

Daily Worker's New Version of CIO Split

By Tom Kerry

Since the campaign against Stalin was unleashed by his closest collaborators in the Soviet Union, it has become standard practice for the leaders of the American Communist Party, to shift responsibility for all the Stalinist crimes and betrayals of the working class onto the malodorous "Stalin cult." In following this course they ape the bureaucrats in the Kremlin who see in Stalin's corpse a convenient scapegoat.

Stalin's closest co-workers in the Kremlin say they did not act when the bloody tyrant was alive because they were paralyzed by fear. They knew what was going on but did not protest because they wanted to save their own skins. They were afraid — so they went along. They participated with Stalin in committing the most monstrous atrocities. But now that their erstwhile chieftain is safely ensconced in his tomb, they appear eager to confess and expose "his" crimes. In doing so they seek immunity from the wrath of the Soviet masses among whom the name of Stalin became anathema. But — while decrying Stalin's name they continue to carry on, deepen and extend, his basic policies — policies which must inevitably lead to further betrayals of the world working class movement. How is this reflected in the policy advocated by leaders of the American Communist Party?

"TAKEN IN" BY STALIN

Because they operated thousands of miles beyond the borders of the Soviet Union, the leaders of the American CP cannot use the excuse of personal cowardice. They pretend they were "taken in" by the Stalin cult. They did not criticize, they say, because they were afraid of giving aid and comfort to the "enemies" of "socialism." They slavishly followed every twist and turn of Stalinist policy because they had faith! They contributed in their own way to the building of the Stalin cult because they believed in the infallibility of Stalin. They supported every crime and participated either directly or indirectly in every betrayal. But since the Kremlin called it to their attention they are prepared to admit they were mistaken. Not

Marshall at '47 CIO Convention



The late Philip Murray (right) shown with former Secretary of State George C. Marshall, at the 1947 CIO convention in Boston. The former Army Chief-of-Staff was permitted to use the CIO's platform to propagandize for Wall Street's war preparations against the Soviet Union. This "partnership" of the labor officials with the cold-war chiefs led to the all-out witch hunt within the CIO and the expulsion of unions led by the Stalinists.

only about Stalin's crimes but some of their own.

All of this mumbo jumbo is intended to conceal the true role of the American CP as a political agency of the Kremlin. Their frantic twists and turns of the past had no relation to the needs and interests of the American working class. On the contrary, they were always ready to sacrifice the interests of the workers to the requirements of Soviet foreign policy. The formula of "coexistence," which translates into class collaboration on an international scale, still determines the basic policy of the American CP. It was first enunciated, not by Khrushchev but by Stalin.

These facts, while generally known, are first being admitted by American CP leaders. But, they hasten to add, all that is part of the past — things will be different in the future. How different? "One basic positive by-product of the post-Stalin developments," writes Stalinist "labor

expert" George Morris in the April 22 Sunday Worker, "has been a quickening of the process of Marxist independence in every land." This tune is played in every key by all CP leaders.

CP UNION POLICY

Independence, critical self-analysis and agonizing reappraisal! That is the theme song of Morris and his cohorts. As the labor movement is his special field, Morris confines his "self-criticism" to CP trade union policy. To begin with says Morris:

"I don't think it is a question of atoning for sins, although that's part of it. Primarily the problem is to look back to see if we are going on the right road ahead. My own view is that the left, particularly the Marxists within it, has been responsible for some serious mistakes in the trade union field. Most of them can be traced to a lack of independence and clinging to dogmatic formulas and doctrinaire

scriptures, when we should have grappled with the problems of REALISTICALLY applying Marxism to American life and problems."

It is first necessary to decipher this Stalinist jargon. The term "Marxist" in the above quoted passage applies to members of the CP. "Lack of independence," refers to selling out the workers whenever Kremlin policy required it. "Clinging to dogmatic formulas and doctrinaire scripture," is a new note coming as an aftermath of the open revision of Marxist theory by the recent 20th Congress. The language is identical with that used by vulgar critics and bitter enemies of Marxist doctrine.

The literature of the reformist Social Democracy, which sought to emasculate the revolutionary essence of Marx's teachings, is studded with such epithets. Lenin spent the better part of his life in irreconcilable struggle against all attempts to present Marx as a bourgeois democratic reformer. He was constantly reviled as "dogmatic" and "doctrinaire." His collected works are a veritable arsenal in defense of orthodox Marxist doctrine. And the October revolution was historical confirmation of revolutionary Marxist theory.

You will find nothing in Marx, Engels, Lenin or Trotsky to support the "coexistence" theory of Khrushchev-Stalin and their American exponents. Marx's outstanding contribution to social science was the disclosure of the class struggle as the greatest motive force in history. He affirmed that in capitalist society the exploited working class has nothing in common with its exploiters — the profit-gouging capitalist class. That the working class can emancipate itself from wage slavery only through independent class action on the economic and political field. That class collaboration was a betrayal of the struggle for socialism. That is basic Marxist doctrine!

How does Morris propose to use his newly acquired "independence" in "REALISTICALLY applying Marxism to American life and problems?" After a soul-searching reappraisal of past events he informs us that:

"A serious examination of the trend in the left, especially since World War II, I am sure, is bound to lead to the conclusion that the split in the CIO, that came to a climax in 1949 might have been avoided. The blame for the split cannot be placed entirely on Philip Murray and the CIO's right wing. For some time before the split it was apparent that the left forces — influenced strongly by the narrowness and leftism in the ranks of the Marxists — forgot that the key to the success that marked the CIO's first ten years was left-center unity.

"That unity was breached — and the left itself contributed to that breach by its narrowness, over-estimation of its strength, refusal to retreat and compromise some when that was imperative (especially on the presidential race and on the Marshall Plan)." (Morris' emphasis)

This is truly amazing — even for a Stalinist. The basis for the expulsion of the Stalinist-led CIO unions in 1949 was laid at the Portland convention which met in November after Truman was elected president with all-out CIO support. The Stalinist-led unions had supported the candidacy of Henry Wallace, running for president on the Progressive Party ticket.

Flushed with their "election victory" the CIO leaders led by Philip Murray opened a slashing attack on the Stalinists. Murray was voted dictatorial powers to "discipline" any union affiliate which failed to follow CIO policy. The central tenets of CIO policy as defined by Murray were: (1) Unqualified support of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, and (2) Support of the Democratic Party and its candidates in elections.

The Truman Doctrine unleashed the "cold war" against the Soviet Union and led directly to the "police action" in Korea and war against China. Marshall Plan funds were used as a weapon in the "cold war." Billions of American dollars were expended to bolster Wall Street's tottering imperialist allies in Europe and to aid them in retaining their grip on their insurgent colonial possessions. More billions were poured into Asia to prop up the reactionary dictator puppets of the American Big Business. The Marshall Plan was devised to save world capitalism, to stabilize capitalist rule, and to lay the ground work for World War III against the Soviet Union and its allies.

Now the "independent" Morris, in a quick glance backward, takes a pot-shot at "the left" for its "refusal to retreat and compromise" "especially on the presidential race and the Marshall Plan." To set the record straight it must be said that the Stalinists did their best to "retreat and compromise" at the 1948 CIO convention. They gave "left" support to the Marshall Plan by proposing that the fund be administered by the United Nations. They protested that the Progressive Party campaign for Wallace aided in the election of Truman. They cringed, they crawled, they retreated, they offered to compromise. But that was not enough for Philip Murray and his lieutenants. Nothing but complete and abject capitulation would have sufficed. Now, in retrospect, Morris comes to the conclusion that Philip Murray was not entirely to blame but that the "left" must share responsibility for their failure to "REALISTICALLY apply "Marxism to American life and problems."

It would be stupid to think that Morris' indulgence in the new-found luxury of "self-criticism" is a mere exercise in critical re-examination of the past. There is method to his madness. Next to the Stalin cult disclosures the thing that is most disturbing to CP members and supporters is the policy of supporting the Demo-Dixiecrat party and its candidates for public office. Morris is engaged in drawing "lessons" from the past in order to sell the Kremlin's present co-existence line to CP members and supporters.

All of the twaddle about applying Marxism "realistically" is mere window-dressing for a policy of class collaboration which violates basic Marxist doctrine. Morris and Co. are trying with might and main to cuddle up to the American trade union bureaucrats, and are prepared to sell-out the interests of the American workers one-thousand-times over to accomplish their aim. While this betrayal is cloaked in all of the paraphernalia of the new dispensation it adds up to the same old poison in new bottles.

Vishinsky Accused

(Continued from page 1)

Stalin. Having coupled its concession on the cult with the immensely popular slogan "Back to Lenin!" the Kremlin is forced to bring out Lenin's real attitude toward Stalin and the bureaucratic danger. Through this, along with genuine economic and legal concessions and reforms, Khrushchev & Co. hope to appear as continuators of Leninism, thus ridding themselves of the taint of their decades of acting as Stalin's hatchet men.

The attack on Vishinsky is of utmost importance as a signal of how far the Kremlin is prepared to go under pressure of the masses in smashing the Stalin cult.

When Vishinsky died in November 1954, he was known in this country as the Soviet delegate to the United Nations. The Stalinist press mourned his death as the "dean" of Soviet law.

But Vishinsky was a sinister figure, who advanced to prominence in the Stalinist machine through his role in the slaughter

this. The death sentence was carried out and Stalin's followers the world over tried to justify the judicial murders by asking why the victims "confessed" if they were not guilty.

In 1937 another trial was staged to make up for the bad impression created by the Zinoviev-Kamenev farce.

Again Old Bolsheviks were put in the dock. Again Vishinsky called them "fascist mad dogs." Again they "confessed" to being in league with Hitler and of organizing the assassination of Kirov, plotting the death of Stalin and attempting to bring back capitalism to the Soviet Union through the aid of a foreign power.

Again the sole "evidence," an alleged airplane trip by Pyatakov to Oslo to visit Trotsky, was proved to be a fabrication. And again despite the exposure of the frame-up, Vishinsky demanded the death sentence and it was carried out.

1938 TRIAL

The last big trial in which

vinced that the plotting was on the side of Stalin and that it was directed against Trotsky and Trotsky's program of revolutionary socialism, by two significant facts. First, Leon Sedov died just a month before the trial under mysterious circumstances in a Paris hospital. Second, while Stalin's agents were trailing Sedov and attempting to assassinate him, the Stalinists organized a big campaign to deprive Trotsky of his asylum in Mexico, thus preventing him from speaking out and exposing the impending trial.

The charges in the 1938 trial were so fantastic that Trotsky said of them: "Having cut themselves loose from every responsibility, the totalitarian leaders have cut themselves loose from the elementary laws of common sense. The Moscow trials strike one as grandiose nonsense, as the delirium of a lunatic armed with enormous power. It would be no exaggeration to say that this part of the accusation is saturated with TOTALITARIAN IDI-OCY."

When Bukharin, Rykov and the

Twin Cities Labor Forum

Montgomery Bus Protest