

No 9745



GIVEN BY

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

HERBERT BROWNELL, JR., ATTORNEY GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITIONER

VS.

COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

RESPONDENT

REPORT OF THE BOARD



PRESENTED BY MR. McCARRAN

APRIL 23 (legislative day APRIL 6), 1953.—Ordered to be printed

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1953

dit

*9335
14A356

U.S. Navy Documents
Aug. 1, 1954

CONTENTS

	Page
✓ Preliminary statement.....	1
✓ I. Findings of fact.....	4
A. World Communist movement.....	4
B. Policies and directives:	
1. Respondent's organization and leadership.....	9
2. Marxism-Leninism.....	21
3. Imperialism.....	44
4. Democratic centralism and self-criticism.....	56
5. Foreign representatives in the United States.....	59
6. The Communist press.....	61
7. Major programs.....	64
(a) Trade-union work.....	67
(b) Youth work.....	71
(c) National liberation.....	74
(d) Ideological versus political aims.....	77
(e) Conclusion as to major programs.....	78
8. Conclusion as to foreign policies and directives.....	78
C. Nondeviation.....	79
D. Financial aid.....	86
E. Training and reporting.....	89
F. Disciplinary power.....	98
G. Secret practices.....	105
1. Secret and open members.....	105
2. Refusal to reveal information.....	106
3. Destruction and secretion of records.....	107
4. Deceptive language in party writings.....	107
5. Use of party names, aliases, etc.....	108
6. Use of codes, couriers, etc.....	109
7. False swearing.....	110
8. Secret meetings of trusted members.....	111
9. Reduction of committee membership for security.....	112
10. Assignment of members in small groups.....	113
11. Underground plans and operation.....	113
12. Infiltration of other organizations.....	115
13. Purpose of secret practices.....	116
H. Allegiance.....	118
II. Legal discussion.....	128
III. Conclusion.....	132

APPENDIXES

Appendix A.....	134
Appendix B.....	136

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

No. 51-101

HERBERT BROWNELL, JR., ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, PETITIONER *v.* THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, RESPONDENT

William A. Paisley, Frank DeNunzio, Robert B. Gaston, Noel E. Story, Benjamin F. Taylor, Jr., Rourke J. Sheehan, Clifford J. Nelson, Nathan B. Lennin, for Petitioner.

Vito Marcantonio, John J. Abt, Joseph Forer, for Respondent.

REPORT OF THE BOARD

On November 22, 1950, the Attorney General of the United States, Petitioner herein, acting under Section 13 (a) of The Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, hereinafter called the Act, filed a petition with the Board for an order requiring the Communist Party of the United States of America (CPUSA), Respondent herein, to register with the Attorney General as required by Sections 7 (a), (c), and (d) of the Act. The petition alleges that Respondent is a Communist-action organization as defined in the Act and as measured by the standards specified therein, and it sets forth numerous allegations of fact in support of its contention.

A copy of the petition was served by Petitioner upon Respondent on November 24, 1950. Answer under protest was filed by Respondent on February 14, 1951, and on April 3, 1951, an amended answer was filed.¹

In the amended answer Respondent admits that it was organized in 1919 and has been in existence continuously since that date. Otherwise, the substance and effect of its answer is to deny that Respondent fits the definition and standards of a Communist-action organization as alleged in the petition.

Hearings for the purpose of taking evidence on the petition commenced on April 23, 1951, before three members of the Board sitting as a hearing panel.

On October 20, 1951, one member of the Hearing Panel became unavailable to the Board by virtue of the adjournment of Congress without taking action upon his nomination to the Board. The hearing proceeded before the remaining two members of the Hearing Panel, who were present and participated during the entire hearing. Respondent, on October 23, 1951, moved the Board for an order striking all evidence theretofore received and all proceedings theretofore held

¹ In the interim period Respondent attacked the validity of the proceeding by various motions addressed to the Board, which were denied, and also instituted suit in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for a preliminary injunction to stay the proceeding and for a permanent injunction and declaratory judgment (Civil Action 419-51). A three-judge statutory court on February 28, 1951, denied Respondent's motion for a preliminary injunction (*Communist Party of the United States v. McGrath*, 96 F. Supp. 47) but on March 13, 1951, issued an order staying answer and hearings before the Board to and including March 27, 1951, pending appeal. An extension of this stay was refused by the United States Supreme Court on March 26, 1951, and Respondent voluntarily discontinued the proceeding.

because of the failure of the Senate to confirm the one member, and because of alleged bias and prejudice of the Panel against Respondent, which motion was denied following oral argument thereon. Respondent thereupon instituted suit in the United States District Court to enjoin the hearings but was not successful.²

Hearings for the purpose of taking evidence on the petition, having commenced on April 23, 1951, terminated on July 1, 1952.

Briefs and proposed findings of fact were filed by each party on July 28, 1952. On August 6, 1952, reply briefs were filed by each of the parties, and on August 14, 1952, oral argument thereon was held before the Hearing Panel.

On October 20, 1952, the Hearing Panel issued its Recommended Decision finding Respondent to be a Communist-action organization as defined in the Act and recommending that the Board issue an order requiring Respondent to register as such with the Attorney General of the United States.

On November 21, 1952, Petitioner filed exceptions to the Recommended Decision requesting that the Board adopt the Panel's findings with certain minor changes of text. On November 24, 1952, Respondent filed its exceptions to the Recommended Decision, accompanied by a memorandum in support thereof, and four motions. Following oral argument, the motions were denied in our Memoranda Opinions and Orders of December 23, 1952, and February 24, 1953. Oral argument on the exceptions to the Recommended Decision was had before us on January 7, 1953.

Respondent notes 310 exceptions, most of which contain numerous grounds for attacking a specified portion or finding of the Recommended Decision. Illustrative of the nature of its exceptions is Exception No. 51, which reads as follows:

Respondent excepts to the statement as to the end towards which certain policies and activities of the Respondent are directed (p. 26, ll. 29-32), as being unsupported by the evidence, contrary to the evidence, based on irrelevant matters, based on constitutionally protected conduct and expression, and made with an improper reliance on pre-Act matters.

In addition to taking exception to virtually every statement in the Recommended Decision on what amounts to a line-by-line basis, Respondent in many instances made a general exception to entire captioned sections of the Recommended Decision, illustrative of which is Exception No. 102:

On the same grounds [same as exception No. 101; i. e., irrational, unsupported by the evidence, contrary to the evidence, beyond the scope of the petition, and based on an improper reliance on pre-Act matters] Respondent excepts to the entire section of the Recommended Decision which appears under the subheading "Trade-Union Activities" (pp. 50-58).

In addition to the foregoing, Respondent, by its Exception No. 310, attacks the Recommended Decision as a whole on the grounds that it is arbitrary; capricious; not in accordance with law; contrary to the Constitution, including the First and Fifth Amendments; made without the observance of procedure required by law; unsupported by the evidence or by a preponderance thereof; contrary to the evidence and a preponderance thereof; largely based on incompetent and irrelevant evidence and on testimony not entitled to credence;

² The United States District Court for the District of Columbia, on February 15, 1952, entered an order granting the Board's motion to dismiss, and dismissing the proceeding before the court. *Communist Party of the United States of America v. Peter Campbell Brown, et al.* (Civil Action 4618-51).

based on evidence and findings outside the scope of the petition; and largely resulting from improper use of, and reliance on, matters and events which antedate the enactment of the Act;³ further, that the Panel has not performed its function of weighing, analyzing, and describing the evidence and contentions of the parties; that the Panel has obscured, concealed, and misstated what the record actually shows; that it has so intermingled pre-Act and post-Act evidence as to confuse and misstate the record and vitiate its findings and conclusions; and, that the Panel's decision is clearly a product of bias and prejudice.

Respondent also preserves all exceptions which have accrued to it as a result of rulings adverse to it heretofore made by the Hearing Panel or the Board.

Notwithstanding the general, sweeping nature of these exceptions and their lack of substantive specificity, we have carefully examined and considered each of them, as well as the matters set forth in Respondent's memorandum in support thereof.

In making our findings herein, we have reviewed the entire record and we have appraised the Recommended Decision, and the exceptions taken thereto by both parties, in the light thereof. Except to the extent the exceptions of either party are expressly or impliedly incorporated herein, they are hereby expressly overruled as being unsupported by the evidence or otherwise lacking in merit.

In this report, we discuss the evidence under topical headings which in the main conform to the sequence of the criteria of Section 13 (e) of the Act which we are required to consider. This arrangement also substantially follows the allegations of the petition.

In making our findings herein, we have considered and weighed all the evidence of record. In weighing Petitioner's evidence, we have considered that certain of its witnesses fall into the category of "informers" and we have scrutinized their testimony accordingly; we have considered and resolved the inconsistencies in the testimony of certain of Petitioner's witnesses; we have considered the testimony of Petitioner's witnesses against the background of their various organizational positions and activities in the CPUSA which afforded the sources of their knowledge; and we have had the benefit of the Panel's observation of their demeanor while testifying. Viewing these considerations in the light of the whole record, we find no basis for disregarding the substance of their testimony.

We have likewise weighed and evaluated Respondent's evidence, taking into account that each of its three witnesses has a vital personal interest in the outcome of this proceeding; that in nature and substance the direct testimony of two of its witnesses amounted, in a large degree, to conclusory denials of the allegations of the petition and the criteria of Section 13 (e) of the Act; that important members of Respondent, whom Petitioner's witnesses had identified as being parties to, or present at, conversations which were detrimental to Respondent herein, were not called to rebut such testimony; and, that the Hearing Panel, having observed the demeanor of its witnesses as they testified, had some misgivings about certain of them.

It is noteworthy that the stenographic record herein comprises 14,413 pages and that in addition 507 exhibits, many of which are entire volumes, are part of the record. To set forth and resolve herein

³ The matters raised in the exceptions pertaining to Pre-Act evidence and Constitutional issues are dealt with later herein under "Legal Discussion."

all the conflicts between the evidence of the parties would unduly protract this report. Where warranted, however, we treat specifically with conflicts in the evidence and the credibility of the witnesses with regard thereto in the body of this report.

Applying the foregoing considerations, we have made our findings below. Such evidence of record that is inconsistent therewith is not credited.

A short biographical sketch of each witness, containing information pertinent to this proceeding, is contained in Appendix A, and a list of publications which are in evidence and have major importance in this proceeding is contained in Appendix B.

For clarity, it is desirable that we make certain findings based on the evidence herein concerning Respondent's publications and its general nature and organizational composition preliminary to setting out the body of the evidence.

Therefore, we find: That Respondent is a disciplined organization numbering many thousands of members, which is controlled internally between conventions by a National Committee; that it has organizational units at city, county, state, and district (includes multistate) levels which include clubs, cells, fractions, branches, and sections, and committees thereof; that, in addition to the foregoing, it maintains other operating committees for specific purposes; that Respondent has been in existence in the United States since 1919; and, that it is not a diplomatic representative or mission of a foreign government accredited as such by the Department of State.

We also find that the following publications, issues of which are in evidence, are or were during their existence official and controlled organs of Respondent:

- (a) *The Daily Worker*;
- (b) *The Worker*; this is currently the Sunday edition of the *Daily Worker*; however, in the 1920's a paper with this name fulfilled much the same function as the present *Daily Worker*;
- (c) *Political Affairs*, a monthly magazine;
- (d) *The Communist*; the predecessor to *Political Affairs*, which served Respondent in the same capacity prior to early 1945. The same title was used for a Party newspaper early in Respondent's existence.

I. FINDINGS OF FACT

A. WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

The definition of a Communist-action organization in Section 3 (3), and the terms of the several criteria in Section 13 (c) of the Act make desirable a finding based upon the evidence in this proceeding concerning the world Communist movement, its characteristics and the identification of the leadership of such movement.

Much of the evidence which establishes the allegations of the petition pertaining to the various criteria in Section 13 (c) necessarily shows the existence of the world Communist movement, its characteristics and its leader. The evidence sustaining these allegations is fully set forth hereafter in this report. Consequently, we now set forth in summary form only the evidence adduced in this proceeding which substantiates the existence of the world Communist movement, describes its nature and identifies its leadership.

The Respondent in its amended answer and through the testimony of its witnesses admits that a world Communist movement exists in the sense that the CPUSA and other Communist parties in countries throughout the world are guided in their activity by a concept of "social science" called Marxism-Leninism,⁴ and have as their common goal the establishment of "socialism." Respondent contends, however, that the international relationship among the Communist parties of the world is merely a fraternal one. It denies that there exists a world Communist movement which is substantially dominated or controlled by the Soviet Union and which has as its purpose the establishment of dictatorships of the proletariat in all countries throughout the world. Respondent's witness Gates testified that, in referring to "the world Communist movement" in his writings, he had in mind separate autonomous movements. Respondent's expert witness, Dr. Herbert Aptheker, teacher and trustee of the Jefferson School of Social Science, Editor of *Masses and Main Stream*, and Managing Editor of *Political Affairs*, offers the explanation that in Marxist-Leninist literature such terms as "international solidarity," "proletarian internationalism," "working class internationalism," etc., are used simply to indicate the fraternal relationship among the working classes of the countries of the world. Respondent's witness Elizabeth Gurley Flynn draws an analogy with the international trade-union movement, asserting that this movement exists but that there is no worldwide trade-union; and that, similarly, a world Communist movement does exist, but that an international integrated Communist Party does not. The witness Flynn admits that Stalin is universally regarded by Communists as the ideological leader of world Communism⁵ and as the leader of the senior Communist Party of the world, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union; however, she denies that either Stalin or the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) exercises domination or control over Respondent or any other Communist Party in the world.

We are unable to accept these contentions of respondent concerning the existence, nature, purpose, and leadership of the world Communist movement, as they are contrary to the clear preponderance of evidence.

The present world Communist movement was first manifested organizationally by the formation of the Third Communist International in Moscow in 1919. This event is recorded in the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* (Pet. Ex. 330), as hereinafter developed.⁶

One year later, July 17 to August 7, 1920, the Second Congress of the Communist International adopted and promulgated its *Theses and Statutes* setting forth its aims and purposes as later detailed herein,⁷ which includes the following:

The Communist International is aware that for the purpose of a speedy achievement of victory the International Association of Workers, which is struggling for the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of Communism, should possess a firm and centralized organization. *To all intents and purposes the Communist International should represent a single universal Communist Party, of which the parties operating in every country form individual sections. The*

⁴ See pp. 21-44, *infra*, for findings re Marxism-Leninism.

⁵ Subsequent to the hearing herein Stalin died; he has been succeeded by Georgi M. Malenkov.

⁶ See p. 10, *infra*; see also pp. 42-43, *infra*, for Respondent's adherence to this work.

⁷ See pp. 10-11, *infra*.

organized apparatus of the Communist International is to secure to the toilers of every country the possibility at any given moment of obtaining the maximum of aid from the organized workers of the other countries.

For this purpose the Communist International confirms the following items of its statutes:

SEC. 1. The new International Association of Workers is established for the purpose of organizing common activity of the workers of various countries who are striving towards a single aim: the overthrow of capitalism; the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of the *International Soviet Republic*; the complete abolition of classes, and the realization of socialism—the first step of Communist Society. [Italic supplied.] (Pet. Ex. 8, p. 5.)

The Communist International was in fact that which these publications proclaim, i. e., a universal Communist Party organized and controlled as to policies and activities by the Soviet Union and consisting of the various Communist parties of the countries throughout the world, which constituted sections of the Communist International. The Communist International embodied an elaborate organizational structure, including an Executive Committee; departments on Organization Agitation and Propaganda, and Youth; Secretariats or Commissions covering sections of the world, such as the Far Eastern Secretariat, Anglo-American Secretariat, etc., which supervised the Communist parties in these respective areas; and Field Bureaus.

Respondent joined this international Communist organization shortly after it was constituted and admittedly until 1940 participated therein. Characteristic of the Communist International's worldwide activities were the Profintern or Red International of Labor Unions; MOPR, or the International Red Aid to defend Communists; the maintenance of representatives in various countries, first to enforce and insure adherence to its policies, and further to afford guidance and assistance; the instruction and training of individual members of its section Communist parties and the payment of expenses incident thereto; the rendering of financial aid to the various Communist parties throughout the world, either directly in money disbursed to or for them or indirectly through furnishing of free propaganda materials, publications, printing, etc.; the exercise of strict disciplinary control over individual members and entire Communist Party sections, resulting in expulsion of a member for failure to follow Soviet Union policies and directives; the settlement of intraparty disputes and the resolution of issues relating to tactics, strategy, procedure, and policy of Communist Party sections; the command of paramount allegiance to the Soviet Union as the leader of international Communism and fatherland of the world proletariat; the strict adherence to that body of principles and policies called Marxism-Leninism;⁸ all in furtherance of making secure the foundation of the world proletarian revolution, i. e., the Soviet Union, and installing Communist dictatorships under the direction and domination of the Soviet Union in all countries throughout the world, including the United States, by activity both open and secret and by any means whether legal or illegal.

As a result of the passage of the Voorhis Act in 1940 (54 Stat. 1204) Respondent announced a disaffiliation from the Communist International, but did not alter fundamentally its relationship with the Communist International.⁹ The Communist International was formally dissolved as such in 1943, at which time the United States

⁸ See pp. 21-41; 120, *infra*.

⁹ See pp. 14-16, *infra*.

and the Soviet Union were military allies. This formal dissolution was accomplished, assertedly, in order to remove the foundation for "Fascist" charges that the Soviet Union was meddling in the internal affairs of other nations. In truth and in practice the world Communist movement, under the hegemony of the Soviet Union, has remained as theretofore, despite the "dissolution" of the Communist International.

In 1947, the Communist Information Bureau, herein sometimes called the Cominform, was organized¹⁰ to facilitate the coordination of activities of Communist parties of various countries in the struggle against "imperialism"; its membership consists of a number of Communist parties.

Zhdanov, then a member of the Politburo of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in calling for greater and closer international coordination of action by Communist parties at the Communist Party Informative Conference in Poland in September 1947 stated, in part, as follows:

* * * There can be no doubt that if the situation [the tendency toward the isolation of individual Communist parties] were to continue it would be fraught with most serious consequences to the development of the work of the fraternal parties. The need for mutual consultation and voluntary coordination of action between individual parties has become particularly urgent at the present juncture when continued isolation may lead to a slackening of mutual understanding, and at times, even to serious blunders (Pet. Ex. 214-A, p. 4).

Georgi M. Malenkov, successor to Stalin and presently leader of the Soviet Union, also addressed this conference laying additional emphasis on the necessity for coordination of international Communist activities. Pertinent excerpts from Malenkov's report are set forth herein at pp. 18-19, *infra*.

In the United States, Respondent refrained from formally joining the Cominform, because "* * * reactionary and pro-Fascist forces now whipping up anti-Communist hysteria and war incitement in our country would undoubtedly seize upon such action * * * as a pretext for new provocations and repressions against the Communists * * *" (Pet. Ex. 368). However, the CPUSA announced firm agreement with and approval of its formation. Notwithstanding this lack of formal affiliation, manifestations of the world Communist movement and Respondent's participation therein continued. Known representatives of the world Communist movement remained in the United States and continued their participation in the affairs of Respondent; leaders of Respondent went abroad at Party expense to international gatherings where they met and consulted with world Communist leaders; the official organ of the Cominform, *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*, is used by Respondent's leaders as a source of authoritative direction on matters pertaining to the world Communist movement and Respondent's participation therein; detailed "greetings" containing messages are sent and received by the various Communist parties of the world, including the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Respondent; Respondent unswervingly adheres to the positions taken by the Soviet Union on international issues; and Respondent continues to advocate, teach and apply Marxism-Leninism.

Adherence to Marxism-Leninism, as its principles and precepts are stated in the Classics, is completely incompatible with Respondent's

¹⁰ See *infra* pp. 16-19, re detailed findings concerning the Communist Information Bureau.

contention that it and numerous other Communist parties throughout the world apply Marxism-Leninism individually, separately and autonomously. It is clear that international organization, which affords the coordination of activity and discipline as directed by the Soviet Union and which commands the subordination of all national duties and also requires allegiance to the Soviet Union, is the very essence of Marxism-Leninism as understood and practiced by Respondent.¹¹

The international integration of the world Communist movement is further illustrated by the perspective in which Respondent regards the incidents affecting, or activities of, Communist parties in other nations. For example, a letter sent by Respondent to the Communist Party of France as reprinted in the *Daily Worker* of June 9, 1952, regards the arrest of French Communist leader, Jacques Duclos, as an act of the men of "Wall Street." The letter states in part:

* * * We American Communists are conscious of our responsibility to show the people at home that it is the Wall Street men of the trusts who are the real fomentors of the present hysteria, arrests, and persecutions in your country. We will do everything to convince the American people that it is U. S. imperialism which strives to impose upon the French people the same kind of wartime dictatorship they seek to impose in our own land. We know your struggle is our struggle—a common fight against a common enemy—to defeat the North Atlantic war alliance, to prevent the renazification [sic] and remilitarization of Western Germany, to fight for a Five-Power Pact of Peace and Friendship as the only path to peace and freedom * * * (Pet. Ex. 495).

Similarly a "greeting" from Respondent to the Seventh Congress of the Italian Communist Party, published in the *Daily Worker* of April 4, 1951, stated:

* * * "your work in defense of peace and socialism under the magnificent leadership of Palmiro Togliatti, has a particular repercussion in our country.

"The great battle of the Italian workers for their independence, peace, and social progress calls forth greatest admiration among us. We are confident that in fraternal battle against Wall Street, the cause of Italy's millions, which is our cause too, will triumph" (Pet. Ex. 456).

Respondent, at its 15th National Convention held from December 28 to 31, 1950, in New York City, received "greetings" from Communist parties in the Soviet Union, People's Democratic Republic of China, France, Italy, Hungary, Poland, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, German Democratic Republic, Western Germany, Austria, Great Britain, Canada, Mexico, Brazil, Cuba, Spain, Norway, Denmark, The Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Eire, India, Israel, Algeria, Ceylon, Free Territory of Trieste, Belgium, Australia, New Zealand, Indonesia, and the Yugoslav Political Revolutionary Emigrants (Pet. Ex. 376).

Many such "greetings" expressed regret that it was impossible to send delegates as Respondent had invited, but noted in varied detail the problems (from a Communist viewpoint) in the particular country involved, as well as those facing Respondent. These "greetings" likewise are replete with phrases that reveal the characteristics and leadership of the world Communist movement, of which the following are illustrative:

* * * all persons who oppose the aggressive policy of American imperialism and the rule of Fascist terror, are uniting in joint resistance * * *.

¹¹ See "Marxism-Leninism" pp. 24-25; 31-32, *infra*, for detailed findings to this effect.

* * * the decisions of your Convention, taken in the light of the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, will enable you to advance forward on the road of unity of action * * *.

Your successes are our successes.

We know your struggle is difficult, but together with you, 800 million people, led by the invincible Soviet Union, defend peace and liberty.

* * * your party will raise still higher the immortal banner of Marxism-Leninism and will honorably fulfill its patriotic and internationalist duty * * *.

* * * the fight of the millions of common people for peace and democracy, inspired by peace-loving Soviet Union and the great Stalin, will win.

Your fight, dear comrades, is our fight, just as the struggle of the German Friends of democracy and peace is your struggle.

The invincible peace camp under the leadership of the Soviet Union and the great Stalin, defends the happiness of all peoples. You have a decisive place in the camp of peace.

We feel closely bound up with your struggles not only because we pursue the same aims but also because we face the same enemy, American imperialism.

* * * our common struggle against Anglo-American imperialism.

Headed by the mighty Socialist Soviet Union and our friend and teacher, Joseph Stalin, the world camp of peace is going forward to win * * *.

* * * your decisions will victoriously guide the American people in their determined struggle for the defense of the cause of peace and socialism so brilliantly led by Comrade Stalin.

United by proletarian internationalism under the banner of the great Stalin, we will march victoriously on the road to peace and Socialism.

* * * we are firmly convinced * * * that you will fulfill the great task of world significance * * *.

Your invitation confirms that proletarian internationalism, in spite of hate, persecution, and terror, is a living reality.

Our fight for peace, independence, and freedom is directed against the same enemy as your fight.

Long live proletarian internationalism.

We pledge our maximum contribution to the peace movement headed by the Soviet Union.

Long live the solidarity of the working people in the whole world * * * for the triumph of the ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin!

The foregoing statements in this section are fully supported by a preponderance of the evidence, which is set out in detail in our findings in the captioned portions of this report which follow. Based on the evidence adduced in this proceeding we find (1) that there exists a world Communist movement, substantially as described in Section 2 of the Act, which was organized by the Soviet Union, and which has as its primary objectives the establishment of Communist dictatorships of the proletariat in all countries throughout the world, including the United States, and (2) that the direction, domination, and control of this movement is vested in, and is exercised by, the Soviet Union.

B. POLICIES AND DIRECTIVES

1. *Respondent's organization and leadership*

The nature of this proceeding is such that we cannot and should not single out one factual situation as determining the issues, but must consider the record as a whole. In so doing, we have taken into consideration the evidence hereinafter summarized concerning the events which have resulted in Respondent's present organizational form, and which establishes certain facts regarding the background and activities of Respondent's present leadership. We find this evidence tends to establish that Respondent is a Communist-action organization.

Respondent was organized in 1919 and has been in existence continuously since that date. The evidence leaves no doubt that the Respondent is molded organizationally and operationally along the

lines found by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to be most effective in establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union. Such an organization and operation is in accordance with the strategy and tactics of Marxism-Leninism. It is also in accordance with the requirements of the Communist International.

Before treating with Respondent's organization and internal administration, it is of major importance for a clear understanding of our findings and of the background and bases for a number of Respondent's policies and activities, to review the evidence and set forth certain pertinent facts regarding an association or organization known as the Communist International (Comintern). According to Respondent's witness Flynn, this organization was "a federation, as it were, of Communist Parties, who met together, consulted together, and exchanged knowledge and experience in relation to the struggles that they were carrying on in their particular countries."¹² The record, however, establishes a different nature and different characteristics of the Communist International.

Upon consideration of the sizable quantity of both oral and documentary evidence relative to the matter, we find that the Communist International was organized in 1919 by the Soviet Union as the international organization of Communist Parties in all countries—a World Communist Party—with the aim to overthrow "capitalist" states and to create the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet form. Significant evidence establishing the foregoing includes the documents, *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)*; *Theses and Statutes of the Third (Communist) International*, adopted July 17–August 7th, 1920; the *Programme of the Communist International*, issued at the Sixth Congress in Moscow in 1928; and, Respondent's *Manual On Organization*, issued in the 1930's. These documents are further identified and discussed later in this report.

In the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, it is stated:

In March 1919, on the initiative of the Bolsheviks, headed by Lenin, the First Congress of the Communist Parties of various countries, held in Moscow, founded the Communist International. Although many of the delegates were prevented by the blockade and imperialist persecution from arriving in Moscow, the most important countries of Europe and America were represented at this First Congress. The work of the congress was guided by Lenin.

* * * * *

The congress adopted a manifesto to the proletariat of all countries, calling upon them to wage a determined struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat and for the triumph of Soviets all over the world.

* * * * *

Thus was founded an international revolutionary proletarian organization of a new type—the Communist International—the Marxist-Leninist International (Pet Ex. 330, pp. 231–232).

