeoisie, that it is necessary to take advantage of these differences and quoting, as he does, Lenin's reference to the need of gaining an ally "even though this ally be temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable and conditional" the inference is, that taking advantage of "the difference within the bourgeoisie" means

to secure one section of the bourgeoisie as an ally for the working class.

What did Lenin mean when he spoke of taking advantage of “the difference within the bourgeoisie?” Magil did not give the full quotation, which reads as follows:

“It is possible to conquer this most powerful enemy only by exerting our efforts to the utmost and by necessarily thoroughly, carefully, attentively and skillfully taking advantage of every ‘fissure’ however small, in the ranks of our enemies, of every antagonism of interests among the bourgeoisie of the various countries; by taking advantage of every possibility, however small, of gaining an ally among the masses, even though this ally be temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable and conditional.” (*Left Wing Communism*, p. 52.)

In the paragraph from which the above sentence is taken Lenin was referring to the Soviet Union. In addition it should be noted he speaks of “in the ranks of our enemies” which Magil omitted to mention. In the first place the bourgeoisie are not part of the “masses” and consequently he would not be referring to the bourgeoisie or a section of them when he speaks of the need of securing an ally among the masses and not as Magil said “a mass ally.” In the second place it is patently ridiculous to assume that Lenin would be advising the working class to secure a mass ally “in the ranks of our enemies.”

How did Lenin propose the working class should take advantage of the “differences within the bourgeoisie,” in “the ranks of our enemies?” Lenin wrote:

“To accelerate the inevitable friction, quarrels, conflicts and complete disunity between the Hendersons, the Lloyd Georges and Churchills (Mensheviks, Socialist Revolutionaries, Constitutional Democrats, Monarchists, Scheidemanns, the bourgeoisie, the Kappists, etc.), and to select the moment when the disunity among these ‘pillars of the sacred right of property’ is at its highest, in order to defeat them all by a determined attack of the proletariat and capture political power.” (*Ibid.*, p. 75.)



It may be argued or the proposition supported (as it was by Tim Buck and Alexander Trachtenberg at the Aug. 1945 National Committee meeting of the L.P.P.) that it is a Leninist or Marxian tactic for the working class to form an alliance or coalition with the liberal bourgeoisie or as the American Party resolution states it, “all other supporters of Roosevelt’s anti-axis policies.”

However, what did Lenin say on the subject? Did he ever propose such an alliance or coalition or compromise as a policy to be followed by the working class in the period prior to the advent of socialism?

In 1908 he wrote:

“The experiences of alliances, agreements and blocs with the social reformists liberals in the west and with the liberal reformists (Constitutional Democrats) in the Russian revolution (the bourgeois democratic revolution for the overthrow of semi-feudal Tsarism in 1905 – F.M.) convincingly showed that these agreements only blunt the consciousness of the masses, that they weaken rather than enhance the actual significance of their struggle by linking the fighters with the elements who are most vacillating and treacherous. French Millerandism – the biggest experiment in applying revisionist political tactics on a wide, a really national scale – has provided a practical judgment of revisionism which will never be forgotten by the proletariat all over the world.” (Lenin is here referring to the action of the French Socialist, Millerand, who accepted a cabinet position in the French Government and was condemned for his action by the revolutionary Marxists of the whole world.) (Vol. XI, *Selected Works*, p. 709.)

Lenin again dealt with the question of the liberal bourgeoisie and the tactics of the Bolsheviks in the 1905 revolution in an article, “History of the Labor Press in Russia,” written in April 1914, as follows:

“The essence of the Menshevik tactics of that period was recently expressed by L. Martov himself in the following words: ‘Menshevism saw no other chance of the proletariat fruitfully participating in the present crisis except by assisting the bourgeois liberal democrats in their attempts to re-

move the reactionary section of the possessing classes from state power – which assistance, however, the proletariat was to give while preserving complete political independence.”

And Lenin comments:

“And these tactics of ‘assisting’ the liberals meant in practice that the workers would be dependent on the liberals; they amounted in practice to a liberal-labor policy. The tactics of the Bolsheviks, on the contrary, insured the independence of the proletariat during the bourgeois crisis by waging a struggle to bring the crisis to a head, by exposing the treachery of liberalism and by educating and consolidating the petty-bourgeoisie (particularly the rural petty bourgeoisie) to counterbalance this treachery.” (Ibid., p. 66.)

Lenin not only condemned alliances between the proletariat and the liberal bourgeoisie as a tactical question but castigated those who advocated such policies as revisionists attempting to revise the very foundations of Marxism. Lenin wrote:

“In the domain of politics, revisionism tried to revise the very foundation of Marxism, namely, the doctrine of the class struggle. Political freedom, democracy and universal suffrage remove the ground for the class struggle – we were told – and render untrue the old proposition of the *Communist Manifesto* that the workers have no country. For, they said, since ‘the will of the majority’ prevails under democracy, one must neither regard the state as an organ of class rule, nor reject alliances with the progressive, social reformist bourgeoisie against the reactionaries.

“It cannot be disputed that these objections of the revisionists constitute a fairly harmonious system of views, namely, the old and well known liberal bourgeois views.” (Ibid., p. 708.)

For the past ten years the petty-bourgeois opportunists who have distorted, revised and perverted the teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin in the United States and Canada, have used the tactic of interpreting and explaining sectarianism as an unwillingness or a failure to co-operate with, form alliances and united fronts with, and subordinate the working class to, the petty-bourgeoisie and the big bourgeois-

sie and their political parties. To achieve this aim their favorite manoeuvre has been to “lift excerpts from their context” particularly from the pages of *Left Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder*.

Lenin wrote *Left Wing Communism* in April 1920, to warn the newly formed, youthful Communist Parties against the danger of their healthy, proletarian disgust of the opportunism and betrayal of the old Social Democratic Parties causing them to overlook the fact that the great mass of the workers and peasants were still politically backward. In order that the Communists might more quickly assist the masses in overcoming their political backwardness Lenin advised the members of the youthful Communist Parties that:

“Participation in parliamentary elections and in the struggle in parliament is obligatory for the Party of the revolutionary proletariat, precisely for the purpose of educating the backward strata of its own class, precisely for the purpose of awakening and enlightening the undeveloped, downtrodden, ignorant peasant masses. As long as you are unable to disperse the bourgeois parliament and every other type of reactionary institution you must work inside them.” (*Left Wing Communism*, pp. 41-42.)

And further:

“It is just because the backward masses of the workers and, to a still greater degree, of the small peasants in Western Europe are much more strongly imbued with bourgeois-democratic and parliamentary prejudices than they are in Russia that it is only within such institutions as bourgeois parliaments that Communists can (and must) wage a long and stubborn struggle – undaunted by difficulties – to expose, dispel and overcome these prejudices.” (Ibid., p. 47.)

But at the same time Lenin warned them:

“It is difficult to form in a bourgeois parliament a Communist fraction worthy of the working class; it is difficult to ensure that the Communist parliamentarians do not play at the bourgeois parliamentary game of skittles, but take up the very urgent work of propaganda, agitation, and organization of the masses.” (Ibid., p. 93.)

By no stretch of the imagination can it be suggested that Lenin, by stressing the need of Communists participating in parliament, was inferring that parliamentary activity was all-important. On the contrary he stated:

“The action of the masses – a big strike, for instance – is more important than parliamentary activity at all times and not only during a revolution or in a revolutionary situation.” (*Left Wing Communism*, p. 43.)

### THE MISUSE OF COMPROMISES

For several years now, the revisionists in the ranks of the American and Canadian Communist movements have been elevating the tactic of “compromise” to a pinnacle and depicting it as the very essence of political sagacity. All kinds of compromises were hailed as tremendous victories for the labor movement: Teheran was hailed as a “class alliance” and “a compromise.” Alliances and coalitions between the labor movement and the bourgeoisie were justified as one of the highest forms of revolutionary tactics, the “compromise.” Subordination of the working class to the big bourgeoisie was hailed as a victory for labor and justified as a “compromise.” In fact social progress was even interpreted as an achievement made possible through compromises.

The tragic part of it was, that the revisionists were able to find phrases and sentences of Lenin’s in *Left Wing Communism* which they used to distort Lenin’s teachings regarding the attitude which Communists should adopt towards compromises. Lenin certainly did not regard compromises necessarily as a virtue. Certain forms of compromise Lenin denounced as absolutely inadmissible betrayals of the working class. Lenin stressed that, on questions of principle, there can be no compromise but, on the contrary, “uncompromising struggle” for these principles.

“The term compromise,” Lenin wrote, “in politics implies the surrender of certain of one’s demands, the renunciation of part of one’s demands by agreement with another party.” (Lenin’s *Selected Works*, Vol. III, p. 208.)

And further:

“Engels held that ‘compromises are often unavoidably forced upon a fighting party by circumstances,’ and it is ab-

surd once and for all to refuse, 'to stop at intermediate stations.'

"The task of a truly revolutionary party is not to renounce compromises once and for all, but to be able *throughout all compromises* (Lenin's italics), when they are unavoidable, to remain true to its principles, to its revolutionary purpose, to its task of preparing the way for the revolution and of educating the masses for victory in the revolution." (Ibid., p. 208.)

Lenin, in *Left Wing Communism*, deals with the following forms of compromises:

1. Compromises which the working class is obliged to enter into to avoid a complete defeat.

2. Compromises with groups, sections, organizations and parties of the petty bourgeoisie, particularly the peasantry, and of working class parties under reformist leadership in order to win them over, secure allies and defeat the bourgeoisie.

3. Compromises with the bourgeoisie of a certain state, whose interests temporarily coincide with the interests of the proletarian state, against the bourgeoisie of a third state.

4. Compromises with one's own bourgeoisie in an advanced capitalist country which constitute a treacherous betrayal of the working class.

Regarding the first kind of compromises, Lenin wrote: "Every proletarian has gone through strikes and has experienced 'compromises' with the hated oppressors and exploiters when the workers had to go back to work without having achieved anything, or after consenting to a partial satisfaction of their demands." (*Left Wing Communism*, pp. 49-50.)

Lenin also gave a specific example of such a compromise being affected by the new Soviet Republic when its Red Army was not yet consolidated, its people exhausted and a retreat was necessary in order to secure a breathing spell. That was the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, under whose terms the Baltic States and the Ukraine were ceded to the Germans, because the Soviet troops were in no condition to stop the German advance. Regarding this compromise Lenin wrote: "It was indeed a compromise with the Imperialists, but it was a compromise which, under the given circumstances, was obligatory." (Ibid., p. 21.)

Of the second type of compromises Lenin gave a number of examples. Speaking of the tactics of the Bolsheviks, Lenin stated:

“Since 1905 they systematically defended the alliance between the working class and the peasantry against the Liberal bourgeoisie and Tsarism, never, however, refusing to support the bourgeoisie against Tsarism (for instance, during the second stage of elections or second ballots), and never ceasing their irreconcilable ideological and political struggle against the bourgeois revolutionary peasant party, the Socialist-Revolutionaries, exposing them as petty bourgeois democrats falsely masquerading as socialists. During the Duma elections in 1907, the Bolsheviks for a brief period entered into a formal political bloc with the Socialist-Revolutionaries. Between 1903 and 1912 there were periods of several years when we were formally united with the Mensheviks in a single Party, the Social Democratic Party, but we never ceased our ideological and political struggle against them as opportunists and carriers of bourgeois influence among the proletariat. During the war we compromised to a certain extent with the Kautskyists, with the Left Mensheviks (Martov), and with a section of the Socialist-Revolutionaries (Chernov and Natanson); we had meetings with them at Zimmerwald and Kienthal and issued joint manifestos; but we never ceased and never relaxed our ideological-political struggle against the Kautskyists, against Martov and Chernov. (Natanson died in 1919; he had become a “Revolutionary Communist” Narodnik – very close to us and almost in agreement with us.) At the very outbreak of the October Revolution we entered into an informal, but very important, and highly successful political bloc with the petty-bourgeois peasantry and adopted the Socialist-Revolutionary agrarian program in its entirety, without a single alteration – that is, we entered into what was undoubtedly a compromise in order to prove to the peasants that we did not want to “steam-roller” them but come to an agreement with them. At the same time, we proposed (and soon effected), a formal, political bloc, including participation in the government, to the ‘Left’ Socialist-Revolutionaries. The latter broke up this bloc after the conclusion of the Brest-

Litovsk Peace, and then in July 1918, rose in armed rebellion and later waged an armed struggle against us.” (*Left Wing Communism*, pp. 53-54.)

As to the term bloc Lenin explains:

“Some maintain that a bloc means putting up a joint list of candidates; others deny this and say that it means a common platform. All these disputes are silly and scholastic. The essence of the matter is not altered a whit whether you call the narrower or the wider agreements blocs.” (*Selected Works*, Vol. III, p. 404.)

In other words a bloc can mean either a joint list of candidates or a common platform between two parties. “The wider agreement,” a “common platform” would, of course, also include a “joint list of candidates.”

It should be noted that all of the instances of compromises with other political parties by the Bolsheviks, which Lenin gives above, were with peasant parties or workers’ parties. The example given of a formal political bloc with the Socialist-Revolutionary Party, the largest peasant party, occurred before the revolution against Tsarism, when the disposition of forces was an “alliance of the working class with the peasantry.” – (Stalin, on Strategy and Tactics, in *Foundations of Leninism*, p. 89.) The other formal political bloc which the Bolsheviks entered into at the time of the Socialist Revolution in Nov. 1917 was with the party of the poor peasantry, namely, the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries with whom the working class had an alliance which Stalin referred to as an “alliance of the proletariat with the poorest section of the peasantry” (Ibid., p. 90.) All the other examples of compromises with other parties were with Socialist Parties with a working class membership. Lenin gave another example of a compromise that was correct in his advice to the German Communists in 1920, as follows:

“The German Social-Democratic Party is obviously not homogeneous. Alongside the old opportunist leaders (Kautsky, Hilferding, and to a considerable extent, Crispian, Ledebour and others) – who have proven their inability to understand the significance of the Soviet power and the dictatorship of the proletariat, their inability to lead the latter in its revolutionary struggle – there has arisen in

this Party a Left proletarian wing which is growing with remarkable rapidity. Hundreds of thousands of proletarian members of this party (and it has, I think, about three quarters of a million members) are leaving Scheidemann and are rapidly going over to Communism.

“This proletarian wing has already proposed – at the Leipzig (1919) Congress of the Independents – immediate and unconditional affiliation to the Third International. To fear a ‘compromise’ with this wing of the party is positively ridiculous. On the contrary, it is the duty of Communists to see and to find an appropriate form of compromise with them, such a compromise as, on the one hand, would facilitate and accelerate the necessary complete fusion with this wing and on the other, would not in any way hamper the Communists in their ideological-political struggle against the opportunist Right wing of the ‘Independents.’ Probably it will not be easy to devise the appropriate form of compromise, but only a charlatan could promise the German workers and German Communists an easy way to victory.” (*Left Wing Communism*, p. 55.)

The philistines and opportunists will undoubtedly howl that even the Bolsheviks entered into a compromise, a bloc with the liberal bourgeoisie. But what were the circumstances, the period, and what conclusions did the Bolsheviks form from that experience? Here is Lenin’s explanation:

“... Before the downfall of Tsarism, the Russian revolutionary Social-Democrats repeatedly used the services of the bourgeois liberals, i.e., concluded numerous practical compromises with them. In 1901-1902 prior to the rise of Bolshevism, the old editorial board of *Iskra* (comprising Plekhanov, Axelrod, Zasulich, Martov, Petresov, and myself) concluded – it is true, not for long – a formal political alliance with Struve, the political leader of bourgeois liberalism while it was able at the same time to carry on an unceasing and merciless ideological and political struggle against bourgeois liberalism and against the slightest manifestation of its influence in the working class movement. The Bolsheviks always adhered to this policy.” (*Ibid.*, p. 53.)



First, it should be noted that the compromise or bloc which Lenin refers to was consummated before the fall of Tsarism. Secondly, the bloc was formed prior to the rise of Bolshevism in 1901-1902. Thirdly, the bloc “was not for long.” Fourthly, during the course of the agreement the Social Democratic Labor Party conducted a merciless ideological and political struggle against the influence of bourgeois liberalism in the working class movement. Furthermore, the group which Struve led were known as the “Legal Marxists” and professed to advocate Marxism.

Writing in 1906 Lenin stated: “We are waging ruthless war on the Social Democrats who allow such blocs – no blocs with the Cadets! (Constitutional Democrats; the party of the liberal bourgeoisie.)” (Vol. III, *Selected Works*, p. 413.)

The resolution of the Bolsheviks adopted at the Third Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Party, which dealt with the question of the party participating in a provisional revolutionary government in the event of the revolution against Tsarism being successful, took a similar attitude toward the bourgeoisie and bourgeois parties. It read:

“A necessary condition for such participation is that the Party shall maintain strict control over its representatives and that the independence of Social Democracy which is irreconcilably hostile to all the bourgeois parties, shall be strictly maintained.” (Ibid., p. 47.)

In *Two Tactics of Social Democracy* Lenin again stressed the need of maintaining complete independence from the bourgeoisie, even in the course of the bourgeois democratic revolution, as follows:

“A Social Democrat must never, even for an instant, forget that the proletarian class struggle for Socialism against the most democratic and republican bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie is inevitable. This is beyond doubt. From this logically follows the absolute necessity of a separate, independent and strictly class party of Social Democracy. From this logically follows the provisional character of our tactics to ‘strike together’ with the bourgeoisie and the duty to carefully watch ‘our ally’ as if he were an enemy, etc.” (Ibid., p. 100.)

Finally in 1908 Lenin wrote:

“The experiences of alliances, agreements and blocs with the social reformist liberals in the West and with the Liberal reformists (Constitutional Democrats) (Cadets – F.M.) in the Russian revolution convincingly showed that these agreements only blunt the consciousness of the masses, that they weaken rather than enhance the actual significance of their struggle by linking the fighters with the elements who are least capable of fighting and who are most vacillating and treacherous.” (Vol. XI, *Selected Works*, p. 709.)

So, although Lenin stated that a bloc had been formed for a short time, during the 1905 Russian Revolution, with the liberal bourgeoisie, that experience, together with the experience of other parties in Europe “convincingly showed” that such blocs were not to the advantage of the working class even during the course of carrying through the bourgeois democratic revolution, at least in Imperialist countries, because “they weaken rather than enhance the actual significance of their struggle.”

As regards the third type of compromises between a proletarian state and a bourgeois state against the bourgeoisie of a third state, Lenin, in his famous *Letter to American Workers*, written in August 1918, denounced those who slandered the new Soviet Republic, explained and justified Soviet tactics:

“The beasts of prey of Anglo-French and American Imperialism ‘accuse’ us of coming to an ‘agreement’ with German Imperialism.

“O hypocrites! O scoundrels, who slander the workers’ government and shiver from fear of that sympathy which is being shown us by the workers of their own countries! But their hypocrisy will be exposed. They pretend not to understand the difference between an agreement made by ‘Socialists’ with the bourgeoisie (native or foreign) against the workers, against the toilers, and an agreement for the safety of the workers who have defeated their bourgeoisie, with a bourgeoisie of one national color against the bourgeoisie of another color for the sake of the utilization by the proletariat of the contradictions between the different groups of the bourgeoisie.

“In reality every European knows this very well, and the American people particularly, as I shall presently show, have ‘experienced’ it in their own history. There are agreements and agreements, there are fagots et fagots as the French say.

“When the German Imperialist robbers in February, 1918, threw their armies against defenseless, demobilized Russia, which staked its hopes upon the international solidarity of the proletariat before the international revolution had completely ripened, I did not hesitate for a moment to come to a certain ‘agreement’ with the French Monarchists. The French Captain Sadoul, who sympathized in words with the Bolsheviks while in deeds a faithful servant of French Imperialism, brought the French officer de Lubersac to me. ‘I am a French Monarchist. My only purpose is the defeat of Germany,’ de Lubersac declared to me. ‘That goes without saying (cela va sans dire),’ I replied. But this by no means prevented me from coming to an ‘agreement’ with de Lubersac concerning certain services that French officers, experts in explosives, were ready to render by blowing up railroad tracks in order to prevent the advance of German troops against us. This was an example of an ‘agreement’ of which every class conscious worker will approve, an agreement in the interests of socialism. We shook hands with the French Monarchist although we knew that each of us would readily hang his ‘partner.’ But for a time our interests coincided. To throw back the rapacious advancing Germans we made use of the equally rapacious counter-interests of the other imperialists, thereby serving the interests of the Russian and the international Socialist revolution. In this way we served the interests of the working class of Russia and other countries, we strengthened the proletariat and weakened the bourgeoisie of the whole world, we used the justified practice of manoeuvring, necessary in every war, of shifting and waiting for the moment when the rapidly growing proletarian revolution in a number of advanced countries has ripened.” (*A Letter to American Workers*, pp. 13-14.)

And Lenin added:

“I would not hesitate a single second to come to the same kind of an ‘agreement’ with the German Imperialist robbers, should an attack on Russia by Anglo-French troops demand it.” (Ibid.)

As Lenin placed it “there are agreements and agreements.” An agreement between a proletarian state and the bourgeoisie of one country against the bourgeoisie of another country is one thing and an agreement between the so-called “Socialists” of an imperialist country with their own bourgeoisie is something entirely different. Regarding this, the fourth type of compromise, Lenin took a very different attitude. He wrote:

“A statesman, desirous of being useful to the revolutionary proletariat must know how to single out concrete cases of precisely such compromises as are inadmissible, as express opportunism and treachery, and to direct all the forces of his criticism, the spearhead of merciless exposure and of irreconcilable war, against those concrete compromises, and prevent the experienced ‘practical’ Socialists and parliamentary Jesuits from dodging and wriggling out of responsibility by resorting to arguments about ‘compromises in general.’ It is precisely in this way that Messieurs the ‘leaders’ of the British trade unions, as well as of the Fabian Society and the ‘Independent’ Labor Party, dodge responsibility for the treachery they perpetrated, for committing such a compromise which really expresses the worst kind of opportunism, treachery and betrayal.” (*Left Wing Communism*, p. 22.)

Regarding the attitude of his own party towards its “own bourgeoisie”:

“The members of this party in the Duma took the road of exile to Siberia rather than the road leading to ministerial portfolios in a bourgeois government. The revolution, which overthrew Tsarism and established the democratic republic, put the party to a new and tremendous test; the party did not enter into any agreement with ‘its own imperialists,’ but prepared their overthrow and did overthrow them.” (Ibid., p. 23.)

It is not an accident that the philistine perverters of Marxism, who advocated agreements, blocs and compromises “in general” failed to quote that section of *Left Wing Communism* in which Lenin pointedly outlined why and whom the Communists should resort to manoeuvres and compromises with. Here is the quotation:

“Capitalism would not be capitalism, if the ‘pure’ proletariat were not surrounded by a large number of extremely varied transitional types, from the proletariat to the semi-proletarian (who earns half his livelihood by the sale of his labor power), from the semi-proletarian to the small peasant (and petty craftsmen, handicrafts worker and small proprietor in general), from the small peasant to the middle peasant and so on; and if, within the proletariat itself there were no divisions into more or less developed strata, division according to territorial origin, according to trades, sometimes according to religion, and so on. And all this makes it necessary – absolutely necessary – for the vanguard of the proletariat, for its class conscious section, the Communist Party, to resort to manoeuvres and compromises with the various groups of proletarians, with the various parties of the workers and small proprietors. The whole point lies in *knowing how* (Lenin’s italics) to apply these tactics in such a way as to raise and not lower the general level of proletarian class consciousness, revolutionary spirit and ability to fight to conquer”. (Ibid., pp. 55-56.)

Lenin here advocates compromises not with “their own” bourgeoisie but “with the various groups of proletarians, with the various parties of the workers and small proprietors.”

Regarding agreements or blocs with the bourgeoisie Lenin wrote:

“The fundamental idea of opportunism is an alliance, or a coming together (sometimes an agreement, a bloc, etc.), of the bourgeoisie with its antipodes.” (*Lenin on Britain*, p. 69.)

“The antipodes of the bourgeoisie, i.e., its “exact opposite,” is the proletariat, the working class. And Lenin stated further: “Opportunism is Liberal-labor politics.” (Ibid., p. 68.)

The opportunists in the Communist movement who were so fond of using phrases and sentences from Lenin's *Left Wing Communism* to justify their arguments in support of alliances, unity, co-operation, etc., between the working class and "their own" capitalist class or sections of it did not, of course, refer to Lenin's statements concerning opportunism as the main enemy even at the time when he was writing *Left Wing Communism*. In answer to the question, "In the struggle against what enemies within the working class movement did Bolshevism grow, gain strength and become steeled?" Lenin replied:

"First of all, and principally, in the struggle against opportunism, which, in 1914, definitely grew into social-chauvinism and definitely went over to the side of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. This was naturally the principal enemy of Bolshevism in the working class movement. This enemy remains the principal enemy also on an international scale. This enemy has claimed, and still claims, most of the attention of the Bolsheviks. This side of the activities of the Bolsheviks is now fairly well known abroad." (*Left Wing Communism*, p. 17.)

Opportunism, then, and not left sectarianism, was the principal enemy, not only of the Bolsheviks, but "also on an international scale." This axiom of Lenin's is more true today, at least in certain English speaking countries of the world, than it was in 1920.

In case there might have been any doubt regarding the attitude of his own party, Lenin made it clear: "It absolutely insists on the need for complete class independence for the party of the proletariat." (Vol. III, *Selected Works*, p. 121.)

Dimitroff, in June 1937, reiterated the same concept when he referred to the Communists as being "free from all connections with and dependence on the bourgeoisie."

### **THE PERVERSION OF THE PEOPLE'S FRONT TACTIC**

It must be stated that when Earl Browder said that the "trade unions and progressive groups" should be encouraged "to systematic and organized activity within the Democratic party (in some places the Republican party)," he was violating Marxian principles and perverting the doctrine of the class struggle which is the "very foundation of Marxism," disregarding the specific advice of Marx,

Engels, Lenin and Dimitroff and abandoning the whole fight for the American Peoples' Front, or for a Workers' and Farmers' Party.

This was not a question, so much, of tailing the "politically immature labor movement," but of playing a role of leadership in further subordinating the whole labor movement to the liberal bourgeoisie. The so-called "democratic coalition" which was "consolidated and strengthened" by Roosevelt was, in fact, nothing more nor less than "liberal labor politics," i.e., the subordination of the working class to the ideological and political leadership of the liberal bourgeoisie and their chief spokesman, Roosevelt. This does not imply that it was wrong for the labor movement to support the re-election of Roosevelt when the choice lay between him and Dewey and there was no mass third party movement. The point is, the American Communists departed from Marxism in abandoning the task of building a mass third party movement and by encouraging the workers to "utilize" the bourgeois parties. This, of course, did not justify their failure to maintain an independent working class position while supporting the re-election of Roosevelt. However, their position could not very well have been otherwise because the abandonment of the fight for an independent mass third party movement signified acceptance of the leadership of and support to, the liberal bourgeoisie as a barrier to fascism, «s an alternative to a people's front of struggle.

But such a tactic is no more justified today than it was forty years ago in Czarist Russia. At that time the notorious Black Hundreds filled a very similar role to that of the modern fascist organizations which everywhere were organized and grew up under the benevolent protection of governments and, quite often, under governments of the liberal bourgeoisie and of Social Democrats. Lenin, at that time launched a devastating attack against the theory that the election of representatives of the liberal bourgeoisie constituted a barrier to the violence and terrorism of the reactionary Black Hundreds.

Lenin wrote:

"The main argument of the Mensheviks is the Black Hundred danger. The first and fundamental falsity of this argument is that it is impossible to fight against the Black Hundred danger by means of Cadet tactics and Cadet policy. The essence of this policy is conciliation with Tsarism,

i.e., with the Black Hundred danger. The first Duma proved sufficiently that the Cadet is not fighting against the Black Hundred danger, but is making indescribably despicable speeches about the innocence and non-responsibility of the monarch, the known leader of the Black Hundreds. Therefore, by helping to elect the Cadets to the Duma the Mensheviks are not only not fighting the Black Hundred danger, but on the contrary, they are hoodwinking the people, are obscuring the actual significance of the Black Hundred danger. To fight the Black Hundred danger by helping to elect the Cadets to the Duma is like fighting pogroms by means of speeches delivered by the lackey, Rodichev: 'It is impertinence to regard the monarch as being responsible for the pogroms.'

"The second fault in the current argument is that the Social Democrats tacitly concede the hegemony in the democratic struggle to the Cadets. In the event of a split vote that secures the victory of the Black Hundreds, why should we be blamed for not having voted for the Cadets and not the Cadets be blamed for not having voted for us? 'We are in a minority,' answer the Mensheviks, thoroughly imbued with the spirit of Christian humility. 'The Cadets are more numerous. Surely the Cadets cannot be expected to declare themselves revolutionaries.'

"Yes! But there is no reason why Social Democrats should declare themselves Cadets! Nowhere in the world has there been a case in an indecisive outcome of a bourgeois revolution when the Social-Democrats have been in a majority against the bourgeois-democrats; nor could this happen. But everywhere, in all countries, the first independent entry of the Social Democrats in election campaigns was met by the howling and barking of the liberals who accused the Socialists of letting the Black Hundreds in. We are, therefore, quite undisturbed by the usual Menshevik cries that the Bolsheviks are letting the Black Hundreds in. All the liberals have always shouted this to all the Socialists. By refusing to fight the Cadets you are leaving masses of proletarian and semi-proletarian elements capable of following the Social-Democrats under the ideological influence of the Cadets. Sooner or later, unless you



cease to be Socialists, you will have to fight your own battle in spite of the Black Hundred danger. And it is easier and more necessary to take the right step today than it would be to take it tomorrow. In the third Duma (if it is called after the second) it will be even more difficult for you to dissolve the bloc with the Cadets, you will be still more entangled in the unnatural relations with the betrayers of the revolution and the real Black Hundred danger, let me repeat, lies not in Black Hundred deputies being elected to the Duma, but in pogroms and courts-martial; and you are making it more difficult for the people to fight this real danger by forcing Cadet blinkers upon them.” (Lenin’s *Selected Works*, Vol. III, pp. 407-8-9.)

The fact that the resolution of the American Communist Party continues to speak of the “Roosevelt, labor, democratic coalition” and to state “it is essential to weld together and consolidate the broadest coalition of all anti-fascist and democratic forces as well as all other supporters of Roosevelt’s anti-Axis policies” simply shows the American Communists have not yet achieved an independent working class position but retain a position which, in practice, cannot but result in subordinating the political interests of the American working class to the interests of the liberal bourgeoisie. Such a policy cannot be justified under any consideration and least of all as a means of blocking fascism coming to power. In his report to the 7th Congress Dimitroff pointed out that coalition governments which included the Social Democrats did not prevent fascism from attacking the working class or of seizing political power, when he stated:

“Participation of Social Democratic ministers in bourgeois governments is not a barrier to fascism.” (*The United Front*, p. 35.)

It logically follows that if a coalition government that included Social Democrats is not a barrier to fascism then neither is a government of the liberal big bourgeoisie.

If reactionary, predatory American Imperialism, intoxicated with its own tremendous economic power and political influence, is to be blocked from the inevitable trend it will follow, towards fascist reaction at home and imperialist aggression abroad, the only force capable of halting it is the American working class.

To achieve this aim the American working class must be led by a leadership, a political party, with a correct theory and tactics which will build working class unity and secure allies from the ranks of the farmers and the urban middle class on the basis of a policy of class struggle, free from all elements of class collaboration or dependence upon the bourgeoisie.

To fulfill this role, the Communist Party of the U.S.A. should immediately proceed with two vital tasks:

1. Correct its programmatic resolution by eliminating the remaining revisionist line, expressed in the formulation "coalition of all anti-fascist and democratic forces as well as all other supporters of Roosevelt's anti-Axis policies" and "the Roosevelt-labor-democratic coalition."

This will enable the C.P.U.S.A. to achieve the correct position which Dimitroff stressed; a position "free from all connection with and dependence on the bourgeoisie" or as Lenin placed it "complete class independence for the party of the proletariat."

2. Once having achieved a correct position "free from all connection with and dependence on the bourgeoisie" the American Communists should proceed immediately either to put their own party on the ballot in a majority of states or carry out the advice of Engels given fifty-nine years ago: the formation of an independent, third mass party of the working people on a national scale. If, because of the peculiar American electoral laws it is found to be impossible to place their own party on the ballot in any number of states so that the workers could have an alternative to the two existing bourgeois parties a mass third party, a Workers' and Farmers' Party, would be an advantage. The base of this party should be the American trade unions and its iron core, the Communists. Such a mass party could enable the American Communists, in the words of Dimitroff:

"To find a common language with the broadest masses for the purpose of struggling against the class enemy, to find ways of finally overcoming the isolation of the revolutionary vanguard from the masses of the proletariat and all the toilers, as well as overcoming the fatal isolation of the working class itself from its natural allies in the struggle against the bourgeoisie against fascism.

“To draw increasingly wide masses into the revolutionary class struggle and lead them to the proletarian revolution, proceeding from their vital needs and interests as the starting point, and their own experience as the basis.” (*The United Front*, p. 92.)

### CHAPTER III:

## THE INTRODUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF REVISIONISM IN THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CANADA

Discussion on revisionism in the ranks of the Communist movement in Canada (The Labor Progressive Party) commenced almost immediately following publication of the Duclos article on May 28th, 1945. However, it was not until almost two months later, July 21st, and after studying all of the material on revisionism published by the American Communists, that the National leadership finally issued a statement, in the name of Tim Buck, National leader of the Party: "The National Executive of the Labor Progressive Party studied and discussed the questions raised in Comrade Duclos' article and subjected our parties recent activities to a critical re-examination. (*The P.A.*, July 21st, 1945.) According to Buck, the collective opinion of the L.P.P. National Executive was, that Browder "Did interpret the Teheran Accord as a platform of class peace." After making that "profound" observation Buck went on to point out that the Labor Progressive Party, on the contrary, regarded the Teheran Accord as "Above all a platform of democratic struggle."

Apparently, in order to make clear what was meant by "democratic struggle," Buck went on to explain that: "The fight for policies in accord with it (The Teheran Declaration) in every country is primarily a struggle to unite labor and all democratic forces, including a section of the capitalist class, behind policies of jobs, social security and progress at home, through co-operation with all democratic peoples in post war reconstruction and development abroad." (Ibid.)

Since Buck had already pointed out that "The essential element in Duclos' comment concerning the Teheran Accord is that it was wrong to estimate it as a platform of class peace after the war." (Ibid.) One would be justified in assuming that Buck therefore agreed with Duclos, Or did he?

Here we have three different interpretations of the Teheran Accord. Browder interpreted it as a platform of class peace which Duclos pointed out was incorrect. Duclos interpreted it as a diplomatic document, i.e., an agreement between the governments of the three states concerned. Buck however, claims it is a "platform of demo-

cratic struggle.” Whether or not this joint struggle of “labor” and a “section of the capitalist class” is some new form of the class struggle to meet the “new conditions” Buck does not explain. However, one would be justified in drawing that conclusion since Buck refers to “The contrast between Comrade Browder’s approach to Teheran as a platform of class peace and our approach to it as a platform of democratic struggle.” (Ibid.)

In regard to whether or not the revisionism of Browder was integrated in the policy of the Canadian Party, Buck states:

“A large part of Browder’s general conception and several of his concrete proposals became integrated in our thinking about political problems. Formulations expressing his point of view appeared in several of our articles. I accepted his proposal for Anglo-United States Agreement upon division of export markets without a thought of the elaborate revisionist concept of world and class relationships upon which it is based and urged that Canada should support such an Anglo-U.S. Agreement. It must be recognized frankly that we identified ourselves with the Communist Political Association in support of Comrade Browder’s ‘New Course’ and our evaluation of the bearing that Comrade Duclos’ articles has upon our own Party work must start with this fact.” (Ibid.)

Having made this admission, Buck then goes on to say:

“It would be a serious mistake, however, to ignore the fact that there was a distinct and in some respects a deep going difference between what we did in Canada and what was done in the United States. If we make the mistake of assuming that our political policies, slogans and activities have been generally wrong we shall inevitably swing to erroneous policies as a result.” (Ibid.)

Indeed! Here we have a real achievement. The Canadian “Marxists” were “frankly” in support of Browder’s “new course” but it would be a mistake to assume that their “practical policies, slogans and activities were generally wrong.” In other words, the “new course” policy of Browder was frankly supported even to the extent of Buck himself urging that Imperialism cease being Imperialism and voluntarily come to “an agreement upon division of ex-

port markets”, yet to assume “that the practical policies, slogans and activities were generally wrong” would be a mistake which would result in an “inevitable swing to erroneous policies.”

After devoting three columns to an attempt to prove that, whereas the policies of the Communist Political Association on specific questions were wrong, the policies of the Labor Progressive Party in connection with these same questions were eminently correct, Buck then asks:

“How is it to be explained that our action slogans and practical activities were generally correct, expressing a line of struggle against reactionary big capital and fascist tendencies when we did not even question Comrade Browder’s theories?” (Ibid.)

Indeed yes! How was it? Here is a real feat of legerdemain. The “new course” of Browder, the new incorrect tactical line, was accepted without question yet, in practise, this tactical line was correct. In other words, in putting the tactical line into practise it underwent a transformation into its opposite. It was admittedly, wrong in theory but became correct in practise. Marxism holds that without a correct theory one cannot be correct in practise. In fact, this is an elementary principle of Marxism. “Our theory is not a dogma but a guide to action,” said Lenin. According to Stalin, “theory ought to be the handmaid of practise;” theory “ought to be verified by the data obtained from practise.” (*Foundations of Leninism*, p. 23.)

According to the fundamental principles of the philosophy of Marxism, Dialectical Materialism, theory is the opposite of practise and the law of the “conflict and unity of opposites” dictates that the harmony or unity of the two is only possible when the correctness of a theory is tested in practice. Conversely, if the theory is incorrect it will be proven so in practice. To argue that a tactical line is wrong in theory but that the “practical activities” based on such an incorrect theory are nevertheless correct is a monstrous absurdity.

Undaunted by this fact, however, Buck proceeds to nonchalantly explain the contradiction:

“It is clear now (?) that the extent to which we avoided repeating Comrade Browder’s errors in our practical work was due solely to our closer contact with the workers and

the greater sensitivity of our Party to working class opinion.” (Ibid.)

Yes, “obviously!” But to whom it is clear, or why it is clear, Buck does not say.

After having stated that it would be a mistake to assume “that our practical policies, slogans and activities have been generally wrong” and that to make any such assumption would result in “erroneous policies,” Buck then advises that, “Our task now is to subject all our work, theoretical and practical, to a critical and searching re-examination.” Does Buck mean to suggest the revisionism should be removed from the Party’s policies? But no! He explains:

“We must root out all tendencies towards revisionist theories and eliminate any reflections of revisionism in our practical work without making the mistake of ‘throwing out the baby with the bath water’.” (Ibid.)

So it is not revisionism that is to be “rooted out” and “eliminated” but “tendencies” and “reflections” (elsewhere he proposes to root out “elements”). But this is quite logical. To root out revisionism would prove that the policies followed were wrong and that in turn would result in an “inevitable swing to erroneous policies” which would (horrors) be even worse. Nevertheless, since most of us are not endowed with the power of clairvoyance it would be fruitless to search for shadows (tendencies, reflections and elements). On the other hand, to endeavour to locate revisionism on the basis of a comparison of Canadian policies to similar American policies already recognized as revisionism would lay one open to the charge of Buck that: “The assumption too readily made by some Comrades, that all criticism appearing in the U.S. Communist press applies to Canada is wrong.” It is possible however to agree with Buck’s statement, that “It is important that this matter (revisionism) be studied on the basis of our own documents, program and statements and our own actual work in Canada.” (Ibid.)

We could, of course, commence our search for revisionism with Buck’s own statement on revisionism from which the above quotation is taken. For instance: His proposal to “unite labor” with “a section of the capitalist class,” or “the campaign” to “put labor in the government as the sole means by which to ensure jobs, security and international co-operation after the war.” We could be so un-

kind as to point out to Mr. Buck that his proposal to “put labor in the government” is nothing more nor less than Millerandism, constitutes a betrayal of Socialism and of the working class and is, in fact, a notorious revision of Marxian tactics and a perversion of Marxian principles. Or, we could ask Mr. Buck his authority for the statement that having labor in the government would “ensure jobs, security and international cooperation after the war.” We could further ask Mr. Buck if having “labor in the government” will also cause the economic laws of capitalism which, Marx teaches, result in the inevitability of economic crises, mass unemployment and insecurity, to discontinue operation in order to “ensure jobs and security.” However, maybe it is possible that the shock of seeing Communists jointly “making Capitalism work” together with the Liberals, a party of monopoly capital, would cause even the economic laws of capitalism to discontinue operation. For the present however, we will refrain from the temptation and proceed to an examination of what Mr. Buck terms “our own Party documents, program and statements.” Since, in the opinion of the American Communists, Browder’s revisionism “goes back at least ten years” and in view of the fact, “documents, program and statements” going back ten years are available, we will commence our search for revisionism in Party documents issued in 1935, the year of the 7th Congress of the C.I. and the introduction of the new tactical line of “The Peoples Front against Fascism and War.”

### **THE NEW TACTICAL LINE PROPOSED BY DIMITROFF IN 1935**

Dimitroff, in his report to the Congress, warned of the danger of Fascism coming to power in a number of countries and characterized it as an “Open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary section of finance capital.” The Congress adopted a reshaped tactical line to cope with the menace of fascism and war. This “reshaped tactical line” was based firstly, on the tactic of the united front of the working class and secondly, on the basis of unity in action of the working class, attracting to it and uniting with itself sections of the urban middle class and the farmers, thus building a peoples front.

What did Dimitroff mean by the United Front of the working class? Did he mean a parliamentary electoral agreement? No! That is not what was meant. The purpose of the United Front was to prevent fascism and war because:



“Fascism was able to come to power primarily, because the working class, owing to the policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie pursued by the Social Democratic leaders, proved to be split, politically and organizationally disarmed in face of the onslaught of the bourgeoisie. And the Communist Parties on the other hand, apart from and in opposition to the Social Democrats, were not strong enough to rouse the masses and to lead them in a decisive struggle against fascism.” (*The United Front*, p. 19.)

The United Front was designed to unite the working class against the onslaught of the bourgeoisie. There are only two basic policies which the working class can follow in the political field, according to Marxism: The policy of class struggle against the bourgeoisie or the policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie. The policy of the Communist Parties was the policy of class struggle, whereas the policy of the Social Democratic Parties was the policy of class collaboration, i.e., co-operation with all, or sections of, the capitalist class, the securing of concessions, discouragement of militant action, confining practically all political action to the parliamentary field in order, first of all, to secure reforms and finally on the basis of the theory of “gradualism” to reform capitalism itself, through a Social Democratic government, to the point where capitalism would be gradually reformed and transformed into socialism through parliamentary acts and governmental decrees. (Such is the basic theory and policy of the C.C.F. in Canada.)

However, as a result of the victory of fascism in Germany and several other countries, large sections of the working class in many countries were, in 1935, becoming disillusioned with the possibility of improving their lot under capitalism or of ever achieving socialism by means of such a policy, of class collaboration. Further:

“The armed struggles in Austria and Spain have resulted in ever wider masses of the working class coming to realize the necessity for a revolutionary class struggle.” (Ibid., p. 28.)

The major political parties of the working class in practically all countries were the Social Democratic Parties and the Communists.

As regards the changed outlook of the members and supporters of the Social Democratic Parties:

“With ever greater ease are the Social Democratic workers able to convince themselves that Fascist Germany, with all its horrors and barbarities, is in the final analysis, the result of the Social Democratic policy of class collaboration with the Bourgeoisie. The masses are coming ever more clearly to realize that the path along which the German Social Democratic leaders led the proletariat must not be traversed again. Never has there been such ideological dissension in the camp of the Second International as at the present time. A process of differentiation is taking place in all the Social Democratic Parties. Within their ranks two principal camps are forming; side by side with the existing camp of reactionary elements who are trying in every way to preserve the bloc between the Social Democrats and the bourgeoisie, and who rabidly reject a united front with the Communists, there is beginning to form a camp of revolutionary elements who entertain doubts as to the correctness of the policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, who are in favor of the creation of a united front with the Communists, and who are increasingly coming to adopt the position of the revolutionary class struggle.” (Ibid., pp. 29-30.)

In other words, because of the rise of fascism a united working class movement based on a policy of class struggle was now necessary and because of the fact a large section of Social Democratic workers were adopting the position of the revolutionary class struggle, a united front of the two principal political sections of the working class was now possible.

It was possible because of the changing outlook of the Social Democratic workers and necessary because:

“Whether the victory of Fascism can be prevented depends first and foremost on the militant activity of the working class itself, on whether its forces are welded into a single militant army combating the offensive of capitalism and fascism. By establishing its fighting unity, the proletariat would paralyze the influence of fascism over the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie of the towns, the youth and the intelligentsia, and would be able to neutralize one section of them and win over another.” (Ibid., p. 25.)

The United Front was to be formed first of all in the factories:

“The first thing that must be done, the thing with which to begin, is to form a united front, to establish unity of action of the workers in every factory, in every district, in every country, all over the world.” (Ibid., pp. 30-31.)

The United Front therefore, was nothing more nor less than unity in action of the workers, in the factories, in every district, region and country. The effect of such unity of action, however, would be widespread:

“A powerful united front of the proletariat would exert tremendous influence on all other strata of the working people, on the peasantry, on the urban petty bourgeoisie, on the intelligentsia. A united front would inspire the wavering groups with faith in the strength of the working class.” (Ibid., p. 31.)

Such unity of action, therefore, would confront the forces of fascism, not only with the sum total of the numerical strength of the workers but would add to that total large sections of middle class people who had previously wavered between support of the workers and support of the capitalists. As regards the conditions for such unity of action:

“The Communist International puts no condition for unity of action excepting one, and that an elementary condition acceptable to all workers, viz., that the unity of action be directed against fascism, against the offensive of capital, against the threat of wars, against the class enemy. This is our condition.” (Ibid., p. 32.)

As regards the issues on which the United Front should be based, the content:

“What is and ought to be the basic content of the United Front at the present stage. The defense of the immediate economic and political interests of the working class, the defense of the working class against fascism, must form the starting point and main content of the united front in all capitalist countries.” (Ibid., p. 36.)

As the joint struggle of the workers strengthened and extended in defense of their vital interests against the capitalists and assumed a scope national in character:

“We must tirelessly prepare the working class for a rapid change in forms and methods of struggle when there is a change in the situation. As the movement grows and the unity of the working class strengthens, we must go further and prepare the transition from the defensive to the offensive against capital, steering towards the organization of a mass political strike. It must be an absolute condition of such a strike to draw into it the main trade unions of the countries concerned.” (Ibid., p. 36.)

So far there is nothing ambiguous or difficult to understand as to what was meant by the united front of revolutionary class struggle of the working class. How were the workers to find the path towards unity of action?

“To ensure that the workers find the road to unity of action, it is necessary to strive at the same time both for short-term and for long term agreements that provide for joint action with Social-Democratic parties, reformist trade unions and other organizations of the toilers against the class enemies of the proletariat. The chief stress in all this must be laid on developing mass action locally to be carried out by the local organizations through local agreements.” (Ibid., p. 37.)

In order to achieve unity of the working class against capital on a national scale, first of all it was necessary to secure agreements in the localities between the principal organizations of the working class, the Communist and Social Democratic Parties and the trade unions.

As to the forms which the united front might take:

“These forms may include, for instance: coordinated joint action of the workers to be agreed upon from case to case on definite occasions, on individual demands or on the basis of a common platform; coordinated action in individual enterprises or by whole industries; coordinated actions on a local, regional, national or international scale; coordi-

nated actions for the organization of the economic struggle of the workers, carrying out of mass political actions, for the organization of joint self defense against fascist attacks; coordinated action in rendering aid to political prisoners and their families, in the field of struggle against social reaction; joint actions in the defense of the interests of the youth and women, in the field of the cooperative movement, cultural activity, sport, etc.” (Ibid., p. 37.)

The united front tactic, then, was to utilize the most varied forms, economic, political, social and cultural from a local to a national scale. In order that there should be no misunderstanding and the mistake made of regarding a formal agreement as in itself constituting a united front rather than actual unity in action of the workers:

“It would be insufficient to rest content with the inclusion of a pact providing for joint action and the formation of contact committees from the parties and organizations participating in the united front, like those we have in France for instance. The pact is an auxiliary means for obtaining joint action, but by itself it does not constitute a united front. A contact commission between the leaders of the Communist and Socialist Parties is necessary to facilitate the carrying out of joint action, but by itself it is far from adequate for a real development of the united front, for drawing the widest masses into the struggle against fascism.” (Ibid., p. 38.)

Even though unity between Social Democratic and Communist workers was obtained and even though there were included in this unity the organized workers of the trade unions such unity would still not include the majority of the working class. Therefore Dimitroff proposed the creation of organizational forms that would embrace all of the workers:

“The Communists and all revolutionary workers must strive for the formation of elected class bodies of the united front chosen irrespective of party, at the factories, among the unemployed, in the working class districts, among the small townsfolk and in the villages. Only such bodies will be able to include also in the united front movement the

vast masses of unorganized toilers, and will be able to assist in developing mass initiative in the struggle against the capitalist offensive of fascism and reaction, and on this basis create the necessary broad active rank and file of the united front and train hundreds and thousands of non-Party Bolsheviks in the capitalist countries.

“Joint action of the organized workers is the beginning, the foundation. But we must not lose sight of the fact that the unorganized masses constitute the vast majority of workers.” (Ibid., p. 38.)

Recognizing the fact that fascism organized its mass base, not in the ranks of the working class, but in the ranks of the peasantry and the urban petty-bourgeoisie, as the success of fascism in Italy and Germany conclusively proved, the Communist International went further than the united front of the working class and proposed:

“In mobilizing the mass of working people for the struggle against fascism, the formation of a wide, popular anti-fascist front on the basis of the proletarian united front is a particularly important task. The success of the whole struggle of the proletariat is closely bound up with establishing a fighting alliance between the proletariat on the one hand and the toiling peasantry and basic mass of the urban petty-bourgeoisie, who together form the majority of the population even in industrially developed countries, on the other.” (Ibid., p. 39.)

It should be noted that Dimitroff here speaks of a fighting alliance between the working class and the peasantry or farmers and the middle class of the towns. And he explains further:

“In its agitation, fascism, desirous of winning these masses to its own side, tries to set the mass of working people in the town and countryside against the revolutionary proletariat, frightening the petty-bourgeoisie with the bogey of the ‘Red Peril’.” (Ibid., p. 39.)

As a tactic to offset this danger Dimitroff proposed:

“We must turn this weapon against those who wield it and show the working peasantry, artisans and intellectuals

whence the real danger threatens. We must show concretely who it is that piles the burden of taxes and imposts onto the peasant and squeezes usurious interest out of him; who it is that, while owning the best land and every form of wealth, drives the peasant and his family from his plot of land and dooms him to unemployment and poverty. We must explain concretely, patiently and persistently who it is that ruins the artisans and handicraftsmen with taxes, imposts, high rents and competition impossible for them to withstand; who it is that throws into the streets and deprives of employment the wide masses of the intelligentsia.” (Ibid., pp. 39-40.)

However, Dimitroff warned:

“But this is not enough. The fundamental, the most decisive thing in establishing the Anti-Fascist Peoples Front is resolute action of the revolutionary proletariat in defense of the demands of these sections of the people, particularly the working peasantry – demands in line with the basic interests of the proletariat – and in the process of struggle combining the demands of the working class with these demands.” (Ibid., p. 40.)

The success of the working class in forming a People’s Front therefore is, resolute action in defense of the demands of the farmers and middle class people. After outlining the need of different methods of approach to the organizations and parties of the farmers and the middle class, Dimitroff emphasizes:

“Our tactics must under all circumstances be directed toward drawing the small peasants, artisans, handicraftsmen, etc., among their members into the anti-fascist Peoples Front.” (Ibid., pp. 40-41.)

And Dimitroff concludes:

“Hence, you see that in this field we must, all along the line, put an end to what frequently occurs in our practical work – neglect or contempt of the various organizations and parties of the peasants, artisans and the mass of the petty bourgeoisie in the towns.” (Ibid., p. 40.)

After dealing with the question of the possibility, after the united front had assumed a powerful mass character on a national scale, of forming a United Front or People's Front Government, Dimitroff again explained the purpose of the united front and of the People's Front:

“We want to find a common language with the broadest masses for the purpose of struggling against the class enemy, to find ways of finally overcoming the isolation of the revolutionary vanguard from the masses of the proletariat and all other toilers, as well as of overcoming the fatal isolation of the working class itself from its natural allies in the struggle against the bourgeoisie, against fascism.

“We want to draw increasingly wide masses into the revolutionary class struggle and lead them to the proletarian revolution, proceeding from their vital needs and interests as the starting point, and their own experience as the basis.” (Ibid., p. 92.)

One would think it would be impossible to misinterpret or misunderstand such a clear exposition of the form, the purpose and the aims of the united front. It was a tactic designed to unite the revolutionary section of the workers with the mass of the working class and to unite the working class itself, on the basis of its own unity, with its natural allies: the poor farmers, the lower middle class and a section of the intellectuals.

Dimitroff concluded his famous speech with the following inspiring call to action:

“And we want all this because only in this way will the working class at the head of the toilers, welded into a million strong revolutionary army, led by the Communist International and possessed of so great and wise a pilot as our leader Comrade Stalin, be able to fulfill its historical mission with certainty – to sweep fascism off the face of the earth, and together with it, capitalism!” (Ibid., p. 93.)

This final call to action of Dimitroff certainly left no room for doubt as to the purpose of the united front. Because “only in this way” could “the working class at the head of all the toilers” fulfill its “historic mission” to “sweep fascism off the face of the earth and together with it, capitalism.” Obviously, the “united front of revolu-



tionary class struggle” could not possibly be a struggle against fascism without at the same time being a struggle against capitalism, and for the eventual establishment of a socialist state. Fascism cannot possibly be eradicated without the eradication of capitalism because monopoly capital constantly breeds fascism. Therefore, as long as capitalism exists the danger of fascism and war will likewise remain.

The tactical line of the United Front of the 7th Congress of the Communist International remained the tactical line of the world Communist movement right up until the outbreak of war and with certain modifications due to conditions created by the war, remains a basic policy of Marxist parties even today.

### **HOW THE TACTICAL LINE OF THE SEVENTH CONGRESS WAS DISTORTED**

We shall now proceed with an examination of how the tactical line of the 7th Congress was presented to the membership of the Communist Party of Canada, and of how it was applied in practise. The new tactical line of the Congress was first presented in Canada at a meeting or plenum of the Central Committee of the CP. of C. in Nov. 1935, just three months after the Congress was held. The report on the new line was delivered on behalf of the Political Bureau by Stewart Smith, who headed the Canadian delegation to the Congress. His opening remarks were as follows:

“The Seventh Congress of our World Party, the Communist International, analyzed the basic changes in the world situation, which have taken place since the Sixth Congress, and laid down the foundation for the greatest mobilization of all workers and progressive people against capitalism that has ever been known in the history of the class struggle.” (*Toward a Canadian Peoples Front*, p. 5.)

This innocent appearing statement nevertheless contains within it the beginning of a revisionist line. Smith does not speak here of a united front of the working class nor does he outline the clear and definite social composition of the People’s Front as laid down by Dimitroff but creates the ambiguous phrase, “all workers and progressive people.” Who the so-called progressive people are, is not stated. However the term is so broad it could include almost anyone. Further on in his speech the tactical line is again placed differently:

“The Communists have the decisive historical task of bringing together into one common front all the people who stand for peace, for democracy, for economic betterment against the reactionary oligarchy who are striving toward fascism, towards war and who are bringing economic degradation to the masses.” (Ibid., p. 13.)

Here again is another sloughing over of the class composition of the People’s Front and of changing the term to “common front” of “all the people who stand for peace, for democracy,” etc. Such phraseology is a distortion of both the class composition of the People’s Front and the purpose. Instead of a “fighting alliance between the proletariat on the one hand, and the toiling peasantry and basic mass of the urban petty-bourgeoisie,” a “People’s Front of struggle against fascism and war,” we now have an insipid, meaningless “common front” of all the people who stand for peace, for democracy, etc.

This perversion of the United Front and the People’s Front tactic is further developed:

“We have commenced active propaganda, for the building up of the united front of all progressive forces of the Canadian people in lasting form through the transformation of the C.C.F. into a broad federated peoples party.” (Ibid., pp. 19-20.)

Instead of proposing a united front of struggle of the working class, beginning in the factories, it now becomes a “united front of all progressive forces” and achieved through “the transformation of the C.C.F. into a broad federated people’s party.” This concept is then developed further:

“The central problem of the united front confronting our Party, the working class and all progressive people is the question of how the C.C.F., the trade unions, the farmers organizations and the Communist movement can be brought together into a broad united front party.” (Ibid., p. 21.)

The united front of revolutionary class struggle of the working class, beginning in the factories, is now perverted into a “united front party”; a party that is to be a hodge-podge of farmers organizations, trade unions, Communists and C.C. Fers. Fascism is then

raised as an argument as to the necessity for such a polyglot conglomeration, such a monstrosity of a political party:

“If the strongest unity of the people has not been welded together before the next elections, we will face at that time if not before, the danger of the most reactionary and possibly open fascist forces coming to power unless in the meantime a broad united front party has been built up, supported by the masses of the Canadian people who are prepared and ready to act against fascism and reaction though not yet prepared to fight for socialism.” (Ibid., p. 25.)

The coming to power of fascism is here presented as an election contest and the struggle against fascism is perverted into a parliamentary election campaign. Compare this concept with that of Dimitroff: “Whether the victory of fascism can be prevented depends first and foremost on the militant activity of the working class itself, on whether its forces are welded into a single militant army combating the offensive of capitalism and fascism.”

No logical arguments are advanced to justify the proposal for the formation of such a party which is also referred to as: “... A broad farmer-labor party, if possible, affiliated to the C.C.F.” (Ibid. p. 30). It is quite true that, as regards the United States, Dimitroff proposed “that under American conditions” a “Workers’ and Farmers’ Party, might serve as such a suitable form.” And he added: “Such a party would be a specific form of the Mass Peoples’ Front in America.”

What were the peculiar “American conditions” to which Dimitroff referred? He was referring to the extreme difficulty of new “third” parties getting on the ballot in the American Federal elections because of the stringent electoral laws which make it almost impossible for third parties to run candidates for Congress. For instance, in the State of New York a petition of 50,000 names is required in order for a third party to get on the ballot. While third parties have been formed and have contested elections they did so in most cases only on a state scale. For instance, the American Labor Party in New York State and the Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota. If our information is correct the Communist Party of U.S.A. for instance, in the 26 years of its existence, has never yet been able to get its candidates on the ballot in federal elections. One of the reasons why Dimitroff proposed that “under American conditions” the

Communists should take the initiative in forming a “third party,” in the form of a Workers’ and Farmers’ party was not only to break through the political monopoly held by the two old line parties in the Parliamentary field, but also because:

“In no case must the initiative of organizing the party be allowed to pass to elements desirous of utilizing the discontent of the millions who have become disillusioned in both the bourgeois parties, Democratic and Republican, in order to create a “third party” in the United States, as an anti-communist party, a party directed against the revolutionary movement.” (*The United Front*, p. 43.)

In other words, the danger existed that unless the Communists took the initiative in forming a “third” party “the millions who have become disillusioned in both the bourgeois parties” might be swept into support of a “third” party organized as an anti-Communist party, or possibly even a straight fascist party.

However, this was not the situation in Canada where there is no difficulty for third parties to get on the ballot either in provincial or federal elections and where a multiplicity of third parties contesting elections were already in existence, such as, the C.C.F., Social Credit, Reconstruction, Union Nationale, Communist, etc. The proposal therefore that “... It is necessary and imperative that the trade unions, C.C.F. Clubs, farmer organizations and Communist Party should come together in some form of a broad farmer labor party if possible affiliated to the C.C.F.” (*Ibid*, p. 30.) was a mechanical transposition of a tactic that was correct under “American conditions” to the Canadian scene where it was absolutely incorrect and ridiculous.

This does not mean that it was unnecessary to build a People’s Front of struggle against fascism and war but the way to build it was not simply to create a hodge podge, farmer labor party, out of the existing parties and other organizations, the leadership of which would inevitably be a petty bourgeois leadership with, not a program of struggle against capitalism, but a purely reformist program. Furthermore, the proposal to begin forming a People’s Front in such a fashion was a complete distortion of the tactic of the united front and the People’s Front and of working backwards, of putting the cart before the horse. As Dimitroff placed it:

“For it cannot be seriously supposed that it is possible to establish a genuine anti-fascist Peoples Front without securing the unity of action of the working class itself, the guiding force of the anti-fascist Peoples Front.”

And further:

“But in a number of countries we shall not get beyond general talk about the Peoples Front unless we succeed in mobilizing the mass of the workers for the purpose of breaking down the resistance of the reactionary section of Social-Democracy to the proletarian united front of struggle.” (*The United Front*, p. 101.)

What Dimitroff warned against was precisely what happened in Canada. The Canadian Communists never did “get beyond general talk about the People’s Front” and three years later even dropped all reference to it. The main energies of the Party were directed, not towards building a united front of struggle of the working class from below, in the factories, but of scheming and manoeuvring, either to transform the C.C.F. into “a genuine farmer labor party” or to secure an electoral agreement with it for a division of seats. Such an electoral agreement, if it had been achieved, would have been nothing more nor less than what Dimitroff termed “The unprincipled tactics of forming blocs with the Social Democratic parties on the basis of purely parliamentary arrangements.” (*Ibid.*, p. 73.)

In order to secure this fictitious unity with the C.C.F. the Party went so far as to propose:

“We need strong party fractions composed of active workers inside of trade unions, C.C.F. Clubs, Social Credit groups and incipient fascist organizations. We want these groups inside of the organizations in order to possess the necessary instruments for winning the masses of Canadian people for a united effort for a better life and against capitalism.” Report of the organizational secretary to the 9th Plenum. (*Towards a Canadian Peoples Front*, p. 106.)

So! In order to secure this pseudo united front with the C.C.F. “strong party factions” were to be established inside the C.C.F. Clubs in order to win over the C.C.F. from within. This is where the perversion of the united front tactic finally led to, a ridiculous cari-

cature of the united front, which instead of assisting in creating confidence and united action between Communist and C.C.F. workers created greater disunity and distrust.

But to proceed with the presentation of the tactical line of the 7th Congress to the Canadian Party. Further on in the report of Stewart Smith we find these astounding statements:

“The urban middle stratum are of decisive importance for the fight against fascism and war. The hundreds of thousands of office workers, school teachers, doctors and storekeepers, salaried employees and intellectuals can be neglected by our party only at the risk of imperiling the whole fight against fascism and war. The Party must bring about a decided change in this respect. We propose that in every district the Party adopt special measures to deal with this problem. Special units and committees must be set up to conduct systematic work among each of these large sections of the population. We must commence work in merchants associations, and must learn how to build trade union organizations among the office workers. We must win the school teachers to the fight against fascism and war. We must learn how to organize associations of the professional people along progressive lines, for example, among the doctors, around the issue of the fight for state health insurance.” (Ibid., p. 44.)

So! “The urban middle stratum are of decisive importance for the fight against fascism and war.” Compare this with Dimitroff: “Whether the victory of fascism can be prevented depends first and foremost on the militant activity of the working class itself.” Any further comment is unnecessary. And the communists were to work in merchants associations and organize the doctors. Well! Well!

We are also told how the revolutionary class struggle against fascism and war is to be conducted:

“The League Against War and Fascism in which our party participates as a minority group in a united front with large masses of workers and farmers and intellectuals becomes decisive for the development of the united front at the present moment against war and must receive far greater support from the Communists in every locality, becom-

ing a centre for millions of the peace loving people of Canada.” (Ibid., p. 28.)

The League against War and Fascism was a delegated body composed of representatives of various organizations which met once or twice monthly and conducted propaganda. Its leadership was made up of middle class intellectuals and we are told that this organization “become decisive for the development of the united front at the present moment against war.” Lenin had a somewhat different concept of unity:

“Unity cannot be created out of agreements between little groups of intellectuals – this is an error of the saddest, most naive and ignorant type. Unity must be won, and only by the workers themselves; the class conscious workers themselves are capable of achieving this by stubborn and persistent work.” (*The United Front*, p. 215.)

And Dimitroff added:

“In the struggle against fascism and war, not empty words, not platonic wishes, but action is needed. To achieve this action it is necessary to bring about the unification of all the forces of the working class and to carry out unswervingly the policy of the Peoples Front.” (Ibid., p. 216.)

As the quotations given above conclusively prove, the policy of the People’s Front laid down in August by the 7th Congress, three months later was presented to the Canadian Party in a completely distorted form. Instead of a united front of the working class we are presented with a “united front of all progressive forces.” Instead of the militant unity of the working class being decisive against war and fascism the middle class is presented as the decisive force. Instead of the united front being unity in action of the workers in the factories and among the unemployed it is presented as an election agreement with the C.C.F., as a farmer labor party and as a propaganda body led by intellectuals such as the League Against War and Fascism.

## HOW THE LIBERAL GOVERNMENT BECAME A BARRIER TO FASCISM

In the report on behalf of the Political Bureau, Stewart Smith also gave an analysis of the Liberal Party and the Government of Mackenzie King:

“The reactionaries in the Liberal Party have already in the provinces put into effect measures of the most ruthless police terror, instigation of fascist repression, utilization of section 98 for the arrest of striking workers, relief cutting, increasing of taxation and extension of the system of forced labor as a compulsory system in every municipality, curtailment of civil rights and annulment of municipal autonomy. It is this line which the reactionaries in the King Government will attempt to extend and put into stronger force through the combined Liberal Provincial and Federal administrations.” (*Towards a Canadian Peoples Front*, pp. 17-18.)

One would be somewhat inclined to believe that this Liberal Party and the King Government were reactionary; “ruthless police terror,” “fascist repression,” “arrest of striking workers,” “relief cutting,” “increasing of taxation,” “forced labor,” “curtailment of civil rights,” “annulment of municipal autonomy.” In fact, one would be justified in believing it must have been at least a semi-fascist government, from this description. Therefore it is somewhat astonishing to read the report of Tim Buck to the eleventh session of the Central Committee of the CP. of C. in February 1937, just one year and three months later. He states:

“The election of King and the Liberal Government was a setback for reaction in Canada.” (*The Road Ahead*, p. 19.)

So! The election of the Government which a little over a year earlier was guilty of “ruthless police terror” and “fascist repression” is now considered a “setback for reaction.”

And not only that:

“But it is equally true that unless the main blows of our party, the labor movement and our people are struck against the 50 ‘big shots’ and their henchmen it will be impossible to rally and organize the united front of the working people. For example: to concentrate the main blows of the people



against the King Government and the Liberal Party at the present historical moment would help to open up the path for the ultra-reactionary Tories headed by Bennett and Meighen.” (Ibid., p. 16.)

Indeed! Not only is this government a “setback for reaction” but we must not criticize it strongly or that would play into the hands of the “50 Big Shots.” After informing his readers not to attack the King Government, Buck then informs us:

“The King Government by itself is no barrier to the Reactionary plans of big Capital. – King has been compelled to give concessions to the working people, but he grants greater concessions to organized reactionary interests.

“Thus the measures adopted by King have not been such as to weaken the grip of finance capital upon the economy of the country, have not weakened or in any way impaired the control of the multimillionaires, who reap all the benefits of the productive wealth of our people and have, so far, benefited the mass of the common people, the farmers and the middle class only indirectly and to a very limited degree.” (Ibid., p. 22.)

And further:

“The official Liberal Party on its part strives to prevent the establishment of a broad peoples movement by democratic gestures and slight concessions to the democratic wishes of the people but fails to halt the strengthening forces of reaction and the growth of semi-fascist organizations which threaten to provide a base for the establishment of a concentration of reactionary forces.” (Ibid., p. 24.)

After first saying that it would be a mistake to direct the main blows against the King Government whose election was “a setback for reaction” and that the main blows must be delivered against a nebulous “50 Big Shots” he then states that this same government grants concessions to reaction and permits the growth of semi-fascist organizations. Just how the working class is going to conduct political action without directing that action against the government of the “multimillionaires” Buck does not explain. Neither does he

explain how the working class is going to direct its main blows against the nebulous “50 Big Shots.”

However he does explain the “chief task” of the Party:

“The building of a united front of all progressive forces in a broad party of the common people remains the chief task of the Communist Party in Canada.” (Ibid., p. 25.)

Buck also enlightens his readers as to who these so called “progressive forces” are. Speaking of united action in Alberta on a joint program of demands, he states:

“Such a program must provide the basis for joint action of all sections of the labor movement, the U.F.A., the Social Credit movement, the Trade Unions, the C.L.P., the C.C.F. and the Communist Party and even sincere progressives from the ranks of the capitalist parties.” (Ibid., p. 50.)

And now the unity movement has become just one big happy family, C.C.F.ers, Social Creditors, Communists and “progressive capitalists.” But of course, there still remains the bold, bad, reactionary capitalists. As regards these Buck states:

“The leaders of finance and industry are being marshaled into a definite political grouping by systematic propaganda of the type of which R. B. Bennett, W. Herridge, and E. W. Beatty (all spokesmen of the Conservative Party) are the exponents but which may be heard in every chamber of commerce and every board of trade, wherever spokesmen of the capitalist class address their fellows. The representatives of reactionary finance capital in Canada are preparing and organizing the advance guard of capitalist reaction.” (Ibid., p. 20.)

Just so! The King Government and the Liberal Party which, only a little over a year previously had been characterized at the previous plenum as organizing “ruthless police terror” and “fascist reaction” have now become “progressive” and the real reactionaries are the “50 big shots” whose chief spokesmen are Bennett, Herridge and Beatty.

## **THE PEOPLES' FRONT IS FURTHER VULGARIZED AND BECOMES THE DEMOCRATIC FRONT**

The next meeting of the Central Committee of the C.P. of C. was held on June 3-6, 1938. The speeches delivered were published in booklet form and entitled, *A Democratic Front for Canada*. In the foreword by Sam Carr we read:

“The speech of Mr. Herridge at the Tory Convention represents the sentiments of a section of progressive Conservatives who can and should become part of the great line-up of democratic forces in Canada.”

And Buck elaborates:

“Herridge’s speeches mirror a large and important sentiment in favor of democratic progress within the Conservative Party. Herridge’s speeches mirror a growing sense among the progressively inclined members of the Conservative Party that if they would serve Canada, they must support progress, that fascism is contrary not only to the interests of labor, but to the interests of 98 percent of the Canadian people.” (Ibid., p. 14.)

Whereas, the year previously, H. W. Herridge had been designated as one of the three chief spokesmen for reaction, he has now become the spokesman for the “progressive Conservatives.” Whereas, previously the Liberals had been “progressive” and the Conservatives reactionary, now a large sections of the Conservatives had also become “progressive”; so “progressive” in fact that, along with the Communists they “can and should become part of the great line up of democratic forces in Canada.”

According to Buck, reaction and fascism in Canada had now acquired a new vehicle: the provincial governments of Ontario and Quebec, headed by Premiers Hepburn and Duplessis. Buck explains:

“There is treason afoot in Canada today just as there was treason within Austria and Spain. To see this one has only to study the record of the two men who comprise the leadership of this reactionary constellation generally termed the Hepburn-Duplessis Axis.

“The Hepburn-Duplessis alliance signalizes a definite stage in the development of the strategy of reaction. There is a difference between the reaction expressed by the Hepburn-Duplessis axis and the reaction of R. B. Bennett. (Possibly a more “progressive” reaction, F. M.) He ruled Canada as the leader of the Conservative Party. He not only did not try to win the reactionary Liberals into his camp (Oh?) but he followed the old and ‘honored’ tradition of firing liberals out of government positions.

“The Hepburn-Duplessis alliance has passed beyond the basis of party interests alone. It cuts across party lines and is based upon class interests, the interests of reactionary big capital, against the whole of the common people of Canada and particularly the farmers and the working class. Its drive toward fascism is against progressive Liberals and Conservatives, equally as against Communists, (Indeed?) C.C.F.’s, and other progressives. The Hepburn-Duplessis alliance is the spearpoint of reaction in its drive towards fascism and war. It is this which makes the new signs of growth of open fascist organizations particularly significant.” (Ibid., pp. 21-22.)

According to this “profound Marxian analysis” the two political parties of the big bourgeoisie no longer represent their class interests. The interests of monopoly capital are no longer served by the Liberal and Conservative parties but by the “Hepburn-Duplessis Axis” and “its drive towards fascism is against progressive Liberals and Conservatives, equally as against Communists...”

That being the case, it logically follows that the so-called “progressive Liberals and Conservatives” should unite with the Communists against this “drive towards fascism.” Buck even explains this further:

“The process of differentiation within the two old line parties continues and the speeches of Herridge reflect clearly, that among sections of the younger Tories and younger Liberals there is a definite opposition to the policy of the die-hards, who dominate the national leadership.” (Ibid., p. 23.)

To meet this threat of fascism and to unite these “progressive forces” Buck proposed:

“If we would save Canada from further division, from the danger of disintegration, if we would save our people from further suffering and starvation, we must gather all progressive people together against Hepburn and Duplessis, against reaction and against fascism and for the democratic unification of our country, for progress and peace.

“Against the concentration of reactionary forces headed by the Hepburn-Duplessis alliance, all the forces of democracy must be gathered into a wide democratic front.” (Ibid., pp. 22-23.)

All reference to the “anti-fascist People’s Front” has already been dropped and replaced by the term “Democratic Front.” Whereas Dimitroff explained: “We want unity of action of the working class, so that the proletariat may grow strong in its struggle against the bourgeoisie in order that while defending today its current interests against attacking capital, against fascism, the proletariat may reach a position tomorrow to create the preliminary conditions for its final emancipation.” (*The United Front*, pp. 32-33.) Buck states: “We must gather all the progressive people together – for the democratic unification of our country, for progress and peace.”

As to the program of this “Democratic Front,” Buck proposes:

“A program around which a democratic front will be rallied must be one which the people understand and which can be carried through by Dominion and Provincial governments under our present governmental set up. Thus, it cannot be a fundamental program for the socialist reorganization of Canada, because the majority of the people are not ready to support such a program. What is required is a series of proposals of a constructive, progressive character, aimed to satisfy the most urgent needs of the people and capable of enactment and fulfillment by provincial and dominion governments now, a program that can be immediately carried out by a parliamentary majority.” (*A Democratic Front for Canada*, pp. 24-25.)

In other words, what is required is not a program such as Dimitroff proposed:

“We want to find a common language with the broadest masses for the purpose of struggling against the class

enemy, to find ways of finally overcoming the isolation of the revolutionary vanguard from the masses of the proletariat and all other toilers, as well as of overcoming the fatal isolation of the working class itself from its natural allies in the struggle against the bourgeoisie, against fascism.

“We want to draw increasingly wide masses into the revolutionary class struggle and lead them to the proletarian revolution, proceeding from their vital interests and needs as the starting point, and their own experience as the basis.” (*The United Front*, p. 92.)

No! What Buck wanted was not a program “for the purpose of struggling against the class enemy,” not a program to lead them “to the proletarian revolution” but a program of collaboration with the capitalists, the “progressive Conservatives,” a program of a “constructive, progressive character.”

Such a program, Buck explained, is contained in the Party’s brief to the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial relations (the commission established to recommend changes in the division of powers and responsibilities as between Dominion and Provincial Governments). The Communist Party brief, Buck points out, gives a “complete plan by which the national income of Canada can be redistributed so as to provide adequately for all the people.” (*A Democratic Front for Canada*, p. 19.)

He further instructs Party members:

“Every member of our party is charged with the responsibility of acquiring such a knowledge of our brief that he can explain it and tell people in simple language how the wealth that is produced today can be redistributed, even under our present set up, to provide a measure of comfort to every man, woman and child.” (*Ibid.*, p. 19.)

Since the Communist Party had now developed a “complete plan by which the national income of Canada can be redistributed so as to provide adequately for all the people,” and since this could now be accomplished “even under our present setup” and by a “parliamentary majority,” there was obviously no need or purpose in “class struggle” nor was there any need for socialism. So Buck quite “logically” points out:

“Our Party declared categorically that the issue in this election is not Socialism but of compelling changes in our national structure that will enable Ottawa to utilize the reserves of our country to improve the conditions of the people.” (Ibid., p. 27.)

As regards the danger of fascism, Buck has also a complete and quite simple plan for overcoming that danger:

“In this situation, the guarantee of democracy against the growing danger of fascism, lies in the strengthening of the democratic powers of the people. The only way it can be strengthened is by a united working class fighting consistently for unity of all democratic forces, in the struggle for democratic unification of our country.” (Ibid., p. 12.)

So now the way to fight fascism is “to struggle for the democratic unification of our country.” This was to be achieved by “extending the process of which Confederation was a part.” Further, national unification was necessary because “the existing distribution of powers under the British North American Act” resulted in a situation where reform “Legislation is not enacted because the provinces in a large measure haven’t the resources and the Dominion Government has not the constitutional right.” (Ibid., pp. 10-11.)

In other words, national unification meant to amend Canada’s constitution, the B.N.A. Act, through a new allocation of powers between the Dominion and Provincial Governments granting greater authority and powers in the fields of taxation, labor laws, social legislation, etc., to the Dominion Government. And this was to constitute a “guarantee” against fascism. How simple!

But regarding this government and its leader, Premier King, Buck then states: “His policy of following meekly at the heels of Chamberlain on all questions of foreign policy has prevented Canada from becoming a positive force for peace against fascist aggression abroad, while at home, instead of actually combating reaction and the fascist threat he capitulates regularly to reactionary big business. (Ibid., p. 21.)

And further: “While democracy is being crushed, full freedom and encouragement is given to fascism.” (Ibid., p. 11.)

And again: "The immediate significance of the fascist organizations is not because of the number they have in their ranks. It is that they are operating under the open protection of governments. It is that the open fascist organizations are now being organized as instruments of policy, which the monopolists hope to utilize in their drive against the working class." (Ibid., p. 22.)

The crude absurdity of Buck's entire position now becomes obvious: McKenzie King, "meekly follows at the heels of Chamberlain"; this policy "has prevented Canada from becoming a positive force for peace against fascist aggression abroad"; he "capitulates regularly to reactionary big business"; under his premiership "the fascist organizations" are "operating under the open protection of governments" and "while democracy is being crushed, full freedom and encouragement is being given to fascism." But, "in this situation, the guarantee of democracy against the growing danger of fascism" lies in "democratic unification of our country" through "changing" the "existing distribution of powers under the British North America Act" and by giving the King Government the "Constitutional right" to achieve "complete unification" by means of granting it greater authority. For, in Buck's own words: "We must formulate demands looking to defeat reaction through democratic national unification. All this is urgently needed to head off reaction and fascism and to preserve the peace of our country." (Ibid., p. 25.)

To such depths of absurdity had the "revolutionary class struggle against fascism and war" been perverted, within three years of the time the tactical line of the People's Front had first been presented as a world policy. And to think that while this absurd nonsense was being presented to the working class of Canada as the means of combating fascism and war, as Marxism, hundreds of Canadian Communists were giving their lives in the armed struggle against fascism in Spain, as members of the International Brigade.

Buck concluded his "masterful presentation" with the following "stirring appeal" to "militant action":

"Our Party must become the driving force in the fight for peace, for protection of the youth, for democratic, nation-



al unification, for security and progress. We do not place our slogan of Socialism in the background (???) but in its correct relation to the actual problems and struggles of today. Our struggle to unite Canada is an integral part of the struggle for Socialism. As part of this struggle today, we call upon all Democratic and Progressive people to unite. Against the reactionary sectionalism of Hepburn and Duplessis, we are for national unification. Against the schemes of reactionary big capital looking to fascist reaction, we are for Democratic progress. Against the war makers, we call for peace. Against the reactionary concentration of Hepburn, Duplessis and the most sinister elements in Canadian politics we call for the building of a wide democratic front to carry Canada forward to Democratic National Unity, progress, peace, prosperity and Socialism.” (Ibid., p. 41.)

And this nonsensical phrasemongering is presented to the Canadian working class as a Marxian program of revolutionary class struggle against capitalism and fascism and as the road to emancipation, to socialism. Just imagine: “we are for democratic progress,” “we call for peace,” “against... the most sinister elements we call for... democratic national unity, progress, peace, prosperity and socialism.” The role of the working class is not even mentioned.

Compare this philistine, pedantic phrasemongering with the unequivocal, clear instructions of Dimitroff:

“When carrying out the policy of the Peoples Front against fascism and war... the Communists do not lose sight of the historic need for the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, which has outlived its day, and for the achievement of socialism, which brings emancipation to the working class and the whole of mankind.” (*The United Front*, p. 236.)

“When we carry on a resolute struggle for the defense of democratic rights and liberties against reaction and fascism, we do so as Marxists, as consistent proletarian revolutionaries and not as bourgeois democrats and reformists. Where we come forward in defense of the national interests of our own people in defense of their rights and liberties, we do not become nationalists or bourgeois patriots – we do so as proletarian revolutionaries and true sons of our people.” (Ibid., p. 231.)

“The experience of many years has gone to prove that the fascist instigators of war are not to be held back by persuasion or arguments. There is only one effective means of curbing them, and that is the united and unbroken struggle of the masses of the people against fascism in the different countries and on an international scale.” (Ibid., p. 227.)

“To want peace is not enough. It is necessary to fight for peace. It is absolutely inadequate to carry on general propaganda against war. Propaganda against war ‘in general’ does not in the slightest degree hinder the conspirators sitting in Berlin or Tokyo from carrying out their dastardly work.” (Ibid., p. 176.)

“The struggle for peace is a struggle against fascism, a struggle against capitalism, a struggle for the victory of socialism throughout the world!” (Ibid., p. 185.)

In October, 1938, in a speech to the Ontario Provincial Convention of the CP. of C, the Ontario leader of the Party, Stewart Smith, presented the party line in the struggle for peace as follows:

“In this noble struggle for peace, which represents the highest interests of humanity, let us above all build the unity of the people. The forces of peace in Canada as in the whole world can win. The forces for peace are strong. Labor has already shown the road at the great convention of the Trades and Labor Congress.

“The churches in large numbers are taking up the struggle. Senator Carine Wilson of the League of Nations Society, representing a large section of Canadian opinion has declared for collective peace action. Never before were the Canadian people so aroused to the struggle for peace. The peace forces can win through unity.

“We appeal to all genuine friends of peace and democracy, all true patriots of Canada, to take up the struggle for a positive Canadian peace policy in world affairs.” (*Has Chamberlain Saved Peace*, pp. 26-27.)

The fight for peace has now reached the point where the churches, women senators and the League of Nations Society become important factors. Now compare this petty bourgeois nonsense about how to fight for peace with Dimitroff’s demands for:

“An independent struggle by the proletariat for the maintenance of peace, independent of the capitalist governments and the League of Nations, making it impossible for the working class movement to be subordinated to the behind the scenes designs of the Imperialist Governments in the League of Nations.

“Under present conditions, the fight to maintain peace is a fight against Fascism, and this fight is in essence revolutionary.” (*The United Front*, p. 184.)

In the same speech, Stewart Smith also presented the Party policy regarding the anti-fascist united front, as follows:

“The aim of every loyal democrat must be one of bringing the maximum degree of unity between all democratic forces.

“It is especially important to develop the independent initiative of labor in the political field through such bodies as the Labor Representation Association, and co-operation and understanding with the C.C.F., in order that in elections the best possible agreements may be made to elect the largest number of progressive candidates.” (*Jobs and Security*, p. 14.)

So! The united front of struggle of the working class has now degenerated into a question of election agreements and blocs with the Labor Representation Association and the C.C.F. “in order to elect the largest number of progressive candidates.”

The People’s Front has now become the Democratic Camp. States Smith:

“The growing democratic camp shows itself in the political life of Ontario as yet mainly in a developing unanimity of opinion among the people on the main issues before the province and nation.

“Its heart is the labor movement, especially the mass trade unions which occupy such a vital part in the life of almost every community and especially now in such cities as Oshawa, Cornwall, St. Catharines, Kitchener and Timmins. It extends to, as yet, widely separated sections – the progressive wing of the McKenzie King Liberals; the Progressives in the Conservative Party, especially supporters of Herridge;

the masses of church people; the movements against the monopolies among the farmers; the housewives movements and the Youth Congress movement.” (Ibid., p. 11.)

Just so! After three years of building the People’s Front it has now become “a developing unanimity of opinion.” It includes the “labor movement,” “progressive Liberals,” “progressive Conservatives,” “the masses of church people,” “farmers’ movements,” “housewives movements,” and the “Youth Congress movement.” The Marxian concept of class divisions in society and of political parties as the representatives of definite class interests has now completely disappeared and in its place we have a “democratic camp” composed of the labor movement, Liberals, Conservatives, farmers, church people, housewives and youth. (The homes for the aged and the kindergartens must have been overlooked.) The “militant struggle of the working class” against fascism and war has now become a “noble struggle” conducted by “true patriots” and “loyal democrats.”

And sixteen years after the foundation of the Communist Party of Canada this childish drivel is presented to a Party Convention as revolutionary Marxism.

The desire for unity with Herridge and his “Progressive Conservatives” finally resulted in 1939 with the Communist Party publishing his speeches in full on the front page of the Party organ, *The Clarion*, with appropriate headlines. H. W. Herridge, millionaire brother-in-law of Ex-Premier R. B. Bennett, had organized and was, in 1939, the leader of the New Democracy Party. The eagerness of the Communist Party Leadership for unity with this section of the bourgeoisie finally culminated with the Saskatchewan leader of the Communist Party securing the nomination as a Federal candidate of the New Democracy Party only to be later repudiated by Herridge. This attempted marriage of the Communist Party to the New Democracy Party was broken up by the war. However, when the smoke of the 1940 election battles finally cleared away the candidates of the New Democracy Party elected to the House of Commons all turned out to be members of the Social Credit Party, including Hlinka, New Democracy member for Vegreville, Alta., who was termed the “most outspoken fascist in the Canadian parliament.”

#### **FROM GROSS RIGHT OPPORTUNISM TO ULTRA-LEFT ADVENTURISM**

As was to be expected, the outbreak of war resulted in one series of blunders after another by the national leadership of the Communist Party. For the first few days they did not take any position, thus leaving the Party organizations throughout the country without any lead whatever.

After a few days a statement was finally made in the name of Tim Buck, in support of the war. This statement was so equivocal and ambiguous that a member of the B.C. Provincial Executive argued for three hours that it was really a statement in opposition to the war as an imperialist war, because of the policies of Chamberlain and of the paper.

With the Communist Parties of other countries characterizing the war as an imperialist war, because the policies of Chamberlain and Daladier, the Canadian Party leadership finally issued a statement in opposition to Canada's participation in the war, several weeks after the war started.

With the outbreak of war and the subsequent illegality of the Party there followed a swing from crass opportunism to the most fantastic leftist adventurism. To begin with, the King Government, whose election in 1935 was considered "a setback for reaction," overnight became reactionary again and now replaced the "Hepburn-Duplessis Axis" as the "spearpoint" of "sinister reaction":

"The King Government is an outright Imperialist Government. It is the pliant and willing agent of the decisive circles of big capital in Canada. King involved Canada in the Imperialist war so cunningly that there was no real debate upon the question. He crushed opposition to the war as ruthlessly as Bennett or Meighen could." (T. B. in *The Monthly Review*, official Party organ, April and May, 1940. p. 15.)

And another article by T.C.S. states:

"We correctly seized upon Mackenzie King's February 21st radio speech to expose his criminal role in bringing about this war hand-in-glove with Chamberlain." (Ibid., p. 34.)

It should be remembered, this was the same government that Buck proposed a few months earlier to grant greater powers to as a "guarantee" against fascism.

The role of Herridge had also apparently been reversed:

“The position of Herridge and Coldwell and Heaps and their leading associates was closer to the position of Manion in several respects than to the avowed position of Mackenzie King. Their treachery to the masses of Canada’s people in hitching the C.C.F. and the Social Credit Parties to the chariot wheel of Imperialist war policy availed them little in their quest for cheap parliamentary advantage but did incalculable harm to the cause of the working class.” T.B. ( Ibid., p. 16.)

So! The leaders of the two Parties which the Communist leadership did their best to secure electoral agreements with a few months earlier, are now revealed to have been merely in a “quest for cheap parliamentary advantage.”

Writing on C.C.F. Peace Aims, S.S. states:

“The theory of imperialism renouncing itself, establishing economic cooperation and equal access to markets and raw materials is, like all other theories of the C.C.F., borrowed from the stinking rubbish heaps of European Social Democracy. Its author was Kautsky.” (Ibid., p. 2d.)

As regards the attitude of Imperialism towards the colonial people S.S. writes:

“To pretend that British Imperialism will voluntarily free peoples as a result of victory in the war is simply to hide the fact that British Imperialism, if it could conceivably free peoples, could set free dozens of times the Czechs, Austrians, and Poles without waging any war in Europe.” (Ibid., p. 26.)

Three months later, in August 1940, the National leadership informed the membership that Canada was, in fact, a semi-colony under the political hegemony of Britain and the economic hegemony of American Imperialism. As a result of the clash of these two rival Imperialisms on Canadian soil they stated: “A revolutionary situation is maturing in Canada.” After making this “profound” observation they then advanced the slogan “For An Independent Socialist Canada.” (Just what happened to the revolution is hard to ascertain.) They also forecast the coming to power of Socialism all

over Europe as a result of the revolutionary situations supposed to be developing in Germany, France, Britain, etc.

Following the entry of the Soviet Union into the war the Party, for a period, followed a policy of practical activity which was basically correct. They campaigned intensively for a total war effort and for a “yes vote” in the plebiscite on conscription.

The public work of the Party was carried on through the medium of the Communist Labor Total War Committee. Membership in the Party soared, discipline was well maintained, a basic industrial form of branches was established which gave direct leadership in the shop to the workers on the job; enthusiasm and devotion to the Party was at the highest level of many years. During this period, the latter half of 1942, the hundred or more Communists arrested and interned under section 21 of The Defense of Canada regulations, after the outlawing of the Party in June 1940, were released.

The opportunism which had sapped the strength of the Party during the prewar period and the leftist adventurism which had tended to make the Party appear in the light of a pro-Nazi force during the early war years, and had consequently discredited it in the eyes of many workers, was to a considerable extent overcome following the change in the character of the war.

The possibility of the Party following its proper role as a Marxist Party of the working class appeared brighter than at any time during the seven previous years. However, whether it would actually rid itself of both deviations – ultra left adventurism and right opportunism – still remained to be seen.

## CHAPTER IV:

### HOW THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IN CANADA REVISED IN THEORY OR PERVERTED IN PRACTICE EVERY FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE AND DOCTRINE OF MARXISM

At the first National Conference of the Communist-Labor Total War Committee, January 16-17, 1943, the opportunism which marked the policies of the pre-war period re-appeared in even more pronounced form. Tim Buck, in that section of his report dealing with the post war period, delivered himself of the following remarkable forecast:

“Victory over the Axis will clear the way for the full democratic development of all peoples – for the liberation of nations, the adoption of policies of economic security, the abolition of national oppression, the lifting of the colonial nations out of slavery into the light of freedom, on the basis of national self-determination. United Nations unity and collaboration, after victory, will assure to the peoples the possibility of orderly progress and the rapid healing of the terrible wounds inflicted by war. It will assure the possibility of tremendous strides forward, towards the great cultural, economic and social advancement outlined in the Atlantic Charter. It will assure freedom for the national development of those peoples who have been oppressed. The people of India will be able to secure their national freedom. China will be free. Nations in which the dominant trend of political opinion is Socialist will be able to translate their opinions into action. Far reaching social progress will be possible for all the people of the world.” (*Canada and the Coming Offensive*, p. 27.)

For a Communist, this is really precious: “full democratic development of all peoples,” “economic security,” “abolition of national oppression,” “national self-determination,” “orderly progress,” “cultural, economic and social advancement,” “freedom of India,” “freedom of China,” “socialism,” all as a result of victory over the Axis. In this idyllic picture Buck is really out-Browdering Browder a year before Browder announced his “new course” based



on the "Teheran perspective." Here, Buck is outlining a perspective almost identical with that advanced three years earlier by the C.C.F. and which S.S. characterized as being "borrowed from the stinking rubbish heaps of European Social Democracy" and "whose author was Kautsky." S.S. further ridiculed the theory that "British Imperialism will voluntarily free peoples."

Consider what the real picture was less than six months after V-J day: "Full democratic development of all peoples" – A pro-fascist government in Greece conducting a reign of terror and maintained in power by foreign troops. General Patton being called before Eisenhower to explain why Nazis run the government of Bavaria. All working class political parties and trade unions in those areas of Germany under Anglo-American occupation suppressed.

"Economic Security" – Mass lay-offs in war industries with no provisions planned or instituted for reconversion. Delegations on way to Ottawa to protest closure of B.C. war industries. 2,000,000 out of work in the U.S. as a result of mass strikes. Veterans obliged to live in army huts with families because of housing crisis.

"National Self-Determination" – French and British troops suppress uprisings in Syria in struggle for National independence. Armed uprisings in Indo-China in struggle for independence also suppressed by British and French troops. All of this is, of course, "orderly progress."

"Cultural, Economic and Social Advancement" – Schools remain closed in much of Europe. Mass famine threatens all of Europe. Forecast: Millions will perish during coming winter through famine and pestilence.

"Freedom of India" – Foreign Minister Bevin out-Churchills Churchill in Imperialistic speech pledging maintenance of British Colonial Empire. Thousands of political prisoners remain in Indian concentration camps.

"Freedom for China" – British troops reoccupy Hong Kong as a continuing British colony. Two divisions of American troops occupy North China to block march of liberation of Chinese Communist 8th Route Army. All Japanese troops in area retain arms on instructions of Kuomintang dictatorship to "maintain order."

"Socialism" – Regimes of democratic governments in areas occupied by Red Army denounced as "totalitarian dictatorships" because of land reforms and other democratic measures. Fears of withholding food supplies by U.N.R.R.A. to starving countries of

Europe, influences even scope of reform measures instituted by provisional governments.

One month after he had delivered the above forecast Buck delivered an acceptance speech when he was nominated as Federal candidate for Toronto-Spadina, in which he stated:

“A necessary condition for government policies that will underwrite social security, provide jobs for all able-bodied Canadians and maintain a generally high and stable level of prosperity, will be maintenance of the National income at a high level. The experience of the war years has proven conclusively that this can be done.” And Buck adds:

“I shall press the government to use the lessons we have learned during the war to finance lasting prosperity in the peace.” (*For Victory In The War and Prosperity In The Peace*, pp. 12-13.)

This is really rich. Here we have the spectacle of the revolutionary leader of the Canadian proletariat in the “uncompromising struggle for socialism” telling the people of Spadina that it has been “proven conclusively” that the national income, doubled as a result of war production can be maintained in the peace and thus “maintain a generally high and stable level of prosperity.” And not only that but pledges that if elected he shall “press the government” to “Finance Lasting Prosperity in the Peace.”

### **THE SPECTRE OF COMMUNISM IS EXORCISED**

Now that Canada and the world was to have “orderly progress,” the “full democratic development of all peoples,” “economic security,” the “abolition of National oppression,” “cultural economic and social advancement,” and in view of the fact Buck himself was going to “press” the Capitalist government of Mackenzie King to “Finance Lasting Prosperity in the Peace,” Communism not only became unnecessary but a definite embarrassment and liability to Mr. Buck. The spectre of Communism had to be liquidated.

Consequently, at a conference held in Toronto just four months later, June 13, 1943, Buck, who had “invited those present on his own initiative and personal responsibility,” informed the handful of Party members present (of the 25 delegates in attendance there were 19 from Ontario, 14 of them from Toronto, three from Montreal and

three from the other seven Canadian provinces – B.C. and N.S. were not represented) that:

“If we permit the continuance of illegality enforced by the government’s ban on Communism, this would only strengthen the sinister spectre of Communism which stands in the way of victory.” (*Canada Needs a Party of Communists*, p. 30.)

So! At a time when the Communist Red Army of the U.S.S.R., the Communist led partisan army of Marshall Tito of Yugoslavia, 500,000 strong, and the Communist led resistance movements of the occupied countries of Europe had definitely turned the tide against the German fascists, after one of the most heroic struggles of all history and the glory of Stalingrad, Mr. Buck discovers that the “spectre of Communism stands in the way of Victory.”

Buck continued:

“We can exorcise that spectre most effectively by uniting ourselves in a new party of our own, and fighting under our own political banner in the open light of day, in systematic parliamentary, educational and organizational activity in every corner of Canada.” (*Ibid.*, p. 30.)

The opening words of the *Communist Manifesto*, the basic program of the world Communist movement, runs as follows:

“A spectre is haunting Europe – the spectre of Communism. All the powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this spectre; Pope and Czar, Metternich and Guizot, French radicals and German police spies.”

Whereas, formerly, dictators and police spies united to “exorcise the spectre of Communism” ninety-seven years later the leader of the Canadian Communists proposes that “we can exorcise that spectre most effectively...” i.e., that the Communists themselves exorcise the spectre of Communism.

Earlier in his speech Buck had stated that: “Continuation of the ban on Communism... is open surrender to reactionary obscurantism.” But instead of fighting to have the ban lifted he proceeded to advocate “open surrender to reactionary obscurantism” by means of “exorcising the spectre of Communism.”

In the course of his speech Buck also outlined, for the whole world to hear, the “respectability” of the new party he had in mind:

“Communists do not advocate violence. We are not a conspiracy, we are an integral part of Canadian democracy. We subordinate ourselves entirely to the democratic will of the majority. We Communists strive to win support for the policies we advocate by exactly the same means as, and by no other means than, the other political parties of Canada. Everything we do and everything we advocate is strictly in accord with the laws of Canada.” (Ibid., p. 23.)

Compare this concept of a Communist Party with that of Lenin:

“Legal work must be combined with illegal work – The heroes of despicable opportunism ridiculed this and smugly extolled the ‘law,’ ‘democracy,’ ‘liberty,’ of the West European countries, republics, etc.” (*Selected Works*, Vol. X, p. 45.)

“Must we always agree with the majority? Not at all.” (Ibid., p. 217.)

“It is not verbal recognition that is needed, but a complete rupture in deeds with the policy of reformism, with prejudices about bourgeois freedom and bourgeois democracy, the genuine pursuit of revolutionary class struggle.

“Attempts are made to recognize the dictatorship of the proletariat in words in order secretly to drag alongside of it the ‘will of the majority’...” (Ibid., p. 51.)

And Dimitroff:

“We Communists employ methods of struggle which differ from those of other parties.” (*The United Front*, p. 132.)

Following the conference the membership of the Party were astonished to learn through the medium of the daily papers that a new political party of Communists was to be formed.

### **A PSEUDO-MARXIST PROGRAM**

The new Party, the Labor Progressive Party, was formed at a constituent convention held in Toronto, in August 1943. In explaining the reason for dropping the word Communist from the name Buck

explained that in addition to affecting the recruiting of new members, the name “Will have even more effect upon the support that our candidates receive at the polls.” (*Victory Through Unity*, p. 21.)

As regards the tasks of the new Party, Buck explained:

“The adoption of democratic Canadian policies in foreign affairs, the struggle for sweeping national reforms in domestic affairs, the role of government in the maintenance of national prosperity and the cementing of unity between the two great peoples, French and English speaking, of our country – these must all be faced and decided upon. Our decisions as a nation on these issues will determine whether Canada shall go forward or if we shall go back.

“These great issues will be fought out in the main, on the field of parliamentary activity.” (*Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.)

In his acceptance speech, following his nomination as National Leader, Buck returned to the same theme, the decisive importance of parliamentary action in the new period when “Old, moth-eaten arguments no longer suffice to meet new conditions.” (*Ibid.*, p. 35.)

Buck waxed eloquent. Said he:

“We see in this tremendous democratic upsurge which has found expression in parliamentary action an historic movement of the Canadian people... This mighty democratic upsurge marks a tremendous forward step. It will bring lasting benefits to the majority of the people, however, only if, out of it, there is developed a unified political movement of progressive workers, farmers and middle class people who can guide that movement steadily forward in a struggle to elect farmer-labor governments and finally a government that will establish Socialism in Canada.” (*Ibid.*, p. 56.)

Bravo! No spokesman of the Capitalist class could have done a better job of eulogising parliament. “Tremendous democratic upsurge,” “mighty democratic upsurge,” “historic movement of the Canadian people.” Votes cast in an election campaign in these “new conditions” now become a “mighty democratic upsurge.”

Lenin had a somewhat different opinion:

“To decide once every few years which member of the ruling class is to repress and oppress the people through parliament – this is the real essence of bourgeois parliamentarism, not only in parliamentary-constitutional monarchies, but also in the most democratic republics.” (*State and Revolution*, p. 40.)

Writing in 1920 for the second Congress of the CI. Lenin further elaborated:

“... The whole history of bourgeois democracy, particularly in the advanced countries, has transformed the parliamentary tribune into the principal, or one of the principal, arenas of unprecedented fraud, of the financial and political deception of the people, careerism, hypocrisy and the oppression of the toilers. Hence, the burning hatred towards parliament entertained by the best representatives of the revolutionary proletariat is quite legitimate.” (Lenin’s *Selected Works*, Vol. X, pp. 170-171.)

For the benefit of those philistines who are so fond of distorting quotations from *Left Wing Communism* in order to magnify the importance of parliamentary activity out of all proportion, it should be noted that Lenin wrote the above statement two months after he wrote *Left Wing Communism*.

However, Lenin did express his opinion regarding Communists gaining parliamentary seats in connection with his proposal that the Communist Party of Great Britain should enter into an electoral arrangement with the British Labor Party. Lenin wrote:

“If the Hendersons and Snowdens accept the bloc on these terms, then we gain because the number of seats in parliament is not a matter of importance to us; we are not chasing after seats.” (*Left Wing Communism*, p. 66.)

According to Buck, the “Progressive” workers, farmers and middle class people are going to elect “farmer-labor governments and finally a government that will establish socialism in Canada.” It is indeed all quite simple. First we elect a “farmer-labor government” and then “finally a government that will establish socialism in Canada.”

But again Lenin's viewpoint differed slightly from that of Buck. Forty years ago he wrote:

"We are all convinced that the emancipation of the workers can only be brought about by the workers themselves; a socialist revolution is out of the question unless the masses become class conscious, organized, trained and educated by open class struggle against the entire bourgeoisie." (Lenin's *Selected Works*, Vol. III, p. 52.)

And ten years ago Dimitroff stated:

"The experience of the victory of the great October revolution on the one hand and, on the other, the bitter lessons learned in Germany, Austria and Spain during the entire post-war period, have confirmed once more that the victory of the proletariat is possible only by means of the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeoisie, and that the bourgeoisie would rather drown the labor movement in a sea of blood than allow the proletariat to establish socialism by peaceful means." (*The United Front*, p. 89.)

As Buck's speech had intimated, the new Labor Progressive Party turned out to be almost exclusively a petty bourgeois, social democratic, parliamentary election machine in program, tactics and organization and not a revolutionary Marxist workers' party at all. On the excuse that "Canada needs a party of Communists" the Communist Party of Canada was liquidated one year before the dissolution of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.

The program of the Labor Progressive Party while paying lip-service to the principles of Marxism is saturated with anti-Marxist policies and flat contradictions. A considerable portion of the program is devoted to a glorification of bourgeois democracy, of hiding the economic contradictions of capitalism, of ignoring the class antagonisms of capitalism, of falsifying the theory of the socialist revolution, of distorting the role of the farmers, of perverting the theory of the state, of revising the theory of Imperialism and of completely perverting the theory of the National Question.

On the National Question the program states first of all that:

"Political equality was won for French Canada by the joint struggle of the Reformers and Patriots of Upper and Lower Canada a century ago." (Program, p. 8.)

It then proceeds to admit on the next page that as a result of:

“Over a century of the deliberate maintenance of feudal restrictions in the province of Quebec, and from Government policies designed to keep French Canada as a zone of specially profitable exploitation, the French Canadians suffer the inequalities of lower wages than those paid in English Canada, inferior health, cultural and educational standards, incomplete recognition of linguistic rights in the armed forces.” (Ibid., p. 9.)

And on page 31 of the Program, in explaining Confederation, it states that:

“By its Federal form, the new state (The Dominion of Canada) acceded to the demand of the French Canadians for their own autonomous state.”

Such sophistry! “Political equality was won for French Canada” a century ago; French Canada constitutes an “autonomous state;” yet, a century later, it suffers from economic, social, and cultural “inequalities” because of “feudal restrictions” and the fact French Canada constitutes a “zone of specially profitable exploitation” because of “government policies.”

And how does the program propose to rectify these monstrous inequalities imposed on the French Canadians because of “government policies”? It is all very simple; through “The removal, by Dominion and Provincial government action, of all national inequalities in Quebec.” (Ibid., p. 18.) Just like that. The same governments that are responsible for the inequalities are now to remove them because of the “great popular crusade of the people of Canada to achieve these sweeping democratic reforms with which the Labor Progressive Party identifies itself.” (Ibid., p. 18).

So! This “revolutionary party of the proletariat” instead of “standing at the head of” and “leading the working class” now “identifies” itself with the “great popular crusade of the people.”

The program continues to jump from one absurd contradiction to another:

“The Labor Progressive Party declares its support of the Atlantic Charter... The Party declares that the application of the Atlantic Charter requires the acceptance of the principle of the full right of self-determination for all nations.” (Ibid., p. 13.)



According to Lenin:

“Self determination of nations means the political separation of the nation from other national bodies, the formation of an independent national state.” (Lenin’s *Selected Works*, Vol. IV, p. 251.)

And further:

“The right of nations to self-determination means only the right to independence in a political sense, the right to free, political secession from the oppressing nation. Concretely, this political, democratic demand implies complete freedom to carry on agitation in favor of secession, and freedom to settle the question of secession by means of a referendum of the nation that desires to secede. Consequently, this demand is by no means identical with the demand for secession, for the partition and for the formation of small states. It is merely the logical expression of the struggle against oppression in any form.” (Lenin’s *Selected Works*, Vol. V, p. 270.)

We can now establish the following points:

(1) The French Canadians suffer from economic, social and cultural inequalities.

(2) These economic, social and cultural inequalities are due to “government policies.”

(3) Government policies are political policies.

(4) Political policies of a dominant nation which result in imposing “economic, social and cultural inequalities” upon a smaller nation within the same state constitute, in fact, national oppression of that nation.

(5) In order to put an end to the oppression of a national minority by a dominant nation within the same state Marxism insists on the right of self-determination.

(6) The right of self-determination means “the right to free political secession from the oppressing nation” and “freedom to settle the question of secession by means of referendum.”

The only logical conclusion, therefore is, that as an oppressed nation, French Canada should have the right to secede, to decide the question by a referendum and that a Marxist Party in English speaking Canada is duty bound to fight for the right of secession by French

Canada. Instead of that, however, this "Marxist Party of the working class" proposes that the government whose policies are responsible for the political oppression should remove "all national inequalities in Quebec." One might well ask: Could sophistry and political bankruptcy be carried further? But in addition to that piece of sophistry, the use of the terms French Canada and Quebec interchangeably, as is done in the program, is also a perversion of Marxism.

Quebec is a province within the Canadian State, whereas, French Canada is a nation which includes not only Quebec, but also the contiguous areas of Ontario and New Brunswick where the French Canadian people constitute a majority of the population and where, it is a well known fact, the French Canadian people suffer from either economic, social or cultural inequalities as bad, if not worse, than they do in the province of Quebec. Furthermore, the French Canadians settled in parts of Ontario and New Brunswick a century or more before the British conquest.

Hence, to speak of removing "all national inequalities in Quebec rather than the nation of French Canada, is in itself, a vulgarization of the Marxian position on the National question.

The Marxian definition of a nation is as follows: "A nation is an historically evolved, stable community of language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a community of culture." (Stalin.) It cannot be denied that French Canada fully meets all of the requirements of nationhood designated in the above definition. Yet, Stanley Ryerson, National Educational Director of the Labor Progressive Party, whose French Canadian forbears date back to 1636 and who is publicised as "an outstanding authority on the question of French Canada," a graduate of the University of Toronto and of the Paris Sorbonne, repeats the same contradictions and errors in his supposed authoritative work *French Canada*. Ryerson writes:

"The question of French Canadian Autonomy, of 'Quebec provincial rights,' must be recognized by English speaking Canada for what it is; the expression of the democratic right of the French Canadians to the choice of their own state. Any denial of that right is a denial of full national equality." And he adds, further on: "This means unqualified recognition, in practise as well as in words," of the

principle of full national equality for the French Canadians.  
(*French Canada*, p. 178-179.)

But how does he recognize this right “in practise as well as in words”? By demanding the right of secession for French Canada, an elementary Marxian principle? Far be it from him, this scion of a French Canadian family dating back to 1636 and of English Canadian forbears who participated in the reform movement of one hundred years ago, to make such a radical suggestion. He writes:

“The raising of the low living standards which monopoly rule has inflicted on Quebec is a common, Canadian responsibility, requiring federal, as well as provincial government action.” (Ibid., p. 178).

In other words, to raise the low living standards that monopoly rule which the federal and provincial governments, which administer monopoly rule, have “inflicted on Quebec” requires “action” by the provincial and federal governments. Such “profundity” is really amazing.

### REVISIONISM ON ORGANIZATIONAL QUESTIONS

The opening words of the preamble to the Party constitution reads as follows:

“The Labor Progressive Party is the political organization of the workers, farmers, professional people and all other Canadians who toil by hand or brain.”

This explanation of the class forces which the party represents is in fact a revision of several basic tenets of Marxism since it claims to be a Party “of scientific socialism, of Marxism” and “dedicated to the achievement of socialism.”

It is now nearly 100 years since Marx and Engels first pointed out in the *Communist Manifesto* that:

“Our epoch, the epoch of the bourgeoisie, possesses, however, this distinctive feature; it has simplified the class antagonisms. Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two classes directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat.”

Marx further recognized that Capitalism resulted in “The organization of the proletarians into a class and consequently into a political Party.” As regards the other classes Marx stated:

“Of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie today, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class. The other classes decay and finally disappear in the face of modern industry; the proletariat is its special and essential product.

“The lower middle class, the small manufacturer, the shopkeeper, the artisan, the peasant, all these fight against the bourgeoisie, to save from extinction their existence as fractions of the middle class. They are, therefore, not revolutionary, but conservative, nay more, they are reactionary, for they try to roll back the wheel of history.” (*The Communist Manifesto*, pp. 26-27.)

Writing in 1905, Lenin also pointed to the basic class divisions of society and the necessity of a strictly class party of the industrial working class even before the overthrow of feudal-military Tsarism:

“The proletarian class struggle for socialism against the most democratic and republican bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie is inevitable. This is beyond doubt. From this logically follows the absolute necessity of a separate, independent and strictly class party.”

The Party of a new type based on the teachings of Lenin was referred to by Stalin as the Party of Leninism. Some of the “special features of this new party” he outlined as follows:

“The Party must first of all constitute the vanguard of the working class. The Party must absorb all the best elements of the working class, their experience, their revolutionary spirit and their unbounded devotion to the cause of the proletariat... The Party is the political leader of the working class.

“But the Party cannot be merely a vanguard. It must at the same time be a unit of that class, be part of that class, intimately bound to it with every fibre of its being.

“The Party is the organized detachment of the working class.

“The Party is the highest form of organization of the proletariat. The Party is the fundamental leading element within the class of the proletariat and within the organization of that class.” (Chapter, on The Party – *Foundations of Leninism*.)

Georgi Dimitroff, general secretary of the Communist International reiterated the same concepts in 1935:

“We Communists are a class party, a proletarian party. But as the vanguard of the proletariat we are ready to organize joint actions between the proletariat and the other sections of the working people interested in the fight against fascism. We Communists are a revolutionary party; but we are ready to undertake joint action with other parties fighting against Fascism.

“We Communists have other ultimate aims than these classes and parties, but in struggling for our aims we are ready to fight jointly for any immediate tasks which, when realized, will weaken the position of Fascism and strengthen the position of the proletariat.

“We Communists employ methods of struggle which differ from those of the other parties; but while using our own methods in combating Fascism, we Communists also support the methods of struggle used by other parties, however inadequate they may seem, if these methods are really directed against Fascism.” (*The United Front*, p. 132.)

The independent, strictly class character of a Marxian Party of the industrial working class has been amply established by every authority on Marxism for the past hundred years. Hence, for a professed Marxian Party to describe itself as: “The Labor Progressive Party is the political organization of the workers, farmers, professional people and all other Canadians who toil by hand or brain” is a complete departure from, and repudiation of the basic Marxist-Leninist doctrines of: (1) The Class Struggle. (2) The theory of the Proletarian Revolution. (3) The theory of the Peasant Question. (4) The theory of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. (5) The theory of Socialism. (6) The theory of the Party.

A comparison between the stated character of the Labor Progressive Party and that of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. de-

notes a glaring difference. The preamble to the constitution of the American Party begins as follows:

“The Communist Party of the United States is the political party of the American working class basing itself upon the principles of scientific socialism, Marxism-Leninism.” (*The Worker*, Aug. 11, 1945.)

Article 3 of the L.P.P. constitution states:

“Any person 18 years of age or over, regardless of sex, national origin, color or creed, whose devotion to the cause of the people is unquestionable, shall be eligible for membership.”

The phrase, “cause of the people,” is absolutely meaningless and anti-Marxian. Every political party and its program, including the fascists, claim to represent “the cause of the people.” To base eligibility on whether or not a prospective member’s devotion to this ambiguous cause is “unquestionable” is equally stupid and ridiculous. It is obviously impossible to determine in advance whether a prospective member’s “devotion” to any “cause” is unquestionable or not. This pedantic phrasemongering stands forth in bold relief when compared to the corresponding Article in the American Party constitution, which states:

“Any resident of the United States, 18 years of age or over, regardless of race, color, national origin, sex or religious belief, who subscribes to the principles and purposes of the Communist Party shall be eligible for membership.” (*Ibid.*)

Having already revised the basic principles of Marxism in the sphere of program and tactics it logically followed that revisionism would be also expressed in the field of organization. Article 6 of the constitution states:

“The basic organization of the Party shall be the branch or club. The Party branch or club shall be organized on a territorial basis, composed of members residing in the area covered by a given club. In exceptional cases, the Provincial Committee may recommend that charters be issued to

clubs or branches organized on an occupational or language basis.”

This concept of the basic form of organization of a Marxist-Leninist Party is the exact opposite of that of Lenin and of the Communist International. Said Lenin:

“The main strength of our movement lies in the workers’ organizations in the large factories. For in the large factories (and works) are concentrated that section of the working class which is not only predominant in numbers, but still more predominant in influence, development and fighting capacity. Every factory must be our stronghold.” (*Lenin on Organization*, p. 111.)

On the same question:

“The Communist Party,” stated R. Palme Dutt, “Requires the basing of the Party in the factories, the stronghold of the industrial working class, and in the mass organizations of the trade unions, etc.” (*Life and Teachings of Lenin*, p. 81.)

And further:

“The basis of the Party organization, its ‘fortresses’ are the factory nuclei.” (Introduction to *Lenin on Organization*, p. 44.)

The L.P.P., however, designates the territorial branch as the basic organization and only considers factory branches in “exceptional” cases. The real purpose for the organization of the L.P.P. on a territorial basis was because it had, in theory and practise, given up any attempt to be a Communist Party and constituted in fact, a right wing, parliamentary, social democratic party with a program of parliamentary reforms designed to outdo the platforms of the bourgeois parties themselves as a workable program for capitalism in the post war.

This fact is further borne out by the choice of a name, in which the chief consideration was given to its “effect upon the support our candidate receives at the polls.” Lenin held a very different view. “The question of name is not merely a formal question, but one of great political importance.” (*Selected Works*, Vol. X, p. 205.) Lenin

further insisted that only the name Communist was politically correct for a Marxist Party.

Four months after the formation of the L.P.P. the national leadership issued the slogan “A C.C.F. Labor-Farmer Government.” This demand for the election of a C.C.F. Labor-Farmer Government met with considerable objection from the membership as they had not even been consulted before arriving at such an important change in policy.

However, this slogan was quickly withdrawn because, as Sam Carr explained, it “would have excluded the whole bourgeoisie from the National Unity Camp, and helped reaction to consolidate its forces.” (*National Affairs Monthly*, Sept. 1944, p. 173.)

This “terrible” mistake of proposing the formation of a government of workers and farmers without also including the capitalists was more fully “rectified” at a meeting of the National Committee of the L.P.P., February 12, 1944. At this meeting the “Teheran line” of Browder was adopted by the L.P.P. in all its essential features and even added to. Tim Buck, in his report to the meeting, stated:

“This agreement (Teheran) marks a turning point in the relationships between the first socialist state and the great capitalist states and, therefore, a turning point in the history of mankind.” (*Canada’s Choice*, p. 8.)

An examination of Buck’s statements in *Canada’s Choice – Unity or Chaos* will disprove the validity of Buck’s claim of the “contrast between Comrade Browder’s approach to Teheran as a platform of class peace and our approach to it as a platform of democratic struggle...”

“The Teheran agreement,” stated Buck, “is a promise that the peoples of the liberated countries shall enjoy the opportunity to establish governments of their own free choice and to reconstruct their respective national economies according to their own needs and desires.”

This statement, in itself, is an interpretation of Teheran as a “platform of class peace” because the question of the types of “governments” and of “national economies” is decided in the final analysis by the respective strength of conflicting class groupings within each given country. Even non-Marxists recognize this obvious fact.



## THE RIGHT OF SELF DETERMINATION AS APPLIED IN GREECE

Buck's interpretation of Teheran seems somewhat ironic, to say the least, in view of the statements contained in *The White Book of the Greek National Liberation Front* (E.A.M.), representing the following democratic political parties, trade unions and youth organizations: Union of Popular Democracy, United Socialist Party, Agrarian Party of Greece, Communist Party of Greece, General Confederation of Workers of Greece, Central All State Employees Committee, National Solidarity Organization, United Pan-Hellenic Organization of Young People. (E.P.O.N.)

An appeal to the allied governments dated Dec. 30, 1944, by the EAM states:

"The British Prime Minister, together with Mr. Eden, departed after repeating the assurance – to make it fully clear – that "Our guns will continue to fire as they are doing now!" In fact, British guns, for the sake of supporting more fully the irreconcilables of the right, had begun firing immediately at the unarmed people, drowning out the bells of the churches of Athens which had been ringing to celebrate the arrival of the British official personalities." (*The White Book of the Greek National Liberation Front*, p. 77.)

And further:

"We are obliged to express to you the bitterness and the disillusionment experienced by the Greek people, who for years have struggled hard for their liberties, and for the aims of the allied cause, at this new failure of our efforts to achieve peace for the country. Moreover, we are obliged to protest because those forces which conducted the Allied fight in Greece and offered so many services to the Allies are considered enemies, and are again to be subdued by guns – British guns this time." (*Ibid.*, p. 77.)

A proclamation of ELAS, the 50,000 strong liberation army of EAM, reads:

"The enemy, being unable to hit our military forces, turned with revengeful fury against the non-combatants. With thousands of missiles, Mr. Churchill's ships, airplanes, cannons and tanks, are daily causing the death of

women, children and old people and are leveling the poor sections of the cities.

“Entire neighborhoods, factories and homes of the poor and hospitals have been reduced to dust. Mr. Scobie’s aim is to change Athens – the city which all conquerors and invaders have respected – into a heap of ruins, into a vast cemetery.

“In the face of Mr. Scobie’s brutal fury of invasion, the central committee of ELAS, in order to save the non-combatants from certain death caused by bombs and machine guns, and furthermore, in order to protect Athens and the Piraeus from certain destruction, have ordered the shortening of the lines of the heroic defenders of the Capital and Piraeus. This reforming of our lines (outside of Athens) is not a victory for Mr. Scobie. It is something worse than a Pyrrhic victory. It is an indelible stigma and an eternal disgrace, because only Scobie used the Sacred Rock of Acropolis as a shield for a war of annihilation.” (Ibid., p. 80.)

And again:

“The mere suspicion that they belong to the EAM side – often simply because they came from or lived in districts branded as friendly to EAM was sufficient to cause their arrest and imprisonment in the police dungeons or concentration camps. Even those who had been taken on English ships outside of Greece were not ELAS fighters but non-combatant citizens. Even the forces of Zervas, upon fleeing from Epirus, kidnapped as hostages, 1,500 non-combatant citizens with the help of the British navy.” (Ibid., p. 108.)

In an appeal to the International Red Cross regarding prisoners of EAM held in prisons and concentration camps the EAM stated:

“As indicated by the figures we have cited, the total number of Greek hostages held in Africa by the English, amounts to 50,000.” (Ibid., p. 111.)

In a final appeal to the governments of the United Nations weeks after the supporters of EAM had surrendered their arms, dated March 12, 1945, the Central Committee of EAM stated:

“Armed gangs of collaborationists and traitors to their country, in co-operation with agents of the Government, have unleashed an unprecedented terrorism. Hundreds of democratic citizens are being arrested, maltreated, reviled in public and executed. Everywhere the offices of EAM organizations are being plundered and destroyed. State authorities prohibit by decrees the circulation of the left-wing press.

“Officers and men of the ELAS who surrendered their honored arms are abused, maltreated and even executed by organized gangs of traitors and by the agents of the State. All those who took part in the resistance movement are persecuted under various pretexts by the State itself.” (Ibid., p. 132.)

“The manifestation on every occasion of the hatred of the extreme right for our great Ally, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, is characteristic. Insignia and emblems of the Soviet state and pictures of its leaders are torn up. Anti-Soviet slogans are given wide circulation. Contempt for this ally is publicly expressed.”

The appeal continues:

“True to her history, Greece was the first country to rise against the barbarous Fascist invaders and wrote with the blood of her children the epic of the Albanian (Greek-Italian) war and of the National Resistance and gave herself as a holocaust to the common Allied cause. Now, following her liberation, she finds herself again in the claws of the Fascist clique of collaborationists and traitors. In Greece today, while affiliation with the National Resistance Movement constitutes a cause for merciless persecution, torture, and even execution, affiliation with the traitorous Security Battalions of the quislings constitutes a scroll of honor which elicits rewards in the form of promotions, state pensions and other compensations.” (Ibid., p. 133.)

#### **BUCK ATTEMPTS TO PROVE THAT CLASS COLLABORATION IS THE VERY OPPOSITE OF CLASS COLLABORATION**

In eulogizing the Teheran accord as the beginning of a new epoch of peaceful social progress, Buck continued:

“It opens up the possibilities for a period of great and far-reaching economic and social progress. Carried through in the spirit which now inspires the United Nations it can result in raising the level of economic activity and social progress throughout the world: complete reconstruction of Europe and parts of Asia, the building of new cities, new transportation systems, new industries and the revitalization of cultural life. These things would mean literally the building of a new world.” (*Canada’s Choice*, pp. 10-11.)

Buck continues to paint his idyllic picture of the “new world” and to refute entirely the historic role of the working class in social progress. He states:

“The Teheran agreement marks out the lines of national and world policy which alone will bring victory in the war and far-reaching democratic progress for all mankind.” (Ibid., p. 11.)

Just think! This “diplomatic agreement” between three states “marks out the lines” not only of world policy but of “national policy,” i.e., the policy of each country. And further, these government policies “alone” will bring “far reaching democratic progress for all mankind.”

However, Buck warns:

“Domestic policies based upon the perspective of world progress through socialist-capitalist co-operation in aiding the liberated nations as envisaged in the Teheran agreement, can be assured only by the fullest possible measure of National Unity.” (Ibid., p. 19).

The successful realization of “Far reaching democratic progress for all mankind” then, for which “The Teheran agreement stands out as the sole basis” is dependent upon “National Unity” after the war.

Buck then devotes an entire section of his speech to proving: “National Unity – the antithesis of class collaboration.” States Buck:

“Contrary to class collaboration policies, national unity is the policy by which the class interests of the working class as a whole will be served, by co-operation with the democratic circles of all classes and all sections of the Ca-

nadian people, including a decisive section of the capitalist class in carrying through the economic and political measures which alone will ensure continual democratic progress and without which there is the gravest danger that Fascist-minded elements will come to power.” (*Canada’s Choice*, p. 21.)

Here we have a crude attempt to prove that co-operation between the working class and “a decisive section of the capitalist class” is not class collaboration but on the contrary, is a policy by which “the class interests of the working class as a whole will be served.” What is the difference between class collaboration and class co-operation? According to *Webster’s Dictionary*, collaboration is defined as: “The act of performing work or labor together.” Co-operation is defined as: “The act of working or operating together to one end.”

Obviously, there is no basic difference between the two terms. They both mean working together. Yet, Buck here endeavors to show that National Unity, which he defines as co-operation between the working class and “the democratic circles of all classes and all sections of the Canadian people including a decisive section of the capitalist class,” is not class collaboration but on the contrary is the policy “by which the class interests of the working class as a whole will be served.” Or, in other words, Buck tries to prove that co-operation between classes is the opposite of collaboration between classes, which is quite an ambitious undertaking. But Buck goes farther and warns that unless the working class co-operates with “a decisive section of the capitalist class in carrying through the economic and political measures” then “there is the gravest danger that fascist minded elements will come to power.”

Let us examine this crude sophistry. What is the “decisive section of the capitalist class”? The decisive section of the capitalist class in any capitalist country is the monopolies, which are decisive both economically and politically and which are designated as “monopoly capital” or “finance capital.”

What is the class basis of fascism? According to Dimitroff “Fascism is the power of finance capital itself.” (*The United Front*, p. 11.) It has been amply established that the class basis of fascism is the trusts, monopoly capital, which also constitutes the decisive section of capital.

Therefore, when Buck proposes that the working class co-operate with “a decisive section of the capitalist class” he is, in fact, proposing co-operation or collaboration with monopoly capital, which forms the class base for fascism, in order to avoid the “gravest danger that fascist minded elements will come to power.”

The proposal of Buck simply amounts to this: That in order to prevent fascism coming to power the working class must co-operate, or collaborate, with the very forces which constitute the base for fascism, the “decisive section of capital,” monopoly capital. Stripped of its verbiage this absurdity reduces itself to the proposal that the working class should collaborate with the very forces which breed fascism, in order to prevent fascism from coming to power.

Unabashed by the absurdity of such nonsense Buck goes on to state: “National Unity now, to win the war and around policies in accord with the Teheran agreement in the post war period, serves the highest interests of the working class, the farmers and the urban middle class people.” (Ibid., p. 21.)

In other words, National Unity, which Buck himself explains as co-operation with the capitalist class, i.e., class collaboration, “serves the highest interests of the working class.”

Buck then concludes triumphantly:

“It is obvious that National Unity in support of policies based upon the perspective opened up by the Teheran agreement is the very antithesis of the correctly condemned policy of class collaboration.” (Ibid., p. 21.)

This is really “brilliant.” We are now told that it is obvious that class collaboration is the very opposite of class collaboration. Of course it might be urged that Buck did not mean monopoly capital when he proposed that the working class should co-operate with a “decisive section of the capitalist class.” However, Buck himself makes it clear as to what section of the capitalist class he was referring when he asks:

“Is it possible to achieve National Unity in Canada for the carrying through of such policies?” And Buck answers: “Indeed it is. One of the best pieces of evidence to show that it is possible is to be seen in the changing tone and character of opinions expressed by many leading spokes-

men of the capitalist class. One of the most outstanding of these comes from no less a person than Mr. Morris W. Wilson, president of the Royal Bank of Canada.”

After quoting from Mr. Wilson’s speech to the annual meeting of shareholders, Buck comments:

“Do not underestimate the significance of those words. They illustrate the fact that the more far sighted men among those who dominate Canadian economy are realizing that the problems of the peace will be tremendous, that failure to solve these problems will entail almost equally grave dangers as we are facing in the war; but that if the United Nations will grapple with the post-war problems in the same spirit that they are grappling with the economic problems of war, there is a possibility to avoid deep post-war crises which otherwise would be inevitable.” (Ibid., pp. 25-26.)

In other words, National Unity is possible because “many leading spokesmen of the capitalist class” and “the more far sighted men who dominate Canadian economy” are “realizing that the problems will be tremendous” and “that there is a possibility to avoid deep post-war crises.”

So, not only is National Unity possible because of “the more far sighted” capitalists who “dominate Canadian economy” but “there is a possibility to avoid deep post-war crises.” There is actually no basic difference between this concept and Browder’s theory of the “intelligent capitalists” who “realize their true class interests” adopting policies to make possible “generations of prosperity.” In fact Buck paints a similar picture of prosperity. Regarding the farmers, he states:

“They know as a result of the war that such markets can be maintained by raising the standard of living at home and adopting policies of international co-operation which will provide steadily expanding markets for the products of Canada’s fruitful farms.” (Ibid., p. 28.)

And not only are the Canadian farmers to have “steadily expanding markets” by collaboration with the “more far sighted” capitalists and thus avoid “deep post war crises,” but everyone is to have social security.

According to Buck:

“The war has shown that every child born in Canada could be guaranteed adequate nutrition, adequate medical care, efficient education and hospitalization. Every adult man and woman could be guaranteed protection against unemployment, adequate widowed mothers’ allowances, free medical care and hospitalization and adequate old age pensions for every Canadian who reaches the age of 60. The people of Canada believe these things are possible and they want a Dominion Government which they believe will provide these things right away.” (Ibid., p. 29.) Just to make clear that this prosperity and social security was to be achieved under capitalism and that he was not referring to socialism, Buck states: “Establishment of Socialism is not an immediate issue in Canada; it will not be in the immediate post war period.” (Ibid., p. 35.) And further: “... The issue of National policy in Canada is ‘Social progress versus Reaction’ not ‘Socialism versus Capitalism’.” (Ibid.)

In an article written shortly afterwards Buck elaborates the same theme:

“There is no objective basis for any suggestion that conditions, objective and subjective, in Canada will be such as to make it possible to abolish the profit system here in the immediate post-war period.” (*National Affairs Monthly*, April, 1944, p. 4.)

This is quite in line with a previous statement:

“Government policies in accord with the Teheran agreement will maintain the National income, the level of employment and popular purchasing power. They will make possible the achievement of a rising level of prosperity.” (Ibid.)

And further:

“On the basis of the Teheran agreement there is now the possibility that capitalist economy will be able to avoid a crisis of the sort which followed the first world war.” (Ibid., p. 5.)



Here we have a complete plan for the post war period by the Canadian “Marxists”: “Government policies in accord with the Telleran agreement... will make possible the achievement of a rising level of prosperity.” “... there is now the possibility that capitalist economy will be able to avoid a crisis of the sort which followed the first world war.”; “There is no objective basis for any suggestion... to make it possible to abolish the profit system here in the immediate post war period.”; “... the issue of National policy is... not ‘Socialism versus Capitalism’.”

Since it is not possible to “abolish the profit system” and since the issue “is not socialism versus capitalism” and since it is possible for the “achievement of a rising level of prosperity” the task of the working class then becomes – not the achievement of socialism but of “making the system work.”

### **THE L.P.P. PROGRAM FOR MAKING CAPITALISM WORK**

Stewart Smith, National Executive member, explains that:

“Government intervention in the National economy after the war, will have large functions in the sphere of foreign markets, opening up for Canadian industry vast markets never dreamed of before and made possible by the establishment of a stable and enduring peace after the defeat of Fascism.” (*National Affairs Monthly*, June, 1944, p. 74.)

Smith then continues:

“But what will be the nature of all this planning? It will be essentially and fundamentally an agreement between the more far sighted sections of monopoly capital, who recognize the need of such control and state intervention to make capitalism work, and the working class and progressive-democratic forces of the nation. It is absurd to think that such controls or state measures could be undertaken without the agreement of the decisive sections of monopoly capital.” (Ibid.)

And just to make it clear Smith reiterates:

“But quite definitely, state policy after the war as during the war can achieve very great results in making the system work, and it is essential that the working class

should support such a policy. But this can only have meaning when understood as an agreement between labor and the decisive sections of monopoly capital.” (Ibid.)

And in the next paragraph Smith elaborates, further:

“The working class is for that degree of state intervention which is needed to achieve certain essential functions in making the capitalist system operate, in averting a crisis, assuring an expanded market, etc. The working class attitude towards the problem is precisely the same as that of the more far sighted sections of monopoly capital.” (Ibid.).

The position of the National leadership of the Labor Progressive Party towards the working class, monopoly capital, socialism and capitalism is now fully outlined!

“It is essential that the working class should support” a policy of “making the system work.” This is to be achieved through “government intervention in the national economy after the war” which will constitute “an agreement between the more far sighted sections of monopoly capital” and “the working class.” This will result in “opening up for Canadian industry vast markets never dreamed of before.” All of this is based upon “an agreement between labor and the decisive sections of monopoly capital.” Not only that, but “the working class attitude towards the problem is precisely the same as that of the more far sighted sections of monopoly capital.” And as for socialism, it is just not “possible to abolish the profit system here in the immediate post war period.”

According to Tim Buck these policies are put forward by, “... The party, which guided by scientific socialist understanding, helps guide the working class movement in fulfillment of its tasks in the struggle for progress.” (*Canada's Choice*, p. 46.)

Since such policies, which are in essence, advocacy of open, unashamed, class collaboration “between labor” and “the decisive sections of monopoly capital,” are expected to result in “opening up for Canadian industry vast markets never dreamed of before” it is quite understandable that monopoly capital in Canada should be quite pleased with the successful efforts of the National Leadership

of the Labor Progressive Party, to substitute the theory and practise of class collaboration for the Marxian doctrine of the class struggle.

Compare the position of Buck and Smith with that of Duclos: "... In France... our anxiety for unity does not make us lose sight for a single moment of the necessity of arraying ourselves against the men of the trusts." (*Political Affairs*, July, 1945, p. 671.)

Having, in practice, completely repudiated the independent and leading role of the working class and subordinated labor to the "decisive sections of monopoly capital," Buck then appeals to the Tories to also become "more far sighted capitalists." Says Buck:

"The men and women who looked to the Port Hope program as the future program of their party, want the party to fight for social reform! They will support policies looking to post-war co-operation and mutual aid. These young Tories can, if they become seized with the tremendous significance of present day developments, become the decisive section of the Progressive Conservative Party." (*Ibid.*, p. 32.)

Since Buck had already arrived at the position where the welfare of the working class was dependent upon the "more far sighted" capitalists the above appeal to the "young Tories" was quite in line with Buck's proposition:

"A high level of employment, maintenance of wage levels, progressive social legislation and general social progress in the post-war years, depends entirely upon the extent to which Canada adopts policies in accord with the spirit of the Teheran agreement." (*Ibid.*, p. 41.)

And not only is employment, wage levels, social legislation and general social progress "entirely dependent upon Government policies" in accord with the "spirit of Teheran," with the strength and activity of the trade unions playing no role whatever, but the "government placed in power" will "probably determine the direction of our national development for a generation." (*Ibid.*, p. 37.)

#### **THE COMMUNIST LEADERS' CAMPAIGN FOR MINISTERIAL POSTS IN THE CAPITALIST GOVERNMENT**

With the class struggle, the role of the trade unions and all prospect of socialism disposed of "for a generation" and the working class committed to "making the system work" through an "agree-

ment between labor and the decisive sections of monopoly capital,” the next step was to complete the marriage between labor and monopoly capital through joint operation of the country’s economy by means of a coalition government of capital and labor.

The proposal for the establishment of such a government followed just three months later at an enlarged meeting of the National Executive of the L.P.P. held on May 26, 27, 28, 1944. Tim Buck presented the now fully developed new line as follows:

“Workers, farmers, middle class people, employers, regardless of their party, who stand for democracy and reform, should come together in unity. A majority of Liberal, labor and farmer M.P.’s can be elected in the Dominion election, to form a Liberal-Labor Government, directly including the spokesmen of Labor and truly representative of Canada’s national interests now and for years to come. This is the only practical road ahead to victory and the reaping of its fruits.” (*National Affairs Monthly*, July, 1944, p. 99.)

Here we have, in the above proposal, the most crude and complete revision of Marxism that has probably ever been advanced by a professed Communist Leader. Classes and parties no longer have any meaning. All classes, “workers, farmers, middle class people, employers, regardless of their party” are to jointly form the government “directly including the representatives of labor” and on the basis of support of bourgeois “democracy and reform” be “truly representative of Canada’s national interests now and for years to come.”

For nearly twenty years Tim Buck had apparently visualized a Liberal-Labor coalition government coming to power in Canada. Speaking at the 5th Congress of the Communist International on June 26th, 1924, he is reported as stating:

“A Farmer-Labor government in Canada and the United States would be a Liberal-Labor government.” (Report of Proceedings p. 93.)

The purpose and the composition of the proposed Liberal-Labor coalition government was more fully elaborated in subsequent statements of Buck and of the National Executive of the L.P.P.

Said Buck:

“The purpose of a democratic coalition is to head off the danger of anti-Teheran Tories securing the government or the balance of power. There is a broad common ground upon which the overwhelming majority of democratic people – Communists, supporters of the C.C.F., the broad masses of workers, farmers, urban middle class people, and genuine Liberals among the bourgeoisie – are in substantial agreement in this connection, that is their desire for domestic and foreign policies in accord with the letter and spirit of the Teheran agreement.

“That fact, combined with the need to prevent establishment of a government subservient to Tory interests, makes election of a government based upon a coalition of democratic forces – uniting the mass support of the CCF, the Labor Progressive Party, the progressive farm organizations, with the trade union movement and the progressive reform Liberals who supported McKenzie King – absolutely essential.” (*National Affairs Monthly*, October, 1944, pp. 198-199.)

This was not simply a proposal that labor or the Labor Progressive Party should support the election of a “progressive government” but that representatives of labor and above all, members of the Labor Progressive Party, should enter the cabinet and assume ministerial posts in a coalition cabinet together with the Liberals representing monopoly capital. Buck explains:

“The danger of Tory-Liberal coalition is the negative aspect of the electoral situation which makes a coalition of democratic forces necessary. The positive aspect of this situation is that it brings forward, for the first time, the possibility for labor to win direct representation in the next Dominion Government. A substantial group of Labor members in the House of Commons, with representation in the Cabinet, will raise the status and influence of the labor movement in the nation.” (*Ibid.*, p. 198.)

The National Executive of the L.P.P. in a statement issued at approximately the same time as that of Buck not only proposed a coalition after the election but during the election campaign:

“In order to defeat the forces of Toryism, the L.P.P. proposes that the democratic coalition be achieved without delay through electoral agreements between the Liberal, C.C.F. and L.P.P. parties.” (Ibid., p. 196.)

Although, as proposed in the above statement, the coalition was to be composed of the Liberal, C.C.F. and L.P.P. parties it was apparent, almost from the time the proposal for a coalition government was first made, that the C.C.F. would not participate. This fact was publicly acknowledged by Buck during the summer of 1944, when he stated:

“There is no prospect that the C.C.F. will even join in such a coalition as Canada will need.” (*What Kind of Government*, p. 14.)

Having made this acknowledgment Buck then continued to eulogize the Liberal Party and the King Government:

“The proposal for Liberal-Labor coalition expresses the realities of the situation. The Liberal Party is a capitalist party, one of the traditional parties of capitalism in Canada. But the overwhelming majority of Canadians still support the capitalist parties and the government which comes to power after the next election will be the government of a capitalist country. The point is that Mackenzie King is responding to the possibilities opened up at Teheran and, with a powerful labor group as partner in the House representing powerful labor support outside, he will go considerably further.

“The King Government, which has organized and leads the war effort of which the nation is justly proud, follows a line of policy much closer to that indicated in the Teheran declaration than any other except the Labor Progressive Party. Mr. Mackenzie King’s role in the London Conference of Commonwealth Prime Ministers was a truly Canadian battle for commonwealth policies in accord with the spirit of the Teheran agreement.” (Ibid.)

The proposed Liberal-Labor coalition very quickly became recognized as a coalition, which if realized, would have been com-

posed of representatives of the L.P.P. and the Liberal Party jointly sharing cabinet positions in order to “make the system work.”

### **SHOULD COMMUNISTS ENTER COALITION GOVERNMENTS?**

Writing on the question of socialists entering a bourgeois government in September 1917, Lenin expressed the following opinion:

“The capitalists, better organized, more experienced in the affairs of the class struggle and politics, learned its lesson faster than the others. Perceiving that the position of the government was untenable, they resorted to a measure which for many decades now, ever since 1848, has been practised by the capitalists of other countries in order to fool, divide and weaken the workers. This measure is what is known as a coalition government, i.e., a joint cabinet of members of the bourgeoisie and renegades from socialism.

“In countries where freedom and democracy have longest existed side by side with a revolutionary labor movement, namely, in Great Britain and France, the capitalists have frequently and successfully resorted to this method. When they enter a bourgeois cabinet, the socialist leaders inevitably prove to be pawns, puppets, screens for the capitalists, instruments for deceiving the workers.” (Lenin’s *Selected Works*, Vol. VI, pp. 197-198.)

Referring to the socialists participating in the Kerensky Government in September 1917, Lenin stated:

“Having set foot on the inclined plane of compromises with the bourgeoisie, the Socialist Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks slid headlong to the bottom.” (Ibid., p. 202.)

And further:

“The lesson of the Russian revolution is that there is no escape for the masses from the iron grip of war, famine and enslavement to the landlords and capitalists... unless they renounce all compromises with the bourgeoisie and decidedly come over to the side of the revolutionary workers.” (Ibid., p. 204.)

Lenin had the deepest contempt for workers who strove to “make capitalism work.” “...The international banner of workers

who serve capitalism by choice and not by compulsion,” said Lenin, “is yellow.” (Ibid., p. 87.)

Stalin held that agreements with the liberal bourgeoisie were not only impermissible during the epoch of the proletarian revolution, but even during the period of the Bourgeois Democratic revolution in Imperialist countries. In 1927 Stalin stated:

“With us in Russia, in 1905, the revolution was directed against the Liberal bourgeoisie in spite of the fact that it was a bourgeois-democratic revolution. Why? Because the Liberal bourgeoisie of an imperialist country is bound to be counter revolutionary. And that is why the Bolsheviks at that time did not and could not consider temporary blocs and agreements with the Liberal bourgeoisie.” (*The National Question*, p. 233.)

But according to Buck:

“Establishment of such a government, with Labor as a full partner in it, would open a new and higher stage of national progress in Canada.” (*What Kind of Government*, p. 11.)

In order to justify the proposed complete betrayal of socialism which the entry of Communists into Canada’s bourgeois government would constitute, Buck endeavored to make the proposal more palatable by drawing a comparison with the coalition governments of Europe. Buck stated:

“The need for a coalition in which Labor and Capital are represented in terms of partnership is not peculiar to Canada. Several coalition governments have come into being as a result of the conditions created by the war and the changing tasks and basis of governments. The Churchill government in Britain is a coalition government. The National Liberation Government of Yugo-Slavia is a coalition government. The Italian government is a coalition. The French Committee of National Liberation is a coalition. The Czecho-Slovakian government in exile is a coalition. There will be more coalition governments as more European nations are liberated and freely elect their own governments. In the existing state of political organization, and



opinion, coalition is the only form through which governments can express the anti-fascist unity of all democratic people. Such a coalition will be necessary in Canada because Labor, alone, cannot carry through the policies that will be necessary in the post war years and capital, alone, will not carry through such policies.” (Ibid., pp. 9-10.)

The above method of presenting the question of labor, and particularly Communists, joining a coalition government is a gross distortion of Marxian principles and tactics, as is the argument that because labor was represented in the People’s Front government of France and Spain before the war, therefore, it is correct for Communists to join a government in coalition with the capitalists during or after World War II in Canada.

Let us first of all examine the position taken by the Communist International on this question.

Speaking on the question of the formation of governments of the United Front or People’s Front in 1935, Dimitroff stated:

“...We recognize that a situation may arise in which the formation of a government of the proletarian united front, or of an anti-fascist People’s Front, will become not only possible but necessary in the interests of the proletariat. And in that case we shall declare for the formation of such a government without hesitation.” (*The United Front*, p. 70.)

But he explained further:

“Under what objective conditions will it be possible to form such a government? In the most general terms, one can reply to this question as follows: under conditions of political crisis, when the ruling classes are no longer able to cope with the powerful rise of the mass anti-fascist movement. But this is only a general perspective without which it will scarcely be possible in practise to form a United Front government.

“Only the existence of definite specific prerequisites can put on the order of the day the question of forming such a government as a politically essential task. It seems to me that the following prerequisites deserve the greatest attention in this connection:

“First, the State apparatus of the bourgeoisie must already be sufficiently disorganized and paralyzed, so that the bourgeoisie cannot prevent the formation of a government of struggle against reaction and fascism.

“Second, the widest masses of working people, particularly the mass trade unions, must be in a state of vehement revolt against fascism and reaction, though not ready to rise in insurrection so as to fight under Communist party leadership for the achievement of Soviet power.

“Third, the differentiation and Leftward movement in the ranks of Social Democracy and other parties participating in the United Front must already have reached the point where a considerable proportion of them demand ruthless measures against the fascists and other reactionaries, struggle together with the Communists against Fascism and openly come out against that reactionary section of their own party which is hostile to Communism.” (Ibid., pp. 70-71.)

As regards the practical policy of such a government once it was formed, Dimitroff insisted that:

“We demand that it should carry out definite and fundamental revolutionary demands required by the situation. For instance, control of the banks, disbanding of the police and its replacement by an armed workers’ militia, etc.” (Ibid., p. 75.) But Dimitroff did not consider even a United Front Government capable of removing the danger of fascism.

“But we state frankly to the masses,” he said, “final salvation this government cannot bring. It is not in a position to overthrow the class rule of the exploiters, and for this reason cannot finally remove the danger of fascist counter-revolution! Soviet power and only Soviet power can bring salvation!” (Ibid., p. 76.)

As regards the question of whether or not Communists should participate in a United Front government, Dimitroff pointed out that:

“The question of whether Communists will take part in the government will be determined entirely by the actual situation prevailing at the time.” (Ibid., p. 108.)

In countries such as Spain which still had to complete the bourgeois democratic revolution Dimitroff explained:

“In countries where the bourgeois-democratic revolution is developing, a People’s Front government may become the government of the democratic dictatorship of the working class and the peasantry.” (Ibid.)

In order to more clearly explain the Marxian position on Communists joining a coalition government we will first deal with the People’s Front Governments of the pre-war and then proceed to examine the coalition governments in which Communists have participated since World War II.

As regards the People’s Front in France, although parties participating in the People’s Front formed the government, which followed the election victory of April 1936, the Communists did not participate in the government which, strictly speaking, was not a People’s Front government. In explaining why the Communists did not join the government, Andre Marty, early in 1936 stated that:

“In a certain situation we can join such a government. But we shall not join it today. Why? The present government of France cannot be identified, for instance, with the bourgeois-Socialist governments of Czechoslovakia and Denmark. Why? Because these governments came to power as a result of parliamentary combinations, whereas the present government in France, formed by the Socialists with the participation of the Radical Party and the Socialist Union, came to power on the crest of a mighty wave of the People’s Front Movement and on the basis of the program of the People’s Front. This program was hammered out during the last one and a half years, in the struggle against the most reactionary elements of the bourgeoisie, against the fascists. And it is precisely because this government was created by an actively operating People’s Front that the bourgeoisie are compelled to tolerate it. But in the above-mentioned countries the position is entirely different. There, coalition governments are in power, governments of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, the result of the usual parliamentary manoeuvres of the bourgeoisie.

“Although the present French government was placed in power by the People’s Front, the strength of this front is still not sufficient to establish a real People’s Front government as understood by the Seventh Congress of the Communist International. The aim of the Communist Party in supporting the new government is to prevent the government from being transformed into the usual government of collaboration with the bourgeoisie and by following the program on which this government was established to urge it on to satisfy the demands of the followers of the People’s Front who placed it in power, and first and foremost to satisfy the demands of the proletariat who inspired the People’s Front.” (*The Communist International*, August, 1936, p. 944.)

Here was a government which did not contain any bourgeois political parties:

“In this government there are thirty-five members, of whom there are eighteen Socialists, including two women; fourteen Radical Socialists including one woman; and three members of the Republican Socialist League.” (*Ibid.*, p. 945.)

The Radical Socialists Lenin termed a “petty bourgeois” party. (Lenin, *On Britain*, p. 92.) But even though the bourgeois parties were not represented, the Communists would not join the government because the three conditions of: (1) political crisis, (2) a mass upsurge demanding ruthless measures against the fascists and (3) the disillusionment of the followers of the Socialists with the policy of class collaboration, had not yet sufficiently matured and acquired a mass character.

The situation was not such as to enable the government to become a “real People’s Front Government” in a position to, as Dimitroff said, establish “control of production, control of the banks, disbanding of the police and its replacement by an armed workers militia, etc.”

Therefore, it is clear, the action of the French Communists could in no way be compared to the proposal of the L.P.P. to enter a Liberal-Labor coalition government in Canada under the conditions prevailing in 1945.

However, the Communists did enter the government in Spain. Could that action be used as a justification for Communists entering a bourgeois government in Canada? Let us examine the situation that existed in Spain.

Following the election of February 10, 1936, the People's Front – which included among others the United Trade Unions, Socialists, Communists, Anarchists, Basque Nationalists, Catalonia Nationalists, Youth organizations and the Left Republican Party – came to power and formed the government. Regarding this government J. Hernandez, one of the leaders of the Communist Party of Spain, writing shortly after the new government's accession to power, stated:

“We do not leave out of account the fact that the present government is a Left Republican Government.” (*The C.I.*, August, 1936, p. 962.)

According to Hernandez it would appear that, at the time, prior to the fascist uprising, the Communists had not even joined the government. In any event, under this “Left Republican government,” at that time, the following had already occurred:

“The state has already provided 87,000 peasants with land...

“A section of the fascist leagues and kindred organizations such as, for instance, the Spanish Phalanx, the Requetes, etc., have been disarmed and disbanded. At the present time 5,000 to 6,000 fascists are in jail.

“A clean up has begun in the police force, the gendarmerie and the army to rid them of reactionary monarchist elements.

“Partial and general strikes take place, accompanied by the occupation of factories and coal mines, and in the villages by the peasants and agricultural workers.

“The Workers and Peasants militia is in the stage of organization...

“In actual fact the militia exists throughout the country. The militia defends the People's Front organization against attacks and aggression by the fascists and reactionaries, and defends the liberties of the people, and the Republic.” (*Ibid.*, pp. 957-58-65.)

Such was the situation in Spain in the Spring of 1936. The political estimation of the Spanish situation by the Communist Party of Spain was as follows:

“Two forces are struggling against each other in Spain – the force of fascism and the force of the anti-fascist People’s Front – revolution and counter-revolution. The outcome of the struggle has not yet been decided. At the present time we occupy a much more advantageous position than the enemies of the people. We can come out of this struggle victorious. The Party is growing rapidly. But the leadership of the Party does not forget that the successes that have been achieved are not yet finally consolidated. At the present time we are not putting forward the transition from the completion of the bourgeois-democratic revolution to the socialist revolution, for the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship, as the immediate task. But we aim at completing and carrying to its conclusion the people’s democratic revolution. This is the basic task of the Spanish people at the present moment.” (Ibid., pp. 968-69.)

Obviously, the situation in Spain was a revolutionary situation – the completion of the bourgeois democratic revolution for the removal of feudal restrictions. That was the situation in which the Communist Party accepted ministerial posts in the Left Republican Government of Spain. Further, the organizations and parties which made up the People’s Front in Spain did not include the political parties of the big bourgeoisie but were confined to the organizations and parties of the workers, peasants and the urban petty bourgeoisie.

Neither in France nor in Spain did the governments elected by the People’s Front nor the People’s Front itself come into being as a result of an electoral agreement but, on the contrary:

“...I must stress primarily that, both in Spain and in France, the People’s Front did not start as an electoral combination, but as a mass movement which was repeatedly in action before electoral agreements and election victories became possible.” Harry Pollitt. (Ibid., p. 974.)

It is clear, that to attempt to justify the proposal for a Liberal-Labor coalition in Canada in 1945 through drawing a parallel with the People’s Fronts of the France and Spain of 1936, as was done by

the National leaders of the L.P.P. at the National Committee meeting of August 10-16, 1945, is not only a distortion of Marxism but an unprincipled falsification of history. So much for the governments formed by the People's Fronts of France and Spain in the pre-war period.

### **THE COALITION GOVERNMENTS OF EUROPE IN 1945**

What of the provisional, coalition governments of Yugoslavia, Italy, France and Czecho-Slovakia to which Buck referred? Let us first of all consider the situation which prevailed at the time these governments were formed. Just prior to, and following the occupation of Czecho-Slovakia, France and Yugoslavia by Hitler's troops, a considerable portion of that section of the bourgeoisie which was anti-Nazi, fled from these countries. Of the bourgeoisie which remained, following the occupation, a large, if not a major section, collaborated with Hitler's occupation forces in the suppression of their own people. Consequently, they were regarded as traitors.

Following the liberation of these countries by the combined efforts of the armies of the United Nations and the local armed resistance movements, which in Yugoslavia numbered 500,000 partisans and tens of thousands in France, those members of the bourgeoisie which had collaborated with the Nazis were hunted down, arrested and in some instances, executed for treason.

In practically every instance the bases for the provisional governments were the armed resistance movements, and while the representatives of the governments in exile were included in the provisional governments at the insistence of the Anglo-American Governments, this did not alter the fact that the provisional governments were representative of and supported by the armed anti-fascist resistance movements of the people, the post-war form of the anti-fascist People's Front.

All of the prerequisites necessary to make the formation of such governments an "essential political task" as laid down by Dimitroff in 1935 were definitely present:

(1) "The bourgeoisie" could not "prevent the formation of a government of struggle against reaction and fascism." The old "state apparatus was disorganized and paralysed."

(2) "The widest masses of working people" were in "a state of vehement revolt against fascism" (1,600 of the French resistance

fighters gave their lives in the seizure of Paris before the American troops reached the city).

(3) The members of the "Social Democratic and other parties participating" in the resistance movement were demanding "ruthless measures against the fascists" and did "struggle together with the Communists against fascism."

In addition to the above, the policy of a People's Front government was also put into effect, namely: "Control of production, control of the banks, disbanding of the police." As for the armed militia, it was already in existence. And further, the property of collaborators (including the huge Renault Auto plant, largest in France) was expropriated without compensation, and in the countries where absentee landlord ownership of the land still existed, the landed estates were expropriated and divided up among the landless peasants. In Italy the conditions and policies outlined above were, in the main, also realized, but under the difficulties of Anglo-American intervention in internal affairs. In Belgium and Greece (which were already referred to), developments took a different course because in both instances representatives of the governments in exile, included in the provisional governments at the instance of the British government, appealed to and secured the aid of British armed forces to maintain themselves in office after the left wing ministers had resigned from the governments in protest against reactionary policies.

An objective examination of the conditions under which the provisional governments were formed, the composition of the governments and the program and policies which they followed, show conclusively that there was no similarity between Communists entering these governments and the proposal of the Labor Progressive Party that the Communists enter a coalition government together with the Liberals in Canada.

In one instance, it was an "essential political task," while in the other it was unprincipled opportunism which could only mean, in practice, the subordination of the class interests of the workers to the interests of the Liberal bourgeoisie.

As for the virtues of the British Labor Party which entered the coalition with the Conservatives, here is Buck's own opinion of it, now that it has formed the Government without a coalition: "The British Government would not be shooting down Indonesian people who want only national independence if that government were



planning to grant freedom to the people of India and Malaya.” (*Atomic Diplomacy*, p. 21.) In 1943 Buck said, “India will be free.”

### WHY COALITION GOVERNMENTS IN CHINA?

The argument is further advanced by certain of the L.P.P. leadership that because the Communist Party of China proposed to enter a coalition government of National Unity, therefore, a government of National Unity, a Liberal-Labor coalition, is correct and necessary in Canada. What are the facts?

The facts are that China is a semi-colonial country, an oppressed country, whereas Canada is an Imperialist country. Speaking on this question in 1927, Stalin pointed out that there is:

“A strict differentiation between revolution in imperialist countries, countries that oppress other peoples, and revolution in colonial and dependent countries, countries that suffer from the imperialist oppression of other states. Revolution in Imperialist states is one thing: in those countries the bourgeoisie is the oppressor of other peoples; it is counter-revolutionary in all stages of the revolution; the national element, as an element in the struggle for emancipation, is absent in these countries. Revolution in Colonial and dependent countries is another thing: in these countries the oppression exercised by the imperialism of other states is one of the factors of revolution; this oppression cannot but affect the national bourgeoisie also; the national bourgeoisie, at a certain stage and for a certain period, may support the revolutionary movement of its country against imperialism, and the national element, as an element in the struggle for emancipation, is a revolutionary factor.” (*The National Question*, p. 233.)

And further:

“With us in Russia, in 1905, the revolution was directed against the bourgeoisie, against the Liberal bourgeoisie, in spite of the fact that it was a bourgeois-democratic revolution. Why? Because the Liberal bourgeoisie of an imperialist country is bound to be counterrevolutionary. And that is why the Bolsheviks at that time did not and could not consider temporary blocs and agreements

with the Liberal bourgeoisie. On these grounds, the opposition asserts the same attitude should be adopted in China in all stages of the revolutionary movement and that temporary agreements and blocs with the National bourgeoisie in China are impermissible at all times and under all circumstances.” (Ibid., pp. 233-34.)

“Lenin,” said Stalin, “understood that at a certain stage of its development the National bourgeoisie in the colonial countries may support the revolutionary movement of its country against foreign imperialism.” (Ibid., p. 234.)

As a matter of fact, the proposal of the Chinese Communists to participate in a government of National Unity was advanced years before the “Teheran agreement” supposedly “marked out the lines of national and world policy.” Writing in 1939, one of the spokesmen of the Chinese Communists stated:

“... The long and successful collaboration of the Communist Party and the Kuomintang in the war of National defense determines their collaboration also after the war.” (*The C.I.*, July, 1939, p. 777.)

And further:

“Victory in the war of national defense will be based upon National solidarity, on the collaboration of the political parties, on the anti-Japanese national united front. The experience of this collaboration teaches all the anti-Japanese parties and the entire Chinese people how necessary it is to continue National solidarity and collaboration for the sake of National renaissance and the reconstruction of a new China.” (Ibid., pp. 777-778.)

It is patently a perversion of Marxism to attempt to draw a parallel between the tactics to be followed by the working class in a semi-colonial, oppressed country such as China and an advanced imperialist country such as Canada because, as Mao-Tse-Tung, the leader of the Chinese Communist Party, placed the question, speaking on May 1, 1945:

“The struggle of the Chinese people, for freedom, democracy, and a coalition government is actually a move-

ment for unification.” (*National Affairs*, Sept., 1945, p. 242.)

And the unification of China as a nation is necessary for the economic, social and political progress of the country and its independence from foreign, imperialist domination.

### **THE L.P.P. LEADERSHIP REPUDIATES THE CLASS STRUGGLE**

In spite of the opportunity which the National leadership of the L.P.P. had to recognize the revision of Marxism which had developed in Canada, on the basis of the criticism of the revisionist policies of Browder by the American Communists, not only did they fail to correct their opportunist policies but actually developed them further and denied that they had followed a revisionist line.

The resolution adopted by the National Committee, August 10-16, 1945, reads:

“Objective consideration shows that the policies, the legislative proposals and the slogans adopted by the Labor Progressive Party during the Federal election campaign were generally correct. The L.P.P. will continue to be guided in shaping its parliamentary proposals and slogans by the need to maintain democratic unity for the complete defeat of toryism in Canada.” (*National Affairs Monthly*, Oct. 1945, p. 281.)

And again:

“Detailed and objective study shows that the political line of the L.P.P. during 1944-45, as set forth in the Party program, resolutions and election platform, was based upon, and in general correctly reflected, the new situation created by the war and the tremendous possibilities that were signaled by the historic Teheran accord. The line of the L.P.P. was not based upon revisionist concepts.” (*Ibid.*, p. 287.)

As regards the economic, social and cultural inequalities of the French Canadians, the resolution states:

“The Labor Progressive Party in French Canada will pay special attention to the task of helping the working people there to develop, by their own methods of work, the

broadest public activity to maintain a high level of employment, decent wages and prosperity through the post war years.” (Ibid., p. 285.)

This is indeed a gem of “Marxian tactics.” The doubly exploited French Canadian workers are to achieve “decent wages and prosperity” through “the broadest public activity” with the help of the Labor Progressive Party. No doubt the French Canadian workers will duly appreciative of this consideration shown by the Labor Progressive Party.

The resolution also puts forward a “profound” program for the trade unions to follow:

“The trade union movement confronts problems of unprecedented magnitude. The shutdown of war industry with mass lay-offs will tend to diffuse union membership. The nationwide attempts to reduce the wage level will compel the trade union movement to fight for maintenance of take home pay. Reconversion will compel new intensive campaigns to organize the unorganized. To solve these problems and defend the interests of the workers while cooperating fully and loyally on joint Labor-Government-Employer bodies in post war reconstruction will be a supreme test of trade union leadership.” (Ibid., p. 284.)

One can at least agree with the latter part of the statement: “To solve the problem” of “nation-wide attempts to reduce the wage level” and “defend the interests of the workers while cooperating fully and loyally on joint Labor-Government-Employer bodies” certainly would be “a supreme test of trade union leadership.” To maintain wage levels against “nation-wide attempts” to reduce them through having the leaders of unions “co-operate fully and loyally” with the managements is a policy that will, no doubt, duly impress the leaders of the trade unions to say nothing of the membership.

According to the L.P.P. resolution:

“... The struggle for aid to the liberation forces in China, to free India, of the fight for adequate lay-off pay in Canada, of the fight for more adequate social legislation will involve a measure of co-operation – at least to the extent of joint support for such measures – with sections of

big business including sections of finance capital.” (Ibid., p. 282.)

This is indeed interesting! “To free India,” “secure adequate layoff pay” and “adequate social legislation” it is now necessary that labor co-operate with “big business.” The people of India, at least, will be interested to know of the proper procedure to follow in order to secure their freedom. The resolution goes further and claims that only through class collaboration can the interests of the working class be served:

“The fight to maintain the national front around post war policies in accord with the perspectives raised at Teheran is the only course by which, in the existing conditions the working class can strengthen itself, extend its organizations, raise its standard of life and advance its political role and influence in Canada.” (Ibid., p. 282.)

At the B.C. Provincial Convention of the L.P.P., held in September, 1945, Sam Carr, National organizer of the L.P.P., explained:

“National unity means unity of everyone in the Nation under the banner of Democracy. Democracy means homes, jobs, rehabilitation, freedom of speech and better education.” (*The P.A.*, September 22, 1945.)

Indeed! Now we are to have “unity of everyone in the nation,” and “under the banner” of bourgeois “democracy.” And this bourgeois democracy, if you please, means homes, jobs, better education, etc. Of course, to even mention the basic conflict of antagonistic classes in this glorification of capitalism would be considered sacrilege. So in the same speech we read:

“By raising the slogan of class against class we ignore the fact that all of the workers are not agreed on the policies of socialism, and that the entire bourgeoisie is not unanimous on the reactionary policies of finance capital. We ignore that we have in Canada millions of farmers and middle class people who must be provided with a banner of working class struggle emanating from the working class and not the bourgeoisie, and we therefore state that issues are the question of the day.” (Ibid.)

Very enlightening! Having already repudiated the class struggle in practice, the National organizer of the L.P.P., a professed Marxist, in effect now publicly repudiates the class struggle as the motive force in social progress.

Over sixty-six years ago Engels wrote:

“For almost forty years we have stressed the class struggle as the immediate driving force of history, and in particular the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie as the great lever of the modern social revolution; it is therefore impossible for us to co-operate with people who wish to expunge this class struggle from the movement.” (Marx, Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, p. 376.)

The question of whether or not all of the workers are “agreed on the policies of socialism” and whether or not the “entire bourgeoisie are unanimous on the reactionary policies of finance capital” has nothing to do with the question of the struggle of class against class. Under capitalism there never will be a time when all of the workers are agreed on the policies of socialism. And neither will there ever be a time when the “entire bourgeoisie” will be unanimous on any policy of reaction. Such statements are merely pedantic phrase-mongering.

Furthermore, the class struggle does not arise because some comical pedant raises the slogan of “class against class.” Engels explained the development of the political class struggle of the workers seventy-four years ago as follows:

“The attempt in a particular factory or even a particular industry to force a shorter working day out of the capitalists by strikes, etc., is a purely economic movement. On the other hand the movement to force an eight-hour day, etc., law is a political movement. And in this way, out of the separate economic movements of the workers there grows up everywhere a political movement, that is to say a movement of the class, with the object of achieving its interests in a form possessing a general social force of compulsion. If these movements presuppose a certain degree of previous organization, they are themselves equally a means of the development of this organization.” (Ibid., pp. 318-19.)

And as to the independent class role of the working class, Engels adds:

“Where the working class is not yet far enough advanced in its organization to undertake a decisive campaign against the collective power i.e., the political power of the ruling classes, it must at any rate be trained for this by continual agitation against and a hostile attitude towards the policy of the ruling classes. Otherwise it will remain a plaything in its hands.” (Ibid.)

And this is precisely what the leadership of the L.P.P. have, by their policies, been attempting to do with the working class, make it a plaything in the hands of the Liberal bourgeoisie.

If “unity of everyone in the nation under the banner of democracy” is not a denial of the existence of classes with conflicting and antagonistic interests then words have lost all meaning. And yet it is now ninety-three years since Marx wrote:

“... No credit is due to me for discovering the existence of classes in modern society nor yet the struggle between them. Long before me bourgeois historians had described the historical development of the class struggle and bourgeois economists the economic anatomy of the classes. What I did was to prove: (1) That the existence of classes is only bound up with particular, historic phases in the development of production; (2) that the class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat; (3) that this dictatorship itself only constitutes the transition to the abolition of all classes and to a classless society.” (Ibid., p. 57.)

However, Marx was ruthless in his criticism of those who denied the existence of classes and of the class struggle:

“Ignorant louts like Heinzen who deny not merely the class struggle, but even the existence of classes, only prove that, despite all their bloodcurdling yelps and the humanitarian airs they give themselves, they regard the social conditions under which the bourgeoisie rule as the final product, the non plus ultra (final limit) of history, and that they are only the slaves of the bourgeoisie. And the less these clowns themselves understand even of the greatness and

temporary necessity of the bourgeois regime the more disgusting is their servitude.” (Ibid., pp. 57-58.)

Lenin held a somewhat similar opinion of those who denied the class struggle. Said Lenin:

“Nicolai-on’s fundamental error is his failure to understand the class struggle, this necessary part of capitalism. This lack of understanding makes Nicolai-on into a Utopian, for a socialist by ignoring the class struggle in capitalist society, *eo ipso* (thereby) ignores the whole real content of the social political content of that society, and in order to realize his desire he inevitably takes refuge in the sphere of innocent dreams. This lack of understanding turns him into a reactionary, for the appeal to ‘society’ and to the ‘state’, i.e., to the ideologists and politicians of the bourgeoisie, confuses the socialist and leads him to take the worst enemies of the proletariat as his allies; it only obstructs the workers’ struggle for emancipation instead of increasing its strength and clarity and the greater organization of this struggle.” (Ibid., p. 361.)

The farther one goes the more stupidly absurd the entire statement of Carr becomes. First, we have “unity of everyone in the nation under the banner of democracy.” Then, to raise the slogan of “class against class” ignores the fact that not all of the workers are agreed on socialism and not all of the capitalists are agreed upon policies of reaction. But after having said all this, “millions of farmers and middle class people” “must be provided with a banner of working class struggle.” So! The banner of working class struggle is to be carried by the “millions of farmers and middle class people” while the working class themselves are not “to raise the slogan of class against class.”

But enough of this nonsense which is being palmed off on the working class as “scientific socialism,” as “Marxism.”

Let us now compare the emasculated, distorted, revised and perverted theories of Marxism propounded by the National leadership of the L.P.P. and the theories as originally presented by the founders and greatest authorities of Marxism.

## **THE THEORY OF IMPERIALISM**



“The Teheran agreement... opens up possibilities for a period of great and far reaching economic and social progress, carried through in the spirit which now inspires the United Nations it can result in raising the level of economic activity and social progress throughout the world: complete reconstruction of Europe and parts of Asia, the building of new cities, new transportation systems, new industries and the revitalization of cultural life. These things would mean literally the building of a new world.” TIM BUCK (*Unity or Chaos*, pp. 10-11.)

“Is there a possibility of establishing a level of industrial activity which will provide full employment in the post war years? Yes, there is, and the outlines of the policies which will enable Canada to maintain such a level are becoming increasingly clear.” TIM BUCK, (*Ibid.*, p. 23.)

Now compare Buck’s position with that of Lenin and the C.I.:

“Imperialism is the epoch of finance capital and of monopolies which introduce everywhere the striving for domination, not for freedom. The result of these tendencies is reaction all along the line, whatever the political system, and extreme intensification of antagonisms in this domain also.” LENIN (*Imperialism*, p. 109.)

“The break up of world economy into a capitalist and a socialist sector, the shrinking of markets and the anti-imperialist movement in the colonies intensify all contradictions of capitalism which is developing on a new post war basis. This very technical progress and rationalization of industry, the reverse side of which is the closing down and liquidation of numerous enterprises, the restriction of production, and the ruthless and destructive exploitation of labor power leads to chronic unemployment on a scale never before experienced.” Program of the C.I. (*Handbook of Marxism*, p. 980.).

### THEORY OF THE AGRARIAN QUESTION

“The Labor Progressive Party seeks to arouse the labor and farm movements to an understanding of the need for establishing parliamentary alliances between themselves

through the medium of labor farmer parties, through electoral agreements and political co-operation of all kinds, in order to elect labor farmer governments to carry through urgent democratic reforms.” Program of L.P.P. (*Program*, p. 28.)

Now consider Lenin’s position:

“The masses of the rural toilers and exploited, whom the urban proletariat must lead into struggle, or at all events, win over to its side, are represented in all capitalist countries by the following classes: First, the agricultural proletariat, wage workers –

“Second, the semi-proletarian or parcelised peasants, i.e., those who obtain their livelihood partly as wage laborers in agriculture and industrial capitalist enterprises and partly by toiling on their own, or rented, plots of land –

“Third, the small peasantry, i.e., the small tillers of the soil who possess, either as their own property, or rent, small plots of land which enable them to meet the requirements of their families and their farms without hiring outside labor.

“... Bourgeois scientists do everything to obscure the wide gulf that separates the above mentioned classes in the rural district from the exploiters, the landlords and the capitalists, and which also separates the semi-proletarians and small peasants from the big peasants.” *Lenin on the Agrarian Question*. (*Selected Works*, Vol. IX, pp. 219-20-21.)

It is a recognized fact that the existing farm movements both economic and political, are dominated and led by the large bourgeois farmers and that consequently a “parliamentary alliance” with them under present conditions would be an alliance, not with those sections of the rural population which are the natural allies of the urban workers, but with the agrarian bourgeoisie. Hence, the program of the L.P.P. obscures the existence of class antagonisms in the countryside and advocates policies which Dimitroff termed the “unprincipled tactics” of “purely parliamentary agreements” which could only result in subordinating the rural poor and the labor movement to the agricultural bourgeoisie.

## THEORY OF THE NATIONAL QUESTION

"The ideal towards which Canada's foreign policy should aim is that of Canada playing a democratic role as a sovereign state in a world association of sovereign states.

"Such an ideal does not exclude or contradict continued Canadian membership in the British Commonwealth; on the contrary, it envisages development of Canada's role in the Commonwealth to one of increasing importance." TIM BUCK. (*Canada's Choice*, p. 30.)

"Thus the Commonwealth, a voluntary association of free sovereign nations, is part of an Empire of which the vast colonial possessions belong, with minor exceptions, to the metropolis, (Britain, F.M.) of the Commonwealth alone." TIM BUCK, (*National Affairs*, June, 1944, p. 68).

"As matters stand, it is no more possible for Canada to evade her share of responsibility for Empire policies than for the Canadian people to escape their results." (Ibid.)

"Important as Empire trade will be to Canada after the war, Imperial preferences will be only secondary to the broader aim of a tremendous expansion of world trade in general. For Canadians it must be secondary even to a tariff agreement between Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States.

"Certainly Canada will not, cannot, agree to any Empire or Commonwealth policy which could bring us to cross purposes with the United States." (Ibid., pp. 70-71.)

Here we have a program, outlined by a professed Marxist, for Canadian Imperialism to follow in the sphere of foreign policy. A program designed to bring the greatest amount of profit to Canadian monopoly capital through wider trade agreements while maintaining the present Imperial preference trade agreements within the Empire.

Consider the propositions which Buck here advances: Canada is a part of the British Commonwealth of Nations. The Commonwealth is composed of the dominant sovereign nations within the British Empire (the other countries of which are denied the right of self-government and independence and are subject nations).

It is not "possible for Canada to evade her share of responsibility for Empire policies," or "for the Canadian people to escape their results." Which means, in fact, that Canada must also share respon-

sibility for the policies which hold in subjection the people of these “vast colonial possessions” whose population amounts to 600,000,000, over one-quarter of the population of the world. But Buck states, “Important as Empire trade will be,” i.e., sharing in the super-exploitation of the colonial people through Imperial preferences, it is also important to extend trade agreements with other countries. However, although Canada should play a “democratic role” as a “sovereign state,” this does not “exclude or contradict continued Canadian membership in the British Commonwealth; on the contrary, it envisages development of Canada’s role in the Commonwealth to one of increasing importance.”

In other words, while Canadian Imperialism should participate in “a tremendous expansion of world trade in general” it should also not only continue its membership in the Commonwealth and Empire but play “a role of increasing importance.”

Consider Lenin’s position on the Colonial question:

“Can a nation be free if it oppresses other nations? It cannot.” (*Selected Works*, Vol. IV, p. 267.)

And Lenin quotes Marx in connection with Ireland:

“... *It is in the direct and absolute interest of the English working class to get rid of their connection with Ireland* – The English working class will never accomplish anything before it has got rid of Ireland – English reaction in England had its roots ... in the subjugation of Ireland.” (Marx’s italics).

And further:

“Imperialism is the progressing oppression of the nations of the world by a handful of Great Powers; it is the epoch in which the masses of the people are deceived by the hypocritical social-patriots, i.e., people who under the pretext of ‘freedom of nations,’ ‘right of nations to self-determination,’ and ‘defense of the fatherland,’ justify and defend oppression of a majority of the world’s nations by the Great Powers.

“This is precisely why the central point in the Social-Democratic programme must be the distinction between oppressing and oppressed nations, which is the essence of

imperialism, which is falsely evaded by the social-chauvinists. This distinction is not important from the point of view of bourgeois pacifism, or the petty-bourgeois utopia of peaceful competition among independent nations under capitalism, but it is most important from the point of view of the revolutionary struggle against Imperialism.” (*Selected Works*, Vol. V, p. 284.)

Writing in *Socialism and War*, Lenin stated:

“The Socialists cannot reach their great aim without fighting against every form of national oppression... A Socialist of a great nation or a nation possessing colonies who does not defend this right is a chauvinist.” (*Socialism and War*, p. 25.)

Lenin concludes the chapter as follows:

“No people oppressing, other nations can be free.” (Marx and Engels). No proletariat reconciling itself to the least violation by “its” nation of the rights of other nations can be socialist.” (Ibid., p. 26.)

Can it be denied that Canada’s continued membership in the British Empire, through the medium of the British Commonwealth, in view of the fact it has sovereignty, is for the chief purpose of participating with the other commonwealth states, by means of Imperial preference trade agreements, in the joint super-exploitation and subjugation of the colonial peoples? No! It cannot be denied. Can it be denied that the working class of Canada must also share “responsibility for Empire policies” as an integral part of the Empire? No! It cannot.

Can it be denied that by sharing responsibility for such policies, which include colonial oppression and participation in the exploitation of the colonial people, that the Canadian working class is “reconciling itself to” the “violation by its nation of the rights of other nations?” No! Neither can this fact be denied.

And how does the “Marxist,” Tim Buck, propose to deal with this problem? “By developing Canada’s role in the Commonwealth to one of increasing importance” and by making “Imperial preferences secondary to the broader aim of a tremendous expansion of world trade.”

In other words, by “bigger and better” methods of expanding markets and exploitation by Canadian monopoly capital.

So much for the treatment of the Colonial Question by the leadership of the Labor Progressive Party.

### THE NATIONAL QUESTION AND FRENCH CANADA

“A nation is an historically evolved, stable community of language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a community of culture.” Stalin.

Does French Canada constitute a nation in accordance with the above definition? Yes! It certainly does. French Canada has existed as a stable community for over 300 years, i.e., over a century before English settlement in Canada. French Canada has a common language and territory, a highly developed and well-balanced economy and a developed culture that is specifically French Canadian. French Canada was conquered by the British in 1759 and forcibly brought under British rule.

According to Tim Buck:

“Inequalities still persist in French Canada.” And further: “The low wage level, the intolerably low standard of public education and social services, the high rate of infant mortality, the high death rate from tuberculosis are but evidence of the conditions created by the systematic economic discrimination from which the workers, farmers, and lower middle class people of the towns and cities, suffer in the province of Quebec.” (*Unity or Chaos*, p. 31.)

The statement of the August, 1945, National Committee meeting of the L.P.P. claims:

“The struggle against social inequalities remains an outstanding task in Quebec.” (*National Affairs*, October, 1945, p. 285.)

According to Stanley Ryerson, the L.P.P. “authority” on French Canada:

“The low wages paid to the French Canadian workers in Quebec are a curse to the whole Quebec people.

“As regards infant mortality, while the rate for Canada as a whole per 1,000 live births was 59.7, that of Three

Rivers, Quebec was 297. In other words, almost one of every three babies born in Three Rivers died before it was a year old because of poverty and inadequate health services.”

And how do Buck and Ryerson propose to overcome these admitted inequalities. According to Buck:

“Correction of this situation is a National duty. Leadership in its correction should come from the Dominion Government.” (*Unity or Chaos*, p. 31.)

And according to Ryerson:

“The raising of the low living standards which monopoly rule has inflicted on Quebec is a common, Canadian responsibility, requiring federal as well as provincial government action.” (*French Canada*, p. 178.)

And according to the L.P.P. program:

“The party presses the governments, provincial and federal, to take immediate measures to redress the burning grievances of the French Canadian people.” (*Program*, p. 9.)

But enough of these caricatures of Marxism, let us now consider the Marxian position on the National Question.

According to Lenin:

“We demand the freedom of self-determination, i.e., the freedom of secession for the oppressed nations, not because we dream of economic disintegration, or because we cherish the ideal of small states, but, on the contrary, because we are in favour of large states, and of the closer unity and even the fusion of nations, but on a truly democratic, truly international basis, which is inconceivable without the freedom of secession.” (*Selected Works*, Vol. V, p. 289.)

And again:

“The Social-Democrats of the oppressing nations must demand the freedom of secession for the oppressed nations, for otherwise recognition of the equal rights of nations and of the international solidarity of the workers in reality remains an empty phrase, mere hypocrisy.” (*Ibid.*, p. 284.)

In these two quotations Lenin makes it clear that democratic unity of nations is inconceivable, and the equality of nations is an empty phrase unless such democratic unity and equality is based on the right of secession.

However, what position does the Labor Progressive Party take? The program reads: "... Political equality was won for French Canada by the joint struggle of the Reformers and the Patriots of Upper and Lower Canada a century ago," and then, in the next page, proves the opposite: "These elements of National inequality stem from over a century of deliberate maintenance of feudal restrictions in the province of Quebec, and from Government policies designed to keep French Canada as a zone of specially profitable exploitation."

Such an absurd contradiction could not arise from Marxian dialectics but only from petty bourgeois eclecticism.

Ryerson, in his so-called "authoritative work," *French Canada*, states:

"The position of the French Canadians is that of a nation which has won the essentials of political equality within the Canadian Federal state...."

What are the essentials of political equality for a minority nation within a given state? According to Lenin the essential question is, the right to secede and form an independent state. Has Ryerson or the leadership of the Communist movement in Canada ever advanced the demand for the right of secession for French Canada during the twenty-three years since the Communist Party was first formed? If they have, there is no evidence of it.

On this point Lenin wrote:

"The Socialist of an oppressing nation, who does not conduct propaganda, both in peace and wartime, in favor of the freedom of secession for the oppressed nations, is not a socialist and not an internationalist, but a chauvinist." (*Selected Works*, Vol. V, p. 287.)

Of Socialists who did not champion the right of secession for a minority nation on the excuse that it was "utopian" or of those who regarded it as "excessive" Lenin wrote:



“They justify their opportunism, they make it easier to deceive the people, they evade precisely the question of the frontiers of a state which forcibly retains subject nations, etc.

“Both groups are opportunists who prostitute Marxism and who have lost all capacity to understand the theoretical significance and the practical urgency of Marx’s tactics, an example of which he gave in relation to Ireland.” (Ibid., p. 277.)

Our examination has shown that the leadership of the L.P.P., in dealing with the National and Colonial questions as regards the British Empire and French Canada, have also prostituted Marxism.

### THEORY OF THE STATE

Frederick Engels, in *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, characterized the State as follows:

“As the state arose out of the need to hold class antagonisms in check; but as it, at the same time arose in the midst of the conflict of these classes, it is, as a rule the state of the most powerful, economically dominant class politically, and thus acquires new means of holding down and exploiting the oppressed class.”

“The modern representative state,” Engels added, “is the instrument of the exploitation of wage labor by capital.”

This explanation of the state is quite simple and understandable: The class which is dominant economically, by virtue of that fact, is as a rule, also dominant politically.

This dominant class acquires state power because of the need “to hold class antagonisms in check” and having achieved power “acquires new means of holding down and exploiting the oppressed class.” In modern society, therefore, the state “is the instrument of the exploitation of wage labor by capital.”

“A standing army and police,” Lenin said, “are the chief instruments of state power.” (*State and Revolution*, p. 19.)

And further:

“In a democratic republic, Engels continues, wealth wields its power indirectly, but all the more effectively, first by means of ‘direct corruption of officials’ (America);

second, by means of ‘the alliance of the government with the stock exchange’ (France and America).” (Ibid., p. 13.)

The state, then, according to Engels and Lenin, is the instrument of the capitalist class generally and of its most powerful section, monopoly capital in particular, for the oppression and exploitation of wage labor, i.e., the working class.

Now try and reconcile this position of Marx, Engels and Lenin with Tim Buck:

“The powerful sentiment for labor representation makes it possible to win a place for labor as an independent partner in a government representing the unity of the overwhelming majority of Canadians around policies in accord with the new world perspective outlined at Teheran. Establishment of such a government, with labor as a full partner in it, would open a new and higher stage of National progress in Canada.” (*What Kind of Government*, p. 11.)

Or take the position of Stewart Smith:

“State policy after the war as during the war can achieve very great results in making the system work, and it is essential that the working class should support such a policy. But this can only have meaning when understood as an agreement between labor and the decisive sections of monopoly capital.” (*National Affairs Monthly*, June, 1944, p. 74.)

So! “Labor and decisive sections of monopoly capital” should have an agreement to “make the system work” through “state policy.” The state is no longer to be an “instrument of oppression” of labor by monopoly capital but labor and monopoly capital are to jointly use the state to “make the system work.”

This L.P.P. concept of the state is really “brilliant.”

How correct Lenin was when he wrote:

“The petty-bourgeois democrats, these sham socialists who have substituted for the class struggle dreams of harmony between classes, imagined even the transition to socialism in a dreamy fashion – not in the form of the overthrow of the rule of the exploiting class, but in the form of the peaceful submission of the minority to a majority conscious of its aims. This petty-bourgeois utopia, indissolubly

connected with the idea of the state being above classes, in practice led to the betrayal of the interests of the toiling classes...

“Marx fought all his life against this petty-bourgeois socialism.” (*State and Revolution*, p. 23.)

Speaking of the major issues of the post-war, Buck claimed:

“These great issues will be fought out, in the main, on the field of parliamentary activity.” (*Victory Through Unity*, p. 18.)

As if in answer to this sophism, Lenin wrote in 1917:

“Take any parliamentary country, from America to Switzerland, from France to England, Norway and so forth – the actual work of the ‘state’ there is done behind the scenes and is carried out by departments, the offices and the staffs, Parliament itself is given up to talk for the special purpose of fooling the ‘common people.’” (*State and Revolution*, p. 40.)

The glaring contradiction between the estimation of the state by Tim Buck and Stewart Smith on the one hand, and Marx, Engels and Lenin on the other, is clear for all to see.

### THE THEORY OF THE PARTY

“The Labor Progressive Party is the political organization of the workers, farmers, professional people and all other Canadians who toil by hand or brain.” (*L.P.P. Constitution*, p. 1.)

Compare this concept with Lenin:

“Social Democracy absolutely insists on the need for complete independence for the party of the proletariat.” (*Selected Works*, Vol. III, p. 121.)

Or with this:

“By educating a Workers’ Party, Marxism educates the vanguard of the proletariat, capable of assuming power and of leading the whole people to socialism, of directing and organizing the new order, of being the teacher, guide and

leader of all the toiling and exploited in the task of building up their social life without the bourgeoisie and against the bourgeoisie. As against this, the opportunism predominant at present breeds in the workers' parties, representatives of the better paid workers, who lose touch with the rank-and-file, 'get along' fairly well under capitalism, and sell their birthright for a mess of pottage, i.e., renounce their role of revolutionary leaders of the people against the bourgeoisie." (*State and Revolution*, pp. 23-24.)

The constitution of the L.P.P. further states that:

"The Labor Progressive Party defends the institutions and rights of popular liberty against any subversive and reactionary minority groups who may seek to destroy them."

And the preamble concludes:

"There is no place in this party for any individual or group seeking to undermine, subvert or abrogate democracy."

Compare this attitude towards bourgeois democracy with that of Lenin:

"Bourgeois democracy, while constituting a great historical advance in comparison with mediaevalism, nevertheless remains and cannot but remain under capitalism, restricted, truncated, false and hypocritical, a paradise for the rich and a trap and snare and a deception for the exploited, for the poor." (*The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, p. 26.)

And further:

"We are governed (and our state is 'run') by bourgeois bureaucrats, by bourgeois judges – such is the simple, indisputable and obvious truth, which tens and hundreds of millions of the exploited classes in all bourgeois countries, including the most democratic, know from their living experience, feel and realize every day." (*Ibid.*, p. 31.)

But "Proletarian democracy," said Lenin, "is a million times more democratic than any bourgeois democracy; the Soviet gov-

ernment is a million times more democratic than the most democratic bourgeois republic.” (Ibid., p. 30.)

What the constitution of the L.P.P. should have stated and which the action of their leadership has proven, is: “There is no place in this Party for any individual or group seeking to replace bourgeois democracy with proletarian democracy, with socialism.”

### THE THEORY OF THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION

Having repudiated the very foundation of Marxism, the doctrine of the class struggle, the theoreticians of the Labor Progressive Party naturally could not speak of the Theory of the Proletarian Revolution, i.e., the period in which the working class would take political power and, as Lenin said, substitute the dictatorship of the proletariat for the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

Neither could or did they refer to the dictatorship of the proletariat nor the theory of socialism except in a vague, distorted and unintelligible way. For instance, the question of capturing political power and establishing socialism is referred to by Buck as follows:

“This mighty democratic upsurge marks a tremendous forward step. It will bring lasting benefits to the majority of the people, however, only if, out of it, there is developed a unified political movement of workers, farmers and middle class people who can guide that movement steadily forward in a struggle to elect farmer-labor governments and finally a government that will establish socialism in Canada.”  
(*Victory Through Unity*, p. 56.)

About all the sense one can gather from this is that sometime, in the distant future, the “progressive workers, farmers and middle class people” will “struggle to elect” a “government that will establish socialism in Canada.”

So! The Theory of the Proletarian Revolution, the Theory of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the Theory of Socialism are all disposed of, in such a manner as to constitute a complete perversion of Marxism, in one garbled sentence.

Writing on these questions in August, 1917, Lenin expressed the following viewpoint:

“Let us, however, cast a general glance over the history of the more advanced countries during the end of the nine-

teenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries. We shall see that the same process has been going on more slowly, in more varied forms, on a much wider field: on the one hand a development of parliamentary power, not only in the republican countries (France, America, Switzerland), but also in the monarchies (England, Germany to a certain extent, Italy, the Scandinavian countries, etc.); on the other hand, a struggle for power of various bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties distributing and redistributing the ‘spoils’ of official berths, the foundations of capitalist society remaining all the while unchanged; finally, the perfecting and strengthening of the ‘executive power,’ its bureaucratic and military apparatus.

“There is no doubt that these are the features common to the latest stage in the evolution of all capitalist states generally...

“Imperialism in particular – the era of banking capital, the era of gigantic capitalist monopolies, the era of the transformation of monopoly capital into state monopoly capitalism – shows an unprecedented strengthening of the state machinery and an unprecedented growth of its bureaucratic and military apparatus, side by side with the increase of repressive measures against the proletariat, alike in the monarchial and the freest republican countries.” (*State and Revolution*, pp. 28-29.)

This description of the modern capitalist state and the struggle of middle class and capitalist parties for the “spoils of official berths” while the foundation of capitalist society and its state apparatus remain basically unchanged, is as true today as it was when it was written twenty-eight years ago.

In the same chapter Lenin pointed out how opportunism evaded the question of state power. Lenin wrote:

“Opportunism does not lead the recognition of class struggle up to the main point, up to the period of transition from capitalism to communism, up to the period of overthrowing and completely abolishing the bourgeoisie. In reality this period inevitably becomes a period of unusually violent class struggles in their sharpest possible forms and, therefore the state during this period inevitably must be a

state that is democratic in a new way (for the proletariat and the poor in general) and dictatorial in a new way (against the bourgeoisie).

“Further, the substance of the teachings of Marx about the state is assimilated only by one who understands that the dictatorship of a single class is necessary not only for any class generally not only for the proletariat which has overthrown the bourgeoisie but for the entire historic period which separates capitalism from ‘classless society,’ from Communism. The forms of bourgeois states are exceedingly variegated, but their essence is the same: in one way or another, all these states are in the last analysis inevitably a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The transition from Capitalism to Communism will certainly bring a great variety and abundance of political forms, but the essence will inevitably be only one: the dictatorship of the proletariat.” (Ibid., p. 30.)

Instead of organizing, unifying and educating the working class as to the real character of capitalism, the need of socialism and the methods to be employed in achieving socialism, the leadership of the L.P.P. has done the exact opposite: glorification of capitalism, repudiation of socialism and has attempted to abolish in theory, class distinctions and the real role of political parties. In fact, the federal platform of the L.P.P. attempts to outdo the platforms of the bourgeois parties themselves in singing paeans of praise to Imperialism and submitting plans for the further expansion and development of Canadian imperialism in order to make Canada a bigger and better Imperialist power.

The following extracts from the L.P.P. 1945 Federal Election Platform illustrate perfectly the degree to which the L.P.P. has degenerated into a petty-bourgeois, liberal-labor party, whose main task is glorification of Canadian Imperialism:

“We can establish a partnership between labor, management and government for reconversion from war to peace-time industry.

“We can maintain in the peace the high level of national income that has been achieved during the war.

“We can restrict monopolistic practices, protect small businesses and give full scope to the development of our national resources.

“We can establish the eight-hour day and 40-hour week at decent wages and guarantee, by law, the right to trade union organization and collective bargaining.

“We can extend to all of Canada’s youth the fullest opportunity to learn, to train and to be usefully employed.

“We can ensure to the women of Canada full equality of opportunity, to enable them to play their rightful part in public affairs and industry.

“We can safeguard the right to publish and speak our thoughts, to worship in our own way, and freely organize politically.

“We can live together, in harmony, English and French Canadian through the enjoyment of equal rights in a Confederation brought up to date by constitutional reforms.

“The approaching victory of the peoples will make possible long years of world prosperity on the secure foundation of United Nations friendship and co-operation. Canada, as a leading exporting nation, must play her full part in the reconstruction of liberated Europe and Asia. Increased world trade, together with rising living standards at home, will enable Canada to maintain her present National income and a high level of prosperity after the war.

“These things can be done (*their italics*), provided there is unity of the democratic, forward-looking forces in Canadian life. They will not be done if the Tory enemies of the people’s interest and democratic reforms are allowed to capture federal power through a coalition of reactionary forces.”

This set of utopian election promises in the “traditional style” of Canadian bourgeois politics is in actual fact an attempt to outdo even the bourgeois Liberal Party. The points which have been italicised constitute a direct repudiation of Marxism. But the L.P.P. leadership claim “these things can be done, provided there is unity of the democratic, forward-looking forces.”

In place of the Marxian concepts of the contradictions of Capitalism, of the class struggle, of the role of parties as representatives



of classes, we have a fairy story about the division of society, on the one hand, into “progressive,” “democratic,” “forward-looking forces” and on the other hand, “sinister forces,” “reactionary forces,” “Toryism,” etc. A division which transcends all class lines and party lines.

The balance of the election platform constitutes, in large part, a platform for Canadian monopoly capital to follow for the greater glory of Canadian Imperialism. In the first section we read:

“The central problem of Dominion government policy after the war will be to maintain the national income and public purchasing power at a prosperity level. This can be done! The war has proved that the nation, through its elected government, can direct its economy so as to maintain any desired level of production within our physical capacity.”

This is indeed a “scientific” assertion for professional “Marxists” to make. But to continue with the instructions of the L.P.P. leadership to the Canadian capitalist class on how to “make capitalism work,” we get the following:

“Hand in hand with reconversion the minister of Reconstruction should see to the establishment of vital basic industries in Canada – production of aviation engines, expansion of iron ore smelting, modern synthetics and plastics, more extensive use of Canada’s vast resources of coal and petroleum, etc.

“The Canadian government must assume responsibility for maintaining our national exports at a level of two billion dollars a year. This can be done through government aid in the organization of private and government large-scale long-term loans, export credits and lend-lease aid to the countries devastated by the war, to Latin America and to the economically backward colonies of Asia and Africa.

“Canada’s government must ensure that every Canadian obtains adequate food, clothing and shelter, medical care, opportunities for education, a career in youth and un-worried comfort in old age.

“Increased utilization of the Hudson’s Bay Railway and the Bay ports.

“The services of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation must be extended and improved as an educational and cultural medium.

“Adopt an official Canadian flag and proclaim ‘O Canada’ the national anthem of our country.

“In the British Commonwealth, Canada must continue to pursue the policy enunciated by Prime Minister McKenzie King at the 1944 conference of Commonwealth Ministers.

“Canada should become a member of the Pan-American Union and participate in all its conferences and other activities.

“Our Dominion government should aim at the largest possible measure of freedom of trade between Canada and the rest of the world, the reduction of tariff barriers and other obstacles to world economic co-operation, through the joint efforts of the United Nations.

“The Department of External Affairs must be elevated to a full Ministry of the government, headed by a Minister for Foreign Affairs.

“We should extend full diplomatic representation to all countries with which Canada maintains trade and diplomatic relationships.”

Thus we see how revolutionary Marxism was transformed, by the Canadian “Marxists,” into its opposite: opportunism, reformism; vulgarized, distorted, revised and emasculated of its revolutionary content; instead of the science of working class strategy and tactics in the struggle for socialism it has been perverted into a program for the development of Canadian Imperialism.

How correct Lenin was, when he stated:

“Opportunism is our principal enemy. Opportunism in the upper ranks of the working class movement is not proletarian socialism, but bourgeois socialism. Practise has shown that the active people in the working class movement who adhere to the opportunist trend are better defenders of the bourgeoisie, than the bourgeoisie itself. Without their leadership of the workers, the bourgeoisie could not have remained in power.” (*Selected Works*, Vol. X. p. 196.)

## CHAPTER V:

### THE ORGANIZATIONAL POLICIES WHICH FOSTERED REVISIONISM AND ITS EFFECTS

As our examination of the policies of the Communist movement in Canada has shown, the deviations in theory and practise from Marxism commenced at least as far back as 1935 when the tactical line of the People's Front Against Fascism and War was presented in a distorted fashion only three months following the adoption of the new tactical line by the 7th Congress of the Communist International.

First, the Marxian concept of the "United Front of the Working Class" was replaced by "The United Front of All Progressive Forces" of the Canadian people in lasting form through the transformation of the C.C.F. into a broad federated people's party. STEWART SMITH. (*Towards a Canadian People's Front*, pp. 19-20.)

Whereas the central and decisive problem of the United Front was "unity in action of the working class" in "every factory, every region," etc., it was presented as:

"The central problem of the united front confronting our Party, the working class and all progressive people is the question of how the C.C.F., the trade unions, the farmer organizations and the Communist movement can be brought together into a broad united front party." STEWART SMITH. (*Ibid.*, p. 27.)

In other words, the united front of struggle of the working class was distorted and presented as the formation of a hodge-podge, farmer-labor party.

As regards the People's Front and the leading role of the working class:

"The fundamental, the most decisive thing in establishing the anti-Fascist People's Front is resolute action of the revolutionary proletariat..." DIMITROFF.

This was revised into its opposite:

"The urban middle stratum are of decisive importance for the fight against fascism and war." STEWART SMITH.

The distortion and perversion of the united front was then carried further and presented almost solely as meaning an electoral agreement in election campaigns. With regard to the October, 1937, Federal election:

“In 20 constituencies a united front was secured in the face of the opposition of top leadership of the C.C.F.” TIM BUCK. (Ibid., p. 85.)

Election campaigns were presented as signifying a revolutionary development:

“That is a sketchy survey of the election campaign and its lessons which is sufficient, if you followed it, to enable you to see the tremendous growth of revolutionary ferment against the Capitalist Parties.” TIM BUCK. (Ibid., p. 92.)

The main energy of the Party was to be devoted, not to “establish unity of action in every factory,” etc., but to securing an electoral agreement with the C.C.F.:

“We need strong Party fractions composed of active workers, inside of the trade unions, C.C.F. Clubs, Social Credit groups and incipient fascist organizations.” SAM CARR. (Ibid., p. 106.)

Work within the C.C.F. and the organizations of the petty bourgeoisie was to become the main field of activity:

“We must have people who can go into the Merchants Associations, speak to Universities and Colleges, to Teachers’ Associations, and who can approach the widest stratum of the population. We must develop people for such work.” STEWART SMITH. (Ibid., p. 66.)

In order “to develop people for such work” the social composition of the Party was deliberately changed over a period through concentrating on the recruiting of university students, intellectuals and middle class elements who gradually assumed a more and more dominant role in the leadership.

Middle class propaganda organizations were also presented as a decisive form of the People’s Front:

“The League against War and Fascism – becomes decisive for the development of the united front at the present moment against war. “ STEWART SMITH. (Ibid., p. 28.)

This distortion and perversion of the united front and the People’s Front was presented in such a way as to utilize the threat of fascism as a bogey to force acceptance of the distorted line. The struggle against fascism was made to appear almost solely as a question of winning election campaigns, not by the working class, but by the “progressive people.” For instance:

“... If the strongest unity of the people has not been welded together before the next elections, we will face at that time, if not before, the danger of the most reactionary forces coming to power unless in the meantime a broad united front party has been built up supported by the masses of the Canadian People who are prepared and ready to act against fascism and reaction, though not yet prepared to fight for socialism.” STEWART SMITH. (Ibid., p. 25.)

In other words, the struggle against fascism was presented as an election contest between a “broad united front party” and the “reactionary forces.” Hence, the question of “transforming the C.C.F.” into a “broad united front party” together with making the League against War and Fascism a “centre for the unity of millions of the peace-loving people of Canada” became the two main political and organizational tasks of the working class in the struggle against fascism and war and the middle class became the “decisive stratum” in the struggle.

#### **THE UNPRINCIPLED TACTICS OF FORMING BLOCS WITH SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTIES ON THE BASIS OF PURELY PARLIAMENTARY ARRANGEMENTS**

The perversion of the tactical line of the 7th Congress resulted in the militant energy of the working class being dissipated in fruitless efforts to secure election agreements, particularly with the C.C.F. leadership, and in subordinating the working class to the leadership of petty-bourgeois intellectuals. The class character of fascism and the independent and leading role of the working class in the struggle against it was obscured if not obliterated. The result of the perverted tactical line within the ranks of the Communist Party

itself was confusion, indecision, dissipation of energy and the development of factional struggles. However, the leadership was able to crush all opposition by branding the opposition as “sectarian” or, in some cases, Trotskyists. The militant, left wing trade unions which had been organized by Communist Party members were either disbanded or their membership transferred to the unions of the A.F. of L. not “on the basis of a platform of struggle against the capitalist offensive and the guarantee of trade union democracy,” not on the “condition” of “struggle against capital, against fascism,” as Dimitroff insisted (*The United Front*, pp. 65-64), but on the basis of transferring the workers concerned from unions based on a policy of class struggle to unions with a policy of class collaboration; of substituting “revolutionary leadership” with “reformist leadership.”

Party members who opposed these policies were either driven out of the Party (Jim McLaughlin, Nova Scotia miners’ leader), expelled or threatened with expulsion.

Having already paralyzed the militancy and disrupted the unity of the working class and subordinated it to the leadership of the petty-bourgeoisie, who were placed in the leadership of many of the organizations, the next logical step was to bring the working class under the direct domination and leadership of the bourgeoisie itself and thus destroy all independent working class political action. The political line which did, in fact, lead towards this objective, was presented a little over a year later at the 11th Plenum of the Communist Party of Canada held in February 1937.

The further perversion of the tactical line of the 7th Congress was accomplished by what was supposed to be a profound dialectical analysis but which was, in fact, philistine eclecticism:

“Our policies must take into account the concrete relationship of class forces at the given historical moment. We cannot be indifferent to the question of which capitalist party is in office. We cannot afford to lump all capitalist parties and movements into one heap. We cannot afford to remain indifferent to the fact that the ultra-reactionary circles of the capitalist class are out to sweep away all the forms of democratic government and introduce fascism. We will not be partners to any moves that would pave the way for the return of the Bennett Tory regime.” TIM BUCK. (*The Road Ahead*, p. 17.)

The inference here was, that the forces of fascism were intending to use the Conservative Party as the vehicle with which to ride into power and set up a fascist dictatorship. In order to prevent this, the working class was warned:

“To concentrate the main blows of the people against the King Government and the Liberal Party at the present historical moment would help to open up the path for the ultra-reactionary Tories, headed by Bennett and Meighen... Such a policy would also mean that the struggle to make the King government enact progressive legislation would be weakened.” (Ibid., p. 16.)

Buck continues:

“This would make it easier for Bennett and his ultra-reactionary associates... to involve Canada in another Imperialist war, to strip us of all our remaining democratic rights, to proceed faster along the road to the establishment of a Canadian fascist dictatorship, to abolish the Federal, provincial and municipal forms of democratic government, to wipe out all the workers, farmers and middle class organizations.” (Ibid.)

This meant that if the working class was to exert mass political pressure against the “executive committee of the capitalist class,” the State, they would weaken the struggle for “progressive legislation,” and pave the way for “wiping out all workers, farmers and middle class organizations,” would lead to “involving Canada in another Imperialist war” and “proceed faster along the road to Canadian fascist dictatorship.” In other words, Buck was warning the workers that if they put up any struggle against the capitalist class and its governments this would result in paving the way for fascism.

Instead of a struggle against the capitalist class and the capitalist Liberal government the workers were told:

“That unless the main blows of our Party, the labor movement and our people are struck against the fifty ‘big shots’ and their henchmen it will be impossible to rally and organize the united front of the working class and the common people.” (Ibid., p. 16.)

All of which was in complete contradiction to the teachings of Marxism generally and in contradiction to the line of the 7th Congress of the C.I. in particular, which stated:

“Whether the victory of fascism can be prevented depends first and foremost on the militant activity of the working class itself.” (*The United Front*, p. 25.)

Instead of a political struggle against the King government the working class was told, in effect, that such a struggle would play into the hands of reaction and pave the way for fascism. The slogan advanced was “Direct the Main Blow Against Reaction.”

The bewildered working class were now to search for this sinister abstraction “Reaction,” and the nebulous “50 Big Shots and their henchmen.” However, they were given to understand that reaction was centered in the Conservative Party, the “ultra-reactionary Tories” headed by Bennett, Meighan and Herridge.

A little over a year later however, in July 1937, Herridge had become a progressive:

“The speech of Mr. Herridge at the Tory convention represents the sentiments of a section of progressive Conservatives who can and should become part of the great line-up of democratic forces in Canada.” SAM CARR.

“Herridge’s speeches mirror a large and important sentiment in favor of democratic progress within the Conservative Party.” TIM BUCK.

In order to fight against fascism the working class were told to form an alliance with the “progressive Conservatives” and the “progressive Liberals.” This alliance was to be known as “A Democratic Front for Canada.” Classes and political parties no longer had any significance.

The entire population of the country was divided into two fronts; the Democratic Front and the Reactionary Front. Both the Liberal and Conservative parties were divided between the two camps of reaction and progress. According to Buck:

“These reactionary forces in each of the old parties, have considerably more in common with each other today than they have with the democratic progressively inclined younger elements who, also in each of the old parties, in-



creasingly lean toward support of more democratic policies and legislation to satisfy the urgent needs of the people.” (*A Democratic Front for Canada*, p. 13.)

The problem was to unite these “democratic, progressively inclined younger elements” “in each of the old parties.” Said Buck:

“The weakness of the forces opposed to reactionary big capital and its policies, lies, almost entirely in their disunity. The “democratic front” is the immediate form by which this can be overcome.” (Ibid., p. 23.)

According to Buck, reactionary monopoly capital was no longer represented by the Liberal or Conservative parties but by the provincial governments of Ontario headed by the Liberal premier Hepburn and the ex-Conservative, Union Nationale, Premier Duplessis in Quebec. Said Buck:

“The point is, that now and for the immediate future, the alliance of Hepburn and Duplessis, is the concentrated spearpoint of reaction around which reactionary forces are already being mobilized and toward which we can see dangerous inclinations on the part of leading politicians.” (Ibid., pp. 15-16.)

But this reaction was different from previous reaction. Buck explained:

“The Hepburn-Duplessis alliance signalizes a definite stage in the development of the strategy of reaction. There is a difference between the reaction expressed by the Hepburn-Duplessis axis and the reaction of R. B. Bennett. He ruled Canada as the leader of the Conservative Party. He not only did not try to win the reactionary Liberals into his camp but he followed the old and ‘honored’ tradition of firing Liberals out of government positions.

“The Hepburn-Duplessis alliance has passed beyond the basis of Party lines. It cuts across Party lines and is based upon class interests, the interests of reactionary big capital, against the whole of the common people of Canada and particularly the farmers and the working class. Its drive toward fascism is against progressive Liberals and Con-

servatives, equally as against Communists, C.C.F.ers and other progressives.” (Ibid., p. 21-22.)

The strategy and tactics for the working class to follow were:

“Against the concentration of reactionary forces headed by the Hepburn-Duplessis alliance, all the forces of democracy must be gathered into a wide democratic front.” (Ibid., p. 23.)

This “brilliant Marxian analysis” of the class forces in Canada was, as usual, in line with the analysis of Browder in the U.S.A. who, during the same period, had defined the Democratic Camp as “now materialized in the organized labor movement, first of all the great movement of the Committee for Industrial Organization, and the progressive movements led by middle class figures within the old parties.” Browder also “foresaw ‘two entirely new political parties’ corresponding to Tory reaction based on finance capital and to this democratic camp.” In 1938 Browder also adopted the term “democratic front.” By this time practically all independent political action on the part of the working class had been effectively wrecked. The main energy of the Communist movement was diverted to striving to obtain an electoral agreement with the C.C.F. on the one hand, and with the New Democracy Party of Herridge on the other. This was so right up until the outbreak of war in September, 1939. Revolts against this line continued intermittently within the Party, but the National leaders were always successful in silencing the opposition, either by plausible “Marxian” explanations or by ruthless denunciations of the rebels.

#### **THE GLORIFICATION OF BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY BY THE CANADIAN “MARXISTS”**

It was also during this period of 1937-38 that Dimitroff’s exhortations to “link up the present struggle with the people’s revolutionary traditions and past” were first distorted and finally perverted into a servile worship and glorification of bourgeois democracy which inevitably carried with it a defense of the capitalist system as a whole.

In his historic speech, Dimitroff stated:

“We Communists are irreconcilable opponents, on principle, of bourgeois Nationalism in all its forms. But we

are not supporters of National nihilism, and should never act as such. The task of educating the workers and all working people in the spirit of proletarian internationalism is one of the fundamental tasks of every Communist. But anyone who thinks that this permits him, or even compels him, to sneer at all the national sentiments of the wide masses of working people is far from being a genuine Bolshevik, and has understood nothing of the teachings of Lenin and Stalin on the National question.” (*The United Front*, p. 79.)

Dimitroff raised the question of National sentiments in order that the Communist Parties might correctly apply Marxian policy on the National question and because: “It is unquestionably an essential preliminary condition for a successful struggle against chauvinism – this main instrument of ideological influence of the fascists upon the masses.” But he also insisted that, “... We prove convincingly that we are free of both national nihilism and bourgeois Nationalism.” (*Ibid.*, p. 82.)

As was the case in applying practically all other phases of the new tactical line, the deviation on this question was not to the left, not National nihilism, but to the right. Bourgeois Nationalism was what the Canadian “Marxists” presented to the working class as an ideological weapon in the fight against fascism, in the fight which Dimitroff called for:

“To defend every inch of bourgeois-democratic liberties, which are being attacked by fascism and bourgeois reaction, because the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat so dictate.” (*Ibid.*, p. 34.)

While Browder in the United States resurrected Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln as examples of revolutionists for the American working class to heroize and coined the chauvinistic slogan, “Communism is 20th Century Americanism,” in Canada Buck and Ryerson proceeded to glorify William Lyons McKenzie and Louis Joseph Papineau as the revolutionary heroes for the Canadian working class to draw inspiration from. The slogan of McKenzie (Premier McKenzie King’s great grandfather), in the 1837 rebellion was: “Freedom of trade – every man to be allowed to buy at the cheapest market and sell at the dearest.” The credo of Papineau was: “I am a

great reformer, insofar as necessary political changes are concerned, but I am a great conservative, so far as the preservation of the sacred right of property is concerned.”

So the Canadian battalion which fought in the International Brigade in Spain was named after these two champions of “free trade” and “the sacred rights of property” while Samuel Lount and Peter Matthews, the yeoman and the blacksmith who were executed on the corner of King and Toronto Street in Toronto for their part in the rebellion were seldom even mentioned.

Stanley Ryerson wrote a book entitled, “1837, The Birth of Canadian Democracy,” while Tim Buck evoked the names of McKenzie and Papineau to bolster his argument for giving greater powers to McKenzie King’s government. Said Buck:

“We speak, then, as a part of the ever growing alignment of the democratic people of Canada. We are for complete National unification. The work of democratic national unification commenced by William Lyon McKenzie and Louis Joseph Papineau a hundred years ago, must be completed by the Canadian people today, by extending the process of which Confederation was a part and making it possible for the urgent needs of the people to be satisfied.” (*A Democratic Front*, p. 13.)

By the time the second world war broke out, the discipline and devotion of the Party membership had been largely destroyed. Many of the old members had been replaced by new members, a large portion of whom were college students and middle class elements. However, the war put an end to the Party’s flirtations with the bourgeois and petty bourgeois parties, although, because of the lack of a disciplined and devoted membership, due to such policies, the Party in many districts nearly collapsed following its outlawing and the arrest of many of its leaders.

#### **THE HEPBURN-DUPLESSIS AXIS IS REPLACED BY THE HEPBURN-BUCK AXIS**

In 1942 when the Party emerged from underground, the “reactionary Hepburn-Duplessis Axis” was replaced by the Hepburn-Buck Axis. (Hepburn was supposed to have reformed in the interim.) The threat of fascism was again raised as an argument for an alliance between labor and monopoly capital. The workers were

told that unless the “progressive forces” unite, there is a danger that “fascist-minded elements will come to power.”

The magic word “Teheran” was used as an argument in support of unprincipled compromises and betrayals of socialism and of the immediate interests of the working class in the most varied fields of political activity. Said Buck:

“We are in a new stage of history... This stage opened at Teheran... That argument also established the basis for a new era of democratic progress...

“The great coalition between the U.S.S.R. and the capitalist democracies is the highest expression of the world-wide class alliance brought into being by the war.” (*Depression or Prosperity*, p. 11.)

The Teheran agreement which Duclos described as a “diplomatic document,” Buck interpreted as a “world-wide class alliance,” as a result of which the people of Europe will be able to “move forward” to “progress such as did not seem possible a few short years ago.” (Ibid.) Following his release after ten days from the Don Jail, Buck jointly addressed a mass meeting with Hepburn in the Toronto Maple Leaf Gardens.

The Hepburn-Buck alliance reached its zenith in the Ontario provincial election when the Liberal Party and the L.P.P. not only arranged a saw-off whereby they would support each other’s candidates against the C.C.F., in a number of constituencies, but in at least three constituencies the two parties endorsed joint candidates.

Although the justification for these scandalous tactics and betrayals of Marxian principles was to defeat the threat of “pro-fascist Tory reaction,” the result was a smashing defeat, not only for the C.C.F., but also for the Liberals and the L.P.P. The Tories on the other hand won a landslide victory.

From the time of its formation in August, 1943, the L.P.P. became the outstanding apologist for every reactionary policy of the King government. When King, in order to retain the political support of the French Canadians, who were anti-conscriptionist, refused to carry out the mandate for total conscription which he obtained in the 1942 plebiscite, the L.P.P. which had campaigned for a yes vote, immediately reversed its position:

“The L.P.P. has made its position clear: unequivocal support to the effort to secure adequate reinforcements through the voluntary system.” (*National Affairs Monthly*, Dec, 1944, p. 258.)

In the North Grey by-election, the L.P.P. publicly endorsed and openly campaigned for the election of the Liberal candidate, Gen. S. McNaughton, Minister of Defense, in opposition to both the candidates of the C.C.F. and the Tories: “We call on the labor movement to back up Gen. McNaughton and to defeat the Tory intrigue against Canada.” (Ibid.)

### **REVISIONISM, REFORMISM AND OPPORTUNISM**

From 1935 onward the general trend of the political line of the National Leadership of the Communist movement was one of reconciliation with and adaptation to capitalism, which is the essence of opportunism. The revolutionary tactics of Marxism, based on the class struggle as the motive force, for the “revolutionary transformation” of society from capitalism to socialism were replaced by tactics designed to secure reforms, “to make capitalism work,” the essence of reformism. The revolutionary theories of Marxism based on recognition of the irreconcilability of antagonistic classes, were revised and replaced by theories of “lasting prosperity,” “full employment,” etc., and of class collaboration (“world-wide class alliance,” “national unity,” “labor management co-operation,” “Liberal-Labor coalition,” etc.), the essence of revisionism.

In the ten-year period, 1935 to 1945, the National Leadership of the Communist movement in Canada replaced “revolutionary class struggle” against capitalism, Communism, with adaptation of the labor movement to capitalism, opportunism; substituted for the “revolutionary overthrow of capitalism,” the reforming of capitalism, reformism; they emasculated Marxism of its revolutionary content and substituted bourgeois liberalism, revisionism.

They carried the revision of Marxism to such lengths that the resultant policies were, in many respects, to the right of the Liberal Party of the big bourgeoisie.

Not even the Liberal Party had the colossal audacity to tell the workers that in the post war: “The National income would be maintained,” “that full employment is possible;” that the Teheran agreement was “a world-wide class alliance;” that the government could

“finance lasting prosperity;” that the post war period would be the “epoch of the abolition of poverty;” that victory in the war would “assure freedom for China” and “freedom for India;” that the government elected would “determine the direction of our National development for a generation;” that “the future of trade unionism in Canada is closely linked up with the Teheran agreement;” that “capitalist economy will be able to avoid a crisis of the sort which followed the first world war;” that “our exports can be maintained at a level of two billion dollars per year;” that “a government based upon a democratic coalition of Progressive Forces is the key to lasting prosperity in Canada...”

### **THE RESULTS OF REVISIONISM IN THE TRADE UNIONS AND IN THE L.P.P.**

Instead of assisting the working class to maintain an independent political position during the course of the war, in order to fight for a total war effort, the L.P.P. leadership adopted the slogans and policies of the capitalists and made them the slogans and policies of labor. Although the war was a just war, following the fall of France and the entry of the U.S.S.R. into the war, and for that reason it was correct for the working class to support it, on the part of British, American and Canadian Imperialism it was not a “people’s war” as the L.P.P. leadership maintained, because the planning, administration and conduct of the war was carried out not by the people but by the capitalist class and its governments. In fact, by using the false slogan “people’s war,” the L.P.P. actually weakened the role of “the people” in the fight for a total war effort and in democratizing the policies used in prosecution of the war.

By falsely propagating the slogan, “labor’s no strike pledge,” the L.P.P. leadership disarmed the working class, subordinated their interests to the interests of monopoly capital and weakened the organizational strength of the trades unions. As a matter of fact, neither the Trades and Labor Congress of Canada nor the Canadian Congress of Labor adopted a no strike pledge. They both agreed to do all possible to avoid strikes in order to maintain production, which was correct, but did not give any unconditional no strike pledge, which would have been wrong. While there might have been some justification for the unconditional no strike pledge of American Labor, which had the machinery and, to some extent, the protection of the Wagner Act, Canadian labor had no such legisla-

tion. Whereas the National War Labor Board in the U.S.A. settled disputes 80 percent in favor of labor, in Canada it was the opposite: Nearly 80 percent of the disputes which came before the Canadian War Labor Board were decided against the interests of labor.

The trade unions which were under the leadership of L.P.P. officials in some cases did not put up a fight for the demands of their own membership regarding working conditions, hours of work, wages and union security to the extent they should have. On the contrary, glaring conditions of injustice, discrimination and bad working conditions were often overlooked on the theory that to make an issue of them might lead to a strike and thus break the "no strike pledge." On the basis of the L.P.P. slogan, "labor-management co-operation," certain trade union officials collaborated with management to the point where they found themselves closer to the bosses than to the membership whose interests they were supposed to represent.

On the basis of the L.P.P. theory that post war issues would be decided "in the main on the field of parliamentary activity," the winning of the membership of the trade unions under L.P.P. leadership to the support of the program, policies and candidates of the L.P.P. became one of the main tasks of the L.P.P. trade union officials. Such tactics were resented by large sections of the membership with the result that many trade unions became sharply divided into factions. Instead of "non-partisan trade union action," which the L.P.P. advanced as a slogan to win the support of the trade union membership, some L.P.P.-led trade unions became the battle ground for the most partisan politics.

Following a policy of collaboration with the bosses, smothering protests of the membership regarding working conditions and attempting to use their positions in the unions to win support for L.P.P. parliamentary candidates increased the rift between the L.P.P. and trade union leaders and the rank-and-file of their own membership. This could and did have one inevitable result: the development of bureaucracy. Union policies were frequently decided, not by the membership, but by bureaucratic leaders who told the membership what policies the unions should follow.

As a result of wrong policies and bureaucracy, dissension and disruption developed in many of the unions under L.P.P. leadership. Disintegration followed, and in some instances declines in union membership. Instead of entering the post war with a trade union



movement marked by solidarity of the membership and trade union agreements providing union security and trade union consolidation, wrong policies and bureaucracy have resulted in many instances in the opposite: Inner dissension, insecurity, disintegration and a decline in union membership and prestige.

Such are the results of the revision of Marxism in the trade union movement. The results of revisionism within the ranks of the Labor Progressive Party itself have also been disastrous. Since revisionism could not be reconciled with Marxism, education, based on the Marxian classics, was almost completely abolished. In fact, hardly any education of any kind was conducted within the L.P.P. Clubs. On the theory that parliamentary activity was decisive, the membership was burdened with the costs of maintaining club rooms in the various constituencies and of raising huge sums of money for election campaigns. This reduced the rank-and-file membership activity almost entirely to the organization of social affairs and the selling of raffle tickets, etc., for the purpose of raising funds. Political activity was reduced to the advocacy of coalition with the Liberals on the one hand, and on the other, vehement denunciation of the C.C.F. because of what was termed their "anti-unity policy."

Conflict with the C.C.F. became inevitable because the L.P.P. itself had lost all semblance of a revolutionary Marxian party dedicated to the organization, education and leadership of the working class and had degenerated into a parliamentary, social democratic, reform party. The basic difference between the L.P.P. and the C.C.F. election platform and policies was that the policies of the L.P.P., in addition to advocating all kinds of reforms to "make capitalism work," openly advocated class collaboration and openly supported the Liberal Party of the big bourgeoisie in opposition to the C.C.F.

As a result of such platforms and policies, the L.P.P. became not just a social democratic party, but a right wing social democratic party in many respects to the right of the C.C.F. In fact, so far to the right of the C.C.F. that its main condemnation of the C.C.F. was that the C.C.F. refused to participate in the unprincipled, open, class collaboration advocated by the L.P.P. and based on the slogans: "Labor-Management, Government-Cooperation," "National Unity," "Unity of All Progressive Forces," "Make Labor a Partner in Government," and "Liberal-Labor Coalition Government." In fact, the L.P.P. in many respects came closer to being a bourgeois Liberal

party in its election platform and policies than a Social Democratic party, in spite of its references to Marxism and the Soviet Union. Tim Buck stated in February, 1944, that the L.P.P. would "Judge parties and individuals by their policies." Judging the L.P.P. and its leaders on that basis can result only in the conclusions reached above.

### **THE SELECTION AND PROMOTION OF PARTY LEADERS**

The question logically arises: How was it possible for a Communist movement which had been in existence for a period of 23 or more years to degenerate from the position of a revolutionary Marxist party of the working class with a background of militant struggle to an insipid, dilettante, petty bourgeois, Liberal-Labor, social democratic Party of class collaboration?

While there is no doubt a number of factors contributed to making such a development possible, one of the principle contributing factors was the cadre policy of the Party, i.e., the policy followed in the selection, training and promotion of individual members for positions of leadership.

In dealing with the question of cadres at the 7th Congress, Dimitroff, in referring to the policy to be followed in selecting cadres, stressed the following:

"First, absolute devotion to the cause of the working class, loyalty to the Party, tested in the face of the enemy – in battle, in prison, in court.

"Second, the closest possible contact with the masses. The Comrades concerned must be wholly absorbed in the interests of the masses, feel the life pulse of the masses, know their sentiments and requirements. The prestige of the leaders of our Party organization should be based, first of all, on the fact that the masses regard them as their leaders, and are convinced through their own experience of their ability as leaders, and of their determination and self-sacrifice in struggle.

"Third, ability independently to find one's bearings and not to be afraid of assuming responsibility in making decisions... Cadres develop and grow best when they are placed in the position of having to solve concrete problems of the

struggle independently, and are aware that they are fully responsible for their decisions...

“Fourth, discipline and Bolshevik hardening in the struggle against the class enemy as well as in their irreconcilable opposition to all deviations from the Bolshevik line.” (*The United Front*, pp. 119-20.)

Having laid down the above criteria to be followed in the selection of Cadres, Dimitroff further emphasized:

“We must place all the more emphasis on these conditions which determine the correct selection of Cadres, because in practise, preference is very often given to a Comrade who, for example, is able to write well and is a good speaker but who is not a man or woman of action, and is not as suited for the struggle as some other Comrade who perhaps may not be able to write or speak so well, but is a staunch Comrade, possessing initiative and contact with the masses, and is capable of going into battle and leading others into battle. Have there not been many cases of sectarians, doctrinaires or moralizers crowding out loyal mass workers, genuine working class leaders?” (Ibid., p. 120.)

The specific qualities and conditions which Dimitroff stressed as essential for Party leaders were, in the main, never observed by the Party leadership in Canada. The people selected for training in Party schools in 90 percent of the cases, had never been tested “in battle, prison, or court,” had not proved their ability to make independent decisions, nor had they been hardened and disciplined in struggle. On the contrary, a large proportion, if not a majority selected for advanced training in Party schools, were youths only a few months, or at best a few years, out of high school or university with no background even in industry, let alone in any struggle. And these youths, many of them from the ranks of the Young Communist League, to whom the class struggle was only a theory, an abstraction, were given up to one and one-half years’ training in Party schools and then sent out as finished Marxists to give leadership and decide policies for the working class movement; people who had never actually participated in the working class movement except in a propaganda or study circle.

These young “professional revolutionists” had in most instances not spent sufficient time engaged in practical work to learn how to think in a practical, materialistic fashion. Most of them were doctrinaire Marxists in the fullest sense, but because of their academic training, they considered themselves authorities on all questions of strategy and tactics of the labor movement. The negative features of such leadership were:

(1) The mechanical copying of the tactics and organizational forms and methods of the Communist Parties of other countries, particularly the American Party, which in many instances were entirely unsuited to Canadian conditions.

(2) The institution of a bureaucratic, mechanical method of instilling and enforcing discipline in the Party. These inexperienced and untried leaders could only enforce their authority through bureaucracy, not through ideological conviction.

(3) The adoption of policies quite out of keeping with the sentiment and needs of the working class, and tactics that extended from the extremes of right opportunism on the one hand, to leftist adventurism on the other.

(4) A tendency to adopt the policies, tactics and methods of work to the outlook and concepts of the middle class rather than the outlook and needs of the class the Party was supposed to represent – the working class.

How correct Dimitroff was when he reminded the Congress:

“Not all graduates of our Party schools prove to be suitable. There is a great deal of phrases, abstractions, book knowledge and show of learning. But we need real, truly Bolshevik organizers and leaders of the masses. And we need them badly this very day. It does not matter if such students cannot write a good thesis (though we need that very much too), but they must know how to organize and lead, undaunted by difficulties, capable of surmounting them.” (Ibid., p. 125.)

These academic “Marxists” regarded the working class as something to experiment with. The “sentiments of the masses” was just a phrase to them, as was Lenin’s dictum to “learn from the masses.” They regarded themselves as people gifted with infallibility who condescended to tell the masses what was best for them, and enforced their proposals through ruthless criticism and denunci-

ation of those who disagreed with their policies. Those who challenged the correctness of their policies and proposals were accused of "opposing the Party line." In other words, they interpreted their own ideas as the "Party line" and almost invariably were successful in forcing the membership to adopt them through fear of being charged with being Anti-Party, Trotskyite, etc.

### **THE REASON FOR LIQUIDATIONISM**

The history of the Communist movement in Canada, particularly from 1931 onwards, is a history of the dissolution of organizations of the workers. In 1932 these doctrinaire Marxists conceived the idea of introducing in Canada the Neighborhood Council and Block Committee system of organization which had functioned satisfactorily in New York City among the unemployed who were housed in large tenement buildings.

In Canada the unemployed workers were already organized in the National Unemployed Workers' Association but this organization, which had led the struggles of the unemployed for adequate relief, was dissolved and replaced by the entirely unsuitable block committees which soon collapsed in many areas and left the unemployed largely without any form of organization.

In fact, every organization of the workers which showed independent initiative, sooner or later came into conflict with the policies of the Communist Party. Policies of struggle of the mass organizations could not be reconciled with the Communist Party policy of "unity of all progressive forces," of subordinating the working class to petty bourgeois and bourgeois leadership, of supporting the Liberal Party as the "lesser evil" in order to block the Tory Party from coming to power.

Following the dissolution of the N.U.W.A. came the liquidation of the Workers' International Relief (W.I.R.), of the Women's Labor League, the Farmers' Unity League (F.U.L.), the unions of the Workers' Unity League (W.U.L.), the Canadian Labor Defense League (C.L.D.L.). The League Against War and Fascism changed its name to the League for Peace and Democracy. Eventually the Young Communist League (Y.C.L.) was dissolved and finally the Communist Party itself was liquidated.

This consistent policy of liquidation was in fact a policy of liquidating all organizations of the working class which accepted the principle of the class struggle which finally culminated in the liqui-

dation of the Communist Party itself. Opportunism in organization was the logical result of opportunism in tactics. Organizations of the workers which based their strategy and tactics on the principle of the irreconcilability of classes could not be used as organizations of class collaboration, inevitably come into conflict with the policies of the Communist Party and were therefore liquidated.

The National leadership of the L.P.P. not only encouraged the liquidation of the workers' organizations which participated in struggle but discouraged independent activities of the workers of a militant mass character which did develop in spite of them. For instance, when the striking relief camp boys first proposed the "On To Ottawa Trek," which was later broken up on Dominion Day, 1935, at Regina, the National leadership of the Communist Party categorically instructed the Party members concerned to call off the trek and published a statement against the proposed trek on the front page of *The Worker*, the National organ of the Party. Under the leadership of Arthur Evans, the Party members concerned disregarded the decision of the National leadership of the Party and the trek went on in spite of the National Party leadership.

#### **THE SUBSTITUTION OF CENTRALIZED BUREAUCRACY FOR DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM**

The substitution of reformism for revolutionary Marxism was facilitated by replacing inner Party democracy by bureaucracy in the formulation of policy and in the election of leading bodies. Democratic Centralism was interpreted as meaning it was the duty of the membership to blindly accept the policies handed down by the leading bodies without question and to have no voice in the formulation of policy themselves. Anyone who even questioned the correctness of a decision of a higher body was in many cases branded as an anti-Party element, or as being undisciplined.

Instead of a discipline based on conviction, the Party membership were induced, cajoled and threatened into the acceptance of a system of mechanical discipline which was a crude perversion of Marxian principles. Writing on the question of discipline Lenin stated:

"We defined it as unity of action, freedom of discussion and criticism. Only such a form of discipline is worthy of a democratic party of the progressive class. The strength

of the working class is organization. Without organization the mass of the proletariat is nothing. Organized it is all. Organization is unity of action, but of course, all action is useful only because and to the extent that it advances and does not retreat, to the extent that it intellectually combines the proletariat and lifts it up and does not degrade and weaken it. Organization without ideas is an absurdity which in practise converts the workers into miserable hangers-on of the bourgeoisie in power. Consequently, without the freedom of discussion and criticism, the proletariat does not recognize unity of action. For that reason, intelligent workers must never forget that sometimes serious violations of principles occur, which make the break-off of organizational relations absolutely necessary.” (*Lenin on Organization*, pp. 31-32)

Real discipline, working class discipline, according to Lenin, is not possible unless it is based on ideological conviction. Discipline is “unity of action, freedom of discussion and criticism.” Organization means unity of action but unity of action without ideas, without ideological conviction is an absurdity. And when “violations of principles occur,” said Lenin, it makes the “break-off of organizational relations absolutely necessary.”

There are two basic forms of organizational structure: centralism and federalism. In a federated structure the federated bodies retain autonomy which makes unity in action of the various autonomous bodies difficult if not impossible. Marxist Parties have always adhered to the form of democratic centralism as being best suited to the tasks confronting the Party. However, centralism was not intended to mean that bureaucracy replaced democracy in the higher organs of the Party.

In an article entitled, *The St. Petersburg Split in 1907*, Lenin explained the structure of the Bolshevik Party as follows:

“The Russian Social Democratic Labor Party is organized democratically. This means that the business of the Party is conducted by its members, directly or through representatives, and that all members are equal without exception. All the officials, all the leading bodies, all the institutions of the Party are elected, responsible and may be recalled.” (*Ibid.*, p. 19.)

This meant that every official and leading body was elected by the membership, was responsible to the membership and could be recalled by them. Lenin explained in further detail:

“The business of the St. Petersburg organization is conducted by the elected Petersburg Committee of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party. The supreme body of the Petersburg organization, in view of it being impossible to gather all the members together at one time (nearly 6,000 members), is a delegate conference of the organization. All the members of the Party have the right to send delegates to this conference: one delegate for a definite number of Party members. For example, at the last conference, it was decided to elect one delegate for each 50 members. These delegates must be elected by all the members of the Party, and the decision of the delegates is the supreme and final decision obligatory for the whole of the local organization. But this is not all. In order to make sure that a decision shall be really democratic, it is not sufficient to gather together delegates of the organization. It is necessary that all the members of the organization, in electing the delegates, shall independently, and each one for himself, express their opinion on all controversial questions which interest the whole of the organization. Democratically organized parties and leagues cannot, on principle, avoid taking the opinion of the whole of the membership without exception, particularly in important cases, when the question under consideration is of some political action in which the mass is to act independently, as for example, a strike, elections, the boycott of some local establishment, etc.” (Ibid., p. 20.)

Here we have a very different explanation of democratic centralism, from that propagated by the National leadership of the Communist movement in Canada. While decisions of the higher organs are binding on the membership which elected them a democratic party must on principle take the “opinion of the whole membership without exception,” particularly on important questions.

Lenin explained further how this should be done:

“A strike cannot be conducted with enthusiasm, elections cannot be intelligently conducted, unless every work-



er voluntarily and intelligently decides for himself whether he should strike or not, whether he should vote for the Cadets (bourgeois liberals) or not, etc. Not all political questions can be decided by a referendum of the whole Party membership. This would entail continuous, wearying and fruitless voting. But the important questions, especially those which are directly connected with definite action by the masses themselves, must be decided democratically, not only by a gathering of delegates, but by a referendum of the whole membership.

“That is why the Petersburg Committee has resolved that the election of delegates to the conference shall take place after the members of the Party have discussed the question as to whether an alliance should be concluded with the Cadets, after all the members of the Party have voted on this question. Elections are a business in which the masses directly take part. Hence, every Party member must intelligently decide the question as to whether we should vote for Cadets at the elections, or not. And only after an open discussion of this question, after all the members of the Party will have got together, will it be possible for each one of us to take an intelligent and firm decision.” (Ibid, pp. 20-21.)

Lenin here insists on democratic discussion on questions of policy. First of all, in order to make an intelligent decision it is necessary “for all the members of the Party to get together” and independently express their views.

Secondly, delegates from regional conferences to the central conference should only be elected after all the local delegates have expressed their opinions and voted on the questions of importance.

Thirdly, all important questions affecting the entire membership were to be decided by referendum. And, it should be remembered, these measures were proposed for the Party in a country in which the Party was either entirely illegal or semi-legal. Lenin regarded inner Party democracy as a question of principle for a Marxist Party.

Violation of inner Party democracy was regarded as a violation of the principle of democratic centralism by the Bolsheviks. As recently as 1937 the Bolshevik Party insisted on the fullest democracy in the election of leading bodies:

“A report of Comrade Zhdanov at the plenum of the Central Committee, revealed the fact that a number of Party organizations were systematically violating the Party rules and the principles of democratic centralism in their everyday work, substituting co-option for election, voting by lists for the voting for individual candidates, open ballot for secret ballot, etc.” (*History of the C.P.S.U.*, p. 349.)

According to the Bolshevik Party therefore the co-option of members to a committee, voting for a slate instead of voting for individuals and voting in elections by means of an open ballot instead of a secret ballot constituted violations of the principles of democratic centralism and of the Party rules.

Let us now consider how the principles of democratic centralism were observed by the National leadership of the Communist movement in Canada in contrast to the Party of Lenin which, prior to the seizure of power, held annual Party congresses.

During the eight-year period from 1935 to 1943 only one National Congress was held, in 1937, and the decision to form a new Party and dissolve the Communist Party itself was decided on, not by the membership, not by a convention, not even by the Central Committee but by a narrow conference of twenty-five people.

In the four-year period, from June, 1938, until February, 1942, not even a meeting of the Central Committee was called. When meetings of the Central Committee were held, many of the members were unable to attend but visitors were invited to attend and given voice in the proceedings; visitors chosen by the National leadership. At the National Convention, held in 1937, the provincial delegations were instructed by the Political Bureau whom they were to nominate to the Central Committee. At the National Convention where the Labor Progressive Party was established, a similar procedure was followed. A nominating committee submitted a list of 75 members to constitute the National Committee. This slate or list was adopted without discussion. The nominating committee itself was dominated by the National leaders who recommended those whom they saw fit from the various provinces and insisted on the main representation being from the cities of Toronto and Montreal. Of the 75 members chosen to form the National Committee, 30 were from Southern Ontario and 20 from Quebec. The overwhelming majority of these were from the two cities of Toronto and Montreal. This

meant that the members from Toronto and Montreal, many of them middle class people, constituted a majority of the National Committee under the domination of the National Executive. On the other hand, British Columbia, with the second largest Party organization in the country, was given only five representatives on the National Committee. But even this disproportionate representation does not give the true picture of how the National Executive members dominated meetings of the National Committee. Each Provincial Committee was obliged to finance 50 percent or more of the costs of sending representatives to National Conventions and National Committee meetings with the result that lack of finances prevented them from even sending the small number to which they were entitled. For instance, at the 1st National Convention of the L.P.P., the B.C. Party sent 12 delegates at a cost of \$2,500.00. While Toronto was represented by three hundred delegates without cost. At National Committee meetings, B.C. rarely had more than three representatives in attendance, whereas Toronto always had at least 25. Representation from other provinces was usually even less than that from B.C. with the exception of Quebec which usually had its full representation present, practically all of whom were from Montreal.

All of which goes to show that both National Conventions and National Committee meetings were always overwhelmingly dominated by the delegates from Toronto and Montreal who constituted two-thirds or more of the total in attendance. It could, of course, be argued that in view of the fact that Toronto and Montreal are the two largest cities, with the National headquarters located in Toronto, that it was logical the majority of the members on the National Committee and of delegates to the National Conventions should be drawn from the "two capitals." The fact remains, however, that the Toronto and Montreal representatives not only constituted an overall majority numerically, but invariably followed the lead of the National Executive and in most instances were under their ideological and political domination.

The basis of representation, however, was not the principle feature of bureaucracy in the affairs of the Party but the almost total lack of democratic discussion on major questions of National policy. Discussion on major questions of policy by the membership and even by the Provincial Committees was only permitted after the policy had already been adopted. For instance, only one referendum vote of the membership was taken during the entire fourteen-year

period from 1931 to 1945, and that was not on a political question but on the relatively trivial question of how many times weekly the National organ, *The Worker*, should be published.

On practically all occasions changes in the Party line were worked out by the National Executive and either adopted by themselves or submitted to the National Committee for their formal endorsement. On the rare occasions the National Committee was consulted before a policy was adopted they were not even given the opportunity to discuss anything tangible, such as a resolution that could be studied before the meeting. Invariably the new tactical line was presented in the form of a speech by the National Leader, Tim Buck, which the Committee members were then expected to endorse. Following these reports, those present witnessed the spectacle of a nauseating acquiescence in everything Buck had said; a spectacle of revolting adulation of Buck. For the past ten years at least the procedure was, not a critical discussion of policy, but a servile acceptance. The overwhelming majority of the members when called upon to speak, prefaced their contributions with the statement: "I solidarize myself with the report of Comrade Buck," or "I wholeheartedly endorse the report of Comrade Buck."

The bolder ones who had the temerity to question or even express doubts about a particular point presented by Buck, were ruthlessly dealt with by the National Leaders by means of a tirade of denunciation which invariably assumed a personal character. The loyalty of the person concerned was actually questioned and in most instances the unfortunate individual was obliged to make one or more statements aligning himself with Buck's position, or face the probability of being removed from his position or even expelled from the Party on the grounds that he was in opposition to the Party leadership and the Party line.

By the use of such high-handed tactics, the National leaders successfully prevented any intelligent, critical discussion from taking place on the points raised and lacking anything in writing to study, it was difficult even to discuss points raised for fear of being accused of "misquoting" what Buck had said. Never, on any occasion during the past ten years, did the membership have an opportunity to discuss or criticize any major political issue until after it had already been adopted and by virtue of that action had become the official Party line, binding on the entire membership. And not only the membership were denied the right to discuss questions of

political importance, not even the Provincial Committees had any voice in deciding National policies.

### **HOW NATIONAL POLICIES WERE ARRIVED AT IN THE LABOR PROGRESSIVE PARTY**

In accordance with such a bureaucratic denial of inner Party democracy, the following major changes in policy were made:

(1) In January, 1943, the war was characterized as a "People's War" and the Policy of "National Unity" adopted as a Party objective at a conference of the Communist Labor Total War Committee held in Toronto.

(2) At a conference held in Toronto on June 13, 1943, attended by only a handful of delegates and with no representation from either B.C. or the Maritime Provinces, it was decided to "exorcise the spectre of Communism" which, it was claimed, "stood in the way of victory" and to form a new political Party of Communists.

(3) In August or September, 1943, the Communist Party was liquidated by the political bureau and its assets turned over to the Labor Progressive Party.

(4) In January, 1944, the objective of a C.C.F. Farmer Labor Government was publicly announced in Tim Buck's New Year's message; the decision having been made by the National Executive.

(5) At the National Committee meeting held on February 12, 1944, in Toronto, it was decided (a) "that the class interests of the working class as a whole will be served, by cooperation with the democratic circles of all classes, and all sections of the Canadian people including a decisive section of the capitalist class." (b) That Canada's next government would "probably determine the direction of our national development for a generation." (c) "A high level of employment, maintenance of wage levels, progressive social legislation and general social progress in the post war years, depends entirely upon the extent to which Canada adopts policies in accord with the Teheran agreement." (d) That "Teheran is the path by which mankind can march forward: to lasting peace, post war prosperity and democratic progress to a better life."

(6) In May, 1944, at an enlarged National Executive meeting, it was agreed that the L.P.P. would strive to participate in the next government together with the capitalists as part of a "Liberal-Labor Coalition Government."

(7) In June, 1944, it was decided that "It is essential that the working class should support such a policy" of "making the system work," i.e., the capitalist system. This policy was first advanced in an article by Stewart Smith in the June issue of *National Affairs*, and later advocated from the public platform by other Party leaders.

(8) In a statement of the National Executive published in *National Affairs*, October, 1944, it was stated that the L.P.P. proposed that "The democratic coalition be achieved without delay through electoral agreements between the Liberal, C.C.F. and L.P.P. Parties." In other words, the L.P.P. was to negotiate an electoral saw-off with both the C.C.F. and the Liberal Party.

(9) In an editorial published in the December, 1944, issue of *National Affairs*, the Party's position in support of universal conscription was reversed and the new policy stated as follows: "The L.P.P. has made its position clear: unequivocal support to the effort to secure adequate reinforcements through the voluntary system..."

(10) In the North Grey by-election, the Party officially endorsed and campaigned for the election of the candidate of the Liberal Party, General McNaughton, and for the defeat of the C.C.F. candidate, also on the decision of the National Executive.

(11) In April, 1945, in an article in *National Affairs*, Tim Buck proposed: (a) that "... The United States should agree to a division of the world export markets, on a basis which will guarantee to Britain a share of world trade sufficient to enable British industries to operate at capacity," and that Canada should "Help bring such an agreement about." (b) That "Canada should join the Pan-American Union." And further, "Canada can play the most fruitful role in world affairs and in the British Commonwealth only if she accepts her rightful role as a sovereign American Nation in Western Hemisphere organization and activities." In advancing these chauvinistic and revisionist policies based on the super-Imperialism theories of Earl Browder, Buck characterized Browder as "The leading Marxist thinker of the Western Hemisphere."

(12) In the Ontario Provincial election of June, 1945, Liberal and L.P.P. candidates were officially endorsed by both parties and ran as Liberal-Labor candidates.

(13) In August, 1945, a meeting of the National Committee announced as a post war policy, "The establishment in all industries of joint government-union-management committees" in order to secure "cooperation" and "national unity."

In arriving at the above decisions on major questions of National policy, in not one single instance was a referendum vote of the membership taken; on not one occasion were the provincial committees consulted; in not one instance was a resolution submitted in advance to the National Committee members; on only one occasion (in August, 1945) were the members of the National Committee supplied with a resolution on which to base their discussion even after the meeting convened; on only three occasions was the National Committee convened to adopt the policies proposed, and on all other occasions the National Executive simply decided on the new policy themselves and informed the Party membership of the New Party line, although on one or two occasions an enlarged Executive meeting was held in order to present some semblance of democracy.

### **OPPORTUNISM AND THE DOMINATION OF PARTY LEADING COMMITTEES BY PAID OFFICIALS**

The revision and perversion of Marxism was smuggled into the official Party literature under the cover of Marxian phrases and of contradictory and evasive formulations. The most characteristic feature of the Party documents was their ambiguousness. This is not a new feature of revisionism but a very old one which Lenin warned against over forty years ago:

“When speaking of fighting opportunism, there is a characteristic feature of present day opportunism in every sphere that must not be overlooked; this is its vagueness, its diffuseness, its elusiveness. The very nature of the opportunist is such that he will always try to avoid formulating the issues clearly and irrevocably; he will always try to find the resultant force, will always wriggle like a snake between two mutually excluding points of view.” (Vol. II. *Selected Works*, p. 455.)

Any explanation of how a complete revision of Marxism, in the spheres of program, tactics and organization, was “put over” on the Party membership would be incomplete without reference to the composition of the leading Party organs. The National Executive, many Provincial Executive Committees and the National Committee were almost exclusively composed of paid Party officials, the editors of various left wing papers, the leaders of mass organiza-

tions and the top officials of trade unions; all of whom were, in the main, dependent on Party support in retaining what were very often well paid positions. For instance, the entire National Executive was composed of paid Party officials, M.L.A.'s and aldermen. The composition of the National Committee was similar. At the last meeting, held in August, 1945, out of about 70 members in attendance, there were only two workers from the shops in evidence. With practically no representation of workers from industry on the leading bodies it is not surprising that bureaucratic methods come to prevail within the Party. In fact, being confronted with the task of forcing acceptance of a policy of class collaboration both within the Party and the mass organizations and trade unions, it was practically inevitable that many of these party and trade union officials should develop into bureaucrats themselves. This is precisely what happened.

It is not a new phenomenon in the history of the Labor movement but a characteristic of reformism and opportunism in both the trade unions and political parties of the working class. Lenin warned against it when he wrote:

“Under Capitalism, democracy is narrowed, crushed, curtailed, mutilated by all the conditions of wage-slavery, the poverty and misery of the masses. This is the reason, and the only reason, why the officials of our Parties and trade unions become corrupt – or more precisely tend to become corrupt – under capitalist conditions, why they show a tendency to turn into bureaucrats, i.e., privileged persons detached from the masses, and standing above the masses.” (*State and Revolution*, pp. 96-97.)

Hence, with Party and trade union officials dominating all of the higher committees of the Party, themselves tending to become bureaucratic and dependent upon the Party for their own positions, combined with an almost complete absence of democratic discussion on important political questions by the membership, the National leadership were enabled to substitute Opportunism for Marxism; to present centralized bureaucracy as its opposite, democratic centralism.

At the August, 1945, National Committee meeting of the L.P.P., Tim Buck, in an effort to dispose of criticism of the revisionism of the Party, attempted to belittle the critics by quoting from the report of Maurice Thorez to the 10th National Convention of the



Communist Party of France as follows: "The sectarians confuse a revolutionary line with gesticulation." However, Buck conveniently overlooked what Thorez had to say on inner Party democracy and opportunism. Dealing with the problem of Party growth, Thorez stated:

"The second problem is the indispensable drawing into political discussions in the basic organizations of each member of the Party new or old."

And further:

"Our Communist Party cannot function without the unity of will and complete unity of action of all members of the Party; but such a common will and joint action, with the iron discipline which constitutes our strength, does not exclude but, on the contrary, rests upon criticism, discussion, struggles of opinion within the heart of the Party.

"In 1929, fighting a sectarian group which stifled all political life in the Party and cut us off from the masses, we carried on, as the old Comrades remember, a public campaign under the slogans, 'Let the Mouths Be Opened,' 'No Mannequins in the Party'." (*Political Affairs*, Aug., 1945, p. 711.)

Speaking on opportunism Thorez declared:

"We must combat the opportunist, liquidationist concepts of certain people who think, without always clearly formulating it, that 'we have passed beyond the stage of the class struggle'."

"The class struggle," Thorez continued, "is a fact," and observed: "Opportunist concepts always lead to the liquidation of the independent role of the working class, the most active element in the union of the toiling strata of the nation. Such concepts lead to liquidation of the Party. Several leaders of the American Communist Party fell into this grave error. We didn't hesitate to offer our advice through an article by our Comrade, Duclos, which, we hope, will help the American Communists to rediscover the correct path." (*Ibid.*, p. 712.)

As it was impossible to reconcile Marxism with opportunism, the speeches of L.P.P. leaders tended to, more and more, copy the demagogy and oratorical style of the old-line politicians, both at public meetings and Party gatherings. Marxian political propaganda, explaining the economic and political characteristics and contradictions of capitalist society were replaced by demagogic speeches replete with funny stories and the advocacy of reforms designed to make the system work more satisfactorily. The main qualifications of the Party spokesmen became, not a knowledge of Marxism and the ability to pass on this knowledge to the working class, but the ability to out-orate the politicians of the other political parties; to agitate audiences to fear the bogey of Toryism. The same type of oratorical dissertations and the eulogizing of Party leaders became a feature of Party conventions. No pretense was made to seriously grapple with the political issues affecting the working class but rather to put on a public exhibition in swank hotels in order to impress the public generally and the bourgeoisie in particular with the "respectability" of the Party.

Delegates were obliged to spend most of their time listening to the oratory of M.P.'s, M.L.A.'s, and aldermen. This procedure was in accord with the traditional opportunism of the Social Democratic Parties of Europe which invariably resulted in the Party becoming an appendage of the parliamentary fractions. The presentation of baskets of roses to the orators, standing ovations in support of various "leaders" and speeches of sickening adulation of "the leader" in a style typical of fascist "fuehrer worship" became the accepted practise at Party conventions.

Selection of Party officials became, more and more based, not on the criterion of devotion to the working class, loyalty to the Party, reliability, Marxian understanding and experience in the class struggle, but on the criterion of ability to mix with the bourgeoisie and deliver demagogic speeches; in other words, on the ability to ape the typical bourgeois politicians.

All of which was quite in line with and logically flowed from the characteristics which Buck maintained the Party should have, when he stated: "We Communists strive to win support for the policies we advocate by exactly the same means as, and by no other means than, the other political parties in Canada."

Unfortunately, but inevitably, the methods and procedure of National gatherings were copied by the Provincial organizations.

Revisionism and perversion of Marxism was not confined to the Communist leaders in Canada as this also made its appearance in other countries in the English speaking world and some Latin American countries. The distinction of the Canadian Communist leaders lies in the fact that they led the Communist movement of Canada farther into the swamp of opportunism than was the case in any other country in the world, and having done so, resorted to the most unprincipled tactics to cover up their opportunism and destroy the political influence and personal integrity of those who criticized their opportunism and attempted to effect corrections.

A study of the writings of Tim Buck in Canada and Earl Browder in the United States shows that on most questions of policy Buck followed the lead of Browder; introduced the same theoretical concepts, advocated similar organizational forms and adopted similar tactics to the Canadian movement. However, on some occasions the opportunism of Buck anticipated that of Browder. For instance, the Communist Party of Canada, on Buck's proposal, was liquidated and replaced by the Labor Progressive Party almost one year before Browder persuaded the Communist Party of the U.S.A. to accept voluntary liquidation and reconstitute itself as a political, educational association. The close similarity of both the timing and character of the opportunist policies imposed on the Communist movements in both countries tends to demonstrate that there existed, for at least ten years, an interaction, and to some extent, an inter-dependence of opportunism in the top leadership of the Communist Parties of the two countries.

Conventions and plenums of the American Party were attended by Buck while the American Party was usually represented at National gatherings of the Canadian Party by Browder. The sum total of the results achieved by the gradual substitution of opportunism for Marxism was in both countries almost identical, namely: Liquidation of the Communist Party; liquidation of the independent role of the working class; subordination of the working class to the political leadership of the liberal bourgeoisie; the strengthening of bourgeois ideology at the expense of proletarian ideology in the ranks of the working class; political retrogression instead of political development; and finally, a considerable strengthening of the ideological and political influence of both American and Canadian Imperialism. On the other hand, the operation of other influences enabled the labor movement of both countries to achieve certain gains, particu-

larly in the sphere of economic organization, in spite of the opportunism of the respective Communist movements. The very process of concentration and centralization of wealth resulted in a parallel concentration of workers in ever larger industrial establishments, thus providing the basis for the development of all inclusive industrial unions.

Marxian economic and political concepts propagated before opportunism had displaced Marxism, left their imprint on thousands of rank-and-file workers and Party members, while the experience of the depression years was too recent to be forgotten by thousands of class-conscious workers who participated in the struggle against wage cuts and for adequate unemployed relief. These factors, together with the ideological influence of the Socialist U.S.S.R., and the almost universal recognition of fascism as the off-spring of monopoly capital, acted as a retarding influence on the penetration of opportunism in the ranks of the class conscious workers both inside and outside the Communist Parties.

#### **SOME OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF REVISIONISM**

However, there can be no question of the fact that the revision of Marxism by the Communist Parties of the United States and Canada, in addition to checking the development of the labor movement within these countries also had international ramifications with possibly serious consequences. Duclos, in his article of criticism of the "new line" of the American Communists, pointed out that several South American countries (Cuba, Colombia), in general followed the same path "as that advocated by Browder," and "considered it correct."

Blas Roca, general secretary of the Popular Socialist Party of Cuba (formed as a result of a merger of the Communist Party with other Socialist groups), in a letter of congratulations to Earl Browder, stated:

"I have just finished reading the Spanish translation of your admirable book *Teheran*, and I would like to congratulate you on this latest contribution to the victory of the United Nations, and to the attainment of better inner-American understanding through which peace and prosperity will be assured in the post war." (*Political Affairs*, March, 1945, p. 268.)

Roca apparently accepted the entire “new line” advocated by Browder, including the concept that as a result of Teheran, Imperialism would become progressive, voluntarily share the world markets, assist in the economic development of colonial countries, and grant political independence to them. The following extracts from his letter give that impression:

“On the whole, it is easier for Latin America to understand and support the program you propose than it is for the United States or Great Britain, because Latin America stands to gain peacefully, after the violent defeat of the Axis, greater prosperity and, furthermore, greater National independence.” (Ibid., p. 283.)

And further:

“We must, of course, accentuate our efforts to make our people aware of the perspective offered by Teheran, and the possibilities of advantageous collaboration with Great Britain and the United States in a joint program for the harmonious solution of our acutest and most urgent economic problems. To that end, we are resolved to distribute your book even more widely, since the 21,000 copies sold to date have reached only those circles directly connected with the Party.” (Ibid.)

There can be no doubt that the supposedly authoritative writings of Browder and Buck over a period of years exerted some influence on the tactics employed by Communist Parties in other English speaking countries. Although it is known that the Communist Parties of Britain, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa were opposed to the revisionist theories advanced particularly by Browder, but also by Buck, which attributed to the Teheran accord the means of abolishing the class struggle, since according to them it was an “international class alliance.” Nevertheless an examination of the literature of the British Party would seem to show that it was influenced also by the revisionism of Browder and Buck. For instance, in a pamphlet published by the C.P. of Great Britain, entitled, *Trade Unions and the General Election*, by J. R. Campbell, the following is stated:

“The age of scarcity is passed. Only the most narrow-minded self-seeking Tories wish to perpetuate the old days of cut-throat competition, unemployment and restricted production.

“The Labor Party and Communist Party, with the active backing of the trade union movement, can make this the age of abundance, and lead the way in building that kind of Britain for which the men in the services are fighting and the workers in civil life are toiling.” (p. 15.)

The revisionist concepts advanced in the above quotation are very similar to those advanced so assiduously by Browder and Buck.

Harry Pollitt, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Britain, expresses somewhat similar ideas in speaking of the Party’s policy for the post war, when he states: “Our policy will produce the opposite results (from 1919-1920). There will be work and good wages for all, side by side with decisive measures of social reform. It is a policy that takes into account all the new political features of the present and coming periods. It depends for its success on the unity and strength of the labor movement and the willingness of the employers to cooperate.” (*How To Win The Peace*, p. 29.)

However the British Communists differed in their writings from Buck and Browder in that they consistently advocated Socialism and conducted education and propaganda for Socialism. Certainly it cannot be said that the crude revisionism of Browder and Buck was characteristic also of the British Party. Nevertheless, a review of recent writings of British Communist leaders cannot but lead to the conclusion that some of the revisionist concepts of Browder and Buck have also found their way into the British Party; particularly theories pertaining to National Unity and international economic cooperation in the post war. And indeed it is not surprising that revisionism, extending over a ten-year period, in such important countries as the United States, the greatest Imperialist power, and Canada, the third greatest industrial country in the capitalist world since the war and a member of the British Commonwealth, should influence the policies of other English speaking countries. Unfortunately, what Lenin said of the Communist Parties in 1921 remains true even today of some of the English speaking countries. Lenin wrote: “In the overwhelming majority of countries our Parties are still very

far from being what real Communist Parties, real vanguards of the genuinely revolutionary and only revolutionary class, Parties in which all members take part in the struggle, in the movement, in the everyday life of the masses, should be.” (Vol. X., *Selected Works*, p. 299.)

The tragedy is, however, that the political development of the working class has been very greatly retarded in both Canada and the United States as a result of the opportunism which permeated both the theoretical and the practical work of the Communist Parties. Instead of having a strong, unified and politically independent labor movement, labor in both countries enters the post war period with an even greater degree of ideological confusion and political disunity than was the case in the pre-war period.

### **THE ECONOMIC ROOTS OF OPPORTUNISM**

A number of factors can be pointed to as contributing towards or facilitating the introduction and spread of revisionism within the Communist Parties of Canada and the U.S.A. However, it would be incorrect to attribute revisionism to subjective factors alone, such as immature leaders, lack of inner Party democracy, the opportunism of particular individuals, etc. Lenin, time and again pointed out that opportunism is an international phenomenon, the basis of which is the economic exploitation of the colonial peoples by the advanced Imperialist powers. As Lenin put it:

“The question of Imperialism and of its connection with opportunism in the labor movement, with the betrayal of the cause of labor by labor leaders was raised long ago, very long ago!

“For a period of forty years, from 1852 to 1892, Marx and Engels constantly pointed to the fact that the upper stratum of the working class of England was becoming bourgeois as a consequence of the peculiar economic conditions of England (colonies, the monopoly of the world market, etc). In the seventies of the last century Marx earned for himself the honorable hatred of the despicable heroes of the ‘Berne’ International trend, of the opportunists and reformists of that time, because he branded many of the leaders of the English trade unions as men who had sold themselves to the bourgeoisie, or were in the pay of

the latter for services they were rendering to its class within the labor movement.” (Vol. X., Lenin’s *Selected Works*, pp. 41-42.)

Opportunism, or reformism, said Lenin, inevitably had to grow into Socialist Imperialism, or socialist chauvinism, which has world historical significance, because imperialism singled out a handful of very rich, advanced nations, which plundered the whole world and by that enabled the bourgeoisie of these countries, out of their monopolist super profits (imperialism is monopolist capitalism), to bribe the upper stratum of the working class of these countries.

“Only utter ignoramuses or hypocrites who deceive the workers by repeating commonplaces about capitalism and in this way obscure the bitter truth that a whole trend in Socialism deserted to the side of the Imperialist bourgeoisie, can fail to see the economic inevitability of this fact under Imperialism.” (Ibid., pp. 42-43.)

The economic inevitability of opportunism in the labor movement of Imperialist countries which Lenin refers to is amply proven by the history of opportunism. The working class of England did not even achieve a Marxist Party until 1920, although Marxist Parties had been established in the continental countries decades previously.

With the development of German and French Imperialism thus putting an end to the British monopoly of colonies and the world market, their Marxist Parties became more and more opportunist. France gave the world the first example of a Socialist, Millerand, entering a capitalist government as a cabinet minister, while in Germany about the same time, the notorious Bernstein developed an elaborate revision of Marxian theory through his writings, and it was the German Social Democratic Party whose leaders allied themselves with the German General Staff to crush the German revolution of 1918, and later objectively paved the way for fascism coming to power.

The leading economic and political role formerly played by Britain, France and Germany has now to a considerable extent been taken over by the United States and, to a lesser degree, by Canada. Hence the economic basis for opportunism is more highly developed in the U.S. and Canada than anywhere else in the world. It



follows therefore, that it is not accidental that the Communist Parties of these two countries should be the ones in which opportunism should take root.

What Lenin wrote following the first world war equally applies at the present time:

“... Unswerving and ruthless war must be waged for the complete expulsion from the labor movement of those opportunist leaders who earned their reputations both before the war, and particularly during the war, in the sphere of politics as well as, and particularly, in the trade unions and the cooperative societies.” (Ibid., p. 46.)

This is particularly true when the opportunist leaders pose as Marxists, as Communists, and when their opportunism is pointed out, proceed to cover it up and deny it through skillful demagoguery and to smother all honest criticism. “The first condition of true Communism,” said Lenin, “is rupture with opportunism.” (Ibid., p. 275.)

Hence it is clear that if the Canadian working class is to have a Marxist Leadership rather than an opportunist leadership, that leadership will have to come from other quarters than the opportunist leaders of the Labor Progressive Party who have demonstrated their determination to continue to cling to their opportunism and therefore to continue to mislead the working class of Canada. A Marxist leadership is essential, and because it is essential, will be created and developed in Canada as it has been elsewhere in the world.

## **CHAPTER VI:**

### **WHAT IS TO BE DONE AND WHY**

Several months have passed since the end of the Second World War. The attempt of German, Italian and Japanese fascism to overrun the world and enslave all peoples – to create a system of world fascism – has been defeated. While the freedom loving people of the whole world contributed to the defeat of the fascist bid for world power, the decisive contribution towards that victory arose from the unparalleled self-sacrifice, heroism and tenacity of the peoples of the world's first and only Socialist State, the U.S.S.R., at a cost of over 10,000,000 dead. The Socialist Soviet Union has emerged from the war with its prestige and influence tremendously enhanced.

Democratic governments have been established in a whole number of countries, particularly in those countries adjacent to the borders of the U.S.S.R. These governments, in practically every instance, are composed of a coalition of the political parties of the workers, peasants and urban petty bourgeoisie to the exclusion of the political parties of the landlords and the big bourgeoisie.

Events since the coming of peace, however, have shown conclusively that the basic world antagonisms of the pre-war period still remain. What are these antagonisms? They can be enumerated as follows:

(1) The Antagonism Between Capital and Labor; between the capitalist class and the working class, which arises as a result of the irreconcilability of interests of the two classes resulting from the contradiction, economic in nature, between socialized production and capitalist appropriation of the products of industry; i.e., the wealth of society is produced by the joint effort of thousands of workers, by society as a whole, but the wealth produced is not owned by those who produce it but remains the private property of a relative handful of the population, the capitalist class.

(2) The Antagonism Between Capitalism and Socialism; between the capitalist economic and social system in five-sixths of the world and the socialist economic and social system in one-sixth of the world, – the U.S.S.R.

(3) The Antagonism Between the Imperialist Powers and the Colonial and Semi-Colonial Countries; whose peoples are exploited, suppressed and denied their national independence by the dominant imperialist countries.

(4) The Antagonism between the Rival Imperialist Powers; which arises as a result of the struggle for markets, for cheap sources of raw material and for colonies.

These four basic world antagonisms have been demonstrated all over the world during the months immediately following the cessation of hostilities and will continue to be demonstrated so long as capitalism exists. Further, as a result of these antagonisms recurring economic crises, unemployment, insecurity, injustices, colonial uprisings and the threat of wars between nations will continue as an inevitable result of the contradictions of capitalism.

Life itself has proven that the idyllic pictures of the post war world painted by Tim Buck and Earl Browder were entirely false. The colonial peoples have not obtained their independence; peoples have not had the right in many countries “to decide their own form of government without outside interference;” the so-called “far-sighted” capitalists have not cooperated with labor to solve the problems of reconstruction; full employment has not materialized; social security and “lasting prosperity” has not been realized; “far reaching democratic progress” remains an empty promise.

Imperialism remains essentially unchanged; its basic characteristic being “reaction all along the line.” American Imperialism has emerged from the war tremendously strengthened and, precisely because of its dominant position, determined to expand its strength and influence at the expense of its much weakened rivals still further.

Canadian Imperialism, also greatly strengthened by the war, because of its interlocking economic and financial interests with American monopoly capital is closely linked with American Imperialism on the one hand, while retaining its economic and political ties with British Imperialism in order to share in the exploitation of the British colonies, on the other. The crushing of German, Italian and Japanese Imperialism and the setback suffered by French Imperialism, places Canada in the position in the immediate post war period at least, of the world’s third imperialist power. All of which goes to demonstrate the correctness of the estimate of the Teheran accord as a diplomatic agreement as made by Duclos, rather than a platform of class peace as Browder maintained, or as an “international class alliance” to be supplemented by “continued National Unity in the post war” as Buck claimed, which means exactly the same thing as Browder advocated – class peace.

Whereas Canadian monopoly capital enters the post war period tremendously strengthened, Canadian Labor enters the post war disunited organizationally and politically and without a program. Ideological confusion is even greater within the ranks of the working class in many respects than was the case at the conclusion of the First World War twenty-eight years ago. This is due primarily to the complete betrayal of Marxism by the national leadership of the L.P.P., to the teaching of the identity of interests of capital and labor, of advocating Liberal-Labor coalition and of the practice of class collaboration. All of which resulted in subordinating the economic and political interests of the working class to the interests of monopoly capital. The working class finds itself in the position of being without capable political leadership.

In modern society the interests of classes are represented by political parties. Regardless of minor differences, bourgeois political parties always and everywhere represent and serve the interests of the capitalist class. There are only two basic classes: The working class and the capitalist class or as Marx more precisely defined them, bourgeoisie and proletariat.

The so-called middle class or petty bourgeoisie not being a basic class, not being homogeneous, cannot and does not develop political parties capable of consistently representing the interests of the middle class themselves even when such parties happen to form governments and certainly they cannot represent the interests of the working class. Under Capitalism all middle class political parties inevitably are obliged to uphold the system of so-called private enterprise and consequently come under the domination of monopoly capital on most essential questions.

### **THE NEED OF A MARXIST PARTY OF THE WORKING CLASS**

Political leadership can only be provided for the working class through the medium of a strictly independent class party of the working class whose membership and leadership is overwhelmingly drawn from the ranks of the working class itself. Such a party must of necessity be a Marxist Party; a party of Marxism-Leninism, a party of scientific socialism. Marxist-Leninist theory is "the science of the development of society, the science of the working class movement." Without such a Party, "Free from opportunism, irreconcilable towards compromisers and conciliators, in opposition to the capitalist class and its state power," the interests of the working

class under capitalism cannot be served nor socialism eventually realized. Therefore the first task confronting the Canadian working class is the immediate creation of a genuine Marxist-Leninist political party, a Communist Party, on a national scale.

The constitution of such a party should and must provide that it be an independent class party of the working class. This does not mean that membership in such a party should be denied to members of other classes but it does mean that members of other classes should be accepted only "in so far as they adopt the viewpoint of the proletariat" as Lenin put it; i.e., in so far as they recognize the independent and leading role of the working class in the struggle of all the toiling and exploited population against monopoly capital and as the class historically destined to take political power in alliance with a majority of the farmers, abolish capitalist society, build a socialist society and proceed to put an end to all forms of exploitation of man by man. In order that such a party should be a working class party, it follows that both the membership and the leadership must, in the majority, be working class in content. Such a party must train and develop its own proletarian intellectuals capable of interpreting and applying the science of Marxism-Leninism.

The party constitution must provide for the widest inner party democracy and self criticism. All major questions of policy, when at all possible, must be submitted to a referendum vote of the membership. All questions of policy relating to action affecting the party membership or the working class must be discussed on the basis of draft resolutions and not on the basis of speeches of "leaders" as practised in the L.P.P. Important questions of policy, even though they affect only a section of the membership, should be thoroughly discussed, not only through the medium of delegated conferences but by the entire membership concerned, if at all possible. At all times in arriving at decisions on political and tactical questions the party must be guided by the dictum of Lenin: "Organization is an absurdity without unity of ideas."

The organizational structure of such a Party must be based on the principle of democratic centralism in fact and not just in words; i.e., the authority of higher bodies must be democratic and not bureaucratic. All officials and higher committees must be subject to recall at any time. The addition of members to existing committees or the appointment of special committees must be carried out by elections and not through co-option. Elections must be carried out

by voting for individuals and not for prepared lists or slates of candidates. Candidates for election to higher bodies or official positions must be voted for by means of secret ballot and not by open ballot. The selection of people for training for leadership must be based primarily on their proven devotion, ability and connection with the masses and not on the basis of their ability "to speak well and write well." Constant application of the principle of self criticism must be encouraged and practised in all party bodies from the highest to the lowest.

While the Party must utilize all forms of organization the basic form of organization must be industrial and not territorial; the "factory nuclei" must be the basis of the Party.

Discipline must be a self imposed conscious discipline and not a mechanical discipline imposed upon the membership by bureaucratic methods. As Lenin defined it, discipline must be "unity of action, freedom of discussion and criticism." However, "the discussion of controversial questions is permissible only up to the moment that they are decided." Once a question has been democratically decided, after discussion has run its course, the principle must be "absolute subordination of the minority to the majority."

This is a fundamental principle of proletarian discipline and of democracy which must be strictly observed. Membership in the Party must be based on the selection of "the most class conscious, most courageous and most far sighted workers." Such a Party must "differ from the rest of the mass of the workers in that it sees the whole of the historical path of the working class as a whole, and strives at all of the turning points of this path to champion, not individual groups, not individual trades, but the interests of the working class as a whole." It must become "the organizational-political lever by the aid of which the most progressive section of the working class directs the mass of the proletariat and semi-proletariat along the right path." (*Theses of 2nd Congress of the C.I.*)

The Party must have the closest connections with the working people in order not only "to lead the masses" but also "in order to learn from the masses." A Party, it must be remembered, in order to lead the masses must learn from the masses. Self criticism must be utilized in order that the Party "may learn from its own mistakes" and thus avoid repetition of the same mistakes.

The Party can of necessity be comprised of only a minority of the working class. It must everywhere and at all times be ready and

capable of giving leadership to all sections of the people who suffer injustice and oppression. If it is unable to do this then it cannot survive. As Lenin put it:

“A political Party can combine only a minority of the class, in the same way that the really class-conscious workers throughout the whole of capitalist society represent only a minority of the workers. For that reason we are compelled to admit that only a class-conscious minority can guide the vast masses of the workers and get them to follow it... If the minority is really class-conscious, if it succeeds in getting the masses to follow it, if it is able to reply to every question that comes up on the order of the day, then it is in essence, a Party.

“... If the minority is not able to lead the masses, link itself up closely with them, then it is not a party and is good for nothing even if it calls itself a Party.” (*Lenin on Organization*, p. 38.)

Why is the formation of a new Party based on the above principle necessary at this time? It is necessary because the working class of Canada does not have a Party with a program, tactics and organizational forms and methods arrived at through democratic discussion and criticism and based on the principles formulated by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. In a word, the Canadian working class does not have a Marxist Party.

Lenin explained why a new Party is necessary when he stated:

“Organization without ideas is an absurdity which in practise converts the workers into miserable hangers-on of the bourgeoisie in power. Consequently, without the freedom of discussion and criticism, the proletariat does not recognize unity of action. For that reason, intelligent workers must never forget that sometimes serious violations of principles occur, which make the break-off of organizational relations absolutely necessary.” (*Ibid.*, pp. 31-32.)

“Serious violations of principles” have occurred in the supposed “Marxist Party of the Canadian workers,” the Labor Progressive Party, which necessitate a break with that Party and the formation of a new party, as the quotations from the stated policies of the L.P.P. have conclusively proven. In fact the Labor Progressive

Party has violated practically every principle which a Marxist Party should follow, as a study of the conclusions drawn in the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Bolsheviks*, published in 1939 and edited by Stalin, shows.

### THE ATTRIBUTES OF A MARXIST PARTY

The Conclusion states that the History teaches:

(1) "The history of the Party teaches us, first of all, that the victory of the proletarian revolution, the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, is impossible without a revolutionary party of the proletariat, a party free from opportunism, irreconcilable towards compromisers and capitulators, and revolutionary towards the bourgeoisie and its state power." (*History of the CPSU*, p. 353.)

As has already been shown, far from being free from opportunism the Labor Progressive Party has been saturated with opportunism, the main advocates of opportunism being the top leaders themselves: "National Unity means unity of everyone in the nation under the banner of democracy." Sam Carr.

Instead of being irreconcilable towards compromisers the L.P.P. made compromises with the bourgeoisie which constituted a complete betrayal of socialism, a virtue to be emulated. "... We are faced with 'compromise' not only as a temporary tactical question but as a problem of maintaining national unity (i.e., compromise between classes) for a whole historical epoch,..." – John Weir, Editor of the Party paper, *The Tribune*. (*National Affairs Monthly*, July, 1944, p. 117.) Weir even went so far as to interpret Confederation as a compromise between two antagonistic classes. The two antagonistic classes, according to him, being the commercial capitalists and the industrial capitalists. To such depths was Marxism perverted in interpreting history in order to justify class collaboration.

Instead of being "revolutionary in its attitude towards the bourgeoisie" the L.P.P. advised:

"State policy after the war as during the war can achieve very great results in making the system work, and it is essential that the working class should support such a policy. But this can only have meaning when understood as



an agreement between labor and the decisive section of monopoly capital.” STEWART SMITH.

And as for the Party being “revolutionary in its attitude towards – the state power” we get:

“... To concentrate the main blows of the people against the King Government and the Liberal Party at the present historical moment, would also mean that the struggle to make the King Government enact progressive legislation would be weakened.” TIM BUCK.

Thus the statements of the L.P.P. leadership themselves prove conclusively that the L.P.P. completely violates the attributes of a Marxist Party outlined in Conclusion (1).

(2) “The history of the Party further teaches us that a Party of the working class cannot perform the role of leader of its class, cannot perform the role of organizer and leader of the proletarian revolution, unless it has mastered the advanced theory of the working class movement, the Marxist-Leninist theory.” (*History of the CPSU*, p. 350.)

As our examination of their statements have shown the L.P.P. leadership not only did not master the theory of Marxism-Leninism themselves but by their organizational policies of preventing any discussion on major questions of policy by the lower bodies until after the policy had been decided on, they prevented the membership from using theory in arriving at policies. And not only that, the study of Marxist-Leninist theory, far from being encouraged, was discouraged. Just as Browder stated: “You will not find the answers in the old books” so Buck argued “Old moth-eaten arguments no longer suffice to meet new conditions.”

The National education department of the L.P.P. consistently refused to supply the provincial committees with study outlines for Marxist classes and maintained each province should prepare their own in spite of the fact the provincial committees could not, in most cases, afford a full time educational director. What few outlines for classes were prepared referred the students to the revisionist writings of Buck and Browder as study material. Attempts of the Provincial Committees to prepare study outlines mainly based on the Marxist-Leninist classics were condemned as “academic” and “ivo-

ry tower” methods of studying Marxism-Leninism by the National Leadership. Hence, we see that the L.P.P. leadership not only did not master the theory themselves but revised the theory, discouraged the membership from even studying the classics and substituted their own revisionist writings.

(3) “The history of the Party further teaches us that unless the petty bourgeois parties which are active within the ranks of the working class, and which push backward sections of the working class into the arms of the bourgeoisie are smashed, the victory of the proletarian revolution is impossible.” (Ibid., p. 359).

According to the above conclusion “unity of the working class” is prevented by the fact that a section of the working class follow the bourgeoisie, thus splitting their unity. And further, that the working class are pushed into the arms of the bourgeoisie by the petty bourgeois parties which must therefore be smashed in order to achieve unity of the working class.

According to the L.P.P. however, labor unity means a division of seats between the petty bourgeois C.C.F. Party and the L.P.P. in parliamentary elections. In other words, the L.P.P., in practise, did the very opposite. Instead of winning the working class away from the petty bourgeois parties they tried to unite with these parties, not on the basis of a common proletarian program but merely by means of a saw-off in the division of seats.

And not only that, the L.P.P. leadership, instead of winning the working class away from following the bourgeoisie, themselves pushed them “into the arms of the bourgeoisie” to a far greater extent than even the C.C.F. did. The practical activity and slogans of the L.P.P. conclusively prove so: “Unity of all progressive forces,” “Democratic Front,” “Unity of everyone in the Nation under the banner of Democracy,” “Labor-management-government cooperation,” “Continuing post-war National unity,” “A National Front,” “An agreement between Labor and the decisive section of monopoly capital,” “National unity is the policy by which the class interests of the working class as a whole will be served, by cooperation with the democratic circles of all classes and all sections of the Canadian people including a decisive section of the capitalist class,” “Government representing a partnership of labor with that section of the capitalist class which is willing to support policies based upon the

principles enunciated in the joint declaration issued at Teheran,” “A Liberal-Labor Coalition Government.”

Hence, it follows, that the L.P.P. is itself a petty bourgeois, social democratic party which splits the working class by pushing sections “into the arms of the bourgeoisie.”

“The unity of the proletariat in the epoch of social revolution” Lenin says, “can be achieved only by the extreme revolutionary party of Marxism, and only by relentless struggle against all other parties.” (Ibid., p. 359.)

(4) “The history of the Party further teaches us that unless the Party of the working class wages an uncompromising struggle against the opportunists within its own ranks, unless it smashes the capitulators in its own midst, it cannot preserve unity and discipline within its ranks, it cannot perform its role as leader and organizer of the proletarian revolution, nor its role as builder of the new, Socialist society.” (Ibid., p. 359.)

As its entire history shows, the struggle within the L.P.P. was not directed against the opportunists since the top leadership themselves were arch opportunists. On the contrary, the struggle was against all those who opposed their opportunist policies by branding them as “Sectarians,” “Leftists,” “Anarchists,” “Syndicalists,” “Trotskyites,” “Screwballs,” “Degenerates,” and so on, ad nauseam.

Consequently, the discipline within the Party was not, and could not be, a “conscious self-imposed discipline” but a mechanical blind discipline, imposed by bureaucratic methods from the top. And the unity of the Party was not based on “unity of ideas” through ideological conviction but an artificial unity maintained by blind acceptance of policies. Unity of the Party was presented as the main object regardless of whether the policies were right or wrong. In fact to even question the correctness of opportunist policies was denounced “as splitting the unity of the Party” and those who did so were branded as “anti-Party elements.”

The membership were not informed of Lenin’s dictum: “... Without the freedom of discussion and criticism, the proletariat does not recognize unity of action.”

(5) “The history of the Party further teaches us that a Party cannot perform its role as leader of the working class

if, carried away by success, it begins to grow conceited, ceases to observe the defects in its work, and fears to acknowledge its mistakes and frankly and honestly to correct them in good time.

“A Party is invincible if it does not fear criticism, if it does not gloss over the mistakes and defects in its work, if it teaches and educates its cadres by drawing the lessons from the mistakes in Party work, and if it shows how to correct its mistakes in time.

“A Party perishes if it conceals its mistakes, if it glosses over sore problems, if it covers up its shortcomings by pretending that all is well, if it is intolerant of criticism and self-criticism, if it gives way to self-complacency and vain-glory, if it rests on its laurels.” (Ibid., p. 361.)

A Party cannot perform its role of leader if it fears criticism, glosses over its mistakes, covers them up, does not draw lessons from them and pretends that all is well. And this is precisely what the L.P.P. has done; covered up its mistakes and “pretended that all is well.”

Consequently, there is little wonder that its membership and supporters are deserting it. It could not be otherwise because “a party perishes if it conceals its mistakes.” Being opportunists to the core, however, the L.P.P. leadership had to gloss over and cover up its mistakes or stand exposed and discredited before its own membership. Hence the drastic lengths they were obliged to resort to in order to continue in the leadership; denounce their critics as “drunkards,” “degenerates,” “Trotskyites,” “traitors,” “disruptors,” etc., etc.; themselves lead all discussion on revisionism in order to cover up their betrayal of Marxism; to announce “The Provincial Executive has ruled there is to be no discussion on revisionism at this meeting;” to propose the Party should “root out all tendencies towards” and “reflections of revisionism.”

(6) “Lastly, the history of the Party teaches us that unless it has wide connections with the masses, unless it constantly strengthens these connections, unless it knows how to harken to the voice of the masses and understand their urgent needs, unless it is prepared not only to teach the masses but to learn from the masses, a Party of the working class cannot be a real mass Party capable of leading the

working class millions and all the laboring people.” (Ibid., p. 362.)

The leadership of the L.P.P. was ever anxious to “teach the masses,” particularly teaching them “socialism is not an issue,” teaching them “the class interests of the working class as a whole will be served by cooperation with a decisive section of the capitalist class,” that “full employment can be maintained in the post-war,” that a “Liberal-Labor coalition government, with Labor as a full partner in it, would open a new and higher stage of National progress in Canada.”

However, the L.P.P. leaders were quite above learning from the masses. They conceived of themselves as the “leaders” whom the poor ignorant masses must follow. If they could not get their policies accepted this simply meant that they must organize and prepare more fully for a further meeting and win a majority vote for their policies.

They could not understand that a majority vote in a meeting did not mean that they had convinced the masses; they did not understand that bureaucracy was no substitute for democracy; they did not understand that in order to teach the masses they should also “harken to the voice of the masses” in order “to learn from the masses;” they did not understand the dialectical unity of teaching and learning because they were not Marxists but opportunists.

They did not know that:

“A Party perishes if it shuts itself up in its narrow Party shell, if it severs itself from the masses, if it allows itself to be covered with bureaucratic rust.” (Ibid., p. 362.)

A study of organizational principles necessary for a real Marxist workers’ Party as outlined in the *History of the CPSU (Bolsheviks)* shows that principles in organization are just as important as principles in tactics and program; that unless a working class party has such organizational principles and adheres to them it will perish. Whereas the constitution of a Marxist Party can provide to a large extent protection and observance of organizational principles, the aims and objects of a Party are also questions of basic importance which must be unequivocally stated in the Party program.

## **THE PROGRAM OF A MARXIST PARTY**

A correct program is of decisive importance to a workers' Party. A political program must outline the aims and objects of a Party. A program should be finally adopted only after the most thoroughgoing discussion and criticism, and once adopted, should be rigidly adhered to. As is the case with a Party constitution, a Party program deals with questions of principle. Whereas, the non-Marxist, vague, equivocal program of the Labor Progressive Party was adopted after only a few hours' discussion at a two-day National Convention, the final program of a new Party should be adopted only after a prolonged and thorough discussion extending over a period of weeks or months and involving the entire membership.

In drafting such a program, consideration should be given to the following important questions:

### **1. THE INTERNATIONAL CHARACTER OF IMPERIALISM.**

The international character of capitalism in its highest stage – Imperialism – which is a world system of exploitation and oppression of oppressed classes and nations. Consequently the international character of the movement for emancipation from capitalist exploitation and the achievement of socialism should be recognized.

### **2. TECHNOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT AND ITS CONSEQUENCES.**

Technological development in the sphere of production, far from resolving the economic, social and political contradictions of Imperialism, serves to further accentuate these contradictions, thus tending to further develop the polarization of great wealth at one pole and abject poverty at the other; to make the recurrence and severity of economic crises due to over-production more prolonged and severe, accompanied by mass unemployment; to increase the rivalry and competition for markets and cheap sources of raw material between rival monopolies and Imperialist states; finally, to intensify all the antagonisms of world society and further develop the objective and subjective conditions necessary for the overthrow of capitalism as the only means of overcoming the antagonisms.

### **3. RECOGNITION OF THE FACT THAT “A PEOPLE WHICH OPPRESSES OTHER PEOPLE, CANNOT THEMSELVES BE FREE.”**

The two following points in connection with the National and Colonial question must be exhaustively studied and a correct Marxian position in the interests of the movement for Socialism formulated:

(a) The Continued Membership of Canada in the British Commonwealth of Nations. The countries which comprise the Commonwealth constitute the self-governing and exploiting states of the British Empire. By continuing the so-called British connection, Canada cannot escape responsibility for the reactionary measures of oppression and suppression practised by the dominant states of the Empire which, during 1945, has resulted in British Empire forces assuming the role of the principle medium of world reaction in preventing millions of colonial peoples from achieving their independence. Armed forces of the British Empire have, during 1945, been used as interventionist troops to prevent the establishment of democratic governments and the achievement of independence in Syria, Greece, Belgium, Egypt, French Indo-China and Java.

The whole history of monopoly capital goes to show that it is not because of patriotic motives that the British connection is maintained by the ruling circles in Canada. The real reason for continuing Canadian membership in the British Commonwealth is for the purpose of enabling Canadian monopoly capital to share with British Imperialism in the super-exploitation of the colonial peoples of the British Empire through the medium of preferential trade agreements and other advantages in trade enjoyed by Commonwealth countries. Certainly it is not for reasons of National defense that the British connection is maintained, as the United States occupies a far more strategic position than Britain in the event there should arise a military threat to Canada. For reasons of geographical proximity and of American financial investments in Canada, the U.S.A. would be, in fact, more interested in preventing any hostile power becoming established on Canadian soil than would British Imperialism. It follows therefore, that Canada's continued membership in the Commonwealth on the one hand, enables Canadian monopoly capital to share in the exploitation of the colonies, and on the other strengthens British Imperialism in its suppression of the colonial peoples and thereby makes Canada a partner in that suppression. The people of Canada as a whole therefore, become a part of the system of suppression and oppression of hundreds of millions of

colonial people, which is an unenviable position for any freedom loving people to be placed in.

(b) The Status of French Canada as a Minority Nation Within the Canadian State – the Dominion of Canada. The fact that the people of French Canada suffer from economic, social and cultural inequalities has been amply established. However, the old Communist movement in Canada and the L.P.P. leadership has always advanced the specious argument that the French Canadian people have political equality while at the same time admitting that the economic, social and cultural inequalities are largely due to “government policies.” Lenin placed the responsibility of the working class on the question of the right of nations to secede as follows:

“The proletariat of the oppressing nation cannot confine itself to general hackneyed phrases that may be repeated by any pacifist bourgeois against annexations and for the equal right of nations in general. The proletariat cannot evade the question that is particularly ‘unpleasant’ for the bourgeoisie, namely, the question of the frontiers of states that are based on National oppression. The proletariat cannot but fight against the forcible retention of the oppressed nations within the boundaries of a given state, and this is exactly what the struggle for the right of self-determination means. The proletariat must demand the right of political secession for the colonies and for the nation that ‘its own’ nation oppresses. Unless it does this, proletarian internationalism will remain a meaningless phrase, mutual confidence and class solidarity between the workers of the oppressing and oppressed nations will be impossible.

“The Socialists of the oppressed Nations, on the other hand, must particularly fight for and maintain complete, absolute unity (also organizational) between the workers of the oppressed nation and the workers of the oppressing nation. Without such unity it will be impossible to maintain an independent proletarian policy and class solidarity with the proletariat of other countries in the face of all the subterfuge, treachery and trickery of the bourgeoisie; for the bourgeoisie of the oppressed nations always converts the slogan of national liberation into a means of deceiving the workers; in internal politics it utilizes these slogans as a



means for concluding reactionary agreements with the bourgeoisie of the ruling nation.” (*Selected Works*, Vol. V, pp. 271-72.)

Lenin not only explained the necessity of the working class of an oppressing nation demanding the right of secession for an oppressed nation, but went further: “... The refusal to advocate the right of self-determination,” he said, “is equal to the worst opportunism.” (*Selected Works*, Vol. IV, p. 291.)

All talk of equality for a minority nation is nothing more nor less than hypocritical phrase mongering unless the oppressed nation has the right to secede. Without this right it is practically impossible to achieve equality in the economic, social and cultural fields.

For the working class of English speaking Canada the problem of French Canadian equality is not a question of ethical principles, but a question of international proletarian solidarity and of the economic welfare and democratic rights of the workers of English speaking Canada themselves. Thousands of workers in attempts to negotiate agreements for wage increases in various industries have met with the stock reply:

“If the management were to increase wages they would be unable to compete with rival firms who pay much lower wages in French Canada.” So long as French Canadian inequality exists, there exists with it a constant threat to democratic rights and liberties, not only in French Canada, but throughout the Dominion. So long as French Canada has not the right of secession, inequalities will remain, and so long as inequalities remain, French Canada will constitute a base for reaction threatening the democratic rights and liberties of all Canadians. Further: “... The socialist of an oppressing nation, who does not conduct propaganda, both in peacetime and in wartime, in favor of the freedom of secession for the oppressed nations, is not an internationalist, but a chauvinist.” (Lenin’s *Selected Works*, Vol. V, p. 287.)

#### 4. DEMOCRACY AND RACIAL EQUALITY.

Although Canada is considered to be an advanced, democratic country, the fact remains that many medieval remnants of feudalism still remain. This is particularly true in the sphere of racial equality, which is supposed to be a recognized principle in all civilized, demo-

cratic countries. Not only do the French Canadians suffer from inequality, but racial discrimination is practised and even encouraged by reactionary circles throughout Canada. This is particularly true of the native Indians, the treatment of whom has been shameful to say the least. No genuine attempt has ever been made to raise their economic, social and cultural level to that of the descendants of the Europeans who despoiled them and robbed them of their best lands.

The same practise of religious, racial and national inequality is true of the treatment meted out to Canadian citizens of Jewish, Negro, Chinese, Japanese and East Indian extractions and to a lesser extent also to citizens of other religious, racial or national extractions. So long as this situation is permitted to continue it will be impossible to establish the unity and solidarity of the working class necessary to their class interests. Therefore it is essential that the working class fight for the complete equality of all citizens and not only equality before the law, but actual equality in practise. The practise of religious, racial and national discrimination should be made a criminal offense, not only because of the injustice of it, not only because it tends to keep the working class divided, but also because it constitutes a basic feature of and breeding ground for fascism.

## 5. CANADA'S PARLIAMENT.

Apologists for Canadian capitalism, such as the L.P.P. leaders, are forever lauding "our" democratic institutions even to the extent of dropping the demand from the L.P.P. election platform for the abolition of the Canadian Senate, the counterpart of the British House of Lords. Actually, the Senate is one of the most autocratic remnants of medieval absolutism, of feudal reaction. It is the very antithesis of democracy. One of the foremost democratic demands of the Canadian working class must be the demand for the abolition of this reactionary institution. In the first place the Senate is not an elective body but one whose members are appointed, the basis of these appointments being property wealth and political service to one or the other of the political parties of the big bourgeoisie. Such a demand is necessary because:

"The proletariat cannot be victorious except through democracy, i.e., by introducing complete democracy and by combining every step of its struggle with democratic de-

mands formulated in the most determined manner.” Lenin.  
(Ibid., p. 283.)

In deciding whether or not a second house of parliament, of a democratic elective character, should be retained, consideration should be given to the advisability of replacing the present Senate by a House of Nationalities in which representation would be based on National lines and not on per capita representation. Such a House could have equal representation from both French and English Canada.

Although Canada’s native Indians do not constitute a Nation, in the scientific sense of the term, nevertheless they should have representation in such a House, if established. (The native Maoris of New Zealand have direct representation in Parliament as a special section of the population.)

It is difficult to conceive of the French Canadians attaining political equality within the Canadian State unless, in addition to the right of secession, some such equal basis of representation be established.

## 6. CANADA’S CONSTITUTION.

Canada’s Constitution must be revised in order to guarantee, among others, the following democratic rights and measures:

(a) The sovereignty of the people, the supreme power of the State, must be vested entirely in the people’s representatives and should be elected on the basis of proportional representation and subject to recall by a majority of their electors at any time.

(b) The right of every citizen 18 years of age to elect or to be elected to any representative institution; adequate payment of people’s representatives elected to municipal, provincial and federal government bodies.

(c) Inviolability of person and domicile.

(d) Unhampered freedom of conscience, speech, press, assembly, strikes and organization.

(e) Separation of Church from State, and schools from Church; schools to be absolutely secular.

(f) Free and compulsory general and technical education for all children of both sexes up to the ages of 18; minimum educational standards to be established.

## 7. TAXATION AND NATIONALIZATION.

The abolition of all indirect taxes such as sales tax, excise tax and “luxury taxes.” Inheritance, corporation, excess profit and income taxes to be retained but more steeply graduated with higher exemptions for low incomes.

Nationalization of all banks and of all trusts.

## 8. THE PHYSICAL AND MORAL WELL-BEING OF THE WORKING CLASS.

In order to safeguard the health and physical and moral well-being of the working class, the Party should demand:

(a) Limitation of the working day of all wage workers to six hours.

(b) A maximum 30-hour work week without reduction of pay.

(c) Complete prohibition of overtime work.

(d) Time and one half for all night work between the hours of 8 p.m. and 6 a.m., and double time for all Sunday work.

(e) Restriction of the working day of youth under 18 to four hours.

## AN AGRARIAN PROGRAM

A Marxist Party’s approach to the problem of the agrarian population must be based first of all on recognition of the class divisions in the countryside. The Party will secure a mass base in the countryside, not among farmers generally, but specifically among the agricultural wage workers, semi-proletarians and poor farmers.

The Party of the proletariat is duty bound to defend the interests of the exploited agrarian population, secure a firm base among the classes enumerated above and eventually secure an alliance with the middle stratum of the farmers.

## THE FIGHT AGAINST OPPORTUNISM

It must be recognized that in Canada at the present time, “opportunism is the main enemy.” One of the main tasks of a Marxist Party, therefore, will be a ruthless struggle against opportunism in all its manifold aspects. Fortunately there are few new forms of opportunism which is as old as the labor movement itself. Since the time of Lasalle, i.e., the “sixties” of the last century, opportunism has been a recognized enemy within the labor movement.

One of the greatest and most comprehensive pieces of Marxist literature, the *Program of the Communist International*, which was

finally formulated only after four years of critical discussion, amendments and improvements, devotes an entire section to the problem of opportunism and the fight against it. This section outlines in detail how “Socialist” reformism, as practised by the Social Democratic Parties, has revised Marxism in all its essential principles. In order that the reader may know what specific forms revisionism has taken, we will quote the entire paragraph, and then, point by point, consider whether similar methods of revision of Marxian theory have been practised in the Canadian Labor movement. Here is the reference:

“In the sphere of theory, social-democracy has utterly and completely betrayed Marxism, having traversed the road from revisionism to complete liberal bourgeois reformism and avowed social-imperialism. It has substituted in place of the Marxian theory of the contradictions of Capitalism the bourgeois theory of its harmonious development; it has pigeon-holed the theory of crisis and of the pauperization of the proletariat; it has turned the flaming and menacing theory of class struggle into prosaic advocacy of class peace; it has exchanged the theory of growing class antagonisms for the petty-bourgeois fairytale about the ‘democratization’ of capital; in place of the theory of the inevitability of war under capitalism it has substituted the bourgeois deceit of pacifism and the lying propaganda of ‘ultra-imperialism;’ it has exchanged the theory of the revolutionary downfall of capitalism for the counterfeit coinage of ‘sound’ capitalism transforming itself peacefully into socialism; it has replaced revolution by evolution, the destruction of the bourgeois State by its active upbuilding, the theory of proletarian dictatorship by the theory of coalition with the bourgeoisie, the doctrine of international proletarian solidarity by preaching defence of the imperialist fatherland, for Marxian dialectical materialism it has substituted the idealist philosophy and is now engaged in picking up the crumbs of religion that fall from the table of the bourgeoisie.” (*Handbook of Marxism*, pp. 1025-26.)

To deal with the first point:

*It has substituted in place of the Marxian theory of the contradictions of Capitalism the bourgeois theory of its harmonious development.*

Has the leadership of the L.P.P. advanced the theory of the “harmonious development” of capitalism? Let the reader consider the following statements of official L.P.P. policy. We will deal with them in chronological order. In 1943 Buck stated:

“Victory over the axis will clear the way for the full democratic development of all peoples – for the liberation of nations, the adoption of policies of economic security, the abolition of national oppression, the lifting of the colonial nations out of slavery into the light of freedom, on the basis of national self-determination.” (*Canada in the Coming Offensive*, p. 27.)

And again:

“Such is the evidence that the defeat of Hitlerism in Europe and Japan in Asia will open up the possibilities for far reaching social progress by orderly means for the peoples of the world.” (*Victory Through Unity*, p. 17.)

We now proceed to 1944:

“The question of how we can continue to produce and dispose of approximately the same amount of goods in peacetime as we are producing today is the crucial question that we shall then face as a Nation. If we solve that problem successfully, in a democratic way, we shall have taken a long stride towards a happier and more prosperous Canada.

“Wartime experience has proven conclusively that we can solve the problem in an orderly and democratic way.” (*Unity or Chaos*, p. 23.)

The same viewpoint of obtaining prosperity under capitalism by orderly means and democratic progress is emphasized by Buck in many of his statements. The 1944 federal election platform of the L.P.P. expresses a similar theory of “harmonious development of capitalism”:

“The approaching victory of the peoples will make possible long years of prosperity on the secure foundations

of United Nations friendship and cooperation.” (*A Better Canada*, p. 5.)

From the above statements we have “full democratic development of all peoples,” “far-reaching social progress by orderly means for the peoples of the world,” “solving the problem” of full production in “an orderly democratic way,” and “long years of world prosperity.”

Thus we see how the L.P.P. leadership “has substituted in place of the Marxian theory of the contradictions of capitalism the bourgeois theory of its harmonious development.”

We shall now consider the second point:

*It has pigeon-holed the theory of crisis and the pauperization of the proletariat.*

In this connection the L.P.P. leadership states:

“Proud of their victorious defense of freedom in this war, and confident of continuing prosperity and progress, our people must march to new horizons in the years to come.” (*A Better Canada*, p. 8.)

“On the basis of the Teheran agreement there is now the possibility that capitalist economy will be able to avoid a crisis of the sort which followed the first world war.” TIM BUCK (*National Affairs Monthly*, April, 1944, p. 5.)

“Government policies in accord with the Teheran agreement will maintain the national income, the level of employment and popular purchasing power. They will make possible the achievement of a rising level of prosperity.” TIM BUCK. (*Ibid.*, p. 4.)

“A government based upon a Democratic Coalition of Progressive Forces is the key to lasting prosperity in Canada and Canadian support to enduring peace in the world.” TIM BUCK (*Depression or Prosperity*, p. 12.)

“In the labor movement we had to combat the malicious sneers of the C.C.F. leaders, their complete refusal to understand that Teheran opens a tremendous perspective not only for speedy coalition victory in the war, but for organized post-war prosperity on the basis of reconstruction of the devastated world and steady increases in the stand-

ards of living.” SAM CARR. (*National Affairs*, September, 1944, p. 173.)

“If proper policies are pursued we can maintain a post war level of employment and purchasing power equal to if not higher than the relative prosperity brought by the war.”

TIM BUCK (*Depression or Prosperity*, p. 4.)

“The central problem of Dominion government policy after the war will be to maintain the national income and public purchasing power at a prosperity level. This can be done. The war has proved that the nation through its elected government, can direct its economy so as to maintain any desired level of production within our physical capacity.” (*A Better Canada*, p. 11.)

Instead of the theory of crisis we have “capitalist economy will be able to avoid a crisis.” Instead of the pauperization of the proletariat we get “continuing prosperity,” “lasting prosperity,” “organized post-war prosperity,” and the “maintenance of any desired level of economy.”

The third point will now be dealt with:

*It has turned the flaming and menacing theory of class struggle into prosaic advocacy of class peace.*

Has the leadership of the L.P.P. turned the theory of class struggle into “prosaic advocacy of class peace?” Consider the following statements:

“The Teheran Declaration is, therefore, above all a platform of democratic struggle. The fight for policies in accord with it in every country is primarily a struggle to unite labor and all democratic forces, including a section of the capitalist class behind policies of jobs, social security and progress at home, through cooperation with all democratic peoples in post war reconstruction and development abroad.” TIM BUCK. (*Club Life*, Aug., 1945.)

And Buck wrote the article the above quotation is taken from to prove that the L.P.P. “did not have a revisionist line.” According to Buck the Teheran Declaration is “a platform of democratic struggle” and this struggle has as its aim to “unite labor” with “a section of the capitalist class.” But to continue:



“The task of labor statesmanship is to go forward on the basis of anti-fascist coalition and cooperation with the decisive sections of monopoly capital who are carrying through the Teheran offensive against fascism both in military terms and in terms of long range policy.” STEWART SMITH. (*National Affairs Monthly*, June, 1944, p. 76.)

Just think! The “decisive sections of monopoly capital” are now “anti-fascist” and “the task of labor statesmanship” is to go forward in “coalition” and “cooperation” with these “decisive sections of monopoly capital.” In other words, the anti-fascist forces, according to Smith, include the “decisive sections of monopoly capital” and “labor” in “coalition” and “cooperation.”

To such abject depths of opportunism has the “People’s Front of struggle against fascism and war,” which Dimitroff stated, was “A struggle against fascism, a struggle against capitalism, a struggle for the victory of socialism throughout the world,” finally been perverted. And it should be noted that these policies were advanced, not as a temporary expedient during the war, but “in terms of long-range policy,” as a policy for the post-war.

The idea of class peace was not confined to Canada alone by the L.P.P. leaders but to the entire world:

“The great coalition between the U.S.S.R. and the capitalist democracies is the highest expression of the world wide class alliance brought into being by the war. This class alliance and the continued cooperation of the socialist and democratic states will be the instrument for an orderly unfolding of a great democratic political transition in the old world.” TIM BUCK. (*Depression or Prosperity*, p. 11.)

To proceed to the fifth point:

*It has exchanged the theory of growing class antagonisms for the petty bourgeois fairy tale about the “democratization of capital.”*

In this connection consider the following:

“Herridge’s speeches mirror a large and important sentiment in favor of democratic progress within the Conservative Party.” TIM BUCK. (*A Democratic Front for Canada*, p. 14.)

“The speech of Mr. Herridge at the Tory convention represents the sentiments of a section of progressive Conservatives who can and should become part of the great line-up of democratic forces in Canada.” SAM CARR. (*Ibid.*, p. 7.)

“It is therefore in the interests of the working class and other sections of the population, including the enlightened capitalists, to oppose policies of wage cutting and advocate policies leading to higher incomes.” W. KASHTON, executive secretary to the National Executive. (*National Affairs*, Aug. 1944, p. 153.)

“But what will be the nature of all this planning? It will be essentially and fundamentally an agreement between the more far sighted sections of monopoly capital, who recognize the need of such control and state intervention to make capitalism work, and the working class and progressive-democratic forces of the nation.” STEWART SMITH. (*National Affairs*, June 1944, p. 74.)

“National unity means unity of everyone in the nation under the banner of democracy. Democracy means homes, jobs, rehabilitation, freedom of speech, and better education.” SAM CARR. (*The P.A. (Pacific Advocate)* Sept. 22, 1945.)

“Is it possible to achieve national unity in Canada for the carrying through of such policies? (Policies of economic expansion, raising of the standards of life of a thousand million people and a higher political stage in the world as a whole. – F.M.) Indeed it is. One of the best pieces of evidence to show that it is possible is to be seen in the changing tone and character of opinions expressed by many leading spokesmen of the capitalist class.” TIM BUCK. (*Unity or Chaos*, p. 25.)

The above quotations graphically depict how the L.P.P. leaders have replaced the Marxian theory of “growing class antagonisms” by the theory of the big capitalists becoming “democratic,” “far sighted,” “enlightened” and “progressive,” i.e., “the democratization of capital.”

We shall now take point six:

*In place of the theory of the inevitability of war under capitalism it has substituted the bourgeois deceit of pacifism and the lying propaganda of "ultra-imperialism."*

We shall now review the position taken by the L.P.P. leaders:

"If anybody cares to study the magnificent panorama laid open to mankind by the agreements of Teheran and the Crimea he will find that what it really amounts to is an agreement between three leaders of world democracy that henceforth their aim and objective must be to maintain peace by making the years which follow this war The Epoch of the Abolition of Poverty." TIM BUCK. (*The Crimea Decisions and Your Future*, p. 8.)

So! Henceforth British and American Imperialism, according to Buck, are going to maintain peace by making the post war years "The Epoch of the Abolition of Poverty," a slogan coined by Buck himself. Imperialism is not only going to maintain peace but abolish poverty. Here we have the theory of ultra-imperialism in all its nakedness and advanced by the National leader of a supposed Communist movement. But to continue:

"We can make our nation a conscious partner in the galaxy of democratic peoples marching through victory to a prosperous peace and through prosperity in the peace to a richer, better world envisaged in the historic agreement consummated at Teheran." TIM BUCK. (*National Affairs*, April, 1944, p. 7.)

"The Teheran agreement opens up the perspective of all the productive power of the United States, Canada and Britain being put to work when the war is over, producing equipment and supplies for rebuilding the devastated cities, railway systems, industries and farms of Europe, parts of the Soviet Union, and vast areas of the Far East. It opens up a perspective in which, for the first time in history, the nations would cooperate in making good the devastation of a great war. It even brings forward the possibility of extending the advantages of industrial civilization to backward areas without subjecting them to Imperialist exploitation. The Teheran agreement opens up the prospect for a period of tremendous economic and political progress." (Ibid., p. 3.)

According to Buck the Imperialist powers are not only going to cooperate in the post war but industrialize the colonial countries “without subjecting them to Imperialist exploitation.” This is really “brilliant.” To continue:

“United Nations unity and collaboration can be maintained when the war is won. Peace can be preserved once the Axis power is destroyed. The twenty year treaty between Britain and the U.S.S.R. is an augury of the international relations which are possible after the war.” TIM BUCK. (*Canada in the Coming Offensive*, p. 27.)

“... Only the overthrow of Capitalism will put an end to all war;...” (*The United Front*, p. 133.)

Point seven reads as follows:

*It has exchanged the theory of the revolutionary downfall of capitalism for the counterfeit coinage of “sound” capitalism transforming itself peacefully into socialism.*

There follows the position of the L.P.P. leadership:

“Victory over the Axis... will assure the possibility of tremendous strides forward, towards the great cultural, economic and social advancement outlined in the Atlantic Charter. It will assure freedom for the national development of those peoples who have been oppressed. (No doubt Java and Indo-China are examples of such freedom. – F.M.) The people of India will be able to secure their national freedom. China will be free. Nations in which the dominant trend of political opinion is Socialist will be able to translate their opinions into action.” TIM BUCK. (*Canada in the Coming Offensive*, p. 27.)

“... This mighty democratic upsurge marks a tremendous forward step. It will bring lasting benefits to the majority of the people, however, only if, out of it, there is developed a unified political movement of progressive workers, farmers and middle class people who can guide that movement steadily forward in a struggle to elect farmer-labor governments and finally a government that will establish Socialism in Canada.” TIM BUCK (*Victory through Unity*, p. 56.)

So “progressive” workers, farmers and middle class people are going to “elect” a “government that will establish Socialism in Canada.”

Speaking of the Teheran agreement, Buck stated:

“This class alliance and the continued cooperation of socialist and democratic capitalist states will be the instrument for an orderly unfolding of a great democratic political transition in the old world.” (*Depression or Prosperity*, p. 11.)

In addition to the above, the writings of Buck and other L.P.P. leaders are replete with statements which although they do not frankly forecast “capitalism transforming itself peacefully into Socialism” in so many words, nevertheless make that inference. For instance, we get such statements as: “The Teheran agreement opens up the prospect for a period of tremendous economic and political progress.” As a variation we get:

“It will be the sacred duty of all men and women who crave for peace and social progress to strive to maintain the largest possible measure of national unity in support of continued unity of the United Nations. Such unity can be the guarantee of a lasting peace, collective security and orderly social progress after victory has been achieved.” TIM BUCK. (*Unity or Chaos*, p. 14.)

From the above it is clear that Buck claimed that national unity which he described as cooperation between labor and a decisive section of the capitalist class, and international unity would guarantee lasting peace, collective security and orderly social progress. Following Teheran the “prospect” became “tremendous political progress” as a result of that “diplomatic agreement” as Duclos termed it.

#### **TO ABOLISH CAPITALISM BECOMES CONTRARY TO THE INTERESTS OF THE “WORKING CLASS”**

Ironically enough the Party which termed itself “The Party of scientific socialism” became one of the principal opponents of the very idea of establishing socialism in Canada. Consider these statements from the leadership of a Party that professes to have as its objective, Socialism:

“Establishment of socialism is not an immediate issue in Canada; it will not be in the immediate post war period. Certain specific objective conditions must exist to make the question of socialism an immediate issue and they do not as yet exist in Canada.” TIM BUCK. (*Unity or Chaos*, p. 35.)

“Any honest appraisal of the situation which exists today compels recognition of the fact that capitalist economy has expanded tremendously and uninterruptedly throughout the past five years and the prospect is for further considerable development after the war. The overwhelming majority of Canada’s people support this economic system and it will unquestionably continue to prevail in the post-war years. In the face of these facts it would be dishonest to suggest that we can determine what sort of economic system we shall live under after the war. Objective forces have decided that for us.” TIM BUCK. (*The Crimea Decisions*, p. 8.)

“There is no objective basis for any suggestion that conditions, objective and subjective, in Canada will be such as to make it possible to abolish the profit system here in the immediate post war period.” TIM BUCK. (*National Affairs*, April, 1944, p. 4.)

“To support policies in accord with the Teheran agreement means to accept the prospect that capitalist relationships will continue in Canada in the post war years.” (Ibid.)

The only kind of sense the above petty-bourgeois sophisms contain, from a Marxist viewpoint, is nonsense. First, Buck states that Socialism is not an immediate issue because “certain specific objective conditions” “do not as yet exist in Canada.” The very fact that Canadian capitalism long ago reached the monopoly stage, the stage of Imperialism, created the prerequisites, the objective conditions, which places the question of Socialism on the order of the day. And even though Canada had not advanced economically to the point it has, during the period of world Imperialism the question of Socialism would still be on the order of the day because:

“Formerly, it was customary to talk of the existence or absence of objective conditions for the proletarian revolution in individual countries, or, to be more exact, in this or that advanced country. This point of view is now inade-

quate. Now we must say that objective conditions for the revolution exist throughout the whole system of imperialist world economy, which is an integral unit; the existence within this system of some countries that are not sufficiently developed from the industrial point of view cannot form an insurmountable obstacle to the revolution, if the system as a whole has become, or more correctly, because the system as a whole has become ripe for the revolution.” STALIN. (*Foundations of Leninism*, pp. 33-34.)

And forty years ago Lenin wrote: “The conditions for Socialism in Europe have reached not a certain degree of maturity, but are already mature.” (*Two Tactics*, p. 69.)

So Lenin pointed out the conditions for Socialism were mature in Europe, but forty years later Buck claims such conditions do not yet exist in Canada.

But having presented his “objective conditions” theory against the possibility of achieving Socialism, Buck goes further and states that: “I would be dishonest to suggest that we can determine what sort of economic system we shall live under after the war. Objective forces have decided that for us.” So! Objective conditions, i.e., the level of development of productive forces, decide whether or not Socialism is realizable. This theory is almost identical with that of Kautsky regarding the “level of productive forces” of whom Stalin wrote:

“... Did anybody betray the working class? Oh, no! Everything was as it should have been. In the first place the (2nd) International is an “instrument of peace,” and not of war. Besides, in view of the ‘level of productive forces’ which then prevailed, it was impossible to do anything else. And so the ‘blame’ is thrown on ‘productive forces.’ This is precisely the explanation vouchsafed ‘us’ by Mr. Kautsky’s ‘productive forces’ ‘theory.’ Whoever does not believe in this ‘theory’ is not a Marxist. The role of the Parties? Their part in the movement? But what could a Party do against so decisive a factor as the ‘level of productive forces?’ A host of similar examples of such falsification of Marxism could be quoted.

“It is hardly necessary to prove that this spurious Marxism which is intended to hide the nakedness of oppor-

tunism, is only a European adaptation of that theory of 'tailism' which Lenin fought even before the first Russian revolution.

"It is hardly necessary to prove that the elimination of this theoretical falsification is a prerequisite for the creation of truly revolutionary parties in the west." STALIN. (Ibid., p. 31.)

But Buck does not confine his argument against Socialism to objective conditions, but goes further when he states: "Conditions objective and subjective" are such that "there is no objective basis for any suggestion to make it possible" "to abolish the profit system here in the immediate post war period."

Here we have a truly formidable array of "objective and subjective" conditions aligned by Buck against the possibility of achieving Socialism. Actually, however, Buck's alignment of both objective and subjective conditions against the possibility of achieving Socialism in the near future is nothing more nor less than the old "theory" of spontaneity of which Stalin wrote:

"The 'theory' of spontaneity is the theory of opportunism. It is the theory of deference to the spontaneity of the labor movement, the theory that actually denies to the vanguard of the working class, to the Party of the working class, its leading role.

"The theory of deference to spontaneity is decidedly opposed to the revolutionary character of the labour movement; it is opposed to the movement following the line of struggle against the foundations of capitalism and is in favor of the movement following exclusively the line of 'possible' demands which are 'acceptable' to and can be carried out under capitalism. It is wholly in favour of the 'line of least resistance.' The theory of spontaneity represents the ideology of trade unionism.

"The theory of deference to spontaneity is decidedly opposed to giving the spontaneous movement a conscious, methodical character. It is opposed to the Party marching ahead of the working class, elevating the masses to the level of class consciousness and leading the movement..." (Ibid., p. 29.)



What are the subjective forces or conditions in the struggle for Socialism which Buck referred to? Obviously the subjective forces are the working class and its allies. And if the subjective forces are not yet ready for Socialism then it is the duty of a Marxist Party to further their development for “the Party to march ahead of the working class” as Stalin stated. Compare Buck’s attitude towards the level of development of the subjective forces with that of Dimitroff:

“Waging a decisive struggle against any reliance on spontaneity, we take account of the process of development of the revolution, not as passive observers, but as active participants in the process. As a Party of revolutionary action – fulfilling at every stage of the movement the tasks that are in the interests of the revolution, the tasks that correspond to the specific conditions at each stage, and soberly taking into consideration the political level of the wide mass of the working people – we accelerate more than in any other way, the creation of the subjective preconditions necessary for the victory of the proletarian revolution.” (*The United Front*, p. 140.)

Whereas Buck informs the working class that subjective conditions do not make possible even the “suggestion” that Socialism can be realized in the immediate post war years, Dimitroff points out that a Marxist Party “accelerates” “the creation of the subjective preconditions” as active participants. Clearly we have here two entirely different viewpoints of the problem of “subjective conditions.”

Instead of utilizing the theory of Socialism as a means of mobilizing the working people for the achievement of Socialism such an attitude does the very opposite. Consider the true Marxian position on the utilization of theory to “change the world:”

“The strength and vitality of Marxism-Leninism are derived from the fact that it relies upon an advanced theory which correctly reflects the needs of development of the natural life of society that it elevates theory to a proper level, and that it deems it its duty to utilize every ounce of the mobilizing, organizing and transforming power of this theory.” STALIN. (*Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, p. 24.)

Thus we see how, instead of utilizing Marxian theory to “transform” society, Marxian theory is perverted to “prove” that “objective and subjective conditions” “do not make it possible to change the profit system in the immediate post war years.” But Buck goes still further and tells us that:

“... A large number of people... try to leap over the immediate problems which confront the democratic movement and assume that the immediate post war issue will be that of abolishing Capitalism. Such an attitude, today, is contrary to the interests of the working class.” (*National Affairs*, April, 1944, pp. 4-5.)

Precisely! To assume that the abolition of Capitalism should be an issue “in the immediate post war” is “contrary to the interests of the working class” according to the leadership of the L.P.P. The Communist movement which came into being for the express purpose of the abolition of capitalism, through its leadership now informs the workers that “to assume” that the immediate post war issue is the abolition of capitalism “is contrary to the interest of the working class.” Such are the fruits of the revision of Marxism.

### EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION

Point eight states:

*It has replaced revolution by evolution*

In this connection we get the following:

“From the dawn of human history, all property relations and state forms have been subject to historical evolution and change consequent upon the evolution in historical conditions.” (Program of the L.P.P., p. 36.)

This apparently innocuous statement is then further elaborated:

“The fundamental issues which will confront the Canadian people when, in their majority, they decide to establish socialism will be the restoration of the industries and resources from which they have been alienated by the monopolists, to their rightful owners – the Canadian people – as public, Socialist property. Such a fundamental transformation of society will come about as the result of the evo-

lution and historical change in the march forward of the Canadian people. It can take place only by the will of the majority of the people.” (Ibid., pp. 37-38.)

Here again we have a “bowing to spontaneity.” When “the Canadian people” in their majority “decide to establish Socialism” it “will come about as the result of the evolution and historical change in the march forward of the Canadian people.” Here indeed is a “clear and unequivocal” explanation of how Socialism is to be achieved “as the result of evolution and historical change.” And this nonsensical phrase mongering is palmed off as Marxism.

Let us now consider the real Marxian position on the question of the “fundamental transformation of society” from Capitalism to Socialism and the role of evolution:

“Up to a certain period the development of the productive forces and the changes in the realm of the relations of production proceed spontaneously, independently of the will of men. But that is so only up to a certain moment, until the new and developing productive forces have reached a proper state of maturity.

“After the new productive forces have matured, the existing relations of production and their upholders – the ruling classes – become that ‘insuperable’ obstacle which can only be removed by the conscious action of the new classes, by the forcible acts of these classes, by revolution. Here there stands out in bold relief the tremendous role of new social ideas, of new political institutions, of a new political power, whose mission it is to abolish by force the old relations of production. Out of the conflict between the new productive forces and the old relations of production, out of the new economic demands of society there arise new social ideas; the new ideas organize and mobilize the masses; the masses become welded into a new political army, create a new revolutionary power, and make use of it to abolish by force the old system of relations of production, and firmly to establish the new system. The spontaneous process of development yields place to the conscious actions of men, peaceful development to violent upheaval, evolution by revolution.” STALIN. (*Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, pp. 43-44.)

Thus we see how the leadership of the L.P.P., in the Party's official program, has substituted for the Marxian theory of the Proletarian Revolution the Social Democratic theory of evolution.

To proceed to point nine:

*It has replaced... the destruction of the bourgeois State by its active upbuilding.*

The following statements by the L.P.P. leaders are worthy of consideration in this connection:

"... State policy after the war, as during the war can achieve very great results in making the system work, and it is essential that the working class should support such a policy. But this can only have meaning when understood as an agreement between labor and the decisive sections of monopoly capital." STEWART SMITH. (*National Affairs*, June, 1944, p. 74.)

"Maintain the right of the provinces in matters pertaining to religion, education, control of natural resources, supervision of municipal affairs and civil rights, while granting the Dominion government extended jurisdiction in matters pertaining to social legislation, restriction of monopolies and national action to maintain production." (*Federal Election Program of the L.P.P.*, p. 27.)

"The department of External Affairs must be elevated to a full Ministry of the Government headed by a Minister of Foreign Affairs." (*Ibid.*, p. 30.)

"We should extend full diplomatic representation to all countries with which Canada maintains trade and diplomatic relations." (*Ibid.*)

On April 20, 1944, Fred Rose (since the election of 1945, sole L.P.P. member in the Federal Parliament) participated in the debate on Canadian State policy in connection with air transit rights for foreign commercial air lines in the post war. Said Rose:

"Freedom of air transit, as defined by the minister in his statement, gives away the geographical advantages which Canada possesses without getting any advantages for us in return which are of practical use."

After quoting the statement of the Minister, in which he, the Minister, proposed freedom of transit for foreign commercial lines crossing Canada, Rose objected:

“If this means anything, it means that Canada gets nothing useful in return for granting freedom of air transit, while countries like the United Kingdom and the United States will get very real benefits. Why should we give up this right so cheaply? What we should do is to grant this right in return for a very concrete quid pro quo, for example, from the United States some integration of the air-craft manufacturing industries in the two countries by which Canada may be guaranteed an outlet for certain definite types of planes which we can make here, plus the right for us to pick up and deliver in the United States traffic to and from the West Indies; from England, the benefits of cheap air mail rates to Empire destinations; from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, reciprocal landing and freight traffic rights on trans-polar routes.” (*National Affairs*, June, 1944, pp. 78-79.)

How touching! Rose’s concern for “advantages for us,” “rights for us to pick up and deliver,” and of securing “rights for us” from the Soviet Union before permitting the planes of that worker’s state to fly over the waste lands of Canada’s polar North is indeed pathetic. His complaint was that the Canadian bourgeoisie were not driving a hard enough bargain in view of the “geographical advantages which Canada possesses” and therefore he felt it incumbent upon himself to tell them, as he did, that:

“It is quite within the realm of full international collaboration for us to ask for and expect to get some usable advantage, such as those just described, in return for making our airfields and services available to the air lanes of other nations.” (*Ibid.*, p. 79.)

All of which is reminiscent of Lenin’s statement that “Practise has shown that the active people in the working class movement who adhere to the opportunist trend are better defenders of the bourgeoisie, than the bourgeoisie itself.”

Buck was also gravely concerned regarding state policy, but in connection with trade agreements. Said Buck:

“Important as Empire trade will be to Canada after the war, Imperial preferences can be only secondary to the broader aim of a tremendous expansion of world trade in general.” (Ibid., p. 70-71.)

### THE THEORY OF COALITION WITH THE BOURGEOISIE

To proceed to point ten of the indictment of Social Democracy for its revision of Marxian theory:

*It has replaced the theory of proletarian dictatorship with the theory of coalition with the bourgeoisie.*

Did the leadership of the L.P.P. advocate coalition with the bourgeoisie? Let the reader peruse the following authoritative statements of L.P.P. policy:

“Is the Labor movement going to work for a class alliance of labor and the liberal sections of the bourgeoisie in Canada in conformity with the general world alliance which is taking shape, or are we going to allow the growing, increasingly consistent, defeatist splitting line of the Coldwell-Lewis-Scott leadership of the C.C.F. to pass itself off as the expression of working class interest and opinion?” TIM BUCK. (*National Affairs*, Oct., 1944, p. 200.)

“The main popular base around which a democratic coalition, which will give labor direct representation in the government and isolate the anti-Teheran Tories, can be established is Mackenzie King and the masses of genuine reform Liberals who support him.” (Ibid.)

So! The leader of Buck’s coalition between labor and the bourgeoisie was to be none other than Prime Minister McKenzie King himself.

In Quebec politics the L.P.P. line was the same:

“Responsibility for deciding the course of events in Quebec rests with the Liberal bourgeoisie and the labor movement: by introducing measures and advancing policies which will help to overcome national inequalities, they can draw into the democratic camp great masses of nationalist supporters and thereby isolate the enemies of the people.

“The fight for democratic labor and wage policies at Quebec can only be waged with success as part of the struggle for a labor democratic unity that will include the liberals...” STANLEY RYERSON. (*National Affairs*, May, 1944, pp. 36-37.)

“In my own province of Quebec my party is strongly advocating a coalition of the forces of Labor and the Liberals in the coming provincial election; for this is the only way to fight and beat the pro-fascist and anti-war conspiracies engineered by the Tory Duplessis and the misleaders of the Bloc Populaire. The political struggle in Quebec has crystallized to the point where thinking people will understand that Labor must exert its maximum efforts to influence and unite with the Liberals to safeguard and advance Labor’s political and economic gains.” FRED ROSE, M.P. (*National Affairs*, July, 1944, p. 100.)

And in Ontario:

“As the days go by there are reasons for thinking that the positive, realistic idea that economic growth in Ontario, conversion to peacetime production and expanding markets, coupled with the lifting and maintenance of wage standards, greater civil rights and provincial and national measures of social reform, is gaining ground among the workers and among the supporters of the C.C.F. Such a policy is one that leads to the strengthening of the labor movement and its greater participation in politics through its own independent political action in cooperation with the governments and the employers.” LESLIE MORRIS. (*National Affairs*, April, 1944, p. 10.)

Just so! During this “new epoch” labor achieves “independent political action” by means of “cooperation with the governments and the employers.” In other words, class collaboration is now sugar-coated and termed “independent political action.” In the hands of the revisionists, English words are defined as meaning the exact opposite to what they actually do mean. But to quote two more expressions of L.P.P. policy:

“We appealed to all sections of labor, including the C.C.F., to understand that the election of a bloc of C.C.F.,

L.P.P. and independent labor men to the House of Commons would be of great value to the people only if this group undertakes to take part in government, by entering a coalition with the Liberal Party, the one capitalist party still amendable to progressive pressure of the masses.” SAM CARR. (*National Affairs*, Sept., 1944, p. 174.)

“I believe that to win the peace, the great forces of Canadian democracy must unite to give Canada the government and policy that Canadians are fighting for.

“I believe these forces are to be found in two places above all:

“Among the Liberals, led by the Prime Minister, who have organized the war effort and who best express the Capitalist interests who now realize they can democratically solve their problems only in cooperation with labor;

“Among labor, which embraces the great working population, and forms the great popular basis for victory in the war and progress in the peace.” TIM BUCK. (*National Affairs*, July, 1944. p. 98.) Buck continues:

“Elect a Liberal-Labor Coalition government, based on cooperation with all the anti-fascist elements in our population.

“Such a government could expand production and provide jobs and social security, and cooperate with the United Nations to outlaw war and aggression.

“To this end, labor must assert itself in political matters, in a united manner, to achieve this great collaboration and to make possible the winning of the conditions for which our armed forces are storming the Fortress of Europe.

“I call on Canadian Labor and all democrats to chart such a course, and do our duty by the fighting sons and daughters of Canada.

“Everything for the Liberation Front!

“A Liberal-Labor Coalition to make Canada worthy of our Heroes!” (Ibid.)

Here we have as complete a revision of Marxian theory as it is probably possible to find in a few short paragraphs. First of all, according to Buck, the Capitalists “now realize” they “can solve their



problems,” i.e., the contradictions of capitalism, i.e., “make capitalism work,” through cooperation with labor. A very interesting statement for a professed Marxist.

Secondly, if labor and the Capitalist Liberal Party would only jointly form a federal government, such a government “could expand production” and “provide jobs and social security.” This also is quite interesting.

Thirdly, Buck “calls on Canadian labor” to “achieve this great collaboration.” In so many words Buck publicly advocates class collaboration which he promises will give the workers “jobs and social security.”

Fourthly, Buck invokes the esteem in which those in the armed forces are held to help put over his policy of class collaboration by telling the Canadian working class it is their “duty” to “the fighting sons and daughters of Canada” to practise class collaboration.

Thus, on the basis of their own statements we see how the leadership of the L.P.P. “replaced the theory of proletarian dictatorship by the theory of coalition with the bourgeoisie.”

Point eleven states:

*It has replaced the doctrine of international proletarian solidarity by preaching defense of the imperialist fatherland.*

In connection with this point the reader should consider the following statements:

“Our first loyalty has been, is, and will always be, to the true national interests of our country – Canada. We are a product of Canadian democracy.” TIM BUCK. (*Canada Needs a Party of Communists*, p. 20.)

“The next parliament of Canada must have a majority who stand for this policy of true Canadian greatness; who will be bold and progressive and not afraid to enact far-reaching reforms; who will unite regardless of partisanship to form a government of National Unity.” (*Federal Election Program of the L.P.P.*, p. 6.)

“Our country’s war effort has been magnificent both in men and materials. We have built up a mighty production machine in the cities and on the farms. The conditions for achieving in Canada a real People’s Peace are ready to our

hand, provided we learn the lesson that the price of National greatness is National Unity.”

In other words Buck is telling the Canadian working class that Canada, which already is a ranking Imperialist power, could become a still greater Imperialist power (“National greatness”) if only the working class would “learn the lesson that the price of National greatness is national unity,” i.e., that if only the working class will agree to class collaboration then “national greatness,” or a really powerful Canadian Imperialism can be achieved.

Compare this attitude with the following estimate:

“Hence the development of Capitalism, and particularly the imperialist epoch of its development, reproduces the fundamental contradictions of capitalism on an increasingly magnified scale. Competition among small capitalists ceases, only to make way for competition among big capitalists; where competition among big capitalists subsides, it flares up between gigantic combinations of capitalist magnates and their governments; local and national crises become transformed into crises affecting a number of countries, and, subsequently, into world crises; local wars give way to wars between coalitions of States and to world wars; the class struggle changes from isolated actions by single groups of workers into nation-wide conflicts and, subsequently, into an international struggle of the world proletariat against the world bourgeoisie. Finally, two main revolutionary forces are organizing against the organized might of finance capital – on the one hand – the workers in the capitalist States – on the other hand the victims of the oppression of foreign capital, the masses of the people in the colonies, marching under the leadership and the hegemony of the international revolutionary proletarian movement.

“However, this fundamental revolutionary tendency is temporarily paralyzed by the fact that certain sections of the European, North American and Japanese proletariat are bribed by the imperialist bourgeoisie and by the treachery of the national bourgeoisie in the semi-colonial and colonial countries who are scared by the revolutionary mass movement. The bourgeoisie in imperialist countries, able to secure additional surplus profits from the position it holds

in the world market (more developed technique, export of capital to countries with a higher rate of profit, etc.), and from the proceeds of its plunder of the colonies and semi-colonies, was able to raise the wages of its 'own' workers out of these surplus profits, thus giving these workers an interest in the development of 'home' capitalism, in the plunder of the colonies and in being loyal to the imperialist State.

"This systematic bribery was and is being very widely practised in the most powerful imperialist countries and finds most striking expression in the ideology and practise of the labor aristocracy and the bureaucratic strata of the working class, i.e., the social-democratic and trade union leaders, who proved to be direct agents of bourgeois influence among the proletariat and stalwart pillars of the capitalist system." *Program of the C.I. (Handbook of Marxism*, pp. 970-71.)

#### **BOURGEOIS IDEALISM VERSUS DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM**

Point twelve of the indictment of those who revised and betrayed Marxian theory reads:

*For Marxian dialectical materialism it has substituted the idealist philosophy.*

The substitution of idealist philosophy for the materialist philosophy of Marxism, dialectical materialism, is expressed throughout the writings of the L.P.P. leadership. In fact, the revision of Marxism generally could not be achieved without abandoning dialectical materialism and substituting idealism. We will consider some examples from official statements of L.P.P. leaders over a ten-year period:

"We have commenced active propaganda for the building up of the United Front of all progressive forces of the Canadian people in lasting form through the transformation of the C.C.F. into a broad federated people's party." STEWART SMITH, 1935. (*Towards a Canadian People's Front*, pp. 19-20.)

The formulation "united front of all progressive forces" is a substitution of idealism for dialectical materialism and is complete-

ly at variance with the 7th Congress of the C.I. at which Dimitroff called for “a united front of the working class.”

Here we have a political concept not based on a materialistic conception of society as being a class society in which the only consistently progressive force is that class which has the historic task of taking political power and introducing a new and higher social order, Socialism, which is the working class. No! Instead of a materialist conception of the progressive forces being class forces, namely, the working class and its natural allies – the semi-proletarian sections of the urban middle class and of the farmers – we have an idealist division of the population into progressive and reactionary forces regardless of their class position. A division based on the ideas which individuals may temporarily hold or profess to hold on a specific issue. No consideration is given here to the fact that:

“... The main feature of the capitalist system is a most acute class struggle between the exploiters and the exploited.” STALIN. (*Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, p. 38.)

This concept of a “united front of all progressive forces” is the very opposite of the concept a Marxist should have:

“The practical activity of the party of the proletariat must not be based on the good wishes of ‘outstanding individuals,’ not on the dictates of ‘reason,’ ‘universal morals,’ etc., but on the laws of development of society and on the study of these laws.” STALIN. (*Ibid.*, p. 19.)

But to continue with other examples:

“The organization of a broad all-inclusive movement for the defense of peace is one of the most urgent tasks of the progressive people. Such a peace movement must embrace a far wider circle of organizations than the purely political labor organizations and the League of Nations Society. The trade union movement, the church, farm movements and, in many places, business men’s organizations, can be mobilized under the banner of the four points of the Cecil Program and the slogans of the Brussels Conference in the fight for peace. The Canadian League Against War and Fascism remains a very important lever of the progres-

sive movement, for this task must be strengthened and extended. It can only play its rightful role, however, when it is energetically utilized by the whole progressive movement as the main channel to a genuine mass movement against the menace of war.” TIM BUCK, 1937. (*The Road Ahead*, p. 32.)

As the above quotations show as far back as 1935, the Canadian self-styled “Marxists” had replaced materialism with idealism, had substituted for “the class struggle of the proletariat” and for the working class movement the “progressive movement.” This idealism was actually an attempt to link the working class movement with the church, the petty bourgeoisie and the liberal bourgeoisie. This becomes clearer in the following statement:

“On the other hand it is possible for the progressive forces to develop and bring before the people a program of demands which will satisfy their most urgent need...

“Such a program must provide the basis for joint action of all sections of the labor movement, the U.F.A. (United Farmers of Alberta), the Social Credit movement, the trade unions, the C.L.P., the C.C.F. and the Communist Party and even sincere progressives from the ranks of the capitalist parties.” TIM BUCK. (*Ibid.*, p. 50.)

So! In this philosophical idealism Buck wishes to unite “sincere progressives from the ranks of the capitalist parties” with the Communists and the labor movement.

Instead of a Marxian dialectical approach we get a bourgeois metaphysical one. Compare Buck’s position with the following:

“In order not to err in policy, one must pursue an uncompromising proletarian class policy, not a reformist policy of harmony of the interests of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie not a compromiser’s policy of ‘the growing of capitalism into socialism’.” STALIN. (*Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, p. 14.)

While Stewart Smith speaks of all progressive forces of the Canadian people Buck refers to the progressive movement and progressive people. This idealistic, non-Marxian concept of the people

was castigated by Lenin forty years ago when he stated that his Party had:

“... Justly fought and continues to fight against the bourgeois democratic abuse of the word ‘people.’ It demands that this word shall not be used to cover up a failure to understand the significance of class antagonisms. It absolutely insists on the need for complete class independence for the Party of the proletariat. But it divides the ‘people’ into ‘classes,’ not in order that the advanced class may become self-centered, or confine itself to narrow aims and restrict its activity so as not to frighten the economic masters of the world, but in order that the advanced class, which does not suffer from the half-heartedness, vacillation and indecision of the intermediate classes, shall with all the greater energy and enthusiasm fight for the cause of the whole of the people, at the head of the whole of the people.” (*Two Tactics*, p. 948.)

Limitations of space compel us to move forward several years for our next example:

“Contrary to class collaboration policies, national unity is the policy by which the class interests of the working class as a whole will be served, by cooperation with the democratic circles of all classes and all sections of the Canadian people including a decisive section of the capitalist class in carrying through the economic and political measures which alone will ensure continual democratic progress and without which there is the gravest danger that fascist minded elements will come to power.” TIM BUCK, 1944. (*Unity or Chaos*, p. 21.)

In the above example we get “democratic circles of all classes” and “including a decisive section of the capitalist class” with whom the working class must “cooperate” to “ensure continual democratic progress.” In contradistinction to these “democratic circles of all classes” we get “fascist minded elements.”

In comparison to this attempt to present class collaboration as a virtue and based on the idealistic division of society into “democratic circles” and “fascist minded elements” consider the following:

“In order not to err in policy, in order not to find itself in the position of idle dreamers, the party of the proletariat must not base its activities on abstract ‘principles of human reason,’ but on the concrete conditions of the material life of society, as the determining force of social development; not on the good wishes of ‘great men,’ but on the real needs of development of the material life of society.” STALIN. (*Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, p. 21.)

Idealism rather than Marxian Materialism probably reached its peak in the following gem of L.P.P. policy:

“Labor must with single minded purpose join hands with the employers and all patriotic forces to subordinate all ideological, political, class and religious differences and weld stronger national unity to win the war and lay the foundation for the winning of the peace through the continuation of that national unity.” Editorial. (*National Affairs*, June, 1944, p. 66.)

So the working class is “to subordinate its ideology, its political and class differences” in order to practise class collaboration not only to win the war but to win the peace also through subordinating its interests to “the employers” “through continuation of national unity” in the post war, i.e., through continuation of class collaboration. And having presented this petty bourgeois, idealistic rubbish, this complete betrayal of working class interests and of Marxism, the L.P.P. leadership then tells the working class:

“We are the Party which, guided by scientific socialist understanding, helps guide the working class movement in the fulfillment of its tasks in the struggle for progress.” TIM BUCK. (*Unity or Chaos*, p. 46.)

The same theme is reiterated over a year later, at the August 1945, National Committee meeting of the L.P.P., this time substituting the term “National Front” for “National Unity” as follows:

“The political content of the post war struggle to maintain a national front will be expressed in the fact that it, also, must be based upon proposals which democratic Canadians can support regardless of class, religion or present po-

litical affiliation.” TIM BUCK. (*The L.P.P. and Post War Canada*, p. 16.)

What kind of political proposals would be those that could be supported by Canadians regardless of class or political affiliations? Could anyone who accepted the Marxist materialist concept of society adopt such a position? According to Buck his “national front” is to be based upon political proposals that can be supported “regardless of class or political affiliations” by all “democratic” Canadians. Buck goes further:

“Finally, while victory is now certain, and will come soon, it does not mean that we should immediately revert to the tactics usually referred to as ‘class against class.’ That would be entirely wrong.” (Ibid., p. 35.)

Just so! For this “Marxist Party of the working class” to adopt policies based upon the independent class interests of the workers in opposition to the interests of the Capitalists “would be entirely wrong.”

Compare Buck’s position with the Marxian concept:

“... The transition from Capitalism to Socialism and the liberation of the working class from the yoke of capitalism cannot be effected by slow changes, by reforms, but only by a qualitative change of the Capitalist system, by revolution.

“Hence, in order not to err in policy, one must be a revolutionary, not a reformist.

“Further, if development proceeds by way of the disclosure of internal contradictions, by way of collisions between opposite forces on the basis of these contradictions and so as to overcome these contradictions, then it is clear that the class struggle of the proletariat is a quite natural and inevitable phenomenon.

“Hence we must not cover up the contradictions of the capitalist system, but disclose and unravel them; we must not try to check the class struggle but carry it to its conclusion.” STALIN. (*Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, p. 14.)

Or compare Buck’s position with that of Lenin:

“The proletariat seeks its salvation not by avoiding the class struggle, but by developing it, by extending its scope,



its own class consciousness, organization and determination.” (*Two Tactics* p. 94.)

### THE CRUMBS OF RELIGION

We shall now proceed to the thirteenth and last point of the indictment of Social Democracy:

*And it is now engaged in picking up the crumbs of religion that fall from the table of the bourgeoisie.*

Here we present a few of the crumbs:

“... The first systematic and consistent efforts to assist the needy poor, to prevent usury, to curb exploitation, to regulate markets and establish just and mutually acceptable relationships between master and man during the feudal era, were supported by the Catholic Church and its various organizations, on the basis of the Catholic conception of the universal brotherhood of man and the dignity of human life. We Communists seek the universal brotherhood of man also, and we strive to safeguard the dignity and freedom of human life.” TIM BUCK. (*A Democratic Front for Canada*, p. 35.)

All of which is very interesting but “slightly” at variance with a Marxian concept of the role of Catholicism “during the feudal era” as the following viewpoint shows:

“On the one hand, the ravages of the Northmen’s invasions, the eternal wars between kings, and feuds between nobles, compelled one free peasant after another to seek the protection of some lord. Upon the other hand, the covetousness of these same lords and of the church hastened the process; by fraud, by promises, threats, violence, they forced more and more peasants and peasants’ land under their yoke. In both cases the peasants’ land was added to the lord’s manor, and was, at best, only given back for the use of the peasant in return for tribute and service. Thus the peasant, from a free owner of the land, was turned into a tribute-paying, service-rendering appendage of it, into a serf. This was the case west of the Rhine. East of the Rhine in the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries, the overwhelming power of the nobles and the church was constantly forc-

ing more and more peasants into serfdom.” FREDERICK ENGELS. (*Socialism Utopian and Scientific*, pp. 86-87.)

According to Buck the Catholic Church “during the feudal era” supported efforts to “curb exploitation” of the exploited i.e., of the peasants. According to Engels, however, the Catholic Church “was constantly forcing more and more peasants into serfdom” for the purpose of exploiting them which is the reason for and purpose of serfdom.

To continue:

“A Catholic, who really tries to carry the philosophy of the brotherhood of man into the daily activities of his life, or who strives consistently to live up to the directives issued from time to time in the Papal Encyclicals, seeks many of the things for which we Communists are fighting, because the Communist movement and the Catholic workers have numerous vital interests in common. Even today this objective common interest can be seen by a study of the declarations of the Pope on the questions of labor, labor organization and industrial relations.” TIM BUCK. (*A Democratic Front for Canada*, p. 35.)

This is very, very interesting. So the Pope’s declarations express “common interests” on questions of “labor, labor organization and industrial relations” with the Communist movement.

Buck then quotes the “impressive” words of Pope Pius XI in the encyclical of 1931 in which the Pope “characterized the outstanding feature of the present period and the trend of its development.” Buck is so impressed by the quotation that he comments as follows:

“The two foregoing paragraphs written by Pope Pius XI in his Encyclical called ‘Quadragesimo Anno,’ outline the main characteristics of modern industrialism and emphasize the driving forces which are urging capitalism to fascism and war in terms which bear a distinct resemblance to those used by the founders of the Communist movement, Marx and Engels, when they wrote the famous *Communist Manifesto* in 1847.” (Ibid., p. 36.)

And this is very, very, very interesting. What Marx and Engels did say in the opening words of the *Communist Manifesto* was as follows:

“A spectre is haunting Europe – the spectre of Communism. All the powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this spectre; Pope and Czar, Metternich and Guizot, French Radicals and German police spies.”

But according to Buck, the Pope’s declarations in Encyclicals express the common interests between Catholics and Communists and further that the Pope’s estimate of modern Capitalism bears a “distinct resemblance” to that of Marx and Engels in the *Communist Manifesto*. Buck concludes that section of his speech entitled Catholics and Communists as follows:

“We, Catholics and Communists, have much in common with each other. It is necessary that we understand each other better and work to make our Canada a better Canada for all of us.” (*A Democratic Front for Canada*, p. 37.)

### **COMMUNISM IS REPLACED BY BOURGEOIS “SOCIALIST” REFORMISM**

Thus on the basis of their own official statements of policy is graphically expressed how the leadership of the L.P.P. has revised Marxian theory on every point that the Social Democratic parties have traditionally revised Marxism. It is further shown how the L.P.P. leadership “has utterly and completely betrayed Marxism, having traversed the road from revisionism to complete liberal bourgeois reformism.” In fact the advocacy of reforms to make capitalism work has become the main stock in trade of the L.P.P. leadership. As Buck himself explains it:

“We propose to fight for national unity around such policies because it will make possible the winning of far-reaching social reforms.” (*National Affairs*, June, 1944, p. 6.)

As their own statements conclusively show, the policies of the L.P.P. leadership have nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism and Communism. On the contrary, their collective policies constitute a complete program of liberal bourgeois reformism with a win-

dow dressing of Marxian phrases. Their economic, financial, social and political reform theories have been adopted in toto from the bourgeois liberal reformers. Many of their economic and financial reform theories are taken from the British bourgeois economist, John Maynard Keynes and Morris W. Wilson, president of the Royal Bank of Canada, whom Buck commends as one of “the more far-sighted men among those who dominate Canadian economy.” The basic economic reform policy of “making capitalism work” through “state intervention” is the product of Keynes and the chief proponent of Keynes theories in North America was the late Franklin D. Roosevelt and his colleague ex-Vice President Henry Wallace whose slogan “The Century of the Common Man” Buck first adopted and later “improved upon” by coining the slogan “The epoch of the abolition of poverty.” It was not an accident that the basic line of the Liberal Party in Canada was almost identical with that of the L.P.P. Buck states:

“It is a significant thing that outside of the L.P.P. press and those papers which support the general line of democratic progress which we stand for, the only papers which came forward in a systematic way, hailing the Crimea decisions as a step forward, were Liberal papers.” (*The Crimea Decisions and Your Future*, p. 13.)

Precisely! It is significant but not in the sense Buck implies. The significance lies in the fact that “the general line of democratic progress” which Buck says “we support” is the line of bourgeois liberal reformism which the L.P.P. adopted from the liberal bourgeoisie. It was not a question of the Liberal Party and its press adopting a Marxian line but of the Canadian “Marxists” adopting a Liberal line and dressing it up in Marxian terminology.

The revision of Marxism in Canada went hand in hand with Browder’s revisionism in the U.S.A. although in some instances the Canadian revisionists anticipated and outdid Browder. The starting point of the revisionism was the abandonment of Marxian philosophical materialism and the substitution for it of bourgeois idealist philosophy, its antithesis. They completely abandoned the materialist conception of society, namely:

“That the economic structure of society always furnishes the real base, starting from which we can alone work

out the ultimate explanation of the whole superstructure of juridical and political institutions as well as of the religious, philosophical and other ideas of a given historical period.”  
FREDERICK ENGELS. (*Socialism Utopian and Scientific*, p. 51.)

For this materialist concept the Canadian “Marxists” substituted the “idealist conception of history” which, Engels stated, “knew nothing of class struggles based upon economic interests, knew nothing of economic interests.” (Ibid.)

Hence, instead of basing their tactics on the class divisions of society the L.P.P. leadership divided the Canadian population according to the ideas they professed to hold regardless of their class position or political affiliation. For example:

“All democratic forces,” “unity of progressive forces,” “the progressive movement,” “all patriotic Canadians,” or as Buck stated in August, 1945, the “National Front... must be based upon proposals which democratic Canadians can support regardless of class, religion or political affiliation.” Or as Carr placed it, “National unity means unity of everyone in the nation under the banner of democracy,” or Stewart Smith’s formulation, “Anti-fascist coalition and cooperation with the decisive sections of monopoly capital.”

In substituting idealism for materialism in their idealistic division of society into “democratic forces” and “reactionary forces” the L.P.P. leadership revised the very foundation of Marxism, the doctrine of the class struggle.

As the program of the Communist International points out, Social Democracy, the theory and practise of class collaboration or “socialist” reformism are agencies of the imperialist bourgeoisie within the working class itself.” (*Handbook of Marxism*, p. 1029.) There is a distinction between social democracy or “socialist” reformism and the various petty bourgeois political tendencies of which the C.C.F. is an example. Social democracy is a political trend within the organizations of the working class, particularly in proletarian political parties and trade unions. The C.C.F. is not and does not profess to be either a Marxian Party or a proletarian party. Both its leadership and membership are overwhelmingly drawn from the ranks of the farmers and the urban petty bourgeoisie.

Hence, the C.C.F. could not betray Marxism as it does not even profess to be a Marxian Party and is not a proletarian party.

Hence, it follows that the foremost social democratic party of Canada, the Party which does profess to be a Marxian Party, which does have a majority of working class membership, the Party which has betrayed Marxism, is the Labor Progressive Party.

Since Canada is not a fascist country, thanks to the military defeat of fascism in the war just ended in which the working class of practically all countries played a self-sacrificing role in achieving that defeat, the leadership of the Labor Progressive Party has a perfect right to promote "socialist" reformist theories to "make capitalism work" to be a social democratic party and promote "the theory and practise of class collaboration" under the laws of a bourgeois democratic country. However, in the eyes of the class conscious section of the working class the leadership of the L.P.P. have no right to carry out their policies of class collaboration in the honored name of Marxism-Leninism. They have no right to revise, distort, vulgarize, falsify and pervert Marxism in order to gain credence for their class collaboration policies. Marxism-Leninism, the science of the strategy and tactics of the class struggle of the working class, belongs to the entire working class. And the working class must jealously guard this science which is its chief weapon in the struggle for its emancipation and the achievement of socialism.

The tragedy is however, that the revision and perversion of Marxism by the national leadership of the Communist movement in Canada from 1935 onwards has confused, disunited and misled precisely the most advanced and class conscious sections of the working class; causing many workers to turn to the C.C.F., Social Credit, Technocracy and other petty bourgeois political trends as an alternative to the class collaborationism of what was supposed to be Marxian Communism. In addition, many members and supporters of the L.P.P. continued to support their reformist policies for a considerable period, of whom the author was one, in spite of many doubts, in the sincere belief that surely the entire national leadership of the Canadian and American Communist movements could not both be wrong and the individual himself correct in his serious doubts regarding the correctness of the policies advanced.

## FOR A MARXIST PARTY OF THE CANADIAN WORKING CLASS

It required the now famous article of Jacques Duclos to resuscitate their basically sound Marxian materialist outlook for many class conscious members and supporters of the L.P.P. to realize the degree to which they had permitted themselves to be misled and to abandon Marxism-Leninism because of their uncritical acceptance of policies and of trust in leaders who were not real leaders but misleaders and opportunists. Whether this misleadership was carried out consciously or unconsciously does not alter one iota the disastrous consequences which it has had for the working class and the cause of Socialism.

But it does confront the sincere adherents of Marxism in the ranks of the working class with the following responsibility:

“... In the struggle against Capitalism we must learn pitilessly to cast aside, pillory and hold up to general ridicule all phrase mongering, use of hackneyed formulas, pedantry and doctrinarism.

“It is necessary to learn, Comrades, to learn always, at every step in the course of the struggle, at liberty and in jail. To learn and to fight, to fight and to learn. We must be able to combine the great teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin with Stalinist firmness at work and in the struggle, with Stalinist irreconcilability on matters of principle toward the class enemy and deviators from the Bolshevik line, with Stalinist fearlessness in face of difficulties, with Stalinist revolutionary realism.” Dimitroff. (*The United Front*, p. 126.)

And one thing that the working class of Canada must learn once and for all is that the theory and practise of coalition or cooperation with the liberal bourgeoisie is the theory and practise of class collaboration regardless of how Marxism may be distorted in order to justify it.

As Dimitroff expressed it:

“An end must be put to the policy of reconciling the interests of the exploited and the exploiters.” (*The United Front*, p. 231.)

Or as Stalin has placed the question:

“Because the liberal bourgeoisie of an imperialistic country is bound to be counter-revolutionary.” (*Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, p. 233.)

Because, as Lenin stated:

“The experience of alliances, agreements and blocs with the social-reformist liberals in the West and with the liberal reformists (Constitutional-Democrats) in the Russian revolution convincingly showed that these agreements only blunt the consciousness of the masses, that they weaken rather than enhance the actual significance of their struggle by linking the fighters with the elements who are least capable of fighting and who are most vacillating and treacherous.” (*Marxism and Revisionism, Selected Works*, Vol. XI, p. 709.)

It is patently ridiculous to assume that the class interests of the working class can be served through collaboration, cooperation, coalition, or whatever similar term may be used, with that class or a section of it whose economic and political interests are diametrically opposed to those of the working class. Such policies are an attempt to reconcile the irreconcilable, exploited and exploiters.

The liberal bourgeoisie constitute that section of the capitalist class who regard reforms in attempts to bolster up the decadent capitalist system as the most suitable tactics to maintain their class rule and their so called liberalism or progressiveness is vacillating, inconsistent and unreliable as every sharp historical turn in recent years has conclusively proven. It could not be otherwise. The only consistently progressive forces in modern society, in the epoch of moribund capitalism, are those forces which stand for the complete abolition of capitalism and its replacement by a higher social order, socialism. And such forces certainly do not include the liberal bourgeoisie whose very liberalism itself is designed for the express purpose, not of abolishing capitalism, but in order to perpetuate it.

This does not mean that occasions may not arise when the liberal bourgeoisie or a section of them may support policies which the working class also support. But that is no justification for forming an alliance with the liberal bourgeoisie but rather to carry out the dictum of Lenin and recognize “the provisional character of our tactics to



‘strike together’ with the bourgeoisie and the duty to carefully watch our ‘ally’ as if he were an enemy, etc.” (*Two Tactics*, p. 72.)

Neither does the correct policy of maintaining a strictly independent class position imply that it was incorrect to regard the war just ended as a just war. It was correct for the working class to work for victory in the war. The mistake was in surrendering its independent class position and uncritically accepting and following the leadership of the liberal bourgeoisie, as a result of the misleadership given by social democratic elements within both the Canadian and American labor movement.

In this connection consider Lenin’s estimation of the liberal bourgeoisie even prior to the overthrow of semi-feudal Czarism:

“Being the ideologists of the bourgeoisie, the Liberals fully understand the advantages ensuing to the bourgeoisie from the ‘practicalness, sobriety, and serious-mindedness’ of the working class, i.e., its practically confining its activities within the limits of capitalism, reforms, trade union struggle, etc.” LENIN. (*Two Tactics*, p. 101.)

“The bourgeoisie will always be inconsistent. There is nothing more naïve and futile than attempts to set forth conditions and points, which, if satisfied, would enable us to regard bourgeois democracy as a sincere friend of the people. Only the proletariat can be a consistent fighter for democracy.” (Ibid., p. 49.)

What the working class requires above all is a capable, Marxist leadership. That is why it is necessary, nay essential, to build a Marxist party of the working class, a Communist Party, dedicated to the organization of the proletariat as a class and to the achievement of Socialism.

Why a “strictly independent class party of the working class?” Because:

“The peasantry consists of a great number of semi-proletarian as well as petty bourgeois elements. This causes it also to waver and compels the proletariat to close its ranks in a strictly class party.” LENIN. (*Two Tactics*, p. 38.)

As our examination has shown the Labor Progressive Party “has utterly and completely betrayed Marxism, having traversed the road from revisionism to complete bourgeois liberal reformism.”

Hence, the necessity of the sincere members and supporters of the L.P.P. realizing that, "... Intelligent workers must never forget that sometimes serious violations of principles occur, which make the break off of organizational relations absolutely necessary."

And a Marxist Party that will organize, educate and unite the working class in defense of its day to day interests and provide the leadership necessary for the attainment of socialism is essential because:

"Outside of Socialism there is no deliverance of humanity from wars, from hunger, from the destruction of millions and millions of human beings." LENIN.