

From *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy*
August 11, 1950, No. 32 (92)

People's Front and People's Democracy

William Z. Foster
Chairman, Communist Party of the U.S.A.

During the Foley Square trial of our Party and its leaders we were confronted with the charge of having conspired to teach and advocate the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence. To make proper reply to this false charge, we not only had to develop many general principles of Marxism-Leninism, and to make an outline history of our Party, but we also had to indicate the main line of the struggle for Socialism in this and other countries. In its defense, which was basically an attack upon capitalism, our Party developed a correct Marxist-Leninist line. Specifically, we placed the responsibility for violence in the class struggle where it belongs, upon the shoulders of the capitalist class and its Government.

Among the materials presented to the Court was my pamphlet entitled "In Defense of the Communist Party and the Indicted Leaders". This was unanimously endorsed by the National Committee as Party policy in the trial. In this pamphlet, in meeting the imperative needs of the defense, I undertook, in addition to dealing with Communist policy in general, to outline, in both a theoretical and practical sense, the world Communist policy with the united-front policy since the Seventh Congress of the Communist International in 1935. In doing this, I analyzed the anti-fascist people's front policy of the pre-war years, the national unity policy of the war years and the anti-imperialist people's front policy and People's Democracy policies of the post-war years.

The pamphlet, therefore, covered a tremendous scope of theory and tactics. It dealt with a whole maze of complexities, covering the past 15 years of vital world struggle. To make the task more difficult, much of the territory traversed was quite new. In the main, the fundamental analysis developed in the pamphlet is correct. Naturally, however, in view of the immensity, complexity and newness of the subject matter, as well as the brief manner in which it was dealt with, certain errors and shortcomings could and did creep into it. Of course, as we all know, many European Communist leaders have also made errors in pioneering an analysis on various parts of this general experience. In my opinion the most serious shortcoming of my pamphlet is that in the last section, in dealing with the policy of the American Communist Party, a number of important propositions regarding the people's front tactic and the new People's Democracy States, while in themselves fundamentally correct, are stated much too briefly and without clear and adequate elaboration. This leaves them open to misunderstanding and distortion and makes it necessary that the implications of all the matters be fully gone into by us. This is all the more needed for, as Comrade Dennis correctly pointed out in the March 1950 meeting of the National Committee, there have been some tendencies in the Party to misunderstand or to distort the Party's correct line in the trial. Therefore, I am writing this article with the special purpose of clarifying and elaborating on a number of questions dealt with during the trial, particularly in my pamphlet.

The significance of fascism

At the Seventh Congress of the Comintern in 1935, Comrade Dimitrov, sweeping aside the current Social-Democratic drivel to the effect that fascism was “a revolt of the middle classes”, correctly characterized fascism as “the open, terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic and most imperialist elements of finance capital.” Dimitrov also stated that fascism “appears as the result of the decline of the capitalist system.” As the general crisis of capitalism becomes deeper, the path toward fascism becomes the inevitable course of monopoly capital in its desperate attempt to prevent the victory of the working class. This is a reality that we must keep firmly in mind in our work. Obviously the big capitalists, who have become aware, from practical if not from theoretical reasons, that their social system is in grave crisis do not intend to stand about idly while it falls to pieces. Fascism, therefore, with its organised attempt to destroy democracy and Socialism through policies of civil war and world war, is basically the effort of finance capital to overcome the general crisis of capitalism and at the same time to gain for itself (concretely, Wall Street) complete domination of the nations of the world.

Fascism has definite roots reaching back into the very beginnings of the general crisis of capitalism. They were clearly to be seen in the ruthless attempts of reaction to crush the Russian Revolution at its inception and also to put down the post-World War I revolutionary struggles of the workers in Central Europe. Fascism was established as a method of rule, first however, in 1922, with Mussolini’s seizure of Italy. It finally became a world threat in 1933, when Hitler seized Germany in the midst of the great world economic crisis. During this general period, the big capitalists of France, Great Britain, the United States and other capitalist countries had also become infected with fascist conceptions. Fascism, therefore, was by no means simply a German-Italian-Japanese phenomenon, although for specific reasons, it came to power only in the Axis countries. It represented the general trend of the world’s biggest capitalists in the face of the deepening crisis of capitalism and the growth of Socialism. The big finance capitalists in the Axis capitalist countries were dreaming of some sort of a fascist world, dominated by themselves, to be initiated by an all-out attack against the U.S.S.R. But the democratic resistance of the peoples, the strength of the Soviet Union and the violent contradictions among the big capitalist powers, prevented the carrying-through of this contemplated drive by the Axis powers for a fascist world built upon the ruins of world democracy and Socialism. Experience demonstrated that fascism, instead of liquidating the imperialist antagonisms, sharpens them.

One of the most basic things we have to understand from all this is, therefore, that the drive toward war and fascism was not and is not a passing phenomenon among the big bourgeoisie. On the contrary, it is their fundamental orientation (particularly in the case of American imperialism), their attempt to overcome the general crisis of capitalism. This explains why the monopoly capitalists of all countries, under the aggressive lead of Wall Street, are so busily trying everywhere to re-organize the fascist groups and movements that were shattered during World War II. Fascism was defeated in the war, but the trend toward fascism of the imperialist bourgeoisie continues. It is still full of virulence. It would be a grave error, indeed, to underestimate the danger of fascism.

Another thing of importance that we must understand about fascism is that it gives the monopoly capitalists a much more highly conscious counter-revolutionary perspective, however impossible, for saving their social system in the face of the deepening general crisis of capitalism. At the Seventh Congress, Dimitrov had the following to say in this general respect:

“The ruling bourgeoisie is more and more seeking salvation in fascism, with the object of instituting exceptional predatory measures against the toilers, preparing for an imperialist war of plunder, attacking the Soviet Union, enslaving and partitioning China, and, by all these means, preventing revolution.”

Prior to the development of the general crisis of capitalism, with its resultant growth of Socialism on the one hand, and the more advanced decay of capitalist institutions on the other, the capitalists and their theoreticians were not confronted with an acute threat to their social system. But the development of the general crisis of capitalism and the challenge of world Socialism rudely shook the monopoly capitalists. They realized with a shock that their system was in danger. Hence their conscious acceptance of a fascist perspective, however much they may now mask this perspective in order to avert mass opposition. This, of course, does not provide the chaotic capitalist system, as such, with a definite perspective. Nor does it prevent the heaviest collisions among the imperialist powers; indeed, fascism accentuates these collisions. This conscious policy of driving to fascism gives it double malignancy and menace, and we must always keep it clearly in mind.

The anti-fascist, anti-war movement

Fascist rule is a ruthless attack upon the living standards, traditional liberties, democratic organizations, national independence and even the very lives of the various peoples of the world. Inevitably, therefore, its growth in the pre-war years evoked a very broad and militant mass movement of democratic resistance. This wide movement drew within its scope workers, peasants, Negroes, intellectuals and small business men; it also largely bridged over ideological differences between Catholics, Social-Democrats, Liberals, Communists, and non-party elements – a vast array of democratic forces. Never before had these democratic strata and groupings been so united. They were animated with a determination to resist and defeat the new social plague, fascism – to prevent this terroristic rule from becoming instituted and from plunging the world into war.

Two basic characteristics of this great pre-war anti-fascist, anti-war movement were to be remarked. First, there was a large element of the defensive in it. That is, it was directed to preserve cherished democratic liberties and organizations from the assaults of fascism; but at the same time the movement contained great potentialities for the counter-offensive – potentialities which, in the war and postwar periods, were to result in major victories for the democratic peoples. The second basic characteristic of the anti-fascist, anti-war movement was its tremendous political breadth. As already stated, the people’s front policy utilized the existing possibilities for workers of various ideological groupings, as well as various middle-class forces, to stand shoulder to shoulder, although not without many difficulties, against the common fascist enemy.

The most important thing in this general respect for us to keep in mind clearly now is that if war and fascism are a threat in the present world situation, and surely they are, then so also must the peoples develop a broad united front to fight for peace and against fascism. With the crushing defeat of fascism during the war, there was a tendency, in view also of the democratic developments in the postwar period, to feel that the fascist danger no longer existed and that,

therefore, the need for the anti-fascist, anti-war broad people's front had expired. Two major forces cultivated and took advantage of this mass illusion. First, American imperialism, in its drive for world conquest, above all had to break up the broad anti-fascist coalition of democratic forces that had won the war. Second, the Right Social-Democrats, loyal servitors of capitalism, carried out this splitting policy in order to combat the prevalent revolutionary moods of the working class. So these two forces, of course with the help of the Vatican, deliberately split the anti-fascist coalition, including the trade-union movement, in the capitalist world, and created the so-called "third force" movement. This movement, as the sequel clearly shows, is but an adjunct to American imperialism and paves the way to extreme reaction and fascism.

But the "third force", backed though it is by the United States and other capitalist governments, by the Vatican and Right Social-Democracy, and also considering that many workers are caught in the trap of the anti-Soviet Red-baiting and imperialist illusions – nevertheless can only be temporary in character. The growth of the new danger of war and fascism which is now rapidly in progress in the world, must result in these democratic masses, who are now under Social-Democratic and other reactionary leadership, breaking with the whole conception of the "third force" and joining with the Left forces in developing a strong anti-war, anti-fascist movement essentially along the lines of the people's front, although this will not take place automatically. Indeed, there are already strong signs of the cracking of the "third force." These signs were exemplified by the recent strikes in France and Belgium when Catholic, Socialist and Communist workers stood shoulder to shoulder against their "third force" governments and Social-Democratic and Vatican leaders. The major lesson from this is that the slogan for the people's front still remains valid, although in the present new world situation the main content of this slogan must be anti-imperialist and anti-war, and we must be very flexible in sloganizing its many possible forms and variations.

The policy of the People's Front

It was a tremendous theoretical and practical political achievement when the Communist International, at its Seventh Congress in 1935, under the leadership of Stalin and Dimitrov, grasped the significance of the new world situation caused by the rise of Nazi Germany and developed the people's front policy to fight the menace of fascism and war. The proposed mobilization of all democratic strata for a joint fight against enslavement and a new world war involved certain important changes in policy and action. These changes were frankly and boldly undertaken. Dimitrov, in his celebrated report, underlined the changes, declaring that "ours has been a Congress of a new tactical orientation of the Communist International."

The substance of the new tactical orientation of the Comintern was twofold: (a) to provide an anti-fascist, anti-war program and organizational form broad enough to encompass the mighty democratic masses that had been set in motion politically by the capitalist crisis and the fascist war threat; and (b) to make provisions for the Communists, under specific conditions, to participate in people's front governments that could develop out of the anti-fascist, anti-war struggle. These new tactical concepts, needless to reiterate, were in full harmony with the whole body of Marxist-Leninist principles.

Political strategy and tactics, as Marx, Lenin and Stalin have taught us, are not permanent, all-enduring, but must evolve to meet changing circumstances. It is not surprising, therefore, that the tactics laid down at the Seventh Congress, while continuing to be fundamentally correct, have, in the ensuing fifteen stormy years, undergone a certain change, growth and development, with the fundamental change in the world situation. It would be absurd to think that it could possibly be otherwise. Among the later developments may be mentioned: the line of national and international unity followed during the war, the new policies used in the establishment of the postwar People's Democracies of Eastern Europe, Communist participation in the coalition governments of France and Italy and the victorious developments of the great Chinese Revolution, the main line of which was stated by Stalin as long as 24 years back. And no doubt other important tactical developments will take place in Communist policy as the world struggle for Socialism proceeds. It is important to note here that all the tactical, and sometimes strategic, changes that have taken place during the past 15 years are in accord with the solid Marxist-Leninist line of the famous Seventh Congress of the Comintern.

This brings me to the question of the so-called "new route to Socialism" that has been so much talked about since the postwar rise of the People's Democracies in Eastern Europe. There were for a time a number of unclarities in developing the theoretical analysis of these vital situations, shared in by many of the Communist leaders of the People's Democracies. Such inadequacies of analysis found expression in our Party (including my own writings).

In using the current phrase at the time, "new route to Socialism" which has since been rejected by the Parties in the People's Democracies, I, in the pamphlet "In Defense of the Communist Party and the Indicted Leaders", was speaking in the tactical sense.

Of course, it is a matter of simple, ascertainable fact that, tactically speaking, the workers of the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe and of the Chinese People's Republic are not proceeding toward the achievement of Socialism with the identical tactics used by the Russian working class. And it could not be otherwise. They would not be Marxist-Leninists but political fools who would try to apply rigid, uniform tactics to all these widely ranging situations. These tactical variations are extremely important. Good or bad tactics in a given situation can make the difference between victory and defeat. But, regardless of tactical variations that may be necessary as the class struggle proceeds. The road to Socialism remains the same – through the defeat of the capitalist class and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The question of a People's Front government in the United States

At the outset, in discussing the matter of the people's front government in this country, we must realize that we are not dealing here with a state form which will necessarily have to be established by the American workers as their way to Socialism. We are dealing, instead, with a general political tactic. Already, at the Seventh Congress, Dimitrov handled this question. He warned us that "It would be wrong to imagine that the United Front government is an **indispensable stage** on the road to the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat." The truth of this statement is graphically illustrated, of course, by the fact that there was no people's front government in Russia before the workers took power there. And who can say positively that the American working class will not also take this course? Besides, there is also the

possibility that fascism might develop in this country before the workers and their allies could succeed in establishing a people's front government.

Nevertheless, and this must be solidly emphasized, our orientation is for a people's front government, stated in terms adapted to American conditions. We do not have an "either or" policy, nor do we indulge in vague political speculation on this matter. Dimitrov also made this clear at the Seventh Congress when, while not laying down the people's front as an indispensable stage, he, at the same time, placed every possible stress upon the burning need for an all-out fight for the people's front. This clear policy is in its basic essentials valid for us now.

A second major thing that we must keep in mind in advocating the people's front is that we can only conditionally presuppose the election of such a government by the democratic masses of the people. That is, it will be possible to elect a people's front government in the United States only if the workers can maintain sufficient democracy in the country to carry through such an election. In view of the drive of American imperialism toward fascism and war, however, it is by no means certain that they can do this. If the reactionaries should succeed in breaking down the democratic system and in establishing fascism in the meantime, then, of course, the possibility of electing a people's front government would be gone, and the whole class struggle, even over the simplest of demands, would become an open, violent struggle.

In my brief remarks on this general subject in my pamphlet, "In Defense of the Communist Party and the Indicted Leaders", I pointed out that the "election of such a (people's front) government could be brought about only in face of a violent opposition from organized reaction." I said: "The whole history of the American class struggle, which is full of employers' violence in strikes and in other struggles of the people, teaches this lesson with unmistakable clarity." Obviously, therefore, a people's front movement would have to be able to smash through this capitalist violence, which, as I pointed out, was inevitable, and force through an election in spite of it.

Now let us examine briefly under what conditions a people's front government might come into existence in the United States. Undoubtedly, it would have to take place in the setting of a very critical political situation. The aroused democratic masses, heading toward a people's front government would have to face the world's most powerful bourgeoisie, resolved upon war and already adopting violent, fascist methods of rulership. The people's front movement, therefore, colliding head-on with the capitalists' main policies of war and fascism, would surely have to confront the full force of their opposition. One would need to be naïve to speak of a peaceful election under such circumstances of sharp political struggle. It would be equally silly, in the face of the organized violence of the big capitalists, to think that it would be simply a parliamentary election struggle. Obviously, and this is a major lesson taught by people's front movements in France, Spain and elsewhere, the trade unions and every other organization of the workers and their allies would have to throw their whole strength into the struggle of the people's front.

A victorious fight to establish a people's front government in the United States would also involve defeating the heavily entrenched labor leaders and the establishment of a solid united front of the working class. And above all, it would require that the Communist Party be far more powerful than it is now to be able to give strong leadership in the people's front combination.

These seem like strong requirements, in view of the difficult situation for the workers now prevailing in the United States. But it may well be that the people's front movement in this country will develop at a very rapid speed. This rapidity could be brought about by a swift spread of peace sentiment among the masses due to dangerous war moves by Wall Street, through a sharpened danger of fascism, through the development of a deep economic crisis, or, as would be most probable, through the joint operation of all these factors.

In my pamphlet, I stated our Party's conditional placing of the question of the election of a people's front government as follows:

“Our Party's political line is based upon the assumption that it is possible in the United States, in a crucial economic and political situation, for the broad masses of the people, militantly led by the trade unions and a strong mass political party, to elect a coalition, anti-fascist, anti-imperialist government. Whether this possibility will last in the face of the dangerous fascist trends in this country, however, is problematical.”

This is the approved line of our Party and it is a correct one. To take that the position that it is impossible to elect a people's front government in the United States (under its specific American forms) would mean to say that fascism is inevitable in this country and is, indeed, almost upon us. This our Party cannot say, and did not say in the trial. We do not recognize the inevitability of fascism, even as we do not recognize the inevitability of a third world war, and for the same basic reasons.

Party policy toward a People's Front government

Here we come to one of the most complex theoretical problems – what we consider would be the attitude of the Communist Party toward a people's front government if it is established in the United States.

The first thing we have to understand about a people's front government in the United States – assuming that the allied democratic forces can beat back the forces of fascism and eventually establish such a government – is that this government would from the very beginning find itself under the heaviest possible fire from the reactionaries. This situation would be inevitable, for such a government, if it at all corresponded to the qualities of a people's front, would place itself directly athwart the war program and world-domination plans of Wall Street Big Business. It would be stupid, therefore, to expect anything else than that this government should, in consequence, be the object of violent assault from the combined forces of reaction; for Wall Street big capital would never abandon its world-conquest program without a last-ditch struggle.

As I have pointed out all too briefly, in my pamphlet, such a people's front government, confronted by the violent attacks of the bourgeoisie, would have to orientate to the Left or it would be destroyed. That is, the people's front would be compelled to pass over from a defensive position to one of counter-offensive. It could not merely stand as a barrier against fascism and war; but in order to accomplish these ends and to enforce its program generally, it would be compelled to begin to attack the monopolists in their economic, military and political spheres. It would face death if it failed to do this.

Securing a majority in Congress for a people's front government would not give the majority the control of the capitalist state – Marxist-Leninists require no instructions in this elementary truth. In such a situation, the very foundations of the state – the army, police, industries, courts, banks, government bureaucracy, schools, etc. – would still be within the control of the big bourgeoisie, who would (with the help of their Social-Democratic leaders) use all these institutions against the new people's front government. We may accept it as a practical certainty, therefore, that any democratic coalition government in this country that would fight the Wall Street program of fascism and war would find itself, as a life-and-death necessity, compelled to attack the monopolies as above stated. It would have to pass over from a defensive program, from one of merely seeking to halt the war-makers – to one of beginning to orientate toward the nationalization of banks and industries, break-up of big landholdings, beginning of a planned economy, elimination of reactionaries from all state institutions, etc., or it would pass from history.

Of course, a Leftward orientation of a people's front government could be achieved only in the face of the stiffest resistance of the capitalist class, including that of its Right Social-Democratic agents within the people's front government itself. It would also require clear leadership from a powerful Communist Party and the active support of the trade unions and all other people's organizations.

The Communists would defend such a government so long as it continues to be a barrier to war and fascism, would defend it against reactionary efforts to overthrow it. The Communists would point out that such a government could not long continue to block war and fascism unless new measures striking at the roots of monopoly power were taken. Whether in the course of defending this government against an armed revolt by reaction these revolutionary changes would take place, or whether such a government would refuse to take such measures and be supplanted by a new government of the working class, as a result of great mass struggles, cannot of course be predicted now.

In any case, a people's front government as such cannot bring final victory, and completely eliminate the danger of fascist counter-revolution. This can only be done by the Socialist revolution.

What we have to bear in mind is what I emphasized in my pamphlet namely, that a people's front government would be compelled to orientate toward a positive, fighting policy, or it would die. The capitalists would destroy it, either through the treachery of a Blum on the inside, or through the counter-revolutionary violence of a Franco from the outside, or, most probably, through a combination of both. This is a basic lesson taught by people's front experiences in France, Spain and other countries.

Communists could not possibly look with indifference upon the defeat or overthrow of a people's front government in the United States. We would be compelled to try with every means in our power to have the workers use such a government as a means of positive struggle. To do anything else would signify surrendering the people's front to the Right Social-Democrats and to eventual crushing defeat. What such a defeat would entail we may forecast by recalling the acute political situation in which it would only be possible to establish a people's front government in

the first place. The crushing of such a government by the combined assaults of the capitalists and their Social-Democratic tools in a situation of political crisis might well have such disorganizing consequences upon the fighting forces of the proletariat as to enable big capital to launch its projected third world war and/or to establish fascism in the United States. We would find, therefore, we may be sure, that the fate of the people's front government would be a matter of profound political significance. Communists cannot participate in the people's front government on the basis that the government must finally come to a disastrous defeat. We must have a victory perspective throughout.

Communists have not always clearly understood the necessity of fighting solidly for a Left orientation when they have participated in coalition, or people's front, government. This weakness was exhibited by some of the Communist Parties of Europe in the postwar coalition governments. And even as early as the Seventh Congress, Dimitrov warned sharply against this type of Right mistake by criticizing the actions of the Communist members of the workers' government of Saxony, Germany, in 1923. He pointed out that "they behaved generally like ordinary parliamentary ministers 'within the framework of bourgeois democracy' "instead of fighting for the revolutionary measures imperatively demanded by the situation. Although establishment of a people's front or democratic coalition government is not yet upon the immediate political agenda in the United States, nevertheless, as Marxist-Leninists, we can already profitably understand our general tasks in such an eventuality.

The question of People's Democracy

The nature and role of a People's Democracy is another question that did not receive as rounded-out a treatment from us as its complex character warranted. Further elaboration of the question is, therefore, in order for the full clarification of our Party on this question.

There are four general aspects of the People's Democracy that we especially need to be clear about. The first of these is on the question of the use of the slogan itself: "For a People's Democracy" in this country. Under present America conditions, it can be agreed that the slogan: "For a People's Democracy" is not one of action, or even of active agitation. Nevertheless, it represents a possible development, although not inevitable, and it is in this respect that we should use it.

The second important thing about the People's Democracy to bear carefully in mind is that between the People's Democracy and the people's front there is a qualitative difference. This basic difference is that a people's front government operates within the framework of a bourgeois state, whereas the People's Democracy is a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The people's front curbs the power of the monopolists and war-makers; the People's Democracy smashes their power altogether and sets out upon the road to Socialism. In my pamphlet "In Defense of the Communist party and the Indicted Leaders", I pointed out that the People's Democracies are forms of the dictatorship of the proletariat. But generally the basic distinction between the two forms was not made sharp and clear enough to avoid all possible misinterpretations. We must, of course, as Comrade Dennis indicated at our recent National Committee meeting, be careful not to allow our Party line to be distorted into a seeming equation of the people's front with the People's Democracy, or a simple evolution of one into the other.

A third phase of the general question of the People's Democracy that we must also understand clearly is, that before a People's Democracy can be established in a given country, the bourgeoisie must be finally and decisively defeated. This implies that the Communist Party is in the leading position among the working class. In my pamphlet, in describing the general political situation in which the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe had come into existence, I said: Thus, the shattering of the capitalist state machinery, which Marx, Lenin and Stalin had long before laid down as a condition for the successful revolution, had been largely accomplished by the people during the course of the great anti-fascist war," in smashing the Hitler machine, as well as in preventing European counter-revolution from attacking the new People's Democracies, the Soviet Army played the decisive role.

A fourth important consideration that we should bear in mind in relation to the People's Democracy is that it is an evolving form of the proletarian dictatorship. The People's Democracies of Eastern Europe did not come full-fledged into existence as did Minerva from the brow of Jove. While they were forms of the proletarian dictatorship from the outset, they grew and consolidated themselves in revolutionary struggle against capitalist reaction. At first the governments of the People's Democracies were made up of broad coalitions of all the parties that that generally had combated fascism during the war. These coalitions included Socialist Parties, Social-Democratic Parties, peasant parties, Catholic Parties and even parties of the smaller capitalists. The strong leaders of the coalition governments were the powerful Communist Parties. Under the double pressure, on the one hand, of the advancing Socialist-minded workers and the peasantry, and on the other, of counter-revolutionary American and domestic reaction, the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe, with the assistance of the U.S.S.R., all went through a rapid process of strengthening and consolidating themselves. The Communist Parties grew tremendously and finally brought about an amalgam with the Social-Democratic parties. The trade unions expanded swiftly and enormously increased their strength. The several coalition governments systematically purged the armies, police forces, state bureaux, schools, industries, etc., of reactionary leadership. The bourgeois elements were forced out of the governments and their parties were largely dismantled. The program for the nationalization of industry, the break-up of the big estates, etc., was pushed with great vigor. This was no mere automatic consolidation of the People's Democracies. It was the sharpest form of class struggle, reaching the point of civil war in some countries – Poland, for example. At times the fight against domestic reaction stimulated by American imperialism was so intense as to threaten the very existence of the young revolutionary governments.

On the question of Socialist "encirclement"

The substance of this so-called encirclement proposition is two-fold: (a) Socialism is rapidly expanding in the world as capitalism sinks deeper into general crisis, and (b) the more world Socialism expands, the more it weakens the position of American imperialism. And should American imperialism try to revise this inevitable process by a resort to war, the armed effort would only serve to hasten it, to speed the breakdown of capitalism and the growth of Socialism.

It would, of course, be a grave error to conclude that because the advances of world Socialism weaken the position of American imperialism, therefore the American capitalists would find themselves in a position where they would feel unable to fight. On the contrary, their increasing

desperation, bred of the weakening world position of capitalism and the failure of the American foreign policies, renders these capitalists all the more disposed to reckless war adventures, as the present dangerous war campaign clearly illustrates. This principle has long been clear to our Party, and we have stated it many times in our analysis of the war danger. And as Comrade Suslov, paraphrasing Lenin, recently said: Historical experience teaches that the more hopeless the position of imperialist reaction, the more it rages; the more danger of military adventures on its part.” (For A Lasting Peace, For A People’s Democracy, December 2, 1949.)

This whole conception is directly opposite to the one which Browder once tried to fasten upon our Party. With his theory of American exceptionalism and glorification of American imperialism, his idea was that American capitalism had become so powerful as to make it impossible for other important sections of the world to become Socialist – Europe, Latin America, Canada, etc. In this respect, we need only recall his infamous letter to the Australian Communist Party, criticizing these comrades as “Leftists” because they had put forward a Socialist perspective for their country. Browder argued with them that Australia was so tied-in economically with the United States that it could not adopt Socialism without the permission of Wall Street. Browder’s was a policy for the defeat of world Socialism and the permanence of world capitalism, dominated by American imperialism.

The responsibility for establishing Socialism in the United States, of course, rests squarely upon the shoulders of the American working class and its political allies. They will also get powerful and increasing support from advancing world Socialism. It would be silly, of course, were anyone to conclude from this that all the American workers have to do is to sit still and let the Socialist workers of other countries solve their problems for them. No working class would ever arise at such a stupid decision. On the contrary, the American working class in its daily struggle and in its eventual fight for Socialism will be greatly strengthened, not weakened, both in understanding and action, by the knowledge that the advance of world Socialism weakens the position of American imperialism, which tries to make the American people and the world believe that it is all-powerful and invincible.

On force and violence

In the trial, on the whole, we presented correctly the complex questions of force and violence in the class struggle. In this matter we specifically met the direct indictment against us. The substance of our position was that, as Marx long ago pointed out, no ruling class in history has ever yielded up its position to a rising revolutionary class, short of using every weapon in its power to maintain itself; and secondly, that the working class and its allies, with the Communist Party at their head, will be strong enough to defeat all such ruling-class violence that will be encountered on the road to Socialism.

It was not enough, however, for us simply to repeat the necessity and certainty of the workers to defeat the employers’ violence by their own superior strength. The whole matter of the use of force in the class struggle had to be examined from a tactical standpoint in the light of the present, recently greatly altered relationship of class forces, and the state of the general crisis of capitalism, on both the world and domestic scales.

When we say that the world forces of democracy and Socialism are today stronger than those of war-making capitalist reaction, this formulation carries with it vitally important implications both nationally and internationally, particularly with regard to the capitalists' power to use violence and the workers' attitude toward that violence. That is to say, the forces of democracy, by the mobilization of their potentially superior strength, now face the necessity and possibility of sapping the ability of the bourgeoisie to employ violence against the people.

In my pamphlet I pointed out that immediately after the end of the war there was a widespread, relatively peaceful and orderly advance toward Socialism in the People's Democracies. This was a fact, and the only reason why such a situation could exist, even temporarily, was because, on the one hand, the bourgeois state machinery was smashed by the war and by the historic, liberating role of the Soviet Army, whereas, on the other, those of democracy and Socialism had been greatly strengthened by this historic anti-Hitler victory. Reaction, in this early postwar period, was simply unable to fight the European workers effectively on a general scale, although it tried to do so to the best of its ability – creating civil war in Greece, uprisings in Poland, putsches in Rumania, etc. Now, however, the situation is vastly altered. Under the aggressive leadership of American imperialism, European reaction has been able somewhat to pull its weakened forces together again, with the result that virtual potential civil-war conditions have been created in France, Italy, Germany and other countries of Central and Western Europe.

A classic example of the working out of the new relationship of class forces, under the leadership of a strong Communist Party, was that given by Czechoslovakia. There, of course, the situation was highly favorable for the workers. Capitalism had been greatly weakened by the war and was overthrown, the Communist Party was powerful, the workers were in a revolutionary mood and in power, and, above all, there was the near presence of the Soviet Union. The workers and their allied forces, consequently, were so strong and well-organized that when the forces of reaction, stimulated by American imperialism, made their well-prepared counter-revolutionary attack in February 1948 – they wanted to turn Czechoslovakia into another Greece – the powerful democratic Socialist forces, led by the Communist Party, strangled the movement at its inception, prevented the contemplated civil war and passed on swiftly to a decisive strengthening of the People's Democracy and its Socialist program. Other countries, of course, will not be as favorably situated as Czechoslovakia, and will have to collide much more heavily with the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. But the general principle applies, nevertheless, of weakening the fighting capacity of the bourgeoisie beforehand so that it may be the more readily defeated when it does use violence against the people.

The supreme example of capitalist violence is, of course, expressed in imperialist war, in counter-revolutionary world war. Here, by virtue of the greater potential strength of the forces of democracy and Socialism, the effort is to prevent the warlike bourgeoisie from plunging the world into a new war, or to defeat them if they do. No Marxist-Leninist can doubt but that the big capitalists will launch a third world war, if they are able to do so. It is the historic task of the democratic-Socialist forces to make it impossible for them to unleash this catastrophe. If we can say that world war is not inevitable, this is only because the people's peace forces are now potentially strong enough to prevent such a war if they will bit act vigorously and together. International peace will be guaranteed in the world, with its rotting capitalist system and rampant

imperialist reaction, only when the democratic-Socialist forces, nationally and internationally, resolutely undertake to maintain that peace.

In conclusion: As for the main line followed by our Party in the big trial, it was politically sound and correct. What we have to do now is to defend that line militantly, while fully developing all its theoretical formulations and implications. Today the supreme menace that our people and the world face is the danger of war. All the other reactionary political trends in capitalist society – the many fascist tendencies, the attacks upon the Negro people, the assault upon the trade unions, the attempts to jail our leadership and to outlaw the Communist Party – all combine and culminate in making more threatening and acute the great menace of these times: the danger of another in the pursuance of American imperialism’s insane attempt to destroy international Socialism and to rule the world. To do our full part in combating this grave threat to civilization and progress, let us never forget that the supreme necessity of the working class and the people is for a powerful mass Communist Party, firmly united and solidly grounded in Marxist-Leninist theory and practice. A strong Communist Party is the key to every success.

Magazine “Political Affairs”, June, 1950.

Click [here](#) to return to the index of archival material.

The American Road to Socialism

William Z. Foster

[section from *History of the Communist Party of the United States*,
International Publishers, New York, 1952]

The transition from capitalism to socialism involves a fundamental reorganization of the nation’s economy, from one based on the private ownership of industry for private profit to one of collective ownership for social use, and also a basic political shift from the tyrannical rule of a small group of monopolists to the democratic regime of the broad working class and its allies, which leads to the abolition of class society. Therefore, it is a revolution. Capitalism established itself in all the major countries by revolutions. These revolutions, accomplished in the youth and progressive period of capitalism, were constructive. In the United States there have been two such bourgeois revolutions: that which achieved national independence in 1776-83, and that which abolished Negro slavery in 1861-65. The workers' advance to socialism will be infinitely more progressive than the bourgeois revolutions, because it not only promises but realizes democracy and well-being for the broadest masses of the people.

Socialism is not an invention of the Communists, as reactionaries assert. Nor is the abolition of capitalism the fruition of a Communist conspiracy. On the contrary, socialism grows out of the long-continued everyday struggles of the workers, enlightened and organized by Marxist theory and guidance. It is the ultimate expression and climax of these struggles. The working class and its allies – the Negro people, small farmers, professionals, and others-making up a vast majority of the people, are oppressed by ever greater economic and political hardships under capitalism. They are especially menaced by war and fascism. These evils are greatly accentuated because the capitalist system is sinking deeper and deeper into general crisis. Inexorably the masses must

unite ever more strongly and fight with increasing vigor to combat the growing disasters of economic breakdown, destitution, fascism, and world war. The daily struggles around broader and ever more urgent demands, led increasingly by the Communist Party, finally culminate in a mighty movement to abolish the capitalist system itself, as the source of the intolerable evils from which the people suffer. The struggles of the workers for immediate demands, in which they create the necessary economic organizations, build the Communist Party, acquire class-consciousness, develop a program, and win democratic rights for themselves, are an organic part of the historic struggle for socialism. This has been basically the course of political development in all those countries where socialism has been, or is now being established. The breakdown of the capitalist system makes socialism both indispensable and inevitable all over the world, including the United States.

The central task of the Communist Party, with its Marxist-Leninist training and in its role as the vanguard of the working class and the nation, is to give the elemental mass anti-capitalist movement the necessary understanding, organization, and leadership. Without this the workers and their allies could never arrive at their historic goal of socialism. The Communist Party is not an intruder among the toiling masses, as the Department of Justice alleges, seeking to thrust an alien program upon them. Instead, the Party is flesh and bone of the working class. It always marches in the forefront of that class, expresses most clearly its interests, and finally leads it and its allies in realizing the great objective of socialism, which is the culmination of the entire historic experience of the working class.

The Communist Party projects and works for a democratic conduct of the daily class struggle and also of the advance to socialism. The Preamble to the Constitution of the Party states this policy as follows: "The Communist Party upholds the achievements of American democracy and defends the United States Constitution and its Bill of Rights against its reactionary enemies who would destroy democracy and popular liberties. It seeks to safeguard the welfare of the people and the nation, recognizing that the working class, through its trade unions and by its independent political action, is the most consistent fighter for democracy, national freedom, and social progress."

Communists are the chief fighters against the two major threats of violence in modern society – imperialist international war and fascist civil war – both of which emanate from the capitalists. The Communist Party's democratic aims are in line with the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, with the course of the everyday struggles of the workers and their allies, and with their world experience in establishing socialism. The danger of violence in 'the daily class struggle and in the inevitable and indispensable advance of the workers and the nation to socialism could come only from the' capitalist class, which, seeing its profits threatened and itself being deposed from its rich dictatorship, then uses every means possible to thwart the democratic socialist will of the people. For as the great Marx has truly said, there is no case in history where a ruling class has yielded up its domination without making a desperate struggle.

Marxist theoreticians, while warning the workers against capitalist violence, have always pointed out possibilities for the peaceful establishment of socialism in countries where the democratic elements are strong. Thus, Karl Marx, three generations ago, before the advent of imperialism, with its highly centralized, heavily armed, and bureaucratic state, said that "If, for example, the

working class in England and the United States should win a majority in Parliament, in Congress, it could legally abolish those laws and institutions which obstruct its development.”¹ Lenin also, in mid-1917, outlined a peaceful perspective for the Russian Revolution. And Stalin, writing in 1928, while pointing out the danger of capitalist violence at that time, also said that with the strong growth of world socialism, “a peaceful path of development is quite possible for certain capitalist countries.”² The C.P.U.S.A. proceeds upon the basis that such a possibility exists in the United States.

The Communist Party's orientation for a possible peaceful transition to socialism in the United States is based upon four elementary considerations: first, the fight of the working class for its immediate demands is the very substance of democracy, it strengthens basically the democratic forces in our country, and by the eventual establishment of socialism it raises democracy qualitatively to a new high level; second, the working class, led by the Communist Party, harmonizes its methods with its ends by fighting for both its immediate and ultimate objectives with the most peaceful and democratic means possible; third, the workers and their allies, constituting the vast majority of the people and possessing immense organizations, now have the potential power to curb, restrain, and make ineffective whatever violence the capitalists may undertake in their attempt to balk the will of the people and to prevent the establishment of socialism; and fourth, in recent years, on the international scale, there has been an enormous growth of power in the camp of democracy and socialism.

The fundamental difference between the Communist Party and right-wing Social Democracy (and its Browderite variant) is not that the Social-Democrats want to establish socialism by peaceful means and the Communists want to achieve it by violence. Instead, the difference is that the Social-Democrats everywhere have abandoned socialism altogether and are committed to an indefinite perpetuation of the capitalist system; whereas, the Communists have shown conclusively that, in line with the democratic will and interests of the workers, they are the ones that are resolutely leading the peoples of the world to socialism.

The Communist Party, although it does not advocate violence in the workers' struggles, cannot, however, declare that there will be no violence in the establishment of socialism in this country. This is because of the certainty of reactionary attacks from the capitalists. The latter might even be able, in case of inadequate resistance by the masses, to destroy democracy outright and to establish an American type of fascist-like regime. In such event there would result an entirely new political situation, where the masses would be faced with the need of militant struggle for the most elementary economic needs and democratic rights. In the United States there is a grave danger of such fascism.

The Communist Party holds the view that socialism in the United States, although inevitable in the future, is not now on the immediate political agenda. Therefore, the Party never has, and does not now, venture to predict the precise time, forms, and methods of the eventual establishment of socialism in this country. Those who state that the C.P.U.S.A. has a blueprint of same kind, or is organizing a conspiratorial “plot” for achieving socialism, are deliberate liars and perjurers. Any consideration that the Party, therefore, gives to this whole question at the present time, to refute the government's indictment leveled against it, can be only on the basis of an estimate of the

eventual working out of general Communist principles in this country, in the light of world experience and American political conditions.

There is no timetable nor blueprinted route to socialism. The American people, led by the working class, will embark upon the road to socialism, all in their own good time and with their own specific methods. As Lenin says, "All nations will come to socialism, this is inevitable, but they will come to it in not quite the same way, each will contribute original features to this or that form of democracy, to this or that variant of the proletarian dictatorship, to this or that tempo of the socialist transformation of the various aspects of social life."³ The experience of the workers in Russia, China, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other countries, in their advance to socialism, has borne out this statement by Lenin, and the ultimate course of events in the United States will doubtless give it further confirmation.

American conditions and world socialist experience make it realistic, however, to suppose that, in their march to socialism, the American people, as many others are doing, will take their path through the successive phases of the people's front and the people's democracy. But in so doing, they will doubtless reflect specific American conditions. That is, just as there have been in this country special adaptations of the people's front slogan (examples, the farmer-labor party, the democratic front, the Roosevelt coalition, and now the peace coalition), so there will also almost certainly develop special American forms and applications of the people's democracy and its slogans.

The basic difference between these two state forms is that whereas the people's front government still operates within the framework of the capitalist system, the people's democracy is a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In both of these types of government, judging from experience elsewhere, there would be several parties represented. In view of the basic tasks confronting the democratic masses, the influence of the Communist Party (or a broad Workers Party based on a consolidation of the most advanced elements among the workers, farmers, Negro people, etc.) would necessarily be of decisive importance, especially in the people's democracy. For only Marxist-Leninists can lead the nation to socialism.

Soviets are the highest form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but they are not the only form. The people's democracy represents a new and distinct type of proletarian rule. It has arisen particularly as a result of the radicalization of vast masses of the people, the great growth of the camp of world socialism, and the continued decline of world capitalism.

It is in line with the foregoing general principles and perspectives that the Communist Party has long proposed the regular election, under the United States Constitution, of a broad coalition government, an American variant of the people's front, made up of the representatives of the political and economic organizations of the workers, the Negro people, small farmers, intellectuals, and other democratic strata, who constitute the great bulk of the American people. In the 1948 election campaign the Communist Party, through its general secretary, Eugene Dennis, stated this political policy as follows: "For a people's government that will advance the cause of peace, security and democracy! For an anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly government! What is projected in this slogan, it should be made clear, is a political objective that reflects the united front program which is bringing into a broad coalition all the democratic and anti-

imperialist forces including the third party movement.”⁴ Despite the dangerous threat of fascism in this country, the Communist Party holds that the workers and their allies could elect such a people's front government under the Constitution by vigorous action.

Beyond this point, in practical policy, the Communist Party has not planned. But it is clear that such a people's front government would be elected, probably, when the great masses of the people, facing conditions of a serious political crisis, would feel the urgent need of it in order to protect their most vital interests. Such a situation is definitely in the political perspective for the United States, resulting from the deepening of the general crisis of world capitalism, intensified by Wall Street's aggressive drive towards war.

A people's front government in this country would have as its great task to preserve the workers and the masses of the people from devastating crisis, from the consequences of the breaking down of capitalism and the reactionary policies of big capital. Its program, therefore, would necessarily involve vigorous measures to maintain or restore world peace, to preserve and extend popular democratic liberties, to keep the industries in operation, to improve radically the living standards of the people, and to realize the economic, political, and social equality of the Negro people, and their right to self-determination in the “Black Belt” of the South.

However, standing athwart the war and fascist policies of monopoly capital, such a democratic people's government, both in its election and in its functioning, would have to face a most determined opposition from the monopolists and their Social-Democratic tools. No one who knows the American capitalist class, with its long record of war aggression, brutality in strikes, slaughter of workers in industry, persecution against the Negro people, etc., can doubt but that the reactionaries would use every available means of Social-Democratic treachery and of outright violence to prevent or destroy any government that cut into their rule and into their robbery of the people. Consequently, the only way the people's government could be elected in the first place and could be enabled to live and to carry out its progressive program would be by defeating this Social-Democratic treachery and capitalist violence. This would also require weakening the economic and political power of the monopolists by the nationalization of the banks, the basic industries, the press, radio, television, etc., and eventually by the reorganization of the army, police, etc., and by beginning to lay the basis for a planned economy. All of which measures the legally elected people's coalition government would have the full authority and national mandate to carry out. This course would be the path to a people's democracy.

Failure of a people's government to take such necessary measures would surely result in its downfall and probably bring about the victory of fascism in the United States. It was, for example, the fatal mistake of the pre-war people's government in Spain that it did not, from the outset, proceed to weaken the capitalists basically, as indicated, and did not nip in the bud the potential military rebellion which finally destroyed it. On the other hand, the fulfillment of the above historic tasks by an American people's government would so strengthen the working class and all the forces of socialism, while weakening those of reaction, that a peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism would become possible through a people's democracy, in its American forms.

The establishment of a people's democracy in the United States would signify that the coalition of workers and their allies had won a decisive political victory over monopoly capital and that a government had come into power, committed to the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of socialism. Such a government, made indispensable under the severe pressure of the capitalist crisis, might evolve either from a people's front coalition government through an internal regrouping of forces, or it might be elected by the masses of the American people after the people's front government had served its historic function. In either event the working class and its allies, with the potential power to do so, would carry through their democratic program, curbing all violent and illegal efforts of monopolist reaction to defeat it and to set up a fascist state.

With the establishment of a Socialist government on the basis of a people's democracy, the American people would logically and necessarily proceed to re-organize and democratize the state. They would make such constitutional changes as the majority would decide. They would learn from Marx and from their own experience that the workers cannot simply take over the bourgeois state machinery and use it to build socialism. Within the framework of the people's democracy, the American people would gradually construct a higher type of democracy and democratic state, in order to build a socialized economy and to make the people the real rulers of the land. With the workers in power, the path from socialism to the higher stage of communism would be one of gradual and peaceful evolution.

This, very briefly, is “the American road to socialism,” on the basis of our country's conditions and of the socialist experience of the workers of the world. But this tentative outline is by no means a blueprint. When the American working class actually starts out to establish socialism, as an imperative necessity under the deepening crisis of capitalism, it will adopt the best, shortest, most fitting routes and forms for the American people. What stands out clearly in this analysis, however, is that, in its perspective for ultimate socialism in the United States, the Communist Party, as the Supreme Court, with a rare exhibition of objectivity, clearly stated in the *Schneiderman* case of 1942, always strives for a peaceful and democratic course to socialism, supported at all times by a huge majority of the American people. The great toiling masses of our country, as of all others, are fundamentally the builders and defenders of peace and democracy, and this elementary course they will strive to follow in their eventual advance to socialism.

Communist Parties in other industrial countries, facing conditions basically similar to those in the United States, generally have a comparable conception of the manner of democratically establishing socialism. Thus, the Communist Party of Great Britain, in its program entitled *The British Road to Socialism*, calls for the election of “a People's Parliament and Government which draws its strength from a united movement of the people, with the working class as its core.” On the question of eventual capitalist violence, the program states that “The great broad popular alliance, led by the working class, firmly based on the factories, which has democratically placed the People's Government in power, will have the strength to deal with the attacks of the capitalist warmongers and their agents.”

Lessons of Communist World Experience

In a capitalist world which is sinking deeper into general crisis, and in which the capitalists, as a matter of course, turn toward world war and fascist civil war in their desperate efforts to solve their insoluble problems, the great defenders of national and international peace and democracy, and the forces that make for the defeat of capitalist violence, are the workers and their allies, led by the Communist Party. The fundamentally peaceful and democratic policy of the Communists is now being dramatically expressed by their present fight all over the world to prevent the re-birth of fascism and the outbreak of a third world war.

This general policy of curbing capitalist national and international violence was well illustrated by the worldwide struggle of the Communists to defeat fascism and prevent war in the 1930's. During these years the big monopoly capitalists in many countries, under the pressure of the general crisis of capitalism and of their own ruthless imperialist drive for power, were pushing relentlessly towards the fierce violence of fascism and war. To combat these twin dangers, the Communists fought for the building of broad people's front governments in the respective countries, in order to strengthen democracy and to avert fascist civil war; and on the international scale the Communists worked tirelessly for the creation of a great world front of all the democratic powers, in order to restrain the fascist Axis aggressor states and to avert a world war.

This Communist course constituted basically a policy of striving to prevent both civil and international war, of holding intact and strengthening the democratic institutions in the respective capitalist countries, of compelling the wolf-like capitalist states to live together without devouring one another, and of assuring the peaceful co-existence of socialism and capitalism in the world. They were the basic democratic tasks of the time, in the workers' historic march towards socialism.

In those years the Communists and their allies were able to prevent civil war and fascism in many countries, and if they were unable to avert World War II, this was primarily because Social-Democratic treachery disunited and weakened the workers' forces of peace and democracy. But at the present time, vastly increased in strength over that period of the 1930's, the workers and other democratic masses, in harmony with basic Communist policy, are in a much better position to push forward with their program of social progress and at the same time to prevent monopoly capital, which grows more desperate with the breaking down of the capitalist system and from the enormous worldwide strengthening of the democratic forces, from plunging the various individual capitalist countries into fascist civil war and from catapulting the world into a devastating atomic war.

The history of the various proletarian and people's revolutions since World War I also proves conclusively that the Communists in other countries, as well as in the United States, seek to accomplish by the most peaceful means possible the inevitable transition of society from capitalism to the higher stage of socialism. Thus, during the great Russian Revolution of 1917, Lenin called for the winning of the leadership in the Soviets, which were not yet led by the Bolsheviks, by a patient, systematic, and persistent explanation. On this matter Stalin said: "This meant that Lenin was not calling for a revolt against the Provisional Government, which at that moment enjoyed the confidence of the Soviets, that he was not demanding its overthrow, but that he wanted, by means of explanatory and recruiting work, to win a majority of the Soviets... to alter the composition and policy of the Government. This was a line envisaging a peaceful

development of the revolution in Russia.”⁵ But Kerensky, like so many other capitalist agents, believed he could stamp out the Revolution by violence. The world knows the results of his folly. Lenin was the greatest of all champions of peace and democracy.

The establishment of the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe – in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Albania – demonstrated the basic Communist policy for a peaceful advance toward socialism. The puppet Hitler governments in these countries were overthrown in the war by the Red Army and these peoples. On the conclusion of peace, democratic governments based on coalitions of all the anti-fascist parties, including petty bourgeois, peasant, socialist, and other parties, were duly and constitutionally elected. These democratic elements put down such violence as the reactionaries were able to organize. By a democratic and peaceful process, these regimes became the People's Democracies, which then, with their peoples' national democratic mandate and with the Communist Parties in the lead, proceeded on their advance toward socialism.

In China, too, the responsibility for the civil war in the great people's liberation revolution, rests squarely upon the shoulders of the reactionary Chiang Kai-shek and the gang of foreign imperialists behind him. During the early 1920's, the Communists, seeking the peaceful and democratic development of China, made a united front with Chiang's Kuomintang Party; but Chiang in 1927, after he had gained political power, violently disrupted this united front and tried in vain to drown the Communist Party in blood. Again, during World War II, the Chinese Communists, led by the brilliant Mao Tse-tung, developed a national united front with Chiang to fight the Japanese. This broad coalition the Communists persistently tried to extend over into the post-war period. But Chiang, in obedience to Wall Street, deliberately broke up the united front with the Communists and in 1946 he launched the civil war to destroy the Communist Party and to disperse its gigantic mass following. But having rejected the Communist path of peace and chosen that of civil war, Chiang, like Kerensky before him, wound up by having his own regime annihilated. Others who may try to block by violence the people's democratic advance to socialism will not fare any better than did Kerensky or Chiang Kai-shek.

The attempt of the Truman government to destroy the Communist Party, on the pretext that it advocates the forceful overthrow of the United States Government, is a lie and a political frame-up. There is no basis for such an accusation-in Marxist-Leninist theory, in the program and activities of the C.P.U.S.A., or in the world experience of the Communist movement. It is an irony of history that the Communists, who throughout the world are the great defenders of peace and democracy, should be condemned in the United States for advocating force and violence, and this by a capitalist class which helped bring about two world wars and is now trying to organize a third mass slaughter. The political purpose of the government's red-baiting attack upon the Communist Party is to cripple this valiant leader of the democratic masses and thereby to demoralize the people and to break down their opposition to Wall Street's ill-omened drive toward fascism and war.

Notes:

1) Cited by Foster, *In Defense of the Communist Party and Its Leaders*, p. 22.

2) Cited by Foster, *In Defense of the Communist Party and Its Leaders*, p. 22.

3) *Bolshevik*, Moscow, Nov. 19, 1951.

4) Eugene Dennis in *Political Affairs*, March 1948.

5) *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, p. 186.

Click [here](#) to return to the index of archival material.