The Theses and Statutes stated that—

* * * all the events of world politics are inevitably concentrating around one point, namely, the struggle of the bourgeois world against the *Russian Soviet Republic, which is grouping around itself the Soviet movements of the vanguards of the workers of all countries, and all national liberation movements of the colonial and subject countries, which have been taught by bitter experience that there can be no salvation for them outside of a union with the revolutionary proletariat, and the triumph of the Soviet power over Imperialism.* [Italic added.] (Pet. Ex. 8, p. 67.)

¹² This is in substance the same characterization Respondent places on the present organization of Communist Parties known as the Information Bureau of Communist and Workers' Parties or the Communist Information Bureau. See pp. 16–19 of this report.

Also:

The Communist International makes its aim to put up an armed struggle for the overthrow of the International bourgeoisie and to create an International Soviet Republic as a transition stage to the complete abolition of the State. The Communist International considers the dictatorship of the proletariat as the only means for the liberation of humanity from the horrors of capitalism (ibid., p. 4).

The Constitution and Rules of the Communist International as set forth in the *Programme* includes—

The Communist International—the International Workers' Association—is a union of Communist Parties in various countries; it is a world Communist Party. As the leader and organizer of the world revolutionary movement * * * and the upholder of the principles and aims of Communism, the Communist International * * * fights for the establishment of the world dictatorship of the proletariat, for the establishment of a World Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, for the complete abolition of classes and for the achievement of socialism—the first stage of Communist Society (Pet. Ex. 125, p. 85).

Respondent's *Manual on Organization* defines the Communist International as follows, which is pertinent for comparison with the foregoing quotations:

The Communist International is the international organization of Communist Parties in all countries. It is the World Communist Party. The Communist Parties in the various countries affiliated to the Comintern are called Sections of the Communist International (Pet. Ex. 145, p. 42).

The record shows, in addition to the fact that the Communist International was organized and formed by the Soviet Union and had the aforesaid aims, that the Soviet Union exercised complete control over the policies and activities of the Communist International. All of the heads of the Comintern that are identified in the record have been leading members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The meetings of the governing committees and the congresses shown in the record have been held in Moscow. Witnesses who had been representatives of Respondent to the Comintern established that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was the leading party (section) in the Comintern, and its decisions were binding on the executive committee of the Comintern and such decisions of the Comintern bound all other member parties; furthermore it had five votes on the executive committee to one each for the other larger parties. The government of the Soviet Union financed the Comintern.

The record also establishes through both oral and documentary evidence that as a section or member of the Communist International, Respondent was under the complete domination and control of the Communist International regarding its policies, activities, programs, and other operations. Illustrations and examples of Respondent's acceptance of and adherence to directions and instructions from the Communist International are covered in the parts of this report which follow and include the teaching and advocacy of the overthrow of "imperialist" governments; trade union activities; work among the youth; and the recognition and acceptance of discipline; as well as details concerning Respondent's organizational structure and internal administration.

Also significant, and indicative of Respondent's acceptance of, or submission to, control over it by the Communist International, are various other official statements and teachings by Respondent subsequent to the time that it became a part of the Communist Interna-

tional, and Respondent's acceptance and following of instructions of Comintern representatives sent to the United States. The activities in the United States of Comintern and other foreign Communist representatives is covered elsewhere in this report. With respect to the specific actions of Respondent and its teachings as evidencing the acceptance of domination and control by the Comintern, the record shows that early in 1921, Respondent revised its program and constitution "in conformity with the Theses and Statutes of the C. I.," and adopted the "twenty-one points for affiliation to the C. I."¹³ (Pet. Ex. 123, p. 1), and became an "integral part of the Communist International" (p. 2). In 1929, Respondent's Central Committee issued a "Discussion Outline for Lenin Campaign" which in effect explains the role of the Party as that defined by the "Program of the Comintern" and states:

One who fights the Soviet Union and the Comintern is an agent of capitalism directed against our Party in its campaign to mobilize the workers against imperialist war and for defense of the Soviet Union (Pet. Ex. 108, p. 6).

The "Thesis and Resolutions" for the Seventh National Convention of Respondent¹⁴ which were adopted by the Convention in 1930, refer to "communications" from the Comintern in connection with various tasks of the Party (Pet. Ex. 132, p. 32, p. 54). The resolutions adopted at the 8th convention of Respondent in 1934 include the following:

The E. C. C. I. is the Executive Committee of the Communist International. It is the general staff of the world revolutionary movement giving unity and leadership to the Communist Parties of the world. The E. C. C. I. meets in plenary session at intervals of between six months and one year. The body acting in highest authority between one plenary session (Plenum) of the E. C. C. I. and the other, is the Presidium of the Communist International. The Communist Party of the U. S. A. is the American Section of the Communist International (Comintern) (Pet. Ex. 136, p. 18).

Petitioner's witnesses Budenz, Crouch, Gitlow, Honig, Johnson, Kornfeder, Lautner, Meyer, and Nowell each testified concerning various aspects and manifestations of the control exercised over Respondent by the Communist International while these witnesses were members of Respondent and held various official positions. Gitlow was a top official of Respondent and in 1928-1929 was a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. He states unequivocally that the Comintern controlled all major policies of Respondent and cites instances such as convention arrangements and the policy of the party press which were based upon Comintern directives or instructions. Kornfeder knows of no instance during his membership, 1919-1934, when Respondent deviated from Comintern instructions and shows that the qualifications for attending Communist training schools in Moscow were set up by the Comintern, and that members of Respondent recommended to become students at the schools had to be approved by the Comintern. Nowell and Honig both were in Moscow during the 1930's as students and representatives of Respondent and participated in the work of the Communist International, particularly the preparation of directives to Respondent which directives were carried out. Meyer, an American citizen, returned to the United States in 1934, having been a member of the British Communist Party, and was not required to fill out an appli-

¹³ These "conditions" spelled out rigid requirements of allegiance to the Comintern with provisions for strict discipline as well as details as to the form of the Communist Parties and their activities.

¹⁴ The "Thesis and Resolutions" represented the prime authority of Respondent in its programs, policy and practical orientation for the period 1930-1934 which were applied in practice and in Respondent's schools.

cation to join Respondent since he was merely transferring from one section of the Communist International, or Communist movement, to another. Johnson, a member of Respondent from 1930 to 1940 and at one time on the Central Committee, was taught at Respondent's National Training School, and saw in operation, that under the rules of the Comintern no person could hold or resign from a position of leadership without the approval of the Comintern. He also states unequivocally that he knows of no single instance during his membership where Respondent ever opposed a decision of the Comintern.

The foregoing is only a part of the considerable testimony on the activities of the Communist International concerning the Respondent in the United States but serves to illustrate Respondent's role as a member or part of the Communist International.

In view of our finding that the Communist International was founded and controlled by the Soviet Union, and of our further finding that the Communist International dominated and controlled Respondent, and upon the entire record, we find and conclude that the Communist International for over twenty years constituted the organizational instrumentality through which the Soviet Union dominated and controlled the Communist Parties throughout the world, including Respondent.¹⁵

As later herein covered, Respondent announced its "disaffiliation" from the Communist International in 1940, and the "dissolution" of that organization was announced in Moscow in 1943. It is pertinent before concluding this aspect of our findings concerning the Communist International to note that the Communist International stood "wholly and unreservedly upon the ground of *revolutionary Marxism* and its further development, Leninism" (Pet. Ex. 125, p. 8). Because of the importance of "Marxism-Leninism" in this proceeding, its meaning is determined in detail later in this report.

Concerning Respondent's organizational form and changes therein, we find that early in Respondent's existence, in 1924, the Communist International "decided" that various factions in the United States should amalgamate into a single party, which was done. The evidence hereinafter summarized and the entire record establishes that Respondent is that Party.

We further find that in 1929 another factional dispute existed in Respondent which was a reflection of a struggle in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and in the Communist International between the forces led by Stalin and those led by Bukharin. Although a minority of only about 10 percent in Respondent, led by Foster, supported Stalin, whereas the majority of about 90 percent, led by Lovestone and Gitlow sided with Bukharin, the solution of the dispute dictated by Stalin was adopted by the Comintern and accepted by Respondent, representatives of the Comintern being sent to the United States to supervise its effectuation. The result of the "liquidation of the factional situation in the Communist Party" (Pet. Ex. 126, p. 245) was the expulsion from Respondent of Lovestone, Gitlow and others and the placing of the leadership of Respondent in the Foster group. Earl Browder was recalled from China by way

¹⁵ Respondent's witness Gates stated on cross-examination that "The Communist International was an actual organization of the world Communist movement and we were affiliated at one time. We are not affiliated now, and the organization no longer exists."

of Moscow to become General Secretary of the Party. Foster was given a high position. He became a "builder of the Party" (Pet. Ex. 126, p. 247). This is the William Z. Foster who is presently National Chairman of Respondent.

In 1940, Respondent announced its disaffiliation from the Communist International. We find that the primary reason for the disaffiliation was to avoid registration of the Respondent as a foreign agent under the Voorhis Act of October 17, 1940; and that the disaffiliation did not alter in any substantive way the relationship between Respondent and the Communist International or the world Communist movement. Respondent's amended answer admits it was "affiliated" with the Communist International prior to November 1940, and states that it "disaffiliated" from the Communist International in November 1940. The amended answer and the evidence offered by Respondent seek to establish, however, that, "Since 1940, the Communist Party has had no international affiliation of any kind—although it follows with interest the experiences of other Communist Parties, reads their journals, and on appropriate occasions sends or receives fraternal greetings" (amended answer, p. 17).

Witness Meyer was present as a member at the State Committee meeting when the delegation to the convention of Respondent which considered the disaffiliation reported back to the Illinois-Indiana District. The substance of the delegation's report was that the disaffiliation was a matter of expediency, that it changed nothing fundamentally or significantly, and that it had to be done to preserve the legality of the Party. Witness Lautner was a delegate to the convention and also describes the understanding of the convention to be that the disaffiliation was one of expediency which in no way affected the Party's attitude on the question of proletarian internationalism. Witness Crouch attended a convention-time meeting of the Politboro and district organizers where Earl Browder, then general secretary of the Party, said that the actual relations of the Respondent to the Communist International would remain exactly the same in the future as they had in the past, that Respondent would continue to be guided by the Communist International and that because of the political development of Respondent the matter of formality in the relationship was no longer as necessary as it had once been. The district organizers were assigned the duty to go back to the respective districts and explain the reasons for disaffiliation which Crouch, being a district organizer at the time, did.

Respondent's witness Flynn testified on cross-examination that she was on the National Committee of Respondent when the resolution of disaffiliation was discussed. She says:

* * * we were not disaffiliating in anger, or disaffiliating to fight the Communist Internationale. It was, you might say, a friendly divorcee (Tr. 14002).

We find the evidence preponderates to establish that the disaffiliation was for the expediency of avoiding registration as a foreign agent and did not alter Respondent's relationship with the Communist International or the world Communist movement.

We have heretofore set forth our finding that the Communist International was the means or vehicle through which the Government and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union directed and led the Communist Parties of the various countries, including Respondent. In 1943, upon approval by the various member Communist Parties of

a proposal by the Presidium of the Executive Committee, the Communist International was dissolved.¹⁶ Respondent, having a few years earlier announced its "disaffiliation" from the Communist International, was not "called upon to participate in the decision" (Pet. Ex. 207, p. 657). It did, however, hail and support the dissolution. Stalin, who at the time was the chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of the U. S. S. R. and a leading member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U., stated the dissolution was "proper and opportune" in that it facilitated the organization of a general onslaught against the common enemy, Hitlerism (Pet. Ex. 204). In supporting and hailing the dissolution of the Communist International, Respondent took the same line as that expressed by Stalin, i. e., that the dissolution "is a well aimed blow * * * at Hitler * * *" (Pet. Ex. 206), and pointed out in the Daily Worker that the "particular organizational form for international proletarian unity * * * became a hindrance to the further strengthening of the national workers' parties" but that the dissolution "must not be mistaken as a sign of weakness or of helpless collapse" (Pet. Ex. 205). In view of the foregoing, and upon consideration of the subsequent manifestations of the operations of the world Communist movement and of Respondent's conduct and activities as elsewhere herein covered, and upon the entire record, we find and conclude that the dissolution of the Communist International was merely the termination of the use of that "particular organizational form," and a change in the means and the particular vehicle for promoting and advancing the world Communist movement.

We find that during the year following the announced dissolution of the Communist International, Respondent's organizational form and some of its tactics underwent a change. It became known as the Communist Political Association from May 1944 until June 1945¹⁷ when it was reconstituted as the Communist Party. During this period, there was a deemphasis on the use of some of the Marxism-Leninism principles and the central teaching was around the current documents of the Party, which put forward the so-called "Teheran line" that advocated, at least for the time being, a peaceful coexistence of the United States and the Soviet Union. We note that in becoming the CPA there was no substantial change: Respondent's membership and leadership were the same, and upon reverting to the CPUSA in 1945, similarly, its membership was the same and, with one substantial exception, so was the leadership. Because of his lack of adherence to the proper tactical line, Earl Browder was characterized as a "revisionist" and "deviationist,"¹⁸ and was deposed as a leader whereupon the full Marxist-Leninist revolutionary ideology and action was again reemphasized.

Respondent's present organizational form commenced with its return in 1945 to the name Communist Party upon simultaneous dissolution of the Communist Political Association. A primary pur-

¹⁶ Petitioner's witness Dr. Mosely considers that because of the nature of the Communist International, the "proposal" to dissolve it by its Presidium was regarded as a "decision" to dissolve it (Tr. 7370).

¹⁷ Foster opposed the change on the ground it was not in line with the revolutionary position of Marxism-Leninism. His opposition was contained in a letter to the National Committee, which letter was suppressed from the membership at the time and not made known until shortly before the change back to the CPUSA.

¹⁸ In January 1950, Petitioner's witness Lantner, then on Respondent's Central Control Commission, and Jack Kling, then National Treasurer, discussed Browder's recent pamphlet wherein he stated that during the fifteen years of his leadership in Respondent, all major policies put into effect had the previous knowledge, consent, and active support of the decisive international Communist leadership. Kling called it stool-pigeon work on the part of Browder.

pose of again changing was to reemphasize the Marxist-Leninist Classics, particularly the writings of Stalin, the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* and Dimitroff's Report to the Seventh Congress which deals with the true nature of how to conduct the united front while forwarding the Communist revolutionary aims.

We find that in addition to this reemphasis on Marxism-Leninism, which it was established by the evidence in this proceeding are the basic laws for a world Communist revolution, the facts directly surrounding the reconstitution are indicative of foreign domination and control of Respondent. A few weeks after returning from Moscow to France, Jacques Duclos, a leader of the French Communist Party, member of the Executive Committee of the Communist-International until the announced dissolution of that organization, and a spokesman for the world Communist movement, issued a statement through the French Communist Party Journal, entitled "On the Dissolution of the Communist Party of the United States" (Pet. Ex. 208). Duclos' statement appeared in the April 1945 issue of the French publication. The substance and effect of the Duclos statement is that it was a mistake to dissolve the Communist Party of the United States—"in truth, nothing justifies the dissolution of the American Communist Party, in our opinion" (Pet. Ex. 208, p. 671); that a "powerful Communist Party" in the United States is necessary "in the struggle taking place between the progressive forces of the earth and Fascist barbarism" (Pet. Ex. 208, p. 672). Upon the record, we find that the Duclos statement represented authoritative criticism made by a spokesman for the world Communist movement.

In the month (May 1945) following the publication of the Duclos statement in the French Communist Party organ, Manuisky, a leading Soviet Union Communist, and a former official of the Communist International, who at the time was in the United States as Ukrainian representative to the United Nations Conference on Organization in San Francisco, let it be known to Respondent that it should observe the guidance and counsel of the French comrades. In June, the National board of the Communist Political Association met and called a meeting of the National Committee for later in the month, which in turn called a national convention for July. It was at this convention that the CPUSA was reconstituted in its present form as a militant Marxist-Leninist party.

As in the case of forming the Communist Political Association the year before, the same persons who had been officials of the CPA and the Party before that, led in reforming the Communist Party and, with the exception of Browder and a few others with minor rank, remained the leaders of the reconstituted party. As earlier herein found, Browder was expelled as a "revisionist" for departing from the orthodoxy of Marxism. Foster, upon taking over as a national chairman pointed out the necessity for reemphasizing the revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism.

The record establishes that subsequent to the reconstitution of Respondent, an additional event of significance has taken place in the world Communist movement—the formation of an organization known as the Information Bureau of Communist and Workers' Parties or the Communist Information Bureau, sometimes referred to in the record as the "Cominform". The significance lies in respondent's attitude

toward this organization, the sameness of views and policies of respondent and the organization, and Respondent's use and treatment of statements appearing in *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*, the official organ of the Cominform.

The exact nature and characteristics of the Communist Information Bureau are not precisely defined on the record. The record shows that the organization is composed of a number of Communist Parties of various countries and was established as a result of a decision taken at a conference held in Poland toward the end of September 1947. The record contains copies of two reports given at this founding conference, one by A. Zhdanov, then a member of the Politburo of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and principal Soviet representative at the founding conference. The other report was given by Georgi M. Malenkov, then a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and secretary of the CPSU.¹⁹ Based on these reports and the testimony of witnesses, we find that the purpose of the Communist Information Bureau is to mobilize forces in opposition to United States "imperialism".²⁰

Shortly after the establishment of the Cominform, Respondent announced publicly that "the present political situation in the United States is such that the Communist Party should not affiliate" with the new Information Bureau, but stated the establishment of the Bureau "is of great significance" and makes more effective the "resistance to the program of imperialist expansion." Respondent's announcement further states that respondent "will continue to promote the international solidarity of all anti-fascists and anti-imperialists" (Pet. Ex. 368).

Respondent's witnesses Gates and Flynn, members of the National Committee, in summarizing Respondent's position stated that all they know about the Information Bureau is what they read in the "capitalist" press and the journal of the Bureau; that the Information Bureau never issued directives to Respondent; and, that Respondent's use of *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy* is to see what is going on within various Communist Parties throughout the world with whom Respondent shares common interests. The record shows an attitude of arrogance and evasiveness on the part of witness Gates concerning the Communist Information Bureau which causes us to discount much of his testimony on the matter. Even after considerable questioning on cross-examination he was unwilling or unable to explain what was meant by "official documents" of the Cominform for which Respondent waited, before taking a position regarding the organization, and was unwilling or unable to explain why and how, in that connection, Respondent's announcement that it would not join the Cominform was made 7 days before publication of the first issue of *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*, dated November 10, 1947, which he had said might have been the official documents. Upon being asked whether issues of *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy* weren't received over here "before they were published? Before November 10, when the first issue came out?" the record shows the following at page 13212:

¹⁹ Subsequent to the closing of the hearings for the purpose of taking evidence in this proceeding, and upon the announced death of Joseph Stalin, Malenkov has become the announced leader of the Soviet Union. See additional reference to Malenkov at p. 53 of this report.

²⁰ The Communist concept of "imperialism" and "the struggle against imperialism" is covered in detail at pp. 44-56 of this report.

Answer: [by Gates]. Well, I don't believe in the supernatural, but if you do, that may have been possible.

Mr. BROWN. That is unnecessary.

The WITNESS. I can only answer a stupid question in such a way.

Later, Gates was questioned regarding whether the Communist Party in the United States or the *Daily Worker* or *Political Affairs* ever deviated from the expressed views and policies of the Cominform, and answered to the effect that the party and *Daily Worker* never deviate from what they consider the best interests of the American people and "if we have not expressed any disagreement with any views that have been put forward in *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*, that is because we believe those views have not been in contradiction to the interests of the American people." (Tr. 13226-13227). He was then asked to give any instances of deviation and replied, "I have answered the question." The question was repeated by a Panel member who asked the witness if he could answer "Yes" or "No," to which the reply was: "[It] is a loaded question," and, upon being advised the panel did not consider it to be, the witness responded with "You may not think so, but I think so"; and, "After all, I am the one who is on the witness stand and not you."

The evidence shows that the Zhdanov report, contained in the first issue of *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*, was studied in Respondent's clubs or cells as "the key to the whole movement"; that it was used in Respondent's schools as a major document stating and explaining the strategic aims of the world Communist movement. Malenkov's report was also studied and discussed. The record further shows that copies of *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy* have been made available to functionaries and clubs or cells of Respondent. Petitioner's witness Philbrick, based on 9 years' membership and activity in the Party, states that a member of Respondent could not disagree with a directive or a position taken by the Cominform and still remain a member of the Party. Additional facts concerning the Communist Information Bureau are set forth elsewhere in this report.

The two aforementioned reports of Zhdanov and Malenkov comprise the most direct evidence of record bearing upon the nature and characteristics of the Communist Information Bureau aside from what is contained in Respondent's announcement that it would not join the organization. Zhdanov's report says the Communist International was dissolved because "the direction ²¹ of these parties [what he calls "mass labor parties"] from one centre became impossible and inexpedient." But, he continues, "experience has shown that such mutual isolation of the Communist Parties is wrong, harmful and, in point of fact, unnatural" and that "continued isolation may lead to a slackening of mutual understanding, and at times, even to serious blunders." (Pet. Ex. 214-A).

Malenkov puts it as follows:

The absence of contact between Communist Parties is a hindrance in coordinating the actions of Communists in various countries in their resistance to the plans of the imperialists, particularly now, when American monopoly capital is organizing an offensive against Communism and democracy against the U. S. S. R. and the new democracies, developing its expansionist plans with the intention, under the guise of "aid", of enslaving a number of European and other countries,

²¹ Compare Zhdanov's use of "direction" with the public announcements that the Comintern was dissolved to help defeat Hitlerism (p. 15 herein) and to stop the "false charges" of direction from Moscow.

and when Communists are called upon to define their attitude to these plans of American imperialism.

In our opinion it is necessary to put into effect definite measures designed to eliminate the present abnormal situation in this respect.

That is why we consider it necessary to discuss at the present conference both the international situation and the question of improving contact between Communist Parties, of establishing regular connections between them a view to achieving mutual understanding, exchange of experience and voluntary coordination of activities of the Communist Parties whenever they consider this necessary (Pet. Ex. 367, p. 145).

Respondent's statement characterized the Cominform as "a medium through which these parties can consult, and, if they deem it desirable, coordinate activity." (Pet. Ex. 368, p. 2).

In 1943, upon approval by the member Communist Parties of a proposal by the Presidium of the Executive Committee, the Communist International was dissolved to stop what they called false charges that the International dictated directives from Moscow.²² As later herein developed, a fundamental principle of the world Communist movement is to do the best possible for the cause under given circumstances—to charge when conditions warrant and to retreat when conditions require so as to marshal forces and await the sharpening of the opportunities. In view of these facts, of the foregoing facts concerning the Cominform, and on the entire record, we find and conclude that the Communist Information Bureau represents what the Communists consider the best possible substitute at the present time for the Communist International and that Respondent's support of the Information Bureau, its use of *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*, and its nondeviation from the line of the Bureau, are done for the purpose and with the aim of advancing the objectives of the world Communist movement.

Summarized, the foregoing establishes that shortly after its formation in 1919 Respondent became a part of the "World Communist Party" dominated and controlled by the Soviet Union; that in 1924 Respondent was "amalgamated" pursuant to instructions of the Soviet Union; that in 1929 a factional dispute in Respondent was settled by the Soviet Union and new leadership of Respondent was installed according to directives from the Soviet Union; that in 1940 Respondent publicly announced "disaffiliation" from the Communist International (organizational form of the World Communist Party) and that the real reason being to avoid registration as a foreign agent and its "disaffiliation" was merely pro forma and represented no change; that from May 1944 to June 1945 Respondent's name was changed to the Communist Political Association and Respondent followed the tactical maneuver of advocating the possibility of peaceful coexistence between the United States and the Soviet Union; that in June 1945 Respondent changed its name back to the Communist Party under circumstances in which the Soviet Union played an active part; and that since June 1945 there have been no major or substantial organizational changes in Respondent.

In addition to the fact that the variations in the organizational structure of Respondent have been based upon specific directives and instructions from the Soviet Union, these variations are a manifestation of Respondent's following the overall Marxism-Leninism policy of doing what is opportune at any stage of the revolution, as later herein developed.

²² See Note 21, *supra*, p. 18.

In determining whether or not Respondent is dominated and controlled by a foreign government, we have taken into consideration certain facts established on the record concerning the careers and activities in their official capacities of a number of Respondent's present leaders, including its national chairman, William Z. Foster. We have previously herein set forth the fact that Foster became a leader of Respondent as a result of the solution in 1929 of the factional dispute in Respondent upon action by Joseph Stalin and the Communist International. In this connection, it is pertinent to consider the following statement by Stalin in 1929 as contained in certain speeches he made on the American Communist Party:

The struggle for the winning of the millions of the working masses to the side of Communism must be intensified. The fight must be intensified for the forging of real revolutionary Party cadres and for the selection of real revolutionary leaders of the Party, of individuals capable of entering the fight and bringing the proletariat with them, individuals who will not run before the * * * storm and will not fall into panic, but will sail into the face of the storm (Pet. Ex. 145, p. 111).

It is reasonable to conclude that the selection of Foster as a leader of Respondent, following the speech of Stalin, identifies Foster as the type of leader to whom Stalin referred.

We further find that for a number of years prior to 1940 Foster was an official of the Communist International; that Foster and Jack Stachel, among others, represented the Respondent at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International in Moscow in 1935; that Foster is a recognized spokesman for the world Communist movement; that Foster is recognized among Communists as an authority on and follower of Marxism-Leninism; that Foster in 1944 did not push his objections to the formation of the Respondent as the Communist Political Association but rather refrained from deviating, for the stated reason that he would have been expelled if he had. In view of the foregoing, and upon the whole record, we conclude that William Z. Foster has been controlled in his activities as a top leader of Respondent by leaders of the Soviet Union and, during its existence, by the Communist International; and we find that this furnishes some evidence that Respondent as an organization has been and is controlled by the Soviet Union.

We further find that a substantial number of Respondent's present leaders, including Foster, Stachel, Bittelman, Green, Winter, and Williamson, have been to the Soviet Union on numerous occasions on Party business and have been indoctrinated and trained in the Soviet Union on Russian strategy and policies. These leaders have taught in Party schools, written for the Party press, and spoken at Party meetings, on various phases of Marxism-Leninism, including the leading position of the Soviet Union, the concept of proletarian internationalism, and the necessity of revolutionary overthrow of imperialist nations, particularly the United States. We find that Foster and these other leaders of Respondent have accepted the views and policies of the Soviet Union and have carried such views and policies into Respondent, making them the views and policies of Respondent. We find that this fact furnishes additional evidence that Respondent is dominated and controlled by the Soviet Union.

In making the foregoing findings, we have taken into consideration the facts as to the recognition by Respondent's leaders of a disciplinary power in the Soviet Union, and the allegiance of such leaders to the Soviet Union, as elsewhere in this report set forth.

The variations in the organizational structure of Respondent can very well be said to conform to the overall policy of Marxism-Leninism of doing what is expedient under the given circumstances at any stage of the revolution, as set forth in *Strategy and Tactics of the Proletarian Revolution* (Pet. Ex. 343, pp. 21-22), one of Respondent's compilations of basic Marxist-Leninist material. It is pertinent at this point to determine the meaning of "Marxism-Leninism" as understood and followed by Respondent.

2. *Marxism-Leninism*

The Respondent's constitution (1948) (Pet. Ex. 374) (readopted in 1950) states in the first sentence of its Preamble: "The Communist Party of the United States is a political party of the American working class, basing itself upon the principles of scientific socialism, Marxism-Leninism." Respondent's amended answer (pp. 10, 20-21) also admits that Marxism-Leninism is basic to the CPUSA. Marxism-Leninism is nowhere in the record specifically defined. It should be noted that we recognize that the theory of Marxism-Leninism, as such, is not an issue in this proceeding. Nor is it our purpose to consider the merits of Capitalism vis-a-vis Communism. However, in view of the fact that Marxism-Leninism is declared to be basic to Respondent and because of the numerous references to it in the course of these proceedings, and in order to cast as much light as possible upon the issues involved, we have deemed it important to determine its actual meaning from the evidence of record. In this section, we present our findings of what it is, and how it is understood, used and followed by Respondent. We have limited ourselves here, in the main, to the meaning of Marxism-Leninism. The extent of Respondent's acceptance of it and adherence to it is more specifically treated in other portions of this report, wherein it is shown that adherence to Respondent's conception of Marxism-Leninism is evidentiary of submission to the domination and control of the Soviet Union.

In our determination we have had to reach certain conclusions concerning some of the terminology employed both in the writings and in the testimony of the witnesses. Where a difference in the meaning of any term appeared, we have given it the meaning warranted by a preponderance of the evidence.

The sources of Marxism-Leninism and also its corpus are to be found in the writings of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin and their collaborators, which writings are generally referred to as the Classics.²³ In order to understand the content of these Classics, we deem it desirable to present something of the background in which they are produced and also to indicate what we consider to be the chief contributions of each of the above individuals to the Classics and to Marxism-Leninism.

In the middle of the nineteenth century, Karl Marx, a German scholar, and Frederick Engels, an Englishman, developed what became known as Marxism. This was a form of Socialism. The basic tenet of Socialism is the ownership by the state of all the means of production and distribution. According to Marx, all society consisted of antagonistic classes, the principal one being the bourgeois or capitalist class, which, as a result of owning privately the means of production, exploited the propertyless working class. Marx announced particular interest in the propertyless factory workers whose numbers had

²³ See Appendix B, attached.

increased as a result of industrialization. These factory workers he designated as the proletariat. Marx was influenced by the dynamic theories of the German philosopher Hegel, and applied Hegel's theories to the materialistic concepts of the Greek philosophers and developed a system which he called dialectical materialism. This is a theory of reality assuming continuous transformation of matter and dynamic interconnection of things and concepts and implies social transformation through socialism toward a classless society. Marx came to the conclusion that the only true value was the labor of the industrial working class. It was his thesis that capitalism had to expand in order to continue to exist and, as it spread, the proletariat class would correspondingly increase in numbers. According to his conception of history, capitalism contained the seeds of its own destruction and consequently it was inevitable that the classless state of society which he designated as Communism would ultimately come about. In order to expedite this, he theorized, it was necessary that the proletarian class, which would be greater in numbers than the bourgeoisie, be organized and be given leadership by a political party of all the workers of the world. The objective of this party would be to bring capitalism to an end and substitute for it a dictatorship of the proletariat in a socialist state. Eventually, according to his theory, the dictatorship of the proletariat would not be necessary because the state would wither away as soon as its citizens had become conditioned to living in a one-class society. Two of his most basic considerations were the class struggle and the world-wide character of the revolution. Much of this appears from the *Communist Manifesto* (Pet. Ex. 31), published by Marx and Engels in 1848.

Lenin, a Russian revolutionist, adapted Marxism to Russian revolutionary purposes.²⁴ He proceeded to implement it in a way that gave it a practical turn. He utilized slogans. Consequently, he gave capitalism a new name: "imperialism." The quintessence of imperialism is monopoly-capitalism which "is the eve of the proletariat social revolution." He recognized that for the success of the proletariat revolution two things were most important: rigidity of organization and flexibility of policy. Organizationally, one of his first postulates was the necessity of creating a homogeneous group of disciplined professional revolutionists, among whom no factionalism or dissent would be tolerated, as a nucleus for the party of the proletariat. It should be noted that the Communist Party was formed in 1898 in Russia.²⁵ Lenin's group therein, the Bolsheviks, obtained control of that party in Russia because it was an intransigent body which permitted no deviation or compromise.

Stalin later advanced the Marxist-Leninist ideas to a practicality which developed somewhat differently from Marxist theoretical schemes. He says (*History of the CPSU(B)*) (Pet. Ex. 330, p. 355):

The Marxist-Leninist theory is the science of the development of society, the science of the working-class movement, the science of the proletarian revolution, the science of the building of the Communist society. And as a science it does not and cannot stand still, but develops and perfects itself. Clearly, in its development it is bound to become enriched by new experience and new knowledge, and some of its propositions and conclusions are bound to change in the course of time,

²⁴ See foreword to *What Is To Be Done?* (Pet. Ex. 117), by Alexander Trachtenberg, one of Respondent's leaders and manager of International Publishers.

²⁵ Trachtenberg's Foreword to *What Is To Be Done?* (Pet. Ex. 117).

are bound to be replaced by new conclusions and propositions corresponding to the new historical conditions.

What this means becomes clearer from what he previously stated (p. 355):

The power of the Marxist-Leninist theory lies in the fact that it enables the Party to find the right orientation in any situation, to understand the inner connection of current events, to foresee their course and to perceive not only how and in what direction they are developing in the present, but how and in what direction they are bound to develop in the future.

There is also clarification in what he says subsequently (p. 356) when he tells how Lenin altered Marxism because of his experience in the Russian revolutions of 1905 and 1917. The tactical aspects of the theory thus attains a flexibility which would appear to make it mean what the current leaders of the CPSU want it to mean. So regarded, the theory supplies an easy explanation for all phenomena and furnishes a justification for any line of conduct which these leaders have adopted.

Marx, Lenin, and Stalin represent the supreme authorities of what became known as Marxism-Leninism as these writings constitute its body. All postulated the revolution on a world-wide basis. Lenin, and after him Stalin, proclaimed that it was not necessary to wait until the proletariat throughout the entire world was ready for a revolution, but that the attack against the capitalist world rightfully began by breaking its chain at the weakest link, which proved to be Russia. The Communists in Russia having succeeded, they then sought help from the proletariat throughout the world to support their victory. They also proceeded to try to foment revolution in any part of the world where it had a chance of being successful. The best example of applied Marxism-Leninism is the Communist International. That this organization is based on Marxism-Leninism appears from the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* (Pet. Ex. 330, pp. 231-232). (See also pp. 10 and 13, under Organization and Leadership, *supra*.) Using the Communist International as an instrument, the Soviet Union, as the leader of an integrated organization with subsidiary groups throughout the world, issued directives to the Communist parties in the several countries. What these directives were and how they applied to Respondent will appear in a discussion of the Classics and of the testimony of witnesses which follows, as well as in various other sections of this report.

Against this background, it is pertinent to inquire why the Classics were written. An examination of their content discloses that they were intended to create, promulgate, and advance the world revolution of the proletariat. At an intermediate stage, they concentrated in large measure on Russia. At no time, however, was the main objective forgotten and when the revolution was successful in Russia, the emphasis was again brought back to the revolution on an international scale.

It should be noted that in the summaries, paraphrases, and quotations from the Classics which follow, we have conscientiously striven, and, we believe, successfully so, for complete accuracy and have endeavored to hold closely to the essence of the material being analyzed. Where excerpts have been quoted, we have selected those which we consider representative of the whole tenor of the writing from which they are taken.

How basic the international and revolutionary factors of Marxism-Leninism are appears at its inception in *The Communist Manifesto* (Pet. Ex. 31); "The history of society is the history of class struggles" (p. 9), "The bourgeoisie has played a most revolutionary role in history" (p. 11). "* * * and are now to be superseded by the proletariat through similar means" (p. 15). The proletarians have become organized into a class and consequently into a political party (p. 18). Of all the classes opposing the bourgeoisie, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class (p. 19). The Communists are a proletarian party whose aim is the conquest of political power by the proletariat (p. 22). The proletariat will become the ruling class and will use its political supremacy to wrest all capital from the bourgeoisie. The measures used to do this will be different in different countries (p. 30). The Communists everywhere must support every revolutionary movement against the existing order of things. Their ends can only be attained by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Workingmen of all countries are exhorted to unite for the Communist revolution (p. 44).

This international and revolutionary aspect is further stressed in the writings of Lenin and Stalin. In *State and Revolution* (Pet. Ex. 139), Lenin objects to the "chauvinism" of those "leaders of Socialism" who would water down Marx's doctrine by limiting it to single states (p. 5). Speaking of the Russian Revolution of 1917, he states: "This revolution can be understood in its totality only as a link in the chain of Socialist proletarian revolutions called forth by the imperialist war" (p. 6). "A Marxist is one who *extends* the acceptance of the class struggle to the acceptance of the dictatorship of the proletariat" (p. 30). In *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat* (Pet. Ex. 423, pp. 47-48), one of Lenin's fundamental postulates is quoted by Stalin on the international question: International imperialism cannot live side by side with the Soviet Republic and the greatest difficulty of the Russian Revolution is "the necessity to solve international problems, the necessity to call forth the world revolution." Stalin makes this thought even clearer in *Foundations of Leninism*. He says (at p. 9) that Leninism is not merely a Russian but an international phenomenon; and (at p. 17) that the Russian Communists were impelled by the whole situation, domestic and foreign, to transfer the struggle to the international arena. The same thought is even more forcibly expressed in Stalin's definition of Leninism (*Problems of Leninism*, Pet. Ex. 138, pp. 7-9; see also p. 19). From this definition it is clear that the whole movement based on Marxism-Leninism is regarded by its founders and chief protagonists as an internationalism which must operate with common theory and strategy and tactics in all countries. It is inescapable that all those working for the ultimate ends of the movement must work in unison and in one cohesive organization on a worldwide basis. This thought is expressed strongly in the *Theses and Statutes of the Third (Communist) International* (Pet. Ex. 8, p. 67):

4. It follows from the fundamental principles laid down above, that the policy of the Communist International on the National and Colonial questions must be chiefly to bring about a union of the proletarian and working masses of all nations and countries for a joint revolutionary struggle leading to the overthrow of capitalism, without which national equality and oppression cannot be abolished.

5. The political situation of the world at the present time has placed the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the foreground, and all the events of

world politics are inevitably concentrating around one point, namely, the struggle of the bourgeois world against the Russian Soviet Republic, which is grouping around itself the Soviet movements of the vanguard of the workers of all countries, and all national liberation movements of the colonial and subject countries, which have been taught by bitter experience that there can be no salvation for them outside of a union with the revolutionary proletariat, and the triumph of the Soviet power over Imperialism.

The same thought suffuses the Classics throughout. It is not a tenet that can be accepted here and rejected there. It is integral in the whole texture of the material of the movement which those Classics represent. Like a fast dye, it colors every portion of that movement and cannot be eradicated because it is of its very essence.

It would burden this report unduly to quote in extenso the references in the Classics to the international and revolutionary nature of Marxism-Leninism and the interrelation of the sections of the Communist parties in all countries which it requires. Attention is directed to a number of places where these references are deemed particularly significant:

Foundations of Leninism (Pet. Ex. 121, pp. 17-19; p. 45, last par. and p. 46); *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* (B) (Pet. Ex. 330, pp. 273-75); *State and Revolution* (Pet. Ex. 139, pp. 5, 6); *The Theory of the Proletarian Revolution* (Pet. Ex. 422, pp. 85-89); *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat* (Pet. Ex. 423, pp. 48-49).

We conclude from the above that the Classics advocate a revolution of the proletariat on an international basis, through the instrumentality of an international organization.

The primary objective of the world revolution is the termination of capitalism and establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin used the word "imperialism" to designate what he calls the parasitism and decay of capitalism at its highest stage of historical development (*Imperialism*, Pet. Ex. 140, p. 14). This imperialism is the arch enemy of the proletariat.

Not the slightest progress can be made toward the solution of the practical problems of the Communist movement and of the impending social revolution unless the economic roots of this phenomenon are understood and unless its political and sociological significance is appreciated.

Imperialism is the eve of the proletarian social revolution. This has been confirmed since 1917 on a worldwide scale.

It should be noted that the Classics emphasize strongly the use of slogans. The word "imperialism" and its adjective-noun form "imperialist" are used therein to form a variety of slogans. Thus, it will be seen from *The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* (Pet. Ex. 330, pp. 167-69) that the Bolsheviks advanced the slogan of "converting the imperialist war into a civil war" and the slogan-policy of "the defeat of one's own government in the imperialist war." As a corollary to this approach, wars are designated as "just" and "unjust." The "just" or "anti-imperialist" war is waged assertedly to liberate the oppressed from the yoke of imperialism. The "unjust" war is supposedly to conquer and enslave others. Wars of the first kind, the Bolsheviks supported. Of wars of the second kind, the Bolsheviks said, a resolute struggle must be waged against them to the point of revolution and the overthrow of one's own imperialist government. From these pages it will be seen that, according to Lenin, while capitalism is decaying and moribund, "imperialism" would not rot on the stalk; it could not be overthrown without a revolution.

We conclude from this that the Classics designate as the enemy, against which the international revolution must be directed, that form of capitalism which they term "imperialism"; and that they declare that any war waged against such imperialism is a just war and any war waged in its behalf is an unjust war.

Equally basic with the international and revolutionary character of the movement is the tenet of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In view of the divergence of testimony of witnesses for Petitioner and those of Respondent concerning the meaning and application of this tenet, we have taken particular pains to ascertain its real character. It is best understood from the volume *Dictatorship of the Proletariat* (Pet. Ex. 423), which is one of a series of "Readings in Leninism," consisting of articles and excerpts dealing with basic points of Leninist theory. Lenin's postulates on this question (pp. 47-54) make clear how important this phase of the revolution is deemed. Having once seized power through revolution, he states it becomes necessary that this power be held by a "dictatorship of the proletariat." A definition of what this is intended to be appears on page 49:

The dictatorship of the proletariat is not the end of the class struggle but its continuation in new forms. The dictatorship of the proletariat * * * which has achieved victory and has seized political power, against the bourgeoisie who have been defeated but not annihilated, who have not disappeared, who have not ceased their resistance, who have increased their resistance.

Lenin makes clear that this dictatorship is not to be confused in any way with "popular" and "nonclass" government. He goes on to say:

The class that has seized political power has done so, conscious of the fact that it has seized power alone. This is implicit in the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This concept has meaning only when one class knows that it alone takes political power into its own hands, and does not deceive either itself or others by talk about popular, elected government, sanctified by the whole people.

Having seized power, the proletariat may find it necessary to enter into certain alliances to maintain that power. These alliances, however, are only temporary for the purpose of consolidating the revolutionary victory. It is emphasized again on page 52 that violence is essential, although not exclusive. The following passages are enlightening:

But, of course, the dictatorship of the proletariat does not merely mean violence, although there is no dictatorship without violence.

Dictatorship (says Lenin) does not mean violence alone, although it is impossible without violence. It likewise signifies a higher organization of labor than that which previously existed (*Collected Works*, Russian edition, Vol. XXIV, p. 305).

It involves the concept of "exercise of violence, unrestricted by law" (p. 54). Also significant is the position to be held by the Communist Party in the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is stated (p. 100): "The stronger the Communist Party created by us in each country the sooner will the 'Soviet idea' triumph." The Communist Party has declared itself to be necessary to the working class not only before the seizure of power and not only during the seizure of power, but before the power has passed into the hands of the working class. It is further stated (p. 101) that the Party must keep in control until the classless society is finally attained.

From *Problems of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 138, pp. 34-38) it will be seen what meaning Lenin and Stalin give to the dictatorship of the proletariat. At the core of the dictatorship is the Party which gives

directions. These directions are carried out by the mass organizations of the proletariat and are fulfilled by the general population. The minority seizes power and controls because the exploited workers have not yet developed their human faculties. There is another step which may become necessary. If the bourgeoisie resist or there is intervention in its behalf then the active body is the proletariat as a class. The Party takes power, the Party governs the country, and it is the core of this power; but it takes power in the name and purportedly on behalf of the class.

In *Foundations of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 121, p. 53), the origin of the dictatorship of the proletariat is thus stated:

Briefly: *the dictatorship of the proletariat is the rule—unrestricted by law and based on force—of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, a rule enjoying the sympathy and support of the labouring and exploited masses (The State and Revolution).*

From this follow two main conclusions:

First conclusion: The dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be "complete" democracy, democracy for all, for the rich as well as for the poor; the dictatorship of the proletariat "must be a state that is democratic in a new way—for **the proletarians and the propertyless in general—and dictatorial in a new way—against** the bourgeoisie * * *" (Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. VII, p. 34) (Pet. Ex. 121, p. 53). **[my italics—J. S.]*

Second conclusion: The dictatorship of the proletariat cannot arise as the result of the peaceful development of bourgeois society and of bourgeois democracy; it can arise only as the result of the smashing of the bourgeois state machine, the bourgeois army, the bourgeois bureaucratic machine, the bourgeois police (Pet. Ex. 121, p. 54).

We conclude that "dictatorship of the proletariat" as used in the Classics connotes a seizure of power by or in the name of the proletariat through violence, if necessary, and the absolute and despotic rule by a minority in the name of the proletariat.

In addition to the requirements for a rigid Party organization with a hard core of dedicated workers, noted above, the overall policies and rules for effectuating the ends and objectives of the Party are to be found in the Classics. These are effected through an organizational principle known as "Democratic Centralism" and by general directions for strategy and tactics.

The *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* (Pet. Ex. 330, p. 198) states that in July and August 1917, prior to the successful October Revolution, the CPSU adopted "new Party rules" providing that "all Party organizations shall be built on the principle of *democratic centralism*," which provided, inter alia, that all directing bodies of the Party shall be elected; that they give periodic reports to Party organizations; that there be strict Party discipline and the subordination of the minority to the majority; and that all decisions of higher bodies shall be absolutely binding on lower bodies and on all Party members.

Strategy and Tactics of The Proletarian Revolution (Pet. Ex. 343, p. 62) states:

The Party is the vanguard of the working class, and consists of the best, most class conscious, most active and most courageous members. It incorporates the whole body of experience of the proletarian struggle. Basing itself upon the revolutionary theory of Marxism and representing the general and lasting interests of the whole of the working class, the Party personifies the unity of proletarian principles, of proletarian will and of proletarian revolutionary action. It is a revolutionary organization, bound by iron discipline and strict revolutionary rules of democratic centralism, which can be carried out owing to the class consciousness of the proletarian vanguard, to its loyalty to the revolution, its ability

to maintain inseparable ties with the proletarian masses and to its correct political leadership which is constantly verified and clarified by the experiences of the masses themselves.

"Democratic Centralism" is stated by the witnesses for Respondent to represent the highest form of democracy in that it provides that all decisions and policies of the Party are determined by the membership and that authority flowed up from this membership through intermediate local and regional committees to the central committee. A decision once made, however, would be binding on all members. Witnesses for Petitioner testified that "Democratic Centralism" was theoretically a two-way process by which authority flowed upward from Party cells through intermediate local or regional committees to the top and discipline flowed downward from the same channels. However, they stated that in practice the double process has been reduced to a single process in which discipline flows downward with limited right of discussion in the lower echelons on matters of local tactics.²⁶

This policy is strongly expressed in the *Programme of the Communist International* (Pet. Ex. 125, p. 84):

This international Communist discipline must find expression in the subordination of the partial and local interests of the movements to its general and lasting interests and in the strict fulfillment, by all members, of the decisions passed by the leading bodies of the Communist International.

The idea behind democratic centralism is best expressed by Stalin in *Foundations of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 121, pp. 119-121): What is required for success is an iron party under iron discipline. A Communist Party will only be able to perform its duty if its Party center is a powerful and authoritative organ. No factions are permitted—there must be absolute unity of will and that must emanate from the Party's center. All groups or factions which disagree must be immediately expelled.

We conclude from the whole record that "Democratic Centralism", as it is used in the Classics, is an organizational principle which contemplates a rigid discipline emanating from the top of the movement, binding on the parent and all subsidiary organizations and on all members of such organizations. Failure to adhere to such discipline is punishable by expulsion from the movement.

With the organizational structure thus indicated, the Classics then provide strategic and tactical directions for arriving at the objectives of Marxism-Leninism.

One of the characteristics of Marxism-Leninism is that in addition to its doctrine it also provides directives for the attainment of the objectives contemplated by such doctrine. Marxism-Leninism is declared to be a guide to action (*History of the CPSU (Bolshevik)*) (Pet. Ex. 330, p. 306). While the ends to be reached are fixed, the manner and methods of reaching them, it will be seen, are exceedingly

²⁶ As witness Kornfeder states it, he was taught that the Party's basic form of organization is a supercentralized political party with a high degree of discipline. He describes it as a military type of political organization with an established chain of command, permitting lower units considerable leeway in discussing local tactical problems. He states that he was taught that the general staff or the general headquarters of the organization was the Communist International, in Moscow. At the time of which he speaks, he says that the Communist parties of all countries were affiliated with the Communist International. Witness Philbrick stated when asked whether a member of his group could refuse to accept the decision of the Cominform and still continue membership in the Communist Party of the United States, that such member could not continue as a member of the Party. Witness Lantner says that it was a breach of democratic centralism for any Communist Party anywhere, including the CPUSA, to refuse to follow the dictates of the Soviet Union.

flexible. What these are appear most concisely in *Strategy and Tactics of the Proletarian Revolution* (Pet. Ex. 343).

In summary, it states the following: The strategy and tactics were elaborated in the period of proletarian revolution when the question of the overthrow of the bourgeoisie became a question of immediate practice. Lenin brought into the light of day the ideas of Marx and Engels on tactics and strategy and developed them further into a "*system of rules and principles for the leadership of the class struggle of the proletariat*" (p. 8). Communists of every country must adapt themselves to the peculiar features of the economics, politics, culture and national composition of the country in which they are operating (p. 14). As long as national and state differences exist among peoples and countries, the unity of international tactics of the Communist working-class movement requires, not the elimination of variety, but an adaptation of the fundamental principles of Communism (Soviet power and the dictatorship of the proletariat) to the national and state differences. The vanguard of the working class having been won over, the next step is to seek the transition or approach to the proletarian revolution (p. 15). The revolutionary class must be able to master all forms of social activity and must be ready to pass from one form to another with the utmost expedition (p. 16). The tactics of the Bolsheviks were correct because they were the only international tactics and did everything possible in one country for the development, support and stirring up of the revolution in all countries (p. 16). Bolshevism has helped in a practical way to develop the proletarian revolution in Europe and America (p. 17). The world proletarian revolution has been assisted, accelerated and supported by the victory of the proletariat in Russia (p. 18). The objective elements of the working class movement are the economic development of the country, the development of capitalism, the disintegration of the old government, the spontaneous movements of the proletariat. The collision of classes proceeds irrespective of the will of the proletariat. But the subjective element, the reflection in the minds of the proletariat of these processes, is the subject of the directing influences of strategy and tactics (p. 19).

The theory of Marxism postulates that the fall of the bourgeoisie, the seizure of power by the proletariat and the replacement of capitalism by socialism are inevitable (p. 20). Strategy is the determination of the direction of the main blow of the proletariat at a given stage of the revolution (p. 21) and it changes with the transition of the revolution from one stage to another and remains unchanged throughout the duration of a given stage (p. 22). Tactics are the determination of the line of conduct of the proletariat during the ebb and flow of the movement, changing the forms of struggle and its slogans (p. 25). Thus, in the Russian revolution changes were made as the struggle progressed; strikes, boycotts, slogans were used and varied along with the forms of organization, a worker's party operated more or less openly, as the immediate situation required. In the earlier phases the Party was compelled to resort to tactics of retreat. When the revolution ebbed, operations were less open and the Party went underground; and cultural work and the organizations "permitted by law" took the place of revolutionary mass organizations. The same was true during later stages of the revolution (p. 26). Tactics are

the operations suited to the concrete situation of the struggle at any given moment (p. 27). The successful struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat presupposes the existence in every country of a compact Communist Party, hardened in the struggle, disciplined, centralized and closely linked up with the masses. The Party is a revolutionary organization, with these fundamental strategic aims: It must extend its influence over the majority of the members of its own class, including working women and youth. It must secure predominant influence in the broad mass proletarian organizations, e. g., trade unions, factory councils, cooperatives, sport and cultural organizations. It is particularly important to win over the trade unions (p. 62). Leadership of wide sections of the toiling masses should be acquired by the proletariat and the membership of the middle classes of the peasantry must be secured (p. 63). It must carry on propaganda against all forms of "chauvinism" and against "imperialist" maltreatment of enslaved peoples and races (e. g., Negroes, "yellow labor" and anti-Semitism) (p. 64).

In determining its line of tactics, each National Communist Party must take into account the concrete internal and external situation, the correlation of class forces, the degree of stability and strength of the bourgeoisie and fit slogans and methods of struggle to the circumstances of the particular country. Demands and slogans must be lent to the revolutionary aim of capturing power and overthrowing bourgeois capitalist society. The party is to utilize the daily needs and struggles of the working class as a starting point from which to lead the working class to the revolutionary struggle for power (pp. 65-66). When the ruling class is disorganized, propaganda in favor of increasingly transitional slogans and mass action should be used. Strikes and armed demonstrations should be used, as well as intensified revolutionary work in the army and the navy (p. 66). When conditions are right, it is dangerous to fail to start rebellion. When the revolutionary tide is at ebb, partial slogans and demands should be made which correspond with the everyday needs of the workers. United front tactics should then be used (p. 67). In this period of marking time, demands and slogans should be made in such spheres as labor, local politics, and world politics, e. g., the attitude toward the U. S. S. R., the struggle against "imperialism" and the war danger, and systematic preparation for the fight against imperial war (p. 68). Also systematic work must be carried on among the proletarian and peasant youth; and, in imperialist countries, Communist Parties must impair the war effort against colonies (p. 69). The further consolidation of the Land of the Soviets, the mighty growth of the international authority of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the growth of the Communist International are all accelerating the development of the world Socialist revolution. The capitalist world is entering a period of sharp clashes. The united front of the working class must be established. The victory of the revolution has to be prepared for by a strong proletarian revolutionary party (pp. 81-82). When the country in which they live engages in an imperialist war in order to utilize the economic and political crisis, it is the duty of Communists to turn the war into a civil war for the overthrow of capitalism (pp. 94-95). Should an imperialist war break out, the interest of the workers of all countries demands that the defense of the Soviet Union be considered paramount (pp. 95-96).

From this résumé, it becomes apparent that the rules for making the doctrine effective have within them instructions for short-range and long-range action and that they are intended for more than local application. In addition, there has been provided an elasticity which makes them applicable under an endless variety of circumstances. Considerable significance, therefore, may attach to their use by allied groups under given circumstances at a given time. Therefore, the manner and extent of their application by the CPUSA is a factor to be considered in determining whether the United States Party is a part of a worldwide movement and whether it is dominated and controlled by the Soviet Union.

Another factor of Marxism-Leninism which pervades the Classics with the same insistence as its international revolutionary character is the dominant position of the Soviet Union, that is to say, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in the world Communist movement. At an earlier date, i. e., after the successful revolution in Russia, Stalin points out (*Problems of Leninism*, Pet. Ex. 138, p. 64) that for an ultimate victory of socialism in the world, the protection of that Russian victory by workers of all countries is necessary. In *Foundations of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 121 at p. 19) he quotes Lenin:

"History has now confronted us [i. e., the Russian Marxists-J. S.] with an immediate task which is the *most revolutionary* of all the *immediate* tasks that confront the proletariat of any country. The fulfillment of this task, the destruction of the most powerful bulwark, not only of European, but also of Asiatic reaction, would make the Russian proletariat the vanguard of the international revolutionary proletariat."

In other words, the centre of the revolutionary movement was bound to shift to Russia.

As we know, the course of the revolution in Russia has more than vindicated Lenin's prediction.

Is it surprising, after all this, that a country which has accomplished such a revolution and possesses such a proletariat should have been the birthplace of the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution?

Is it surprising that Lenin, the leader of this proletariat, became the creator of this theory and tactics and the leader of the international proletariat?

In *The Theory of the Proletarian Revolution* (Pet. Ex. 422, p. 87) Stalin states it is necessary to support Russia in order to make it "the basis of the further unfolding of the world revolution, into the lever for the further disintegration of imperialism." He emphasizes this (p. 88) by asserting that "the victorious proletariat of Russia" should "after it has expropriated the capitalists and organized its socialist production at home," rise against the capitalist world, attract to itself the oppressed classes of other countries, raise insurrection in them against the capitalists, and even use military force against the exploiting classes and their states.

Dimitroff in *The United Front* (Pet. Ex. 149, at pp. 279 and 280) restates the importance of the U. S. S. R. to the international proletariat. And in the *Theses and Statutes of the Third (Communist) International* (Pet. Ex. 8, p. 67) it will be seen that the Russian Soviet Republic is "grouping around itself the Soviet movements of the vanguard of the workers in all countries."

What is being advocated is an extension of Lenin's hard-core principle to a wider area. Whereas in the Soviet Union the party is that core, in the world scheme the U. S. S. R. becomes the center. As such, it must be protected, and from it will emanate leadership which

will direct and hold together the party in other countries. This thought is thus expressed in *Strategy and Tactics of the Proletarian Revolution* (Pet. Ex. 343, p. 81):

In the struggle to defend against fascism the bourgeois-democratic liberties and the gains of the toilers, in the struggle to overthrow fascist dictatorship, the revolutionary proletariat prepares its forces, strengthens its fighting contacts with its allies and directs the struggle toward the goal of achieving real democracy of the toilers—Soviet power.

The further consolidation of the Land of the Soviets, the rallying of the world proletariat around it, and the mighty growth of the international authority of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the turn toward revolutionary class struggle which has set in among the Social-Democratic workers and the workers organized in the reformist trade unions, the increasing mass resistance to fascism and the growth of the revolutionary movement in the colonies, the decline of the Second International and the growth of the Communist International, are all accelerating and will continue to accelerate the development of the world Socialist revolution.

At pages 95 and 96, it is declared that if an imperialist war breaks out, the defense of the Soviet Union must be considered paramount.

It will be seen from the above that allegiance to the Soviet Union assumes considerable proportions in the Classics of Marxism-Leninism. First, after the 1917 Revolution, it must be protected from outside intervention. Thereafter, its role as a leader of a successful world revolution is stressed. At all times, loyalty and assistance are due it in a conflict which may arise between it and any "imperialist" power.

We conclude from the Classics that the Soviet Union has a specific place in Marxism-Leninism; it represents the first victory of the proletariat; therefore, it is the center of the world proletariat and it is entitled to the allegiance of the proletariat everywhere. The authority of its Communist Party is international. The corollary of this is that a Communist Party which adheres to Marxism-Leninism is, of necessity, under the domination and control of the Soviet Union.

It is also evident from the Classics that as the Soviet Union is to be considered the leader of the world proletariat in the class war, so the United States takes on a special importance as the mightiest of the "imperialist" powers, the arch enemy of the proletariat. Lenin, in *Imperialism* (Pet. Ex. 140, p. 125) states: "In the United States, economic development in the last decades has been even more rapid than in Germany, and for this very reason the parasitic character of modern American capitalism has stood out with particular prominence." Stalin points out (*Foundations of Leninism*, Pet. Ex. 121, last par., p. 55 and 1st two pars., p. 56) that conditions in the United States had changed since the days of Marx and that this country could no longer be considered one in which there could be a "peaceful evolution of bourgeois democracy into a proletarian democracy." The United States has become definitely "imperialistic" and "the law of violent proletarian revolution" becomes applicable to it. This quotation from Lenin in this connection (p. 56) reveals how strongly the Soviet Union felt that action was required in this country:

Today, said Lenin, "in 1917, in the epoch of the first great imperialist war, this qualification made by Marx is no longer valid. Both England and America, the greatest and the last representatives—in the whole world—of Anglo-Saxon 'liberty,' in the sense that militarism and bureaucracy were absent, have slid down entirely into the all-European, filthy, bloody morass of military-bureaucratic institutions to which everything is subordinated and which trample everything underfoot. Today, both in England and in America, the 'preliminary condition for every real people's revolution' is the smashing, the destruction of the 'ready-

made state machine' (brought in those countries, between 1914 and 1917, to general 'European imperialist perfection'" (Selected Works, Vol. VII, p. 37).

A Resolution on the American Question (Pet. Ex. 43) issued by the Communist International in 1929, begins with the statement that: "The United States of America has developed into the mightiest imperialist power * * *. The task of the Workers (Communist) Party is to form a broad united front and to intensify the struggle against American imperialism." (See also Tr. 619; 667-68.) Specific attention is directed to this aspect of the approach to be used in applying Marxism-Leninism to the United States. In Dimitroff's *The United Front* (Pet. Ex. 149, pp. 41-43) an anti-Fascist party is suggested. We find, at page 43, some revealing language. "Our comrades in the United States acted rightly in taking the initiative for the creation of such a party. * * * We should develop the most widespread movement for the creation of such a party, and take the lead in it." The "we" who are planning parties in the United States have "comrades" there who have already started work in that direction. The *Theses and Statutes of the Third (Communist) International* (Pet. Ex. 8, p. 28) has this to say:

The class struggle in almost every country of Europe and America is entering the phase of civil war. Under such conditions the Communists can have no confidence in bourgeois laws. They should create everywhere a parallel illegal apparatus which at the decisive moment should do its duty by the party, and in every way possible assist the revolution. In every country where, in consequence of martial law or of other exceptional laws, the Communists are unable to carry on their work lawfully, a combination of lawful and unlawful work is absolutely necessary.

In *Strategy and Tactics of the Proletarian Revolution* it is stated (p. 17):

Bolshevism has helped in a practical way to develop the proletarian revolution in Europe and America more powerfully than any party in any other country has ever succeeded in doing.

From these expressions, it must be concluded that the Classics disclose a positive attitude on the subject of the United States which makes it a prime objective for the activities of the Soviet Union and for any of its subsidiaries.

In order fully to understand what Marxism-Leninism is, the significance of certain of its programs and policies must be considered. Certainly in the Classics themselves, these programs and policies are all aimed at one objective: the forwarding of the world revolution. That such a revolution was not an evolutionary one in the normal use of this term appears from Stalin's statement in the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Pet. Ex. 330, p. 168) which he presents as one of Lenin's teachings; without a revolution of the working class capitalism cannot be overthrown; even though capitalism is moribund, it must be given the coup de grace:

Lenin showed that under imperialism the unevenness of development and the contradictions of capitalism have grown particularly acute, that the struggle for markets and fields for the export of capital, the struggle for colonies, for sources of raw material, makes periodical imperialist wars for the redivision of the world inevitable.

There is nothing to indicate that "The elements of a war of liberation from imperialism" is used in any figurative sense. The context in which this appears leads to a contrary conclusion.

Consequently, while some of the policies and programs may have a dual character, one of the elements of each of them is always the furtherance of the *war* against capitalism and of speeding the ultimate victory of the proletariat over the "imperialists." This we find to be so in work with and in labor unions, with youth and with minorities; it is the real purpose in resorting to secrecy, entering into united fronts, and in resorting to slogans; it is the motivating force in training Communists, requiring reports from them and insisting that they do not deviate from the strict Party line.

As appears from Lenin's *What Is To Be Done?* (Pet. Ex. 417, pp. 105, *et seq.*) the Marxist should not be interested in labor unions, as such, but rather from the use which can be made of such organizations as part of the revolutionary scheme. A union can be used as a front for political, agitational, and revolutionary organizations. As Stalin points out in *Problems of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 138, p. 30), they are the all-embracing organizations of the working class. "They constitute a school of Communism." "They unite the masses of the workers with the vanguard." In effect, what Lenin and Stalin are saying is: Here are ready-made groups of substantial size, made up of members of the class which according to the labor theory of value are the exploited, and consequently should belong in the revolution; and infiltration of such groups by a hard core of diligent workers for the Party offers a ready field for propaganda and proselytizing. As it is stated in the *Theses and Statutes of the Third (Communist) International* (Pet. Ex. 8, p. 29):

Every party desirous of belonging to the Communist International should be bound to carry on systematic and persistent Communist work in labor unions, cooperatives, and other labor organizations of the masses.

The same volume discusses the trade-union movement (p. 53, *et seq.*), and (at p. 57) it states:

Consequently, the Communists must strive to create as far as possible complete unity between the trade unions and the Communist Party, and to subordinate the unions to the practical leadership of the Party, as the advance guard of the workers' revolutions.

Strategy and Tactics of the Proletarian Revolution (Pet. Ex. 343, pp. 67-68) states that one of the principal tasks of a Communist is the joining of a union to win the leadership in the workers' struggle.

We conclude that the Classics direct Communists to engage in activity in trade unions in order to utilize such unions for the purposes of the Party and to further the world revolution.

The Classics disclose that youth programs are considered to be important. Concerning the Young Communist League, Stalin says in *Problems of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 138, p. 31):

Its task is to help the Party educate the younger generation in the spirit of socialism. It provides young reserves for all the other mass organizations of the proletariat in all branches of administration.

Lenin's attitude on the necessity of particular emphasis on youth may be gleaned in part from two quotations in an article in *Political Affairs* (Pet. Ex. 477, pp. 86 and 88):

Is it not natural for young people to predominate in our party, the party of revolution? We are the party of the future and the future belongs to the youth. We are a party of innovators and innovators are always followed most eagerly by the youth. We are a party of self-sacrificing struggle against the rotten old system, and the youth are always the first in self-sacrificing struggles.

* * * * *

The youth will decide the issue of the whole struggle, the student youth, and still more the working-class youth. * * * Do not fear their lack of training, do not tremble at their inexperience and lack of development. If you are unable to organize and stimulate them to action, they will turn to the Mensheviks and Gapons, and this inexperience of theirs will cause five times more damage. * * * Only you must unfailingly organize, organize and organize hundreds of circles. * * * Either you create new, young, fresh, energetic, militant organizations everywhere for revolutionary Social-Democratic work of all sorts and kinds, and among all strata, or you will perish, enveloped in the glory of "committee" bureaucrats.

Dimitroff offers another reason for enlisting the efforts of youth (*The United Front*, Pet. Ex. 149, p. 150):

The whole antifascist youth is interested in uniting and organizing its forces. Therefore you, comrades, must find such ways, forms and methods of work as will assure the formation, in the capitalist countries, of a new type of mass youth organizations, to which no vital interest of the working youth will be alien, organizations, which, without copying the Party, will fight for all the interests of the youth and will bring up the youth in the spirit of the class struggle and proletarian internationalism, in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism.

There is no question that the enrolling and training of youth is deemed to have value in the world revolutionary movement. From the *Theses and Statutes of the Third (Communist) International* (Pet. Ex. 8, p. 8), it appears that the International League of Communist Youth was given a representative with a right to vote on the Executive Committee of the Communist International and the Communist International had the right to a similar representative on the Executive Committee of the League. And in the *Strategy and Tactics of the Proletarian Revolution* (Pet. Ex. 343, p. 69), it is stated that "Systematic work must also be carried on among the proletarian and peasant youth. * * *" It will be seen from this that a youth program is considered an essential part of the activities of the Party in all countries and is required by the dictates of Marxism-Leninism.

We conclude that the Classics direct Communists to engage in youth programs for the purposes of the Party and to provide reserves for the world revolution.

In *Foundations of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 121, p. 89), Stalin states that Lenin developed the tactics of Marx and Engels and combined them into a system of rules and guiding principles for the leadership of the class struggle.

Among these, as noted above, is the use of slogans and their propaganda value (*Strategy and Tactics of the Proletarian Revolution*, Pet. Ex. 343, pp. 66-67); *Foundations of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 121, p. 92). "Imperialism" is one of these; and as a corollary thereto, "anti-imperialism" and "just and unjust wars." "Peace" was another of the slogans which eventually came into use. These slogans have been used by the Soviet Union, by the Communist Parties throughout the world, and by the CPUSA. Their common use, contemporaneously and currently by the Soviet Union and the CPUSA, is significant. Their use also is recommended for the purpose of forwarding the world revolution (*Strategy and Tactics*, *supra*).

The same can be said to apply to united-front tactics. Throughout the Classics, the value of such tactics is stressed. The extent of such collaboration furnishes a considerable part of the texts of the writings of Lenin and Stalin. Dimitroff's *The United Front* (Pet. Ex. 149) devotes itself to that tactical principle. Again, it should be noted that united fronts, at the organizational, political and national levels,

are to be used but not in any way that might bolster capitalism. At all times they are to be used to protect the Party in Russia, to increase the number of its adherents and always to promote the world revolution. Their simultaneous adoptions by the Parties in various forms in various countries also cannot be ignored. This stands out particularly at the time of the Soviet Union's changes of alliances before and during World War II.

We conclude that the use of slogans as shibboleths for the purposes of Communist Parties, including Respondent, in order to advance the world revolution, is directed by the Classics.

Secrecy and its uses also finds a place of prominence in the Classics. (See Pet. Ex. 343, pp. 22-26; and Pet. Ex. 417.) Respondent contends that its practice by the CPUSA was not for the purpose of concealing foreign direction, domination and control or of expediting or promoting its objectives, but rather to protect its members from local hysteria or from being harassed and penalized economically for the holding of unpopular views. In *What Is To Be Done?* which Respondent urged its members to read as recently as 1951, Lenin shows how Party members can use trade unions as a front, keeping their identity as revolutionists secret. Stalin, in his speeches on the CPUSA (Pet. Ex. 109), published by the Central Committee of the CPUSA, in pamphlet form, speaks of the danger of exposing the "conspirative" nature of the Communist Party. The manner of use and timing, and the nature and degree of these practices negatives the contention of Respondent's witnesses. Certainly, as used in the Classics, secrecy was not always to be used for legal purposes (*What Is To Be Done?* Pet. Ex. 417, p. 107).

We conclude that the secrecy directed by the Classics is, among other things, for the purpose of concealing the conspiratorial nature of Communist Parties and for the advancement of the world revolution.

Operationally, it will be seen that the Classics propose a strong central organization, on an international as well as on a national scale. As Trachtenberg says in the introduction to *What Is To Be Done?* (Pet. Ex. 417):

Only a centralized party, working according to a carefully prepared plan, with each member assigned a specific task for which he is to be held accountable, could successfully lead the Russian working class in the struggle against capitalist exploitation and tsarist rule.

Lenin points out that with this, it is necessary for the organization to be composed of professional revolutionists, trained men, that no movement can be durable without a stable organization of leaders to maintain its continuity. The training of cadres is thus basic in the movement (p. 116); and in view of the centralized nature of the organization, leaders and cadres once trained, can be depended upon to keep in touch with the center of the movement and keep it informed of all that transpired by reports.

We conclude that the training of leaders and cadres and the reporting by such leaders to the controlling body of the movement is directed by the Classics.

The position taken by the Classics on the questions of Minorities and Colonials is also basic to the whole movement advocated by Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin, particularly the latter two. Any contributions in those directions by their collaborators is no more than

elaboration and amplification of the works of these four. They are implicit in Lenin's definition of imperialism. It will be seen from these and other portions of the Classics that the founders of the movement were not concerned with purely local conditions in Russia. In *Foundations of Leninism*, cited above, it becomes clear (p. 79) that the national problem is part of the general problem of the proletarian revolution to be used for that purpose only to the extent that it is of advantage to such revolution. This also appears from *Strategy and Tactics* (*supra*, pp. 63-65).

We conclude that the Classics contemplate work among Colonials and Minorities to advance the world revolution.

One of the requirements of Marxism-Leninism is conformity. Discipline is considered vital. Deviation from doctrine and practice is not permissible except in local problems in the area of minor tactics. That nondeviation is abjured is patent from *Foundations of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 121, pp. 119-21).

The achievement and maintenance of the dictatorship of the proletariat is impossible without a party which is strong by reason of its solidarity and iron discipline. But iron discipline in the party is inconceivable without unity of will, without complete and absolute unity of action on the part of all members of the Party.

As stated by Stalin (p. 120), the existence of factions is incompatible either with the party's unity or its iron discipline. He quotes Lenin:

"In the present epoch of acute civil war," says Lenin, "a Communist Party will be able to perform its duty only if it is organized in the most centralized manner, only if iron discipline bordering on military discipline prevails in it, and if its Party centre is a powerful and authoritative organ, wielding wide powers and enjoying the universal confidence of the members of the Party" (*Selected Works*, Vol. X, p. 204).

The penalty for nonconformity is expulsion from the Party (p. 121). (See also *Strategy and Tactics*, Pet. Ex. 343, p. 62.)

We conclude that the Classics require conformity on the part of all organizations and members in the movement and that no deviation from the party line is permitted on penalty of expulsion therefrom.

From the Classics themselves, Marxism-Leninism constitutes an uncoded system of political philosophy and practice which declares that it is inevitable that a classless state of society will be reached through an intermediate stage in which there will be socialist states controlled by dictatorships of the proletariat under the leadership of the Soviet Union. For the attainment of these dictatorships, a hard core of revolutionary zealots is required who operate under exceedingly flexible rules on an international basis. The vehicle for their operation is a so-called political party, the Communist Party, which is provided with strategic and tactical directives. The first objective is to bring to an end capitalistic (bourgeoisie) society. For this purpose, special attention must be paid to labor unions, youth, Minorities and Colonies. Temporary alliances, known as fronts, may be entered into, but always with the ultimate revolutionary goals in view. Capitalism is termed "imperialism." Slogans should be employed in aid of the Party's objectives. "Anti-imperialism" and "peace" are two of the slogans which may be effective. The leader of the movement, which is integrated on an international scale, must be the Soviet Union, which must be protected as the first country in which the dictatorship of the proletariat has been attained. All allegiance is due the Soviet Union as the leader of the vanguard of the proletariat. Force and violence

shall be used to reach objectives if persuasion and guile are ineffective. Where lawful methods are effective, these should be used; where not, unlawful methods should be resorted to. Secrecy, where necessary, should also be used. Discipline must be rigid, though a certain amount of latitude is permissible in local tactical matters, under an organizational structure designated as democratic centralism. This is supposed to be a two-way process but orders emanating from the top, which is the Soviet Union, may not be ignored. Operations are to be on a world-wide basis, including in its sphere, *inter alia*, the United States. Taken on its face, Marxism-Leninism, as it appears in the Classics, is a system under which there is to be a world-wide revolution for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat under the domination and control of the Soviet Union. This revolution is to take place in the various countries as conditions permit. An accepted Marxist-Leninist party is one which is a part of this system.

Subjecting the content of the Classics to further scrutiny in the light of the testimony of the witnesses for both sides, we are better able to reach a determination of the real meaning of Marxism-Leninism. All of the witnesses (except Petitioner's witnesses, Dr. Mosely, Logofet, and Carrington) testified to some knowledge of the Classics and of Marxism-Leninism. They studied it, were taught it, or were subject to it in practice. Admittedly, the Classics have been in use by the members of the CPUSA continuously to the date of the hearings in this proceeding.

Respondent's chief witness concerning Marxism-Leninism was Herbert Aptheker, a teacher at the Jefferson School of Social Science, a school with a general Marxism-Leninism orientation, whom it offers as an expert and who says Marxism-Leninism principles are fundamental to the CPUSA.

Summarized, his testimony is to the effect that Marxism-Leninism is in its inception and thereafter to be found in the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and others; that its heart is dialectic materialism; that its aim is the end of capitalism and the attainment of a socialist state which will eventually dissolve into Communism; that it is a science, usable in all countries as such and that in this sense it applies to the United States which is an "imperialist" nation; that it only contemplates revolution in the sense of an evolutionary change to rule by the proletariat, and that a dictatorship of the proletariat means rule by that class when that class represents a majority; that its international aspects are only fraternal and represent a similarity of interests of the working class of all countries; that the Classics are used for illumination and for historical background by Communists; that Marxism-Leninism provides a guide for action only as a science would be a guide for a scientific experiment; that it contains no directives and the CPUSA is not controlled or dominated by the Soviet Union thereby; that the name Marxism-Leninism is not used to denote any hidden meaning for the direction of initiates in the Communist movement.

What is not clear from his testimony is the actual content of Marxism-Leninism and the extent of its applicability to the CPUSA. It is not possible to determine therefrom what portion of the Classics have asserted current validity and how much of Marxism-Leninism is acknowledged to be applicable in any particular place. Moreover,

the credibility of his testimony as a whole is impaired by the inverted outlook it discloses. An example of this appears from his explanation of Lenin's use of Aesopian language (*Imperialism*, Pet. Ex. 140, p. 7) which Lenin said was used to avoid Czarist censorship when the pamphlet was originally written. Aptheker says, as a Marxist-Leninist scholar, that Marxists understood Lenin's use of Aesopian language not in terms of deception; Lenin was not trying to fool anybody, he was trying to illuminate ideas by the use of allegory. This is patently not so, as far as the censors were concerned. It did apply to the initiates of his own party. Again, his insistence that Douglas was right in lying to a court because that court represented what the witness characterized as tyrannical oppressors is indicative of a viewpoint that might permit his conscience to misstate facts if they did not favor his side. His explanation that the American revolution was not in a real sense a revolution because the colonists were oppressed by England casts some doubt on his definitions of revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Moreover, these definitions are not in accord with those which appear in the Classics. The evasiveness of Aptheker's testimony, and the distorted viewpoint, indicated above, renders extremely questionable what he says concerning Marxism-Leninism and the Classics and the extent to which they apply to the CPUSA.

Respondent's witness Gates adds little to the meaning to be given to Marxism-Leninism. He says it is a social science. He says that the CPUSA is an independent and completely autonomous organization. Concerning the Classics, he states that while *Problems of Leninism* has been used for teaching in the CPUSA schools, it is taught as historical writing and not as a blueprint or an order for Communists to follow all over the world and that it is not the program of the CPUSA.

Witness Flynn states that the Classics have been and are used in the Party schools as of the date of her testimony (June 26, 1952) but as reference books for history, and for the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

The witnesses for Petitioner,²⁷ all of whom, as Party members, had some instruction in the meaning of Marxism-Leninism and some of whom were officials, writers or teachers for the Party, agree with Respondent's witnesses only to the extent that one of the component parts of Marxism-Leninism is the philosophic-sociological concept that capitalism must and will inevitably be superseded by a dictatorship of the proletariat which will eventually be succeeded by a stateless class of society known as Communism. This original Marxist doctrine, they state, has superimposed on it the revisions and the supplementations of Lenin, Stalin, Dimitrov, and others which provide it with plans, policies, programs, and directives to bring about the end of the present capitalistic era, designated as "imperialism," on a worldwide scale and by any means, including force and violence. The effort to bring about the dictatorship of the proletariat is an integrated effort of the working classes in all countries and the leadership thereof is in the Soviet Union, where it has succeeded.

Witness Lautner states: "The leader of the world Communist movement is the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the

²⁷ Whose testimony we accept in this connection.

Soviet Union, Joseph Stalin ²⁸ * * *. And the Party he represents." He says adherence to Marxism-Leninism has implicit in it complete subservience on the part of all Communist Party organizations, whether in the United States or elsewhere, and on the part of the individual members in all strategic and most tactical matters, to the rulers of the Soviet Union. The CPUSA adheres to Marxism-Leninism and consequently its Constitution is no more than a bylaw to Marxism-Leninism and has no validity except insofar as it conforms thereto. Petitioner's witness Budenz, a former Party member and Editor of the *Daily Worker* testified when asked the meaning of the first sentence of the Party's 1945 Constitution (which sentence is identical with the first sentence of the 1948 constitution):

Marxism-Leninism is a well-known and historical term in the Communist documents and discussions. It is that interpretation of so-called scientific socialism based on the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, and which holds as the goal of the Communist Parties of the world the necessity for the violent shattering of the bourgeois states in order to set up in their place a completely new state machinery, the dictatorship of the proletariat. This shall be achieved under Marxism-Leninism through the Party of the new type, the Bolshevik Party under Bolshevik discipline, which rejects the concept of class peace (Tr. 11831).

He goes on to state that the Communists in the United States at that time (1945) regarded the American government as a bourgeois state, and that further statements in the Preamble concerning the Communist Party's defense of the United States Constitution were not reconcilable with the sentence above quoted. He goes on to say:

The statements cannot be reconciled. The dedication of Marxism-Leninism is the dedication historically and categorically to the violent shattering of the bourgeois state as the necessary step toward progress, and this other language in the light of that, since Marxism-Leninism principles prevail, is merely a window-dressing for legal protective purpose. It is part of the Aesopian language recommended by Lenin ²⁹ (Tr. 11832).

He states further that the classics were used in his work up to the time he left the party (October 1945). Speaking of his use of Aesopian language, he states:

I referred to Marxism-Leninism. I referred to Stalin as the leader, teacher, and guide, things of that sort, which was Aesopian to the extent that it presented Stalin as the leader, teacher, and guide, but didn't explain that he completely controlled the Communist movement, although I could have done it because Bittelman had stated in Milestones that Stalin was the leader, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was the leader (Tr. 12263).

He says, concerning Communist activity in the trade-union movement: "No Communist is permitted to deviate from the line set down for the Communists of the world * * *" (Tr. 12267). Petitioner's witness, Lautner, former Party member, leader, and teacher, tells what he was taught concerning the meaning of Marxism-Leninism, and at Tr. 9514, states:

Marxism-Leninism taught us that monopoly capitalism or imperialism was a worldwide phenomenon, therefore there is need of a worldwide organization, an organization that has ties to successfully cope with this problem and eventually bring about the downfall of monopoly capitalism and imperialism.

Further, that the *Program of the Communist International* was used by him in classes in 1947, 1948, and 1949 "because the program of the

²⁸ The record discloses no basis for any inference that the death of Stalin will terminate, lessen, or otherwise affect the domination of Respondent by the U. S. S. R.

²⁹ For a definition of "Aesopian," see *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (Pet. Ex. 140, p. 7, n. 1).

Communist International lays down the strategic aims of the Communist Parties.”

Another witness for Petitioner, Meyer, said he taught Marxism-Leninism in Respondent's schools and that it was a body of doctrine which is first a philosophy of history, secondly, a guide to the Communist Party on the basis of that philosophy, in carrying out its historical role which is the overthrow of the capitalist system and its replacement with a dictatorship of the proletariat to establish socialism which is to lead to the stage of Communism. Petitioner's witness, Philbrick, states he was taught this, and that the lessons of Marxism-Leninism were to be applied to present-day affairs as a guide to action.

The witnesses for the Petitioner aver that the Classics represent a body of living doctrine and directives by which the Communists throughout the world are guided and governed. Witness Meyer testified that the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* was used as a living guide to revolutionary action based on the experience of the Bolsheviks and the writings of Lenin and Stalin. He points to a speech by Trachtenberg made in Washington, D. C., in 1949, which declares that the leaders must know the Classics and be able to apply the basic principles to any current situation at any time. Witness Matusow says, by way of example of current applicability of the Classics that the *Communist Manifesto*, though 100 years old, “is just as relevant today as it was in 1848 when it was written.” He goes on to say that this was so of other pieces of Marxist literature, pointing out particularly *The Young Generation* by Lenin, written in 1905 and used extensively in the Labor Youth League in 1949. The Classics were in use by the CPUSA, to his knowledge, as of December 1950 (tr. 11032-33). Witness Evans says the Classics were used in the Marxist-Leninist Institute from April 1949 to June 1950. Witness Budenz testified that Trachtenberg, head of the cultural commission in charge of the direction of Communist cultural activities and in charge of the Party's general publishing field, stated he was not permitted to issue any Marxist literature, especially the Classics, without the authorization of the Marx Institute in Moscow. The *Daily Worker* used the Classics in its work. He states that Dennis recommended:

A thorough return throughout the Party to the Marxist-Leninist Classics, particularly to the writings of Stalin, the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Foundations of Leninism, and Dimitrov's Report to the Seventh Congress, which dealt with the true nature of how to conduct the United Front while forwarding the Communist revolutionary aims (tr. 11812).

While writing for the *Daily Worker* (from 1935 to 1945), Budenz did not directly advocate the overthrow of the government by force and violence. This was done by reference to Marxism-Leninism and the Classics. Witness Lautner testified that on the basis of the Classics, at the National Training School in 1941, he was taught how Lenin applied Marxism to the epoch of imperialism and established a party of a new type; how Stalin applied this to the party as a force, the leading political party of the working class; that Marxism-Leninism was a guide to action in the party in the United States; that the aim of the party was to gain political and economic power in this country and that this was to be accomplished, on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, by a worldwide organization.

From the Classics themselves, it is clear that force and violence was deemed necessary for the overthrow of the government of the Czars by the Russians. It is also clear that they call for international action by the working class in other countries so that Russia, when freed from the Czars would not be left standing in a hostile bourgeois world alone and friendless. The Classics definitely call for action on an international scale. It is the contention of the Respondent that the call to aid the Soviet Union was only applicable when the Soviet Union was weak and struggling; now that it is strong, such international action on her behalf is not necessary. Is this so? It is clear that, in the period of the Communist International, the Classics were admittedly meant to be applied as the basic law of all Communist Parties, in every country where such parties existed. Under this basic law, the Soviet Union was the leader of a world organization of all such Communist Parties, in a worldwide movement to emancipate the working class from capitalist rule, so the directives, programs, and policies by which this was to be accomplished were clearly set forth in such Classics. Deviation therefrom was considered heresy and not to be tolerated.

While Marxism-Leninism is allegedly dynamic, there is no internal evidence in the portion of this amorphous amalgam which has been reduced to writing, and has become known as the Classics, which indicates a change in its character to make it inapplicable to the CPUSA. On the contrary, Petitioner's witnesses have established that the Classics are in current use and are applicable to the Party. Dr. Aptheker admits that no CPUSA member has altered the fundamental precepts of Marxism-Leninism.

We find the testimony of the witnesses for Petitioner, concerning Marxism-Leninism credible and in accord with the meaning thereof to be obtained from a reading of the record as a whole.

We find that the testimony of the witnesses for the Respondent concerning Marxism-Leninism is in and of itself, and in the context of the record as a whole, unrealistic, apologetic rather than explanatory, and not credible, except as to the origins of Marxism-Leninism and, generally speaking, that its objectives are the attainment of a socialist state under a dictatorship of the proletariat and an eventual classless state of society known as Communism.

How Marxism-Leninism is understood, used, and followed, by Respondent has been established in the discussion of the testimony of the witnesses, above. In addition thereto, consideration has been given to the numerous exhibits which shed light on the above question. From them it further appears that Respondent, its leaders, and its members taught, studied, discussed, used, and applied the Classics in the manner intended by the authors of these Classics and to an extent incompatible with any claim that the Classics are not binding upon them in all fundamentals.

One of the most important, if not the most important, of the Classics in the period under examination in this proceeding, is the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* (Pet.

Ex. 330).³⁰ A resolution, adopted August 10, 1939, signed by the Communist Parties of France, Great Britain, the United States, Germany, and Italy (Pet. Ex. 296), states, *inter alia* (p. 73):

The appearance of the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* is one of the greatest events in the life of the Communist world movement and of the international labor movement, in the struggle of the working people of all countries for emancipation. Written with the immediate participation of Comrade Stalin and authorized by the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. (B.), the *History* occupies an extraordinary place among the classic works of Marxism-Leninism. The *History* is intended to play—and will undoubtedly play—a very important role in the successful mastering of Bolshevism by the Communists of the capitalist countries, in the consolidation of the Sections of the Communist International, and in raising their ideological and political level.

A reading of the exhibit as a whole is enlightening concerning the use of the Classics advocated by Respondent and the position they are given in the propagation of Marxism-Leninism. At page 83 it states:

(g) The work of the publishing houses is to be so organized that, besides the contemporary agitational literature, they not only publish the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, but also strive to achieve for them the very widest distribution.

Not only are the Classics given wide distribution but they are also integral in the teachings and activities of the Respondent.³¹

Consequently, we conclude that the classics are one of the chief means by which the CPSU directs, dominates, and controls the CPUSA.

From a review of the classics and of the testimony, we make the following findings concerning Marxism-Leninism as it is understood, used, and followed by respondent:

Marxism-Leninism is a composite of the doctrines, dogmas, and guides to action of Marx and Engels, as supplemented and revised by Lenin, Stalin, and others, which advocates a worldwide revolutionary movement. The objective of the movement is the destruction of capitalism (which it designates as "imperialism"). It asserts as its ultimate goal a stateless class of society which it designates as "communism." The first step toward this end is the attainment of a socialist state under a dictatorship of the proletariat. "Proletariat" generally is synonymous with "working class." But "a dictatorship of the proletariat" connotes the rule by a minority in the name of the working class. Such a dictatorship should, theoretically, come about

³⁰ Witness Meyer's testimony on this point (Tr. 5554) is sufficiently significant to warrant quotation here: "The WITNESS. The fundamental textbooks used before the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union appeared—that must have appeared late in 1939, but I can't date it exactly. I can date it by epoch. It appeared during that general 1939 to 1940 epoch, but I think it appeared in late 1939 or it might have been early 1940. At any rate before that appeared the major textbooks used, at the core of the whole problem—there were others used but the essential ones always were the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Foundations of Leninism, by Stalin. The whole course of Marxism-Leninism was organized around these two. Then, so to speak, radiating from them were special problems: Lenin's State and Revolution, Lenin's Imperialism, Stalin's Problems of Leninism. I should say these were the central ones, except at one point also, I think in the earlier part of this period primarily, there were three rather widely used textbooks of excerpts from the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin. One was called Strategy and Tactics, another the Theory of the Proletarian Revolution, and another one the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. After the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union appeared it became the Central Textbook."

³¹ Some of the instances of the use of various of the more important classics in evidence appears from the following exhibits which refer to study outlines, reading lists, school curricula, sales lists of Marxist literature and advertisements. It should be noted that these represent use of the items in years 1948 and 1949 and 1950. *Foundations of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 121) Pet. Exs. 339, 346, 351, 369, 370, 416, 419, 420, 424, 425, 427; *Problems of Leninism*: Stalin (Pet. Ex. 138) Pet. Exs. 370, 416, 419; *State and Revolution*: Lenin (Pet. Ex. 139) Pet. Exs. 346, 370, 424; *Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism*: Lenin (Pet. Ex. 140) Pet. Exs. 339, 346, 369, 370, 419, 425, 427; *Communist Manifesto*: Marx and Engels (Pet. Ex. 31) Pet. Exs. 339, 351, 369, 370, 420, 424; *The Theory of the Proletarian Revolution* (Pet. Ex. 422) Pet. Exs. 419, 425, 427; *The United Front, The Struggle Against Fascism and War* (Pet. Ex. 149) Pet. Exs. 346, 420, 424, 427; *Theses and Statutes of the Third (Communist) International* (Pet. Ex. 8) Pet. Ex. 7; *Mastering Bolshevism*: Stalin (Pet. Ex. 335) Pet. Exs. 370, 416; *What Is To Be Done?* (Pet. Ex. 417) Pet. Exs. 346, 370, 416, 420, 424.

by a nonviolent revolution which would evolve from natural economic change. Actually, Marxism-Leninism requires that such revolution be hastened by action. This action must be taken by a dedicated group of revolutionaries, banded together as a so-called political party: the Communist Party. Under the leadership of the Soviet Union, this Party shall bring about, by force and violence if necessary, dictatorship of the proletariat in every country of the world whenever circumstances shall permit. Marxism-Leninism includes within itself the plans and procedures to accomplish this end. Adherence to its principles involves acceptance of its doctrines, tenets, and obligations; and membership in the world revolutionary movement mentioned above. Marxism-Leninism contemplates the Communist Party of the United States as part of the world Communist movement. The name "Marxism-Leninism" is frequently applied in an esoteric sense to conceal from the uninitiated the full implications of such adherence and membership.

We proceed to examine the record as to Respondent's basic policies and activities to determine the extent to which they are formulated and carried out pursuant to Marxism-Leninism as hereinbefore defined; the extent to which such policies and activities reflect compliance in their formation and execution with other directives or instructions of the Soviet Union; and, the extent to which such policies and activities have as their purpose the furtherance of the policies of the Soviet Union and the advancement of the objectives of the world Communist movement. We treat first with the voluminous evidence concerning what Respondent and other Communist Parties throughout the world Communist movement constantly term the "struggle against imperialism", and with Respondent's participation in such "struggle".

3. *Imperialism*

The record establishes and we find that among the major activities of Respondent are teaching, advocacy, and agitation in opposition to what Respondent calls United States imperialism. This includes programs and activities such as "the struggle for peace"; the doctrine of "just and unjust wars"; the theory that the world is divided into two hostile camps, one led by the Soviet Union and the other by the United States; and the necessity of overthrowing existing "imperialist" governments by force and violence if necessary.

The record further establishes, and therefore we find, that a basic objective of the Soviet Union and of the world Communist movement is to bring about the downfall of the so-called "imperialist" countries, including the United States, believing that, in so doing, several coveted objectives will be achieved: protecting and defending the Soviet Union, establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat in the various countries, centralizing of all power—political, economic, and social—in the Communist Parties.

Upon consideration of the evidence hereinafter summarized and upon the entire record, we further find and conclude that respondent's teachings, advocacy, and agitation as above stated have as their objective and purpose the advancement of the world Communist movement; and they are formulated and carried out on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and other directives and instructions from the Soviet Union. We proceed to review the more significant evidence establishing the foregoing findings.

Respondent's witness Dr. Aptheker says there never was a period when the Communists of the United States ceased to characterize the United States Government as "imperialist," and that the United States, with its social system and ruling class, fits the definition of "imperialism" as given by Lenin and as adopted by Respondent. Typical of Respondent's position in this respect is the following quotation from an article appearing in the January 1951 issue of

Political Affairs:

* * * U. S. imperialism is the most reactionary force in the world today, seeking to fascize, not only America, but every capitalist country (Pet. Ex. 378, p. 9).

Additional illustration is furnished by an article by Betty Gannett published in the February 1951 issue of *Political Affairs* (Pet. Ex. 376, pp. 183-194) which emphasizes that the United States is imperialist and is plotting a new world war (p. 186); that "one of the main pillars of U. S. imperialism is its anti-Sovietism" (p. 189), whereas the Soviet Union is for peace, is not an aggressor, and, being a workers' state, cannot and does not pursue an imperialist course (p. 190). The oral and documentary evidence establishes convincingly that Respondent has consistently characterized the United States as an "imperialist" nation. This fact, standing alone, is not disputed on the record.

We proceed to review the evidence and make our findings concerning why Respondent teaches, advocates, and agitates against what it calls American imperialism. The *Communist Manifesto* (Pet. Ex. 31, p. 9) declares that society as a whole is splitting into two great hostile camps, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Lenin in *Imperialism* (Pet. Ex. 140, pp. 9, 11, 126) designates capitalism as "imperialism" and predicts a proletarian victorious revolution after the impending imperialist war; the United States is designated as "imperialist." In *State and Revolution* (Pet. Ex. 139, p. 6), Lenin explains in the preface that the Russian Revolution of 1917 "can be understood in its totality only as a link in the chain of Socialist proletarian revolutions called forth by the imperialist war." Stalin in *Foundations of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 121, p. 15) develops the idea further to show that "imperialism" has made the revolution inevitable and has provided favorable conditions for it. In *Problems of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 138, p. 9), he indicates that Leninism provides "suitable and obligatory" theory and tactics for the proletarian revolution against "imperialism".

In 1927, the Communist International issued a *Resolution On The American Question* (Pet. Ex. 43) which states that "The United States of America, during the last decade, has developed into the mightiest imperialist power" (p. 1); and, that the task of the Communist Party is "to form a broad united front and to intensify the struggle against American imperialism" (p. 1). The *Resolution* lists the policy of the United States in China and its attitude against the Soviet Union among the questions that "must" be utilized by the Party to rally the broad masses in defense of the Soviet Union and in its struggle against American imperialism (pp. 2-3).

The evidence summarized above is illustrative of a quantity of evidence which establishes that it is fundamental to Marxism-Leninism and to the world Communist movement led by the Soviet Union that all countries other than those of a victorious socialist revolution—which encompasses only the Soviet Union and those brought within

its orbit—are characterized as “imperialist,” against which the Communist Parties must wage the “struggle against imperialism.”

In addition to the voluminous documentary evidence of record, Respondent's continuous adherence to these fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism and of the world Communist movement is established by the testimony of Petitioner's witnesses based upon their experiences as members and officials of Respondent; upon directions they received while in the Party and the instruction they gave as teachers in the Party; and upon their study of official Party publications. The more significant oral testimony is summarized as hereinafter set forth.

While Petitioner's witness Gitlow was a high officer of Respondent, until 1929, its aims and purposes were: to defend the Soviet Union as the fatherland of the working class of the world; to carry out the orders and directives of the Communist International; and to work for the undermining of the foundations of the American Government in order to make it possible for Respondent to overthrow our form of government and set up in its place a dictatorship patterned after that which operates in the Soviet Union today.

In 1932, Petitioner's witness Kornfeder, a former leading official of Respondent, taught in a school at the Party headquarters that the main doctrine of Lenin called for the complete and total overthrow of all existing social institutions, the government, the existing organizations that support the government, the complete elimination of the present state structure and its replacement by a dictatorship led by Respondent.

Petitioner's witness Nowell was taught at the Lenin School in Moscow in 1932, and subsequently he himself taught in Respondent's schools in 1933 and 1934 in the United States, that the Government of the United States was the executive committee of the capitalist class in the United States and was subject to the same Marxism-Leninism laws of growth, development, and decay as all capitalist states; that the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat were necessary and equally as inevitable in the United States as in other capitalist countries; that it was the duty of the Communists to work for the overthrow of the Government of the United States and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, following the form of the Soviet, and under the hegemony of Respondent and the Communist International; and, that it was the necessary duty of Respondent, as a part of world Communism, to work for the overthrow of the other “imperialist” nations.

Petitioner's witness Meyer taught in Respondent's schools until near the end of 1945. He instructed the members of Respondent that Marxism-Leninism is a guide to Respondent in carrying out its *historical role or mission* to overthrow the capitalist system and political states founded on the capitalist system, to destroy the economic organization on which that society is founded and its political system, and to replace it with the dictatorship of the proletariat, to establish the kind of socialism that will lead to Communism.

Petitioner's witness Johnson was taught at Respondent's training school in about 1932 that it was the duty of the Communists to build themselves up to the position where they could challenge the power of the government, and that the Red Army would not hesitate to throw its weight into the scales to tip the balance in favor of the

Communist revolutionists in America; also,⁷ that the Communists should agitate and work for the demoralization of the Armed Forces of the United States by convincing them that they must refuse to fight against the Soviet Red Army and go over on the side of the Red Army using their guns against the Government of the United States and all the forces that remained loyal to it. This was the policy of Respondent throughout Johnson's membership, until 1940, and was elaborated upon by such leaders as Foster, Bedacht, Bittelman, Browder, and Stachel, at committee meetings and conventions. It is significant that Foster is the present national chairman of Respondent and some of these others are still high officials (see pp. 20 to 21 herein).

Petitioner's witness Lautner who was a member of Respondent until 1950, and Petitioner's witness Janowitz who was a member at the time of testifying in this proceeding, corroborate this evidence.

Petitioner's witness Matusow stated the aims and objectives of Respondent in case of a war between the United States and the Soviet Union were not to support the American, "imperialists." The establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the United States would have to be accomplished by violent means because "the ruling class would not give up its power." While in the Party (1947 to 1951), he did not hear or see anything to indicate a change in the aims of Respondent. He refers to a statement of Izzy Brown, Club Education Director of the Friedlander Youth Club in New York in 1948, that it was the policy of Respondent not to support the United States in an "imperialist war" against the Soviet Union.

Petitioner's witness Scarletto relates a discussion in the latter part of 1950 by Party members in which it was felt advisable that members go into the service of the United States in the Korean War because they would be in a position to sabotage the United States effort. At a meeting about the middle of November 1950 of functionaries of the Mexican Concentration Club, a suggestion was made to raise money through a neutral country for the North Koreans. The chairman of the Club at a meeting in the latter part of 1950, told witness Scarletto that it would be a good idea if he went back into the Navy Air Corps where he would have a good opportunity to sabotage. At a meeting of a Party club about December 1, 1950, the chairman reported American officers had been killed by their Korean orderlies. There were several expressions of satisfaction over this and the report that the war was going against the Americans at the time.

Petitioner's witness Evans, a member of Respondent from 1948 to 1952, was taught that in a war between the Soviet Union and the United States all members of Respondent should help defeat the predatory aims of imperialism.³²

In the years between 1945 and 1950, Petitioner's witnesses Cummings, Hidalgo, Blane, Markward, and Baldwin were taught that the world was divided into two camps: the imperialists and the anti-imperialists (democracies); that Russia was anti-imperialist and democratic; that the wars of the imperialists were unjust wars and the wars of the anti-imperialists were just wars; that in a war between imperialists and anti-imperialists, the members of the CPUSA must

³² The organ of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in March 1950 stated that while imperialism exists there also exists the danger of new aggression and that in the presence of imperialism and its predatory plans wars are unavoidable (*Pravda*, Pet. Ex. 217).

aid the anti-imperialists; and that this would hold true in the case of a war between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Documentary evidence of Respondent's expressions confirms the oral testimony that Respondent's policy is to oppose many United States policies and activities as imperialists, and as aggressive against the Soviet Union; also, that Respondent's policy is to support the Soviet Union and defeat the aims of imperialism. *Political Affairs* for March 1951 describes President Truman's activities as "imperialism" on the way to bankruptcy and as a provocative semimobilization for an outright war against the Soviet Union.

A pattern throughout the world Communist movement for teaching, advocating, and agitating for the overthrow of "imperialist" governments exists in the concept or slogan that the world is divided into two hostile camps, one led by the Soviet Union and the other by the United States. As previously herein set forth, Lenin, Stalin, and the Communist International, in interpreting and adapting to the world Communist movement the writings of Marx and Engels, took the original concept that society is divided between the bourgeoisie and proletariat, and developed it into the doctrine or slogan that the world is divided into two hostile camps—the camp of the imperialist states and the camp of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the USSR. In the *Programme of The Communist International* (Pet. Ex. 125) this is explained as follows:

The difference in class structure and in the class character of the government in the two camps, the fundamental differences in the aims each pursues in internal, foreign, economic, and cultural policy, the fundamentally different courses of their development, brings the capitalist world into sharp conflict with the victorious proletariat State. * * * The class struggle, which hitherto was conducted in circumstances when the proletariat was not in possession of State power, is now being conducted on an enormous and really world scale; the working class of the world has now its own State—the one and only fatherland of the international proletariat * * * (pp. 24 and 25).

* * * * *

Thus, as a result of the first round of imperialist wars a new, fundamental antagonism has arisen of world historical scope and significance; the antagonism between the U. S. S. R. and the capitalist world (p. 25).

The record establishes a consistent advancement of this doctrine or slogan by the Soviet Union and by the Communist Information Bureau, and its acceptance and use by Respondent. Of late, the slogan of "peace" has been added as hereinafter covered.

The Soviet Union in January 1949 characterized the postwar foreign policy of the United States and Great Britain as one of aggression and unleashing a new war for world domination, whereas, it stated, the Soviet Union struggles for universal peace and international security. This position of the Soviet Union as reported in *Pravda*, points out that "The very existence of the Soviet State, with its growing power and its international authority, and likewise the powerful support given to it by the democratic forces in other countries constitute an insurmountable barrier in the way of all plans of any kind for the establishment of world domination by one power or another." (Pet. Ex. 251, p. 19).

Pravda for March 11, 1950 (Pet. Ex. 217), contains a speech by V. M. Molotov which states that "Since the October Revolution in our country, the victory of the national liberation movement in China appears as a new and most powerful blow at the entire system of world imperialism and at all plans of imperialist aggression in our

time" (p. 4), and "Now the Soviet Union has not only come out of international isolation but is also the center of the powerful international democratic camp. * * * In the capitalist countries themselves, we now have millions of active friends who are closing ranks more and more in a broad democratic, anti-imperialist movement." (p. 5) * * * "The democratic camp, which unites the USSR and the countries of the people's democracy, is opposed by the camp of the imperialist powers, headed by the ruling circles of the United States of America" (p. 6). [Emphasis added.]

For a Lasting Peace, for a *People's Democracy* issue of November 10, 1947, sets forth a speech delivered by A. Zhdanov³³ at the Informative Conference of the Nine Communist Parties held in Poland at the end of September 1947. A section of this speech is entitled: "The New Post-War Alignment of Political Forces and the Formation of Two Camps: the Imperialist and the Anti-Democratic Camp, and the Anti-Imperialist and Democratic One" wherein it is stated the principal driving force of the imperialist camp is the United States with whom Great Britain and France are allied; the second camp—anti-imperialist—is based on the USSR and the "new democracies" (Pet. Ex. 214-A).

For a Lasting Peace, issue of March 10, 1950, contains an article which concludes with the following:

A comparison of the economic successes achieved by the Peoples' Democracies in a very short period of their history with the extremely difficult position of the working people in the capitalist countries constitutes a terrible indictment of American imperialism and of the whole decaying capitalist system (Pet. Ex. 412, p. 1).

With respect to Respondent, when Petitioner's witness Lautner left the Party at the end of 1949, the Party line was that the United States headed the imperialist forces of the world and that Russia led the anti-imperialist forces and that everything should be done to aid Russia and to disconcert the United States. Further, in 1949 an instructor in courses on the ABC's of Marxism included the United States in the imperialist camp and a similar position was taken by a Party study group in Boston, Massachusetts, in 1948, where it was stated that the United States led the "imperialists" and the Soviet Union led the anti-imperialists or Peoples' Democracies.

A "Discussion Outline" on "The Marxist Position Toward War" issued by Respondent's Educational Department, Michigan State Committee, in April 1949 (Pet. Ex. 400) has a section entitled, "IV. World War II was Just War" which says in part:

The post-war world was split by the U. S. and Britain into two camps—the camp of imperialism and fascism under the leadership of American imperialism and the camp of democracy, national freedom and peace, headed by the U S S R (p. 4). Similar teachings by Respondent are evidenced by study and teaching material used in various schools and groups (Pet. Ex. 425, p. 16; Pet. Ex. 424, Sess. 9).

Related to the concept of the world being divided into two hostile camps, is the concept or slogan set forth by Lenin and Stalin that distinguishes between "just wars," which are those carried on by "anti-imperialist" nations, and "unjust wars," i. e., those engaged in

³³ The Zhdanov Report has recently been widely used and followed by Respondent. It was published in *Political Affairs* and discussed and studied throughout the Party while Lautner and Philbrick were members. It is variously listed as "required reading," "reading material," and "reading," in study and teaching materials used by Respondent in 1949.

solely by "imperialist" nations among themselves or against any "socialist" country, such as the Soviet Union. We find that the concept of "just" and "unjust" wars, requiring the Communist Parties to support the Soviet Union in a war between the Soviet Union and any other country, and in a war between the Soviet Union and their own country to use every means to assist the Soviet Union, is basic to Marxism-Leninism; and that it has been continuously advanced and advocated by the Soviet Union, and has been continuously taught and followed by Respondent. Respondent's policies and activities centering around the doctrine of "just" and "unjust" wars is covered later in this report in connection with the issue as to what country the leaders of Respondent consider they owe allegiance. Accordingly, it is sufficient at this point to state our finding that Respondent's teachings and advocacy of this line represent a continued following of directions as to the line from Marxism-Leninism, the Communist International, and the Soviet Union.

We proceed to review the evidence concerning Respondent's use of the words "peace" and "democracy" in connection with the struggle against "imperialism" and for the advancement of the aims and objectives of the world Communist movement. Earlier in this report we have reviewed the united-front tactic as set forth in Marxism-Leninism as one of the means used for establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat. The united front has taken various approaches throughout the period since 1919. In the interest of reasonable summarization of the record, we limit this report to the use of the united-front tactic from 1935 on.

In 1935, the Communist International, with Respondent represented, mapped out the "tactical line" for the years ahead which consisted of forming a "united front" with other organizations in order to achieve national unity in the various countries for the purpose of combatting fascism.³⁴ The record shows that early in the 1930's, Stalin, in a report on behalf of the Central Committee of the CPSU to its Party Congress, pointed out that "the bourgeoisie would seek a way out of the economic crisis, on the one hand, by crushing the working class through the establishment of fascist dictatorship, i. e., the dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic, most imperialistic capitalist elements" (Pet. Ex. 330, pp. 300-301). The record also shows that the Soviet Union realized a "second imperialist war" represented a serious danger to the USSR. (Pet. Ex. 330, pp. 334-5). In mid-1935, discussions were started in the Communist International on the matter of the united front—the "anti-Fascist front"—which were supported by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as evidenced by an article in the August 6, 1935, issue of *Pravda*; this points out that "Unity—that is the command of the movement!" and emphasizes "that this unity be directed against Fascism, against the danger of a new imperialist war, against the offensive of capital," while also emphasizing that the Communists "know that only the dictatorship of the proletariat, only the Soviet Government is the sole salvation of the working class * * *" (Pet Ex. 183).

Thus, it is more than a coincidence that the Communist International in 1935 gave among the reasons for developing the "new

³⁴ In Communist documents, fascism is a form of imperialism.

tactical orientation," the economic crisis facing capitalism, the offensive of fascism, and the growth of the threat of a new imperialist war and of an attack on the U. S. S. R. (Pet. Ex. 137, pp. 21-22). In a speech at the close of this meeting of the Comintern, Georgi Dimitrov pointed out that "Ours is a Congress of struggle for the preservation of peace, against the threat of imperialist war"³⁵ (*ibid*, p. 8), and that:

Standing firmly on the impregnable position of Marxism-Leninism, which has been confirmed by the entire experience of the international labor movement, and primarily by the victories of the great October Revolution, our Congress, acting in the spirit and guided by the method of living Marxism-Leninism, has reshaped the tactical lines of the Communist International to meet the changed world situation (*ibid*, p. 11).

The Resolution of the Comintern concerning the new approach or use of the united-front tactic lays down various things which the Communist Parties are to do in carrying out the revised line, and in that connection uses such words as "enjoins" (p. 26), "must" (p. 36), and "imperative" (p. 37). The record shows that Respondent fully and completely complied with this line laid down by the Communist International as evidenced by the following, which is among the more significant evidence of record on this point.

In November 1935 the Central Committee of Respondent adopted a resolution "fully and wholeheartedly" endorsing the decisions of the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International in which resolution the "chief task" of Respondent at the time is stated to be "to reorientate the work of the Party in accord with the tactical line of the Seventh World Congress" and in which "The Central Committee calls upon the party organizations and every Party member to prosecute the struggle for the united front with the utmost determination and flexibility in the *new way* pointed out by the Seventh World Congress" (emphasized in text) (Pet. Ex. 185, pp. 1182-1184). Like the resolution of the Comintern and the statements of the Soviet Union, Respondent's resolution takes care to point out that the line is an application "in a living way" of "the teachings of Marx, Lenin, Engels, and Stalin"; and that it is linked to the prosecution of the Party's "revolutionary aims" and "revolutionary principles and program" (*ibid*, p. 1185).

Some of the details of Respondent's compliance with the instructions of the Communist International are furnished by Petitioner's witness Nowell who in the latter part of 1935 was instructed by William Weinstone and other functionaries of the Michigan District of Respondent to proceed to set up certain organizations in accordance with the united front policy and conforming to the new type of reorientation, as set forth in the resolutions of the Comintern. The witness shows that he carried out these instructions by forming fractions in various organizations for the purpose of influencing the policies of the organizations and to guide them along the lines of the Communist Party in setting up the "united front" movement.

In 1936, Respondent's Central Committee issued a statement which was printed in Respondent's magazine, *The Communist*, issue for May 1936, calling upon all workers to unite to defeat fascism and on May Day to pledge to defend the Soviet Union. *The Communist*

³⁵ The speech of Dimitrov and the Resolutions adopted by the Comintern were printed in pamphlet form in the United States by Workers Library Publishers and have been widely used by Respondent.

for May 1940 carries an article by "Gene Dennis" which points out the danger to the Soviet Union from the imperialist war and states that the united front can only be achieved successfully if consistently directed against the imperialist war and capitalist reaction.

Some aspects of Respondent's line during the period of the second world war shifted back and forth to follow the position of the Soviet Union. The pertinent facts in this respect are covered in our findings under the section of this report on the issue of nondeviation; we have taken them into consideration as part of the pertinent evidence involving Respondent's following of foreign directions concerning the use of the united front tactic. The record shows that after World War II, the use of the united front tactic received a different emphasis in the form of the united front for "peace." The testimony of Petitioner's witness Lautner, which is corroborated by other evidence of record, furnishes a clear understanding of this aspect of the issues and is therefore pertinent for review in some detail. The witness testified in part as follows, which we find to be an accurate statement of the facts:

The United Front tactics of the Communist Party were part of the subject matter of Marxism-Leninism, and in class [referring to Party classes in 1948] we tried to convey the idea that the Seventh World Congress decisions pertaining to the United Front tactics and Dimitrov's report in no way eliminated or negated the decisions of the Sixth World Congress but implemented the decisions of the Sixth World Congress in a way to enable the Party to develop a wider base on specific issues. Before the Seventh World Congress we had United Fronts that were based on a narrow concept popularly known as United Front from Below, United Fronts on specific issues, but were elements that were ready and willing to work on specific issues with the Communist movement. In the main it was an effort to increase and to advance the influence of the Communist Parties. This policy, based on the strategy and tactics of the Sixth World Congress, was a failure of the Party in Germany to make headway, the defeat suffered by the German Party, based on the strategy and tactics and the program of the Sixth World Congress, the failure in China, the failure to build the Red International Trade Union movement, the failure to gain a way or win a way to working classes, the organized section of the working classes from the influence of social democracy, with the result that reaction gained power in a number of countries. Hitler came to power in Germany. The Seventh World Congress devised a new tactical approach in order to achieve the main strategic objectives by developing a program of United Front from below and from above, and also the program of the people's fronts and coalitions around a specific issue in the struggle against fascism and in the struggle against war, because fascism was the main danger of war at that time.

* * * * *

So The United Front is not a repudiation of the basis [sic] strategic aims of the Communist movement, but as step that will bring closer the realization of that strategic aim.

* * * * *

After 1945 there came a re-evaluation of the world situation. Now the problem was to find that link in the chain again with which a new coalition could be developed on a united front basis, on a minimum program, on a partial program of the Communist International, with which coalition we could go forward to a new milestone, to a new point and gain new adherents to the Communist movement, and when we reached that milestone there would be a new situation, a new realignment of forces, and we would find that new link with which we could go forward again. *This link after the second world war was the struggle for peace.* The question of peace was the new link. At the reconstitution convention Foster in his report already indicated the direction in which the Party will travel in this postwar period, and Zhdanov's report later on precisely sets the two world camps and the main issue in the coming period, the issue of peace. That is the new link today around which the Party develops its activities to broaden out and to bring about an alignment of forces on the basis on which it can extend its

influence and exert its influence among a broader section of the population of this country (Tr. 9543-46). [*Italic added.*]

The record clearly shows that the Communist Parties throughout the world, including the Respondent in the United States, are now actively and strongly presenting the line of "peace," particularly the united front in the "struggle for peace." The very name of the official organ of the Communist Information Bureau, which is *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*, is indicative thereof. Key material used by Respondent in forming its "peace" line is the Zhdanov report, previously mentioned (see p. 49 and footnote 3), from which a typical quotation is as follows:

All the forces of the anti-imperialist and anti-fascist camp are united in the effort to secure a just and democratic peace. * * * These countries, and in the first place the new democracies * * * have proved themselves in the postwar period staunch defenders of peace, democracy and their own liberty and independence against all attempts on the part of the United States and Great Britain to turn them back in their course and to bring them again under the imperialist yoke (Pet. Ex. 214-A, p. 2).

The position or line of the Soviet Union in this matter is evidenced by a report delivered by G. M. Malenkov at the meeting of the Moscow Soviet in November 1949 and printed in the November 11, 1949 issue of *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*. In this report, Malenkov devoted a substantial portion to the heading "The Soviet Union Stands for Peace and Defends the Cause of Peace" (Pet. Ex. 231, p. 1). He points out that there is not a single country in which the movement uniting the supporters of peace does not possess a "base" (p. 2) and that the successes of "the camp of peace" drives the "enemies of peace," "by means of violence and new wars," to attempt the creation of an American world empire designed to turn the whole world into a "colony of the American imperialists, of reducing sovereign peoples to a state of slavery."

The December 1951 issue of *Political Affairs* contains a condensed translation from the Soviet philosophical journal *Voprosi Filosofie* which is entitled: "Stalin on the War Danger and the Possibility of Averting It." This Soviet statement, which by its publication in *Political Affairs* and in view of the entire record, makes it reasonable to conclude that it was adopted by Respondent and thus becomes the line of Respondent and is very similar in content to the above-mentioned Zhdanov and Malenkov reports. The statement outlines various forms which "the struggle for peace" has taken, such as fighting for an end to the war in Korea, against rearming West Germany and Japan, and a ban on atomic weapons. It also quotes with approval a declaration by Joseph Stalin in 1946 to the effect that "the peoples" are taking the fate of their states in their own hands and establishing "democratic regimes" and "carrying on an active struggle against the forces of reaction, against the incendiaries of a new war" (Pet. Ex. 488, p. 20).

Respondent's following of the line of the united front, and particularly the united front for peace, is evidenced by a quantity of documentary material probative of Respondent's policies and doctrines. Typical recent expressions of this line by Respondent appear in the *Daily Worker* issues of March 3, 1949, June 9, 1950, July 13, 1950, September 18, 1950, February 19, 1951, April 1, 1951, October 19,

1951, November 7, 1951, and June 9, 1952. The issue of November 7, 1950, contains the following as part of an editorial:

Today the Soviet Union is indestructible. The work of Lenin and Stalin is immortal. The Socialist State has become the leader of a new force in modern history—the great camp of peace. This new alliance of hundreds of millions of people in China and the People's Democracies, together with the vast millions in the colonial and capitalist countries, can prevent war. This is the new achievement of the Soviet Union, the glorious vision that the people can make a reality (Pet. Ex. 468).

Recent indications of Respondent's following of this united front for peace line also appear in *Political Affairs* for November 1950, February 1951, April 1951, December 1951, and January 1952. The issue of February 1951 (Pet. Ex. 376) contains "greetings" from Communist Parties of some thirty countries sent to Respondent on the occasion of its 15th National Convention. These greetings condemn American imperialism and support the struggle for peace. The "greetings" from the Soviet Union says in part: "May the international solidarity of the toilers in the struggle for peace, democracy, and Socialism gather strength." The People's Democratic Republic of China advised Respondent: "As a result of common struggle of the people of the world and awakened people in the United States, American imperialism has met with huge defeats and will continue to meet with even bigger defeats." The French Party pointed out that Respondent's decisions "taken in the light of the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, will enable you to advance forward on the road of unity of action of the working class." The Italian Party stated Respondent's struggle in defense of peace was greeted as its struggle. The German Democratic Republic said Respondent's fight is their fight "just as the struggle of the German friends of democracy and peace is your struggle." The Party of Great Britain expressed its "solidarity" with Respondent in the common struggle against Anglo-American imperialism. The Canadian Party expressed certainty that "Headed by the Mighty Socialist Soviet Union * * * the world camp of peace is going forward to win" and that Respondent "will not be found wanting."

Respondent's teaching materials used in its training schools and for self-study by the members furnish, among other things, still further evidence on the following of the united front for peace line. The "Discussion Outline" on "The Marxist Position Toward War" (*supra*, p. 49 of this report) put out in 1949 devotes considerable space to "Peace" and lists works by Lenin and Stalin and the *History of the CPSU (B)* as reading material. The "Outline For Nine-Day School," issued in 1948 (Pet. Ex. 346), has as the topic for the third lesson "Imperialism-War-Fascism-Struggle For Peace" and lists Lenin's *Imperialism* and the *United Front Against Fascism* as the reading material. Part II of the Study Outline for the Marxist Institute, issued in 1949 (Pet. Ex. 427), includes the study of the tactics of the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International and teaches that in the present period the strategic objective remains the same but the tactical line of the united front and peoples coalition developed still further, citing Dimitrov's report to the *Seventh World Congress* as required reading and the *History of the CPSU (B)* as supplemental reading (Session 9, pp. 1-3).

We find based on the foregoing and upon the entire record, that "the struggle for peace" including the tactic of the united front for

peace, is presently a main line of Respondent, the Soviet Union, and the Communist Information Bureau, and that this line is based upon the tactics set forth in Marxism-Leninism. It is therefore important to consider what the Communists mean by "peace," as an aid in determining whether the "peace" line is a link or tactic in seeking to advance the objectives of the world Communist movement. The testimony of Petitioner's witness Lautner regarding the united front tactic as heretofore set forth is relevant to this matter. Also, the *History of the CPSU (B)* teaches:

The Bolsheviks were not mere pacifists who sighed for peace and confined themselves to the propaganda of peace, as the majority of the Left Social-Democrats did. The Bolsheviks advocated an active revolutionary struggle for peace, to the point of overthrowing the rule of the bellicose imperialist bourgeoisie. The Bolsheviks linked up the cause of peace with the cause of the victory of the proletarian revolution, holding that the surest way of ending the war and securing a just peace, a peace without annexations and indemnities, was to overthrow the rule of the imperialist bourgeoisie (Pet. Ex. 330, p. 167).

The *History* further teaches that to achieve "peace" the Communist Parties should convert imperialist war into civil war and defeat one's own government in an imperialist war (*ibid.*, p. 167).

The understanding of the "struggle for peace" as an active, revolutionary struggle is further evidenced from a resolution adopted in 1935 by the Comintern, which resolution reads in part as follows:

At the present historical juncture, when on one-sixth part of the globe the Soviet Union defends socialism and peace for all humanity, the most vital interests of the workers and toilers of all countries demand that in pursuing the policy of the working class, in waging the struggle for peace, the struggle against imperialist war before and after the outbreak of hostilities, the defense of the Soviet Union must be considered paramount (Pet. Ex. 137, p. 48).

These tactics are also revealed in Dimitroff's *The United Front*, a part of the body of Marxism-Leninism, which says, *inter alia*:

* * * You cannot carry on a real struggle against fascism if you do not render all possible assistance in strengthening the *most important buttress* of this struggle, the Soviet Union. You cannot carry on a serious struggle against fascist instigators of a new world blood bath, if you do not render undivided support to the U. S. S. R., a *most important factor* in the maintenance of international peace * * * (Pet. Ex. 149, p. 279, emphasized in text).

Additional insight into Respondent's use of the "struggle for peace" is furnished by the aforementioned "greeting" sent to Respondent by the Soviet Union on the occasion of Respondent's 15th National Convention in late 1951. This "greeting" is later herein discussed in more detail with respect to the issue of Respondent's reporting to the Soviet Union. Petitioner's witness Lautner, based on his experiences as a member of Respondent including what he taught and was taught, considers the greeting "a political document of the highest importance" (Tr. 10068), which raises all the basic questions that Respondent is confronted with at the present time and "gives leadership to the American Party" (Tr. 10069). Lautner interprets "struggle for peace, democracy and socialism" as "the new tactical approach since the end of the war, the link with which this tactical united front is to be built." (Tr. 10070); and so we conclude.

In view of the foregoing and upon the entire record, we find and conclude that the "struggle for peace" as used and practiced by respondent, sometimes called the "struggle against reaction", represents the present emphasis of the "struggle against imperialism" which is and has been a basic, active, revolutionary doctrine taught

and advocated by respondent for the purpose of overthrowing "imperialist" governments (by force and violence if necessary) and substituting the dictatorship of the proletariat. We further conclude and find that respondent's "struggle for peace," "struggle against imperialism" and united-front tactics followed in connection therewith, represent a continued following of directives of the Soviet Union as contained in Marxism-Leninism, in specific instructions of the Soviet Union and in the program of the Communist International; and are designed to advance the objectives of the world Communist movement.

4. Democratic Centralism and Self-Criticism

Respondent's use of the organizational principle known as democratic centralism, hereinbefore referred to under "Marxism-Leninism", is one of the many facts indicative of its operation pursuant to directives from the Soviet Union through which the policies of the Soviet Union are effectuated.

The *Programme of the Communist International* covers democratic centralism as follows:

The Communist International and its Sections are built up on the basis of democratic centralism, the fundamental principles of which are: (a) Election of all leading committees of the Party * * *; (b) periodical reports by leading Party committees to their constituents; (c) decisions of superior Party committees to be obligatory for subordinate committees, strict Party discipline and prompt execution of the decisions of the Communist International, of its leading committees and of the leading Party centres.

Party questions may be discussed by the members of the Party and by Party organizations until such time as a decision is taken upon them by the competent Party committees. After a decision has been taken by the Congress of the Communist International, by the Congress of the respective Sections, or by leading committees of the Comintern, and of its various Sections; these decisions must be unreservedly carried out even if a Section of the Party membership or of the local Party organizations are in disagreement with it (Pet. Ex. 125, p. 86).

Respondent admittedly follows and applies the principle of democratic centralism.³⁶ It has done so substantially throughout most of its existence. In 1945, when Respondent was reconstituted as the Communist Party, its leader, William Z. Foster, proclaimed:

* * * Only by applying the sound principles of Leninist democratic-centralism can our Party keep its mistakes to a minimum and develop the clear-thinking unity of action and resolute discipline that are the great strength of Communist parties all over the world (Pet. Ex. 372, p. 793).

Respondent's position with respect to the issue of democratic centralism is as expressed by its counsel in arguing before us: "What has all that got to do with domination and control by Moscow?" (Tr. Jan. 7, 1953, p. 51). Respondent's evidence is to the effect that the principle of democratic centralism is the ultimate in democracy in that the rank-and-file members elect the next higher officers and so on up to the highest authority of the Party—the national convention. Respondent states that once a decision is reached by the majority, that decision is binding on the whole body.

Witnesses for the Petitioner testify to a different understanding of democratic centralism.

Gitlow stated: "The Communist Party in the United States was a centralized organization, ruled from the top down, and not from the bottom up;" and when he, Lovestone, and Wolf were deposed in the schism of 1929, arrangements were made in Moscow that control of

³⁶ Respondent's witness Gates says democratic centralism is the principle which governs the party organization and function. He does not, however, indicate its origin.

the United States party was to be vested in a representative of the Communist International who was given specific power to nullify any decision that any committee or any branch of the CPUSA made. He was also given power to expel any member of the party as well as other powers over the party.

Kornfeder likened the party structure to a military one, with power coming from above.

Nowell testified that, during his membership (between 1929 and 1936), in actual practice authority descends upon the membership from the top.

We find that the materiality and relevancy of the issue of democratic centralism lies in its source as concerns Respondent's acceptance and practice of it, and in its use as a means of bringing Respondent within the authority of the Soviet Union. The record leaves no real doubt that, at least until 1940, Respondent followed democratic centralism as a requirement of membership in the Communist International,³⁷ and that on the basis of democratic centralism all decisions of the Communist International had to be fulfilled by Respondent. From this it follows, based on the evidence elsewhere herein set forth, that for the period covering over twenty years of Respondent's existence, the principle of democratic centralism was one of the means whereby Respondent came within the authority of the Soviet Union.³⁸ Upon consideration of all of the evidence concerning Respondent's policies, activities, and conduct over the subsequent period of its existence, particularly the evidence covering non-deviation and allegiance as elsewhere set forth in this report, it is reasonable to conclude, and we do so, that Respondent's continued following of the principle of democratic centralism keeps Respondent within the authority of the Soviet Union.

We further find that the principle of democratic centralism is one of the policies established by the government and Communist Party of the Soviet Union, through adaptations of Marxism-Leninism, as an organizational policy of the world Communist movement, and that Respondent's operations based upon the following of the principle evidences the purpose to effectuate the policies of the Soviet Union and of the world Communist movement.

In making our findings and conclusions concerning democratic centralism, we have taken into consideration the disciplinary aspect of the principle which is treated later in this report.³⁹ We have also taken into consideration the evidence concerning the collateral Marxist-Leninist concept or device called self-criticism, as followed and understood by Respondent. In arguing about self-criticism before us, Respondent's counsel stated as follows concerning self-criticism:

Another instruction or directive that the recommended decision relies on is what the Marxists call self-criticism. What is self-criticism? You get it from the books that are in evidence here. You get it from testimony of the witnesses. It is the proposition that Marxists assert that any serious political party should be willing openly to admit its mistakes, should discuss its mistakes of the past openly, and in the course of such public and open discussion also decide how those mistakes should be corrected. That is all that this principle of self-criticism means (Tr. Jan. 7, 1953, p. 54).

³⁷ See pp. 9 to 14 concerning the Communist International and Respondent's membership therein.

³⁸ See pp. 27 to 28 herein.

³⁹ This includes the evidence furnished by Petitioner's witness Johnson and others which establishes that in the past Respondent's organization included a Central Control Commission—the national disciplinary body—which was the American section of the International Control Commission in Moscow that maintained the strictest, iron discipline in the Party and kept every Communist in line.

The record, however, shows that the source of the doctrine and its use by Respondent lies in Marxism-Leninism and has as its primary purpose keeping Communists in line with the policies of the Soviet Union. As elsewhere herein noted, Respondent in 1945 reemphasized the revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism and expelled Earl Browder as a "revisionist." Those who had supported Browder engaged in "self-criticism" by saying that they were wrong in adhering to Browder's deemphasis of the revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism and in committing the other errors pointed out by Jacques Duclos, a spokesman for the world Communist movement.

"Self-criticism" is a device for safeguarding the unity of the Party and the iron discipline required by the Soviet Union. Elsewhere herein we discuss the evidence on these points in more detail. It is pertinent here to set forth a few illustrations from the record. Respondent's *Manual on Organization* contains the following:⁴⁰

It is clear, however, that basic principles and decisions, such as, for example, the Program of the Communist International, cannot be questioned in the Party (Pet. Ex. 145, p. 26).

We do not question the correctness of the revolutionary theory of the class struggle laid down by Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin (*ibid*, pp. 26 and 27).

Self-criticism is a natural part of the life of the Party. Without self-criticism, there can be no Communist Party. But this criticism must never depart from the line of the Party, from the principles of Marxism-Leninism. * * * destructive criticism * * * if tolerated * * * leads to factionalism (*ibid*, pp. 32 and 33).

In short, the policies of the Soviet Union cannot be questioned.

An "Outline On Fundamentals of Marxism For Class Use or Self Study," issued by Respondent's National Educational Commission, cites Stalin's *Foundations of Leninism* as the "source of unity and discipline in the Communist Party" and quotes from Lenin, *Selected Works*, on the practice of self-criticism (Pet. Ex. 370, p. 31), which is indicative of the source of Respondent's use of the doctrine. Further, an article in *Political Affairs* for January 1951 covering the main resolutions of Respondent's 15th National Convention, treats with the practice of criticism and self-criticism as "the inner law of Party development" (Pet. Ex. 378, p. 33) and includes the following:

Thus the whole Party does not often enough participate in evaluating major developments and struggles; does not sufficiently learn from mistakes committed.

This in turn leads to many "independent" estimates which are not resolved into one single Party estimate. This tends to weaken Party discipline and the carrying out of Party decisions (pp. 33 and 34).

The 15th National Convention of the Communist Party, U. S. A., demonstrates the firm political unity of our Party. It calls upon the whole membership to guard the monolithic character and unity of our Party, based on democratic centralism. We must strive for the highest discipline arising out of conscious understanding of the Party's theory and political line. Tendencies toward factionalism are totally impermissible and must be sharply dealt with because they weaken the Party and make it possible for the enemy more easily to penetrate its ranks (pp. 34 and 35).

In view of the foregoing and upon consideration of the evidence concerning discipline and allegiance as later in this report reviewed, and upon the record as a whole, we find and conclude that Respondent

⁴⁰ According to Respondent's witnesses, the *Manual* is obsolete in Party circles. On the other hand, the evidence furnished by witnesses Nowell, Crouch, Lautner, and Budenz, and the fact that the author of the *Manual*, J. Peters, a high officer of Respondent, only left the United States and Party work in 1949, preponderates to establish the continued use of the *Manual* until at least 1949.

practices the doctrine of self-criticism in compliance with the requirements of the Soviet Union and for the purpose of keeping its members in line with the policies and directives laid down by the Soviet Union.

5. Foreign Representatives in the United States

The foregoing facts concerning Respondent's organizational structure and the changes therein, the true meaning and use of Marxism-Leninism, and Respondent's policies and activities in "the struggle against imperialism" demonstrate and confirm the international character of the world Communist movement; that Respondent is the United States section or part of that movement; and, that the movement is dominated and controlled by the Soviet Union. Further confirmation and demonstration are found in the evidence concerning other activities or programs which the record establishes are the subjects of Respondent's major attention and efforts. These are hereinafter covered under the headings "Major Programs" and "The Communist Press."

We find that from time to time throughout Respondent's existence, the formulation and carrying out of its policies, programs, and activities as aforesaid have been directed or supervised by foreign representatives in the United States from the Soviet Union; this serves to illuminate and explain the basis and source of the policies and activities, and further illustrates the international aspects of Respondent's operations, as well as the foreign control thereover. A condition of the Communist International which was accepted and followed by Respondent was that:

The E. C. C. I. and its Presidium have the right to send their representatives to the various Sections of the Communist International. Such representatives receive their instructions from the E. C. C. I. or from its Presidium, and are responsible to them for their activities. Representatives of the E. C. C. I. have the right to participate in meetings of the central Party bodies as well as of the local organizations of the Sections to which they are sent. * * * Representatives of the E. C. C. I. are especially obliged to supervise the carrying out of the decisions of the World Congresses and of the Executive Committee of the Communist International (Pet. Ex. 125, pp. 89 and 90).

It would unduly burden this report to trace the many instances of record where such foreign representatives have been in the United States and active in the affairs of Respondent. Among such representatives identified in the record are Gerhardt Eisler (sometimes known as Edwards and Hans Berger), J. Peters, Pogany (John Pepper), Golos, Peterson, Frank Miller, P. Green (Gussev), Yusefovich, Merker (Wagner), Walettsky, and Allen. Limiting this report to a few examples, the record supports the testimony of Petitioner's witness Johnson who testified, based on what he was taught in Respondent's training school in 1932, that a representative of the Comintern had power superseding that of any leader in the American Party and was the complete boss over Respondent's policy. Similarly, Petitioner's witness Lautner shows that when a Comintern representative spoke at Party meetings, no one questioned his decisions and they were accepted as the Party line.

In the light of the record, we find that many of the policies and activities presently being carried out by Respondent were originally formulated under the supervision of representatives of the Communist International, and that this fact is indicative of foreign domination and control of Respondent. This, however, is not the entire state

of the record as to activities of foreign representatives. When viewed in the light of the facts that Respondent announced its disaffiliation from the Comintern in 1940 to avoid identification as a foreign agent in the United States, and that the dissolution of the Comintern was announced in 1943 as a tactical move for unity in World War II and to eliminate that manifestation of foreign direction over the member Communist Parties, the less apparent but yet identifiable subsequent activities of foreign representatives in the United States becomes significant.

We have previously found that Manuilsky, while a Soviet Union representative to the United Nations in 1945, sent word to Respondent to the effect that it should heed Duclos' statement concerning the reconstitution of the Communist Party.⁴¹ Other individuals who had previously been here as Communist International representatives are identified on the record as active in the United States after 1940. J. Peters and Gerhardt Eisler⁴² are the subjects of considerable testimony.

Respondent's witness Flynn states on direct examination that since she assumed her duties as a member of the National Committee in 1938, Respondent has not received any directives or instructions from any representative of the CPSU and that to her knowledge no Communist International representative has been in the United States since 1946. She knows Gerhard Eisler but did not meet him until after his arrest. She states that neither he nor any of her fellow officers in the CPUSA ever told her that he (Eisler) was a representative of the Communist International. The testimony of Respondent's witness Gates is to the same effect.

Of the reputed Communist International representatives in the United States, Eisler was the most conspicuous and most noteworthy. Eisler was in this country for many years and fled the United States while on bail, pending the appeal of his conviction in 1949 for false swearing. Witness Kornfeder shows that in 1933 Eisler, whom he had originally met in Moscow, was a Comintern representative in the United States and discussed with him the infiltration of the American Federation of Labor and the Railroad Brotherhoods. Eisler warned him of serious consequences if he spoke against a new trade-union policy at a national convention of the Communist Party in 1934. Kornfeder disregarded Eisler's warning and was told to repudiate in the Party press within sixty days what he had said. He was expelled from the Party. Witness Johnson stated that Eisler's word was law in the CPUSA. Witness Meyer knew Eisler as a Comintern representative, as did witness Lautner. Lautner testified that after 1945 he knew that Eisler undertook to influence Party activities in the United States. Witness Budenz said that Stachel, a high Party leader, received orders from Eisler in 1943 and 1944, and that there was talk of Eisler as a Comintern representative in 1945. During this period Stachel consulted with Eisler frequently.

Another person conspicuously active in the activities of the CPUSA was J. Peters, author of Respondent's *Manual On Organization*. Witness Nowell identifies him as a Comintern representative. Witness

⁴¹ See *supra* p. 16.

⁴² The record shows that both Peters and Eisler as well as other Comintern representatives have used various other names and aliases. Eisler has been known as "Edwards" and "Berger," and on one occasion he asked witness Nowell to call him "Brown." J. Peters was also known as William Peters, Alexander Stevens, and Clarence Miller. Also as Joe Peters, Alexander, or Goldberg.

Crouch said he took orders from Peters between 1934 and 1940, and witnesses Johnson and Lautner testified that Peters provided them with secret codes.

Peters was deported in 1949. Subsequently, an official actively engaged in Respondent's youth activities met Peters in Hungary while the former was attending the World Youth Festival there.

We find that the testimony of Petitioner's witnesses is credible and that the testimony of Respondent's witnesses is not in accord with the facts in this matter. A preponderance of the evidence clearly shows that representatives of the CPSU were in the United States and that through them Respondent received directives and instructions.

6. *The Communist Press*

In addition to the foregoing, further indication that the Respondent operates pursuant to directives of the Soviet Union, and is controlled by the Soviet Union in its views and policies, is furnished by the evidence hereinafter summarized concerning the Communist press and its use for the exchange of information. In the United States the *Daily Worker* and *Political Affairs* operate as guides for the membership of Respondent as to the correct views and policies. In the Soviet Union, the organ of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is a paper called *Pravda*. On an international scale, *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy* is the organ of the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties (Cominform).

We find that one significant aspect of the issue of domination and control lies in the formation, nature, and character of the *Daily Worker*. The record shows that the Communist International required the member parties to "create a new type of periodical press * * * in which the Communists * * * learn to utilize the slightest liberty allowed by the laws * * *" and without which "the preparation for the dictatorship of the proletariat is impossible" (Pet. Ex. 8, p. 20). The International also required that such a Party press carry on a policy fully corresponding to the policy of the Party; edited by reliable Communists; and subject to the control of the governing body of the Party (*ibid.*, p. 27). We find that the policy, content, and advocacy of the *Daily Worker* is and has been under the complete supervision and control of Respondent's leaders and top committees; that officers of Respondent have been the principal officers of the paper; that the paper's policies correspond to the policies of the Party and the paper is considered a necessity for the effectuation of the Party's aims and purposes. In its early years, the *Daily Worker* was aided by financial subsidies from Moscow and until about 1944 was furnished free information or dispatches at nominal cost, from Moscow through a Soviet Union news service. The record shows various directives issued by the Communist International concerning the *Daily Worker*, which were followed. Upon consideration of the foregoing and upon the whole record, we find and conclude that the *Daily Worker* was established pursuant to directives of the Communist International and presently fulfills the function it has always had.

We further find, on the basis of the evidence hereinafter summarized, that the *Daily Worker* is the counterpart in the United States of the Soviet Union organ, *Pravda*, translated issues of which are part of the record in this proceeding. While Petitioner's witness Budenz was managing editor of the *Daily Worker* (1941-45), staff

meetings were held for political education—"to keep the staff on their toes regarding Party theory and thinking"—at which meetings the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* was used. We have heretofore found that the *History* constitutes one of the principal sets of rules and guides followed by Respondent. It is stated in the *History* that, "A powerful instrument used by the Bolshevik Party to strengthen its organizations and to spread its influence among the masses was the Bolshevik daily newspaper *Pravda* * * * founded, according to Lenin's instructions, on the initiative of Stalin, Olminsky, and Poletayev" (Pet. Ex. 330, p. 149). The *History* also states that *Pravda* "directed the working class movement toward one definite aim—preparation for revolution" (*ibid*, p. 153) and that a legally published newspaper "could not call openly for the overthrow of tsardom" and "had to resort to hints, which, however, the class-conscious workers understood very well * * *" (*ibid*, p. 150). Examples are given of "modest" sounding words which were understood by the workers as a "call" (*ibid*, p. 151). Respondent's official concept of the *Daily Worker* in the 1930's, which the record shows still persists, is that the paper is "One of the main and most important instruments of agitation and propaganda * * * for reaching and winning the masses" (Pet. Ex. 145, pp. 78-79). This is pertinent for comparison with the aforequoted concept of *Pravda* as "A powerful instrument used by the Bolshevik Party to * * * spread its influence among the masses."

We treat now with the issue as to whether the foreign Communist press contains articles or statements that constitute directives or instructions to Respondent. Respondent's witness Gates is a member of the National Committee, and is editor of the *Daily Worker*.⁴³ He denies that any foreign publication contains directives to the Respondent. The testimony of Respondent's other two witnesses is to the same effect. On the other hand, while petitioner's witness Budenz was managing editor of the *Daily Worker*, "the Communists looked in these articles from Moscow for the directives and the line that was to be pursued, the attitude that should be taken."

The direct oral testimony, however, is not the full state of the record in the premises. In resolving this issue, we have taken into consideration the facts elsewhere herein set forth concerning "non-deviation," and particularly, as established by a review of the pertinent documents of record, the fact that the *Daily Worker* does not deviate from or disagree with the Soviet press.⁴⁴ We have also taken into consideration the background of the Communist press in this country and in the Soviet Union as heretofore set forth, and the aforementioned principle that the press resorts to "hints" or "modest" language but which the "workers" understand. Further, it is not seriously disputed on the record that the *Daily Worker* receives political news from abroad, particularly from Moscow, which includes translations from the Soviet press, and that a correspondent of the *Daily Worker* is stationed in Moscow.

Additional evidence on this issue consists of the fact that the Communist publication *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy* is

⁴³ He held these positions prior to starting to serve a prison sentence for conviction in 1950 for violation of the Smith Act, and, as far as he knows, still retains the positions.

⁴⁴ Respondent's witness Gates says the similarity between Respondent's views and those of the Soviet Union is only the coincidence of the common application of Marxist-Leninist principles.

distributed in the United States to functionaries of Respondent, and copies have been made available by Respondent to meetings of various of Respondent's committees and groups. Petitioner's witness, Matusow, furnishes an example of the effect of an article in *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*. In the summer of 1948, the director of the Jefferson School gave a lecture at the school's summer camp to the effect that the Communists agreed with Tito and Yugoslavia and all the things they were trying to do. A few weeks later, the news was published in *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy* that Marshal Tito and the Yugoslav Communist Party had been denounced by the Cominform. The same school director then took the reverse position in his lectures although his only source of information was the Cominform journal.

Other parts of this report present our findings concerning the well-established requirement of the Soviet Union that vigilance be maintained against "reformists," "opportunists," "stool pigeons," etc.; and the application in this respect of the Communist doctrine of self-criticism. An article by Gilbert Green, high officer of Respondent, entitled "For Communist Vigilance" appears in the May 1950 issue of *Political Affairs*. The article refers to the way in which the Polish and Bulgarian Communist Parties dealt with lack of vigilance—"the reflection of opportunism in the thinking and work of the Party"—and quotes articles from *Pravda* and *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy* on the need for Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism. It is reasonable to conclude from the article that the author considered the foreign articles as authoritative instructions.

Some of the articles which are in evidence from *Pravda* contain specific reference to the United States. The March 11, 1950, issue (Pet. Ex. 217) contains a speech by Molotov on the international situation in which the following appears:

The democratic camp, which unites the USSR and the countries of the people's democracy, is opposed by the camp of the imperialist powers headed by the ruling circles of the United States of America (*ibid*, p. 6).

* * * * *

It is our permanent task and important duty to watch everything that is going on in the camp of imperialism (*ibid*, p. 6).

* * * * *

We fully stand for the Leninist-Stalinist principles of peaceful coexistence of the two systems and their peaceful economic competition. But we know it to be true that while imperialism exists, there also exists the danger of new aggression and that in the presence of imperialism and its predatory plans wars are unavoidable. Therefore, the advocates of a durable peace among the peoples must not be passive and become empty pacifists who are charmed by phrases, but they must every day conduct a stubborn and still more effective struggle for peace, drawing into it the masses of the people and not stopping before appropriate measures when the imperialists attempt to unleash new aggression (*ibid*, p. 11).

When read in the light of the considerable evidence of record respecting Respondent's position concerning the United States as an aggressive, imperialist power, and Respondent's policies and activities in the struggle for peace, all of which is set forth in detail elsewhere in this report, it is reasonable to conclude that the foregoing article in *Pravda* demonstrates that the so-called struggle for peace is used in order "to sweep imperialism and aggression from the face of the earth forever" (Pet. Ex. 217, p. 11).

Upon the whole record, we find and conclude that articles published in *Pravda* and *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy* are understood by Respondent and treated as authoritative instructions or directives as to the line to be taken or the policy to be pursued.

7. Major programs

We have hereinbefore referred to the fact that Marxism-Leninism, through the so-called Classics, sets forth certain programs and policies as the means of forwarding the world revolution. Particular emphasis as to programs (as distinguished from organization and discipline in the world Communist movement and from the strategies and tactics for the overthrow of imperialism), is placed upon work in and with labor unions, youth, and minority groups (see pp. 33 to 37, *supra*).

We also find that such programs were basic requirements of the Communist International and have been and are constantly advanced by the Soviet Union. We find further that Respondent early formulated and has consistently carried out such programs in the United States in conformance with Marxism-Leninism and pursuant to other directives of the Communist International and of the Soviet Union, and that the formulation and carrying out of such programs have as their aims and purposes the advancement of the objectives of the world Communist movement. The evidence as to Respondent's activities in and with labor unions, youth, and minority groups, particularly the Negroes, is voluminous. It would unduly burden this report to set forth the many detailed facts from which the foregoing findings are established. We limit ourselves to what we consider the more significant—those in the past which determine the source and illuminate the present, and those of more or less current use and application which determine the continuity and consistency.

It is clear, and as we read the record not disputed, that major attention is given by Respondent to trade-union work, to youth and to "the struggle for national liberation of the Negro people." At issue are the reasons for this attention—why and for what purposes. In other words, this proceeding is concerned with whether these policies and activities were formulated and are being carried out on Respondent's initiative or whether they come within Section 13 (a) (1) of the Act.

The preceding section of this report which establishes the meaning of Marxism-Leninism as understood and used by Respondent shows that trade-union work, youth work, and work among the minorities, are given importance in the world Communist movement. Trade unions and youth under Marxism-Leninism are the "belts" and "levers" without whose aid the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be realized, while the directing force is the Party. Trade unions are "a school of Communism"; youth are "young reserves"; and national minorities have "latent revolutionary capacities." Under the Classics, Communists are taught the necessity of "winning over and "utilizing" trade unions in order to carry on the struggle against the government; the necessity of "organizing the Marxist-Leninist training of youth"; and, the necessity of "utilizing" the latent revolutionary capacities of the minority groups for "the overthrow of imperialism."

Additional evidence as to the importance of trade unions, youth, and national minorities in the world Communist movement is furnished by the consistent requirements of the Communist International. The *Theses and Statutes* required that the component member parties carry on Communist work in labor unions and form Communist groups within the organizations to "win over labor unions to Communism" and "to subordinate the unions to the practical leadership of the Party, as the advance guard of the workers' revolution" (Pet. Ex. 8, pp. 29-57); that organizational relations between youth and the Communist Party be basically defined in every country after the same system (p. 8) and, that a policy be carried out for the closest union between all national and colonial liberation movements and Soviet Russia—"to support the revolutionary movement among the subject nations (for example, Ireland, *American Negroes*, etc.) and in the colonies" (p. 69, emphasis added). In discussing preparation for the dictatorship of the proletariat, the *Theses and Statutes* says in part:

In every organization, union, association—beginning with the proletarian ones at first, and afterwards in all those of the nonproletarian workers and exploited masses (political, professional, military, cooperative, educational, sporting, etc.) must be formed groups or nuclei of Communists—mostly open ones, but also secret ones which become necessary in each case when the arrest or exile of their members or the dispersal of their organization is threatened; and these nuclei, in close contact with one another and with the central Party, exchanging experiences, carrying on the work of propaganda, campaign, organization, adapting themselves to all the branches of social life, to all the various forms and subdivisions of the working masses, must systematically train themselves, the Party, the class, and the masses by such multiform work (p. 16).

The *Programme of the Communist International* further emphasizes these policies and activities. Concerning trade unions, the *Programme* says:

* * * It is particularly important for the purpose of winning over the majority of the proletariat, to capture the *trade unions* (emphasized in text), which are genuine mass working class organizations closely bound up with the every day struggles of the working class. To work in reactionary trade unions and skillfully to capture them, to win the confidence of the broad masses of the industrially organized workers, to change and "remove from their posts" the reformist leaders, represent important tasks in the preparatory period (Pet. Ex. 125, p. 76).

With respect to youth, the *Programme*, in what we find to be adherence to the principles of Lenin and Stalin, points out that the Party relies directly on the mass organizations which include youth, and that systematic work must be carried on among the proletarian and peasant youth (p. 82).

Concerning minorities, the *Programme* points out the necessity to support every movement "against imperialist violence in the colonies, semicolonies, and dependencies themselves"; to carry on propaganda against all forms of chauvinism and against the "imperialist maltreatment of enslaved peoples and races, big and small (treatment of Negroes, yellow labor, anti-Semitism, etc.)."

Still further evidence concerning the role to be given trade unions, youth, and national minorities in the world Communist movement lies in the official organ of the Communist Information Bureau. The December 2, 1949, issue of *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy* contains a report submitted to the Cominform by M. Suslov, representative of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, entitled "Defense of Peace And The Struggle Against The Warmongers,"

which emphasizes the necessity of drawing trade unions into the "camp of the fighters for peace, against the warmongers"; it points out the help that can be furnished by youth; and says that the duty of the Communist and working class parties in the capitalist countries is to merge the struggle for the national independence with the struggle for peace (Pet. Ex. 249, p. 3). The Zhdanov report, previously herein referred to, includes the following statement:

Imperialist countries like the United States, Britain and countries near to them become dangerous foes of the national independence and self-determination of nations, while the Soviet Union and the countries of the new democracy are a secure bulwark in the defense of the equality and national self-determination of nations (Pet. Ex. 214, p. 22).

Upon consideration of the foregoing and upon the entire record, we find and conclude that trade union work, the training and organization of youth, and national liberation movements, all under the guidance of the Communist Party, are essential elements in carrying out the world Communist movement and that these policies were formulated and have been from time to time implemented by Lenin and Stalin, the Communist International, and the Communist Information Bureau. We proceed to examine the record concerning Respondent's use and application of these elements. Evidence as to Respondent's direction in its trade union and national liberation programs is furnished from an article by "Alex Bittelman" which was printed in the March 1934 issue of Respondent's magazine *The Communist* (Pet. Ex. 126). The author, Bittelman, is presently a high official of Respondent. The theme of the article was to seek to make it appear that the Communist International did not "interfere" in American affairs or "dictate" to Respondent, but that Respondent heeded the Comintern in the exercise of Respondent's own conviction and will.⁴⁵

With respect to trade union work, Bittelman wrote in part as follows:

The next milestone in the Comintern leadership for the American party we find on the question of trade union work. * * * The Comintern brought the American militants and lefts closer to the world labor movement and to the basic problems of the American labor movement. The trade union question was one of them. * * * Even the best and most experienced among the left and militant leaders of the American workers * * *, such as the late Charles E. Ruthenberg, as well as the present leader of our Party, William Z. Foster, were able to rid themselves and our movement of the old ballast of opportunism only by coming closer to Leninism and into the Comintern * * * (p. 239).

It was Comintern advice and guidance that helped the American Communists to turn full face to the building of a left wing in the reformist unions beginning with 1920; it was the advice of the Comintern that helped formulate a correct solution to one of the basic problems of the American proletariat—the organization of the unorganized into trade unions; it was advice of the Comintern on independent leadership of the economic struggles by the revolutionary elements that helped formulate strike policies and tactics; * * * (p. 210).

Comintern influence on the development of revolutionary trade union policies in the United States has especial significance. * * * It is significant, therefore, that the first question which Comrade Stalin put to the American trade union delegates was: "How do you account for the small percentage of American workers organized in trade unions?" * * * the intent of Stalin's question is clear: Why don't you organize the workers in trade unions? Why don't you strengthen them

⁴⁵ Bittelman's attempt to explain away control by the Comintern is not in accord with the facts. From the record as a whole, it is apparent that the Comintern in fact dominated and controlled Respondent under conditions whereby Respondent could not exercise its own volition in any major respect. An example is furnished, among many, by Kornfeder's expulsion from the Party for failure to follow the instructions of a Comintern representative. See p. 60 herein. Cf. Nowell's trial by the Comintern for opposing the Negro policy of the Comintern, pp. 75-76.

against the capitalists? (pp. 240-241). And it was in this direction that the Comintern threw the full weight of its influence and advice in the American labor movement. * * * Tactics and methods of work might vary, depending upon the state of the class struggle. * * * But the strategic aim always remained the same, and for this aim the Communist Party fights bravely and persistently and with increasing effectiveness. * * * So, we ask again: can any American worker, who is alive to the needs of his class and is willing to fight for them, find anything to object to in this "interference" of the Communist International in American affairs? And will he object to the Communist Party of the U. S. accepting and taking deep satisfaction in such "interference"? No, he will not * * * (p. 241).

And concerning the matter of national liberation, the article includes:

Once more came the "outside" influence of the Comintern, and what did it say? It said that the struggle against discrimination and for Negro rights is a revolutionary struggle for the national liberation of the Negroes, that we must fight for complete Negro equality, and that in the Black Belt the full realization of this demand requires the fight for the national self-determination of the Negroes, including the right to separation from the United States and the organization of an independent state. Furthermore, it was the interpretation of Leninism and its application to the United States as made by the Comintern that showed the American Communists that the agrarian revolution in the Black Belt, * * * is the basis of the national-liberation movement and that this movement is one of the allies of the American proletariat in the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat. * * * Will the Negro workers, farmers, and city poor consider the Comintern advice on the Negro question 'outside dictation'? No. They will, as they actually do, receive this advice with outstretched arms and will continue in every-larger masses to rally around the Communist Party as the leader of the liberation fight * * * (ibid., p. 244).

A review of Respondent's early documents and the testimony of witnesses who were officials of Respondent during its formative years, establish that Respondent gave to trade unions, youth, and minorities as prominent a place in its structure as did the founders of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union. Respondent's articles, publications and other documents, together with the testimony of witnesses, show that throughout its existence and up to the time of this proceeding, Respondent has continued to give importance to trade union work, the mass organization and training of youth, and the struggle for national liberation of the Negroes. It is not necessary to review herein the considerable quantity of evidence that shows the extent of Respondent's policies and activities in furtherance of the world Communist trade union, youth, and national liberation movements; nor to review the large quantity of evidence from which we find that these policies and activities of Respondent represent to a substantial degree the continued following and adherence by Respondent to unrepudiated directives given by the Soviet Union. We limit this report to some of the more significant indications. For clarity, we treat the subjects separately. The evidence hereinafter set forth is in addition to the fact, which we find, that Respondent's policies and activities with trade unions, with youth, and in the struggle for national liberation are based upon and adhere to Marxism-Leninism.

(a) Trade-Union Work

In 1927, Benjamin Gitlow, at the time a member of the Politburo of Respondent and its Central Committee, was sent by Respondent to the Soviet Union at the special request of the Communist International to attend the Plenary sessions of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. While there, Gitlow, and other

leaders of Respondent, met with Joseph Stalin at Stalin's office at the Headquarters of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Stalin directed the Communist Party to make a very serious effort, among other things, to get a foothold in the trade-union movement of the United States, in order to attract to the Communist Party a much larger membership, and to await a sharpening of the economic and social situation in the United States for future revolutionary action.

It will be noted that Stalin's statement is in line with the policies of Marxism-Leninism and of the Comintern, to which we have previously referred. The record shows that Respondent has continuously and consistently placed major emphasis on trade-union work to build up the Party and to aid in what Respondent sometimes calls the "class struggle."

Petitioner's witness Nowell in 1929 received instructions from the Central Committee of Respondent concerning an elaborate program, later adopted at the founding convention (which Nowell attended as a representative) of a national parent organization—Trade Union Unity League—affiliated with the Red International of Labor Unions in Moscow, for organizing industrial workers in basic industries as well as to foster Communism in unions and for facilitating the proletarian revolution. In 1935, Nowell was instructed as an official of Respondent to gain control of local unions for the purpose of gaining hegemony of the C. I. O. After certain strikes in 1936, Respondent counted on the C. I. O. as part of the People's Front movement to influence United States home and foreign policy in conformity with the International People's Front movement outlined by Dimitroff in his Seventh World Congress speech and resolutions in August 1935.

The official minutes of the proceedings of Respondent's governing committees for a number of meetings during the period from late in 1925 to late in 1928 were put in evidence by Petitioner. Many of these minutes show action by Respondent concerning trade-union work pursuant to specific instructions and directives from the Communist International. (Examples are Petitioner's Exhibits Nos. 53, 63, 65, 77, 80, 87, and 91.)

The record shows that Respondent's tactics in its trade-union work have been changed at least three times pursuant to directives of the Communist International and to effectuate the policies of the Communist International. Originally, the policy was to operate in existing unions. This was changed in 1928 to a policy of concentrating on forming new unions. In 1934, the policy reverted to one of operating in existing unions. This policy is still in existence as established by the evidence herein reviewed. Respondent's united-front program in the trade-union field which presently receives considerable attention from Respondent, originated with the Communist International. As expressed in the aforementioned article by Alexander Bittelman:

* * * In short, at every stage in the development of the revolutionary trade-union movement in the United States (TUEL, class struggle unions of the TUUL, the application of the united front on the trade-union field, the fight for trade-union unity, etc.), it was with the help of the Comintern that the American revolutionary workers were able to find the correct way, to correct their errors, and, through manifold changes in tactics, to press on to the goal of building a revolutionary trade-union movement in the United States (Pet. Ex. 126, p. 240).

Petitioner's witness Kornfeder taught a course at one of Respondent's schools at the national headquarters in New York in 1932

which covered Communist labor-union tactics and strategy, including the organization of secret groups inside of labor unions for the purpose of gaining control of such unions, and the preparation and conduct of strikes.⁴⁶

At its national convention in 1950, respondent resolved:

We must face the fact that the overwhelming bulk of the organized workers in the country are in the A. F. of L., C. I. O., and independent Right-led unions. It is this which must determine the main direction of all of the Party's work, and especially its trade-union and industrial concentration policy (Pet. Ex. 378, p. 13).

In May 1940, Respondent published in its magazine, *The Communist*, an article by Dennis, then and now a high official of Respondent, entitled "The Bolshevization of the Communist Party In The Struggle Against The Imperialist War," which states it is particularly urgent, in accordance with certain conditions outlined by Stalin in *Pravda* in 1925, to conduct more consistent and effective activity among the A. F. of L. Workers.

An article by Henry Winston appearing in *Political Affairs* for September 1948 (Pet. Ex. 418), entitled "For a Fighting Party Rooted Among the Industrial Workers," was used in discussions at Party Club meetings in October and November 1948, attended by witness Matusow. The article concerns the necessity for mobilizing the workers in the factories as a main base for a successful fight against war and fascism. In a subsequent discussion of the article with witness Matusow, the writer, Winston, said that the question of industrial concentration and the movement of young people, members of the Communist Party youth movement, to basic industries was important at this time because in the event of any "imperialist war" it would be necessary to have people in basic industries to mobilize the workers against such war in an effort to slow down production and to do anything possible to see that such an "unjust war" should not be successful. The writer, Winston, is a member of Respondent's National Committee and was the National Organizational Secretary.

The February 1951 issue of *Political Affairs* (Pet. Ex. 376) "devoted to reports, speeches, and greetings of the 15th national convention of the Communist Party, USA, held in New York City on December 28-31, 1950," contains an article by John Williamson entitled "The Main Direction of the Party's Trade-Union Work" (pp. 54-73), which direction, the author says, must be "among the members of the reformist-led unions" (primarily the A. F. of L. and C. I. O.) (p. 66). The article refers to the role of the Party through its thirty-one years existence and concludes that "in general, the trade-union policies adopted by our Party were correct" (*ibid*, p. 72). According to Williamson:

The present situation demands from all Party trade unionists, especially in positions of leadership, closer ties with the Party, better understanding of policies, and a more vigorous fight for Party policies among the masses (*ibid*, pp. 72-73).

* * * * *

We know * * * our Party, headed by its helmsmen Foster and Dennis, will lead the working class safely to the port of Socialism (*ibid*, p. 73).

Petitioner's witness Janowitz was a member of Respondent both during the period it was called the Communist Political Association and after it reverted to the name Communist Party. He joined in

⁴⁶ His course also included one in Leninism, including the main doctrine calling for the total and complete overthrow of all existing social institutions, the government, and organizations which support the government, as well as the complete elimination of the present state structure and the substitution of a dictatorship led by the Communist Party.

1943 and was still a member at the time he testified in this proceeding. He held minor official positions and was active in Respondent's trade-union work in Ohio. He and one Fred Haug, at a meeting of Communist labor members in 1950, were assigned the duty of getting new members for the Party. Also in 1950, at a meeting of a Communist Party group at the plant where Janowitz was employed, a state official of Respondent handed out copies of *New Times*, published by the newspaper *Trud* in Moscow, and of *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*, official organ of the Cominform. The official told the labor members to read and study the documents and pass them on. These documents contain articles which strongly condemn the United States while praising the Soviet Union (Pet. Exs. 412 and 413). On the basis of his experience in the Party, Janowitz learned that the Communists are to take advantage of every opportunity that arises to lead the masses, whether it be through depression or strikes or anything else, and are to be the leaders in any movement that unites the masses for the purposes of "getting rid of the capitalist system in America," and substituting Communism.

Petitioner's witness Evans attended a regional convention of Respondent in 1951 where a talk was made concerning the policy of industrial concentration and Communist work in trade unions. The witness describes the talk as including reference to the necessity of infiltrating the different unions, especially the key unions. His best recollection is that the speaker actually used the word "infiltrating." Similar evidence is furnished by Petitioner's witness Cummings who was taught in Respondent's schools in 1945 that to infiltrate trade-union movements was one of the primary objectives of Respondent.

We have previously referred to the supervision of Respondent's activities by foreign representatives in the United States. In trade-union work, the record shows that Petitioner's witness Kornfeder, while an official of Respondent, disagreed with the change in trade-union policy in 1934 and was expelled for failure to heed Gerhardt Eisler, a foreign representative, who told him not to voice his disagreement. Witness Honig in the early 1930's was given instructions by a Communist International representative in the United States concerning his Party assignment as editor of a publication called *Labor Unity*.

Members of Respondent have in the past been sent to the Soviet Union where they received schooling and instructions regarding trade-union policies and activities. Four of the witnesses in this proceeding had this experience. Witness Nowell was taught trade-union and strike strategy at the Lenin School in Moscow in 1931. Witness Honig was sent by Respondent to Moscow in 1932 where he remained until 1935. While there, he studied the operations of the Soviet trade unions and helped the Communist International to formulate policies to be carried out by Respondent in the trade-union field. Honig sent back to Respondent reports on decisions made by the Communist International or its affiliated Red International of Labor Unions with headquarters in Moscow, on such things as where the Respondent was to step up its activities and try to produce strikes and try to capture control of unions. The Respondent reported back to Moscow commenting on the instructions it received to the effect that the Party had been attempting and believed it was succeeding in carrying out these directives.

The record shows that under Marxism-Leninism, as well as the Communist International and the Soviet Union, the incitement to strike is a tactic of labor union policy and activity. In the late 1920's, a special committee was created by Respondent in an attempt to gain control of the United Mine Workers by utilizing anthracite strikes to Respondent's advantage. In 1934, the Comintern and the Red International of Labor Unions at joint meetings in Moscow, instructed Respondent to press the current situation among the longshoremen and dockworkers in San Francisco to the point of a general strike. These instructions were communicated to Respondent by coded message and were carried out. Manuilsky, then secretary-general of the Communist International,⁴⁷ expressed himself as anxious to have the strike since a cardinal principle of Leninism was that a general strike is a rehearsal for revolution or for a seizure of power by the Communist Party.

A strike meeting was called at the Fisher Body Plant in Cleveland in the 1930's at the direction of the Communist International representative, Gerhardt Eisler. In 1940, Respondent instigated a strike at Allis-Chalmers in order to slow down the production of war materials for Great Britain, then at war with the Soviet Union's then ally, Germany. In 1941, Respondent instigated and led a strike conducted by the aircraft division of the United Auto Workers at the North American Aviation Co. in California.

(b) Youth Work

As in the case of Respondent's other policies, activities, and programs, we have taken into consideration in arriving at our determinations regarding Respondent's youth work, the fact that Respondent has republished in the United States and uses as textbooks and guides to action, many of the documents, publications, and writings of leading officials of the Soviet Union and organs under its control, such as the Communist International. We have also taken into consideration the fact that various members of Respondent have been trained in the Soviet Union and that some of its present top officials were intimately connected with the Communist International.

The evidence clearly preponderates to establish that while it was a part of the Communist International, Respondent's youth policies were formulated and carried out and its activities performed pursuant to directives of the Communist International. A decision of the Comintern in 1926, contained in the "Resolution on the American Question" and requiring greater attention to the building of a mass Young Communist League and pioneer movement was distributed by Respondent's general secretary to all District, City, Section Committees, and Language Bureaus of the Party.

A resolution of Respondent's Central Committee wholeheartedly approved the decisions of the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern in 1935 "to build the widest anti-fascist youth front through the world." The Central Committee in its resolution called upon the Party to do all in its power to help the Young Communist League accomplish a change in its character indicated by the Sixth World Congress of the Young Communist International and which had subsequently been approved by the Communist International.

⁴⁷ Manuilsky in 1945 was Soviet representative to the initial United Nations conference on international organization held in San Francisco.

The minutes of various top committees of Respondent for the period from October 1925 through November 1938 disclose guidance by Respondent of the Young Communist League in the United States on the basis of directives from the Communist International (examples are Pet. Exs. 58, 71, 72, 73).

Additional evidence as to foreign direction of Respondent's youth policies and activities is furnished by Alexander Bittelman's pamphlet issued in 1932 entitled, "*The Communist Party in Action*" (Pet. Ex. 144) and by Respondent's *Manual on Organization of the Communist Party* (Pet. Ex. 145). In the pamphlet entitled "*The Way Out*,"⁴³ issued by Respondent in 1934, the Young Communist League is defined as the mass political organization of young workers which leads them in the struggles for their demands and acts as a training school for Communism. It is organizationally independent of the Communist Party, but acknowledges its political leadership and is affiliated with the Young Communist International.

The record establishes that the Young Communist League in the United States was dissolved in 1943 (when the Communist International ceased to exist) and that in its place the American Youth for Democracy was formed as what is known by Communists as a coalition group, being composed of both members and nonmembers of the Communist Party. It was technically a non-Communist organization, formed as a win-the-war organization designed to recruit and influence as many young people as possible for the Respondent Party. Witness Philbrick, a member of Respondent, was State Treasurer of the American Youth for Democracy and one of its leaders. Witness Matusow joined the American Youth for Democracy in 1946 and through his associations therein became a member of Respondent in 1947. He continued to be active in Respondent's youth work and in 1949 assisted in the formation of a new Marxist-Leninist youth organization in the United States—the Labor Youth League. The plan of Respondent which was carried out was to disband all Communist youth clubs and to transfer their leadership to the Labor Youth League under Respondent's leadership. Among the books used by the educational committee of the Labor Youth League for training its members are: *Twilight of World Capitalism*, by William Z. Foster; *The Tasks of Youth*, by Stalin; and *The Young Generation*, by Lenin.

In view of the policy of the world Communist movement for the mass organization of youth organizationally independent of the Party, and in view of the various directives issued to Respondent, all as heretofore set forth, the following quotation from an article in *Political Affairs* for February 1951 (Pet. Ex. 376) is relevant to the issues herein:

This Convention [15th Natl. Convention, Dec. 1950] reflects real progress in our youth work and better understanding of our Party policy in this field.

* * * * *

The 1948 Convention of our Party gave important emphasis to the need of establishing a non-Party working-class youth organization dedicated to the training of the youth in the spirit of socialism.

* * * * *

The recent founding Convention of the Labor Youth League * * * has made a deep impression on our whole Party. In this short time the League has proven

⁴³ Manifesto and Principal Resolutions adopted by the Eighth Convention of the Communist Party of the USA, held in Cleveland, Ohio, April 2-8, 1931 (Pet. Ex. 136).

itself to be a worthy heir of all the best traditions of the Young Communist League, its 25-year record of struggle and its training of many of the outstanding leaders of our Party today * * * (p. 175).

* * * * *
Experience has borne out fully the correctness of establishing L. Y. L. as an independent non-Party mass youth organization. The best answer to those comrades who two years ago thought Party youth clubs filled the need for youth work are the thousands of non-Party members of L. Y. L. who are today participating in its activities and learning in a Marxist spirit (p. 180).

Other contents of this article are pertinent for comparison with the principles of Stalin and of the Communist International, as previously herein set forth, that a matter of decisive importance in the proletariat's fight against imperialist wars is the work among the youth. This 1951 article says:

There can be no fully effective fight for peace without waging a struggle against the militarization of youth * * * (p. 176).

* * * * *
It follows that these are some of the most immediate issues around which our Party must develop an energetic struggle.

1. No extension of the draft to 18-year olds, veterans and married men. No lengthening of the draft service term. No universal military service and training (p. 178).

Particularly significant for comparison with the foregoing evidence as to respondent's present policy concerning work among the youth as part of the fight against imperialism, is the resolution passed by the Communist International in 1928 entitled "The Struggle Against Imperialist War and the Tasks of the Communists" (Pet. Ex. 148), which says the greatest efforts must be exerted—not only by the youth organizations, but by all Communists—in combating bourgeois sport organizations, fascist organizations, military schools, etc., through which the bourgeoisie are training the youth for imperialist wars. Also, it is stated that bourgeois military training of the youth must be combated.

The obligation which the Sixth Congress of the Communist International (1928) placed upon all Communist Parties to assist in setting up Youth Leagues was approved by Respondent's publication as late as 1950, of an article in *Political Affairs*, entitled "A Generation of Soviet Youth," which refers to such obligation as still authoritative on Party members (Pet. Ex. 477, pp. 85-95). In this article, the author holds up Lenin and Stalin as models for youth and, after reviewing the role which youth played in bringing about the establishment and consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia, pictures the lot of the Soviet youth under such dictatorship as one of security, free from unemployment, and with the right to leisure, whereas in sharp contrast the American youth must face the constant fear of unemployment under the scourge of American capitalism. In conclusion, the author declares that solidarity with the Soviet Union and appreciation of its leading role in the struggle for peace, democracy, and socialism, become the touchstones of true internationalism among young people of all countries; and that it is particularly important in the United States—the center of world imperialism—to bring this wonderful understanding to the young people who are studying Marxism-Leninism and to the Party which helps to guide their youth.

The experiences and careers of various witnesses in this proceeding while engaged in youth work as members of Respondent furnish still

further relevant evidence. While in Moscow in 1927 and 1928, witness Crouch as a member of Respondent and a representative of the youth organization, was directed to form in the United States joint units of the Party and the Young Communist League to work together in the Navy yards. He followed this and other directives upon his return to the United States and upon reporting to William Z. Foster and the national officers of the Young Communist League. In 1929, Crouch was a member of the National Young Communist League Secretariat and National Educational Director of the Young Communist League but upon orders given to the National Convention of the Young Communist League in 1929 by a representative from Moscow, Crouch was not elected National Secretary because of his previous support of Lovestone in the factional dispute of the Party.

Witness Meyer before coming to the United States was a member of the Communist Party in Great Britain, where he was active in work for the Young Communist League and was associated with the secretariat of the Central Committee of the British Young Communist League. In 1934, he went to Paris, France, in connection with setting up a world student and youth congress with counterparts in America and Great Britain. This work, while Meyer was in Paris, was under the direction of Walter Ulbricht, who at the time Meyer testified herein was Vice Prime Minister of Eastern Germany. Upon arrival in the United States in 1934, Meyer was assigned by "Gil Green" to youth work in the United States and during the summer of 1934 attended the convention of the Young Communist League of Canada together with "Gil Green" and a Max Weiss from the Young Communist League of the United States.

Witness Philbrick was a member of the Young Communist League for a couple of years before joining Respondent in 1944, of which he remained a member until 1949, continuing his duties in the Young Communist League and later the American Youth for Democracy. The meetings of the American Youth for Democracy which he regularly attended were conducted along the same lines as those held by the Young Communist League, which included training in organization, discussion of current activities on the part of young Communists in the group, and educational sessions on Marxism-Leninism.

Respondent's witness Gates joined the Young Communist League in 1931 to attain what he thought to be the answer to the "personal tragedy" of the depression (Tr. 12595-12603). His activities in the Young Communist League led to his attaining a position of leadership in Respondent, which he joined in 1933. He participated in League agitation for the Unemployment Insurance Act and about the Scottsboro affair (Tr. 12609-10). He says his duties and activities as head of the League in New York State were almost identical with the general activities of Communists during the period—activities by the young people of New York State on behalf of the economic welfare, democratic rights and peace. Later herein we deal with the evidence as to the ideological aspects of Respondent's trade-union, youth, and minorities work.

(c) National Liberation

We have previously herein referred to the fact that Marxism-Leninism, the Communist International, the Soviet Union, and the Communist Information Bureau give importance to what they call

the national problem—the “world problem of emancipating the oppressed peoples in the dependent countries and colonies from the yoke of imperialism” (*Foundations of Leninism*, Pet. Ex. 121, p. 77). We have also noted that under Marxism-Leninism, the Comintern, the Soviet Union, and the Cominform, the “national problem” is applied to the Negroes in the United States on the theory that the Negro people in the Black Belt of the South constitute an oppressed nation within the territorial borders of the United States.

The record clearly establishes that a main “line” of Respondent is and has been what it calls the struggle for national liberation of the Negro people. This proceeding is concerned with whether or not the concept and application by Respondent of the theory as to the right of the Negro people in the Black Belt to self-determination is a program which Respondent arrived at independently.

Respondent’s position in this respect is summed up by its witness, Dr. Aptheker, as follows:

* * * I would stick to my answer that the Negro question is a national question, it is certainly not something dictated from abroad or by the Communist International. The Negro question is a national question, is a reflection of objective reality. If it is dictated, it is dictated by life (Tr. 14149).

Dr. Aptheker concedes that, although certain Negro leaders after the Civil War thought in terms of the concept of Negro nationalism, that was not known to the leaders of Respondent and was not used by Respondent in evolving its position on the Negro question. Also, that at the time the policy of self-determination of the Negro people and the Black Belt was enunciated by the Party, it was not the policy advocated, in the developed sense at least, by the majority of the Negro people or a majority of their leaders.

In the early 1930’s, the Executive Committee of the Communist International drew up and passed certain resolutions concerning the Negro question in the United States which were sent to Respondent to be carried out. These resolutions established the line of the Communist International to be a demand for self-determination of the Negroes in the United States in the form of unconditional autonomy-separation, or secession from the United States and the establishment of a separate Negro government in the Black Belt of the South. As explained by witness Nowell and corroborated by the copy of the resolution in evidence, if no proletarian revolution has occurred, Respondent is to support the rebellious government of the Negro republic in its opposition to the Government of the United States, in order to weaken the Government of the United States and aid Respondent in precipitating and executing the proletarian revolution. During Nowell’s membership in the Party, definite steps were taken to execute this program.

As a member of Respondent, witness Nowell attended the Lenin School in Moscow in 1931, where he was taught that the Negro question in the United States was a part of the colonial question; that the foundation of the colonial problem was imperialist exploitation by the mother countries; that the Communists were to help colonial countries break themselves away from their mother countries, thereby weakening the mother countries and thus aiding the proletariat and the Communist Parties in those countries to precipitate and carry through a proletarian revolution and the establishment of a communist dictatorship. Witness Nowell was disciplined while in the Soviet

Union for voicing disagreement with the theory and demand for separation and secession by the Negroes from the government of the United States and the establishment of a separate government.

Witness Johnson was active in Respondent's Negro work during his membership from 1930 to 1940. In 1932, he attended respondent's National Training School in New York City, where his instructors included William Z. Foster, Gilbert Green, Jack Stachel, Max Bedacht, and others who are presently leaders of the CPUSA. At the school he was taught by a member of Respondent's Central Committee that members of the Party were to work for equal rights for Negroes, which included specifically the right in the Black Belt to rebel and wage civil war to form an independent autonomous Soviet Republic; that the movement toward the establishment of this autonomous Negro Republic should be guided and steered in such a way by the Negro Communists that it would take place simultaneously with the general proletarian or Communist revolution in America. Johnson, who became a Negro member of Respondent's Central Committee, subsequently lectured in the school and before Party meetings and study groups on this program.

In its "*Manual On Organization*," first issued in the 1930's, Respondent said the Negro people are "the other important ally" in speaking of those that the proletariat must win to its cause, and "without whom there cannot be a successful revolution." (Pet. Ex. 145, pp. 14 and 15). The *Manual* quotes the following from an "Open Letter" adopted by Respondent's Central Committee in 1933:

The Party must mobilize the masses for the struggle for equal rights of the Negroes and for the right of self-determination for the Negroes in the Black Belt. It must ruthlessly combat any form of white chauvinism and Jim-Crow practices. It must not only in words but in deeds overcome all obstacles to the drawing in of the best elements of the Negro proletariat, who in the recent years have shown themselves to be self-sacrificing fighters in the struggle against capital * * * (*ibid.* pp. 15 and 16).

Witness Cummings was a member of Respondent from 1942 to 1949. He attended one of Respondent's training schools and many of Respondent's meetings. He also read Party literature. He was taught that the primary objective of Respondent was "to infiltrate trade-union movements, Negro organizations, and any organizations that we were able to get into and take control of, to eventually change the system of American Government."

Benjamin Davis, National Committee member, in his report to Respondent's 15th Convention, held on December 28-31, 1950, in New York City, said an important feature of the Negro liberation movement is "the international significance of this question" (Pet. Ex. 379, p. 12); that the "Party's line on the Negro question is a Leninist-Stalinist principle and method of work" (*ibid.*, p. 19); and that—

Tendencies to treat the Negro people as mere victims of oppression, without seeing their unique positive and revolutionary role in the struggle against capitalist reaction, are a patronizing form of white chauvinism (*ibid.*, p. 19).

John Williamson, in a report to the 15th National Convention of Respondent in December 1950, pointed out that "the cause of the working class as a whole cannot advance unless a firm alliance is established with the Negro people and unless the working class assumes its full responsibility in support of the struggle of the oppressed Negro

nation for freedom" (Pet. Ex. 376, p. 69). Jim Jackson, another of Respondent's leaders, puts it as follows:

The development of higher levels of the Negro national revolutionary struggle in the Black Belt, and the broad mass movement for democratic rights in the South as a whole, is an indispensable prerequisite for insuring the victory of the working class and the American people over the menacing challenge of the ruling-class forces of fascism and war *presently*, and for working-class victory over capitalism *ultimately*. This is a basic fundamental in the strategy for working-class victory, and a special feature of the path to the triumph of Socialism in our country (Pet. Ex. 376, p. 119).

An article in *Political Affairs* for January 1951, entitled "Working Class and People's Unity for Peace! (Main Resolution of the 15th National Convention, CPUSA)," characterizes the Negro people as a "tremendous reservoir of strength for the whole democratic movement" (Pet. Ex. 378, p. 11) and states:

Because U. S. imperialism is compelled to cloak with demagogic phrases about democracy and equality its drive for world conquest, particularly its military assault against the colonial liberation movement in Asia, the Negro question tears the mask off Wall Street's real face and assumes the greatest international significance (*ibid*, p. 17).

(d) Ideological Versus Political Aims

The foreign-evolved policies, activities, and programs for the carrying out of the world Communist movement, as set forth by the Soviet Union through Marxism-Leninism, the Communist International and otherwise, teach and sanction activities calculated to achieve reforms. The record shows that Respondent has campaigned for and championed reforms such as shorter working hours, nonmilitarization of youth and Negro rights. However, the record shows that such activities are political and only incidentally ideological; that the campaigns are primarily carried out not for the ostensible objective of the campaigns but to aid in the accomplishment of the objectives of the world Communist movement.

In addition to the evidence hereinbefore set forth concerning the true purposes of Respondent's trade union work, youth work, and national liberation activities, the following is pertinent.

Petitioner's witness Evans, chairman of a Party club, delegate to a Party regional convention in 1951, and section educational director in 1951, states, on cross-examination as to recent Negro rights activities of his Party club, that a study of Communist tactics and of Communist strategy will refute the declaration that the interest of the Party in the fight for Negroes is focused upon the individual; he shows that, in effect, the fight for Negro rights is an effort by the Party to make the Negro a useful means of helping the Party obtain the victory of socialism.

Foundations of Leninism points out that the necessity for the proletariat to support the national liberation movement of the oppressed and dependent countries does not mean everywhere and always, in every single concrete case, but only where the national movement tends to weaken, to overthrow imperialism, and not to strengthen and preserve it (Pet. Ex. 121, p. 79).

Respondent's publication *The Communist Party In Action*, written by one of Respondent's present leaders, Bittelman, in 1934, says the importance of the daily struggles concerning "small" grievances must

not be underestimated, and quotes the Communist International as stating in effect that only by conducting everyday struggles can the Party achieve a united front and lead the working class to a victorious dictatorship of the proletariat (Pet. Ex. 144, pp. 43-44).

In 1924, Stalin wrote in *Foundations of Leninism*:

Some think that Leninism is opposed to reforms, opposed to compromise and to agreements in general. This is absolutely wrong. Bolsheviks know as well as anybody else that in a certain sense "every little bit helps," that under certain conditions reforms in general, and compromises and agreements in particular are useful * * *.

Obviously, therefore, it is not a matter of reforms or of compromises and agreements, but of the use people make of reforms and compromises * * *.

To a revolutionary, * * * the main thing is revolutionary work and not reforms: to him reforms are byproducts of the revolution * * *.

The revolutionary will accept a reform in order to use it as an aid in combining legal work with illegal work, to intensify, under its cover, the illegal work for the revolutionary preparation of the masses for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie (Pet. Ex. 121, pp. 103-4).

(c) Conclusion As To Major Programs

Our summary of the evidence concerning trade-union work, youth work, and work among the Negroes, does not include all of the evidence relevant to these subjects. On the basis of the foregoing and upon the entire record, we find and conclude that early in its existence Respondent accepted these policies and programs and has continued to follow them and has not repudiated them; that Respondent's trade-union work, youth work, and national minorities work could only have as their aim the effectuation of the policies of the Soviet Union with respect to the world Communist movement; and that Respondent's policies and activities in these fields are substantially formulated, carried out, and performed, pursuant to directives of the Soviet Union.

8. *Conclusions as to Foreign Policies and Directives*

In view of the findings and conclusions hereinbefore set forth in this section of our report, we find and conclude that:

1. Respondent's organizational form is based upon instructions and directives issued by the Soviet Union;

2. Respondent's organizational policies are formulated and carried out to effectuate the policies of the Soviet Union and the world Communist movement;

3. A substantial number of Respondent's leaders have accepted the views and policies of the Soviet Union concerning the advancement of the objectives of the world Communist movement, and have made such views and policies the views and policies of Respondent;

4. Marxism-Leninism, as understood, used, and followed by Respondent, consists of a body of doctrine, policies, strategies, and tactics intended to bring about the end of capitalism and to substitute for it a dictatorship of the proletariat; it has been promulgated and issued by the Soviet Union as the overall philosophy, authoritative rules, directives, and instructions governing the world Communist movement;

5. Among other things, by the acceptance and following of the organizational devices of democratic-centralism and self-criticism,

as these devices are defined and explained by the Soviet Union, and by the acceptance of and adherence to Marxism-Leninism, Respondent subjects itself to the authority of the Soviet Union;

6. Respondent throughout its existence has and does at the present time teach, advocate, and carry out activities having for their objective the overthrow of the United States Government and other governments which are designated as "imperialist" by the Soviet Union, pursuant to directives of the Soviet Union and to effectuate the policies of the Soviet Union, all for the purposes of defending and protecting the Soviet Union and of establishing in the United States (and other countries) a dictatorship of the proletariat patterned after that in the Soviet Union;

7. Respondent has established a press in the United States patterned after that in the Soviet Union which operates as a means of setting forth for Respondent's members the correct line as laid down by the Soviet Union;

8. The press in the Soviet Union and the journal of the Communist Information Bureau are major communication means whereby directives and instructions of the Soviet Union are issued to Respondent;

9. Representatives of the Soviet Union who were sent by it to the United States have been instrumental in putting or keeping in power leaders of Respondent, devotedly loyal and subservient to the Soviet Union, who have continued to be and still are Respondent's leaders; that such representatives have on behalf of the Soviet Union directed the adoption and use of a number of the Respondent's present policies and activities;

10. Among the major programs set forth by the Soviet Union for the accomplishment of the objectives of the world Communist movement are trade union work, youth work, and work with national minorities; and, pursuant to requirements of the Soviet Union, Respondent has made these its major programs in the United States and carries out such programs pursuant to directives issued by the Soviet Union, for the purposes of effectuating the policies of the Soviet Union and advancing the objectives of the world Communist movement;

11. Respondent's policies are formulated and carried out and its activities are performed pursuant to directives of, and to effectuate the policies of, the Soviet Union, which directs and controls the world Communist movement.

C. NONDEVIATION

Section 13 (e) (2) of the Act provides that the Board shall take into consideration "the extent to which its [Respondent's] views and policies do not deviate from those of such foreign government or foreign organization."

The petition alleges, in part, on this subject:

Throughout its existence the Communist Party never knowingly has deviated from the views and policies of the government and Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Communist International, the Communist Information Bureau and other leaders of the world Communist movement. Whenever such views and policies have conflicted with the position taken by the Government of the United States, the Communist Party has opposed the position of the United States.

Dr. Philip E. Mosely, Professor of International Relations at Columbia University and Director of the University's Russian Institute, was Petitioner's principal witness for the purpose of establishing that Respondent's views and policies do not deviate from those of the Soviet Union. Dr. Mosely has had a distinguished and active career in the field of international relations and for more than 20 years has devoted his research primarily to Russian political and diplomatic history. While so doing, he has had occasion to analyze carefully the publications and other documents issued by Respondent and the Soviet Union. He is eminently qualified to testify as an expert on evidence relative to the "nondeviation" criterion of the Act.

Dr. Mosely's testimony traced the continuing stream of international questions, upon which both the Soviet Union and the CPUSA have announced a position. He enumerated some 45 international questions of major import,⁴⁹ extending over the past 30 years, with respect to which there was, as revealed by his testimony, no substantial difference between the position announced on each by the Soviet Union or its official and controlled organs and that announced by the CPUSA or its official and controlled organs.

On each specific topic, several exhibits illustrating the views or policies of the Soviet Union and the CPUSA, respectively, were introduced contemporaneously with Dr. Mosely's oral testimony.

At the hearing, Respondent moved to strike Dr. Mosely's testimony and objected to the admission into evidence of the exhibits offered through this witness on the grounds that: (1) basing a registration order thereon would violate the First Amendment; (2) to base a finding of domination and control thereon would violate the Fifth Amendment; (3) it was not proved that the Soviet Union adopted its views first; (4) Respondent was not allowed proper cross-examination; (5) Dr. Mosely was disqualified as an expert; and (6) exhibits purporting to be translations from the Russian language were not properly authenticated.

Additional objections also raised at the hearing were that specific documents (a) predated the Act;⁵⁰ (b) pertained to subjects not covered in the petition; (c) were not shown to express authoritative views; (d) did not establish a parallel view; (e) did not support allegations of the petition; and (f) did not support Dr. Mosely's testimony.

We have reviewed the entire record relative to all of the aforementioned contentions of Respondent. Those pertaining expressly to Constitutional issues will be treated later in this Report under "Legal Discussion."⁵¹ Viewing the record in a light most favorable to Respondent, we find no error in the Panel's acceptance of this particular evidence or in its rulings with respect thereto.

Passing to its exceptions, Respondent took issue in the manner described heretofore (pp. 2-3, *supra*) with every statement in the Panel's decision concerning nondeviation. These exceptions are gen-

⁴⁹ Among these are the following: the League of Nations; Soviet Union purge trials, 1937; Russo-Finnish War, 1939; Russian invasion of Poland, 1939; Hitler-Stalin nonaggression pact, 1939; attitude toward World War II before and after German attack on Soviet Union; incorporation of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union, 1940; second front in Europe; dissolution of Communist International, 1943; revision of Montreux Convention, 1946; Communist movements in Bulgaria, Roumania, Hungary, Albania, China, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia; Berlin Blockade, 1948; West Germany; Italian election, 1948; North Atlantic Pact; control of atomic energy; election of Yugoslavia to United Nations Security Council, 1949; Cardinal Mindszenty case, 1949; United Nations police action in Korea; Communist China's intervention in Korea, 1950; seating Communist China in United Nations; Peace Treaty with Japan, 1951; and peace in Korea.

⁵⁰ We discuss the question of pre-Act evidence later in this Report under the caption "Legal Discussion," pp. 125 to 132, *infra*.

⁵¹ See pp. 131 and 132, *infra*.

erally contentious, lacking in specificity and without merit; and, except to the extent that they pertain to matters discussed below or are incorporated in our findings, they do not warrant further comment.

In its brief accompanying its exceptions, Respondent contends that the Panel's concept of the nondeviation criterion is (a) irrational, erroneous, and based on incompetent evidence, and (b) involves conclusions which Dr. Mosely admitted he could not draw. Respondent further asserts that the Panel's misconception in this regard is reflected by rulings which prevented it from showing on cross-examination of Dr. Mosely and in its affirmative case that its views preceded those of the Soviet Union, were correct and reasonable, were arrived at independently by Respondent, and coincided with universal opinion and the best interests of the American people.

With regard to these contentions, we find no material error or irrationality in the Panel's conception of this criterion. We likewise find no merit to the contention that the Panel reached a conclusion which the witness Dr. Mosely admitted he could not make. Dr. Mosely stated in effect that his expert testimony was directed toward analyzing the basic line of thinking, analysis and advocacy of views and policies of the Soviet Union and Respondent and not at the process by which Respondent arrived at a given position on an international question, i. e., whether independently of the Soviet view or as a result of Soviet domination and control of Respondent. We do not understand this to conflict with, or detract from, the purport of his testimony. Whether the oral and documentary evidence adduced through Dr. Mosely tends to establish domination and control of Respondent when viewed with the evidence of record in the light of the other criteria of Section 13 (e) of the Act is for the Board's determination.

With respect to the remaining contentions related above, we conclude that Respondent was permitted reasonable opportunity to cross-examine Dr. Mosely and to establish its affirmative case. It is noted in passing that Dr. Mosely was cross-examined for 15 days. Respondent was not permitted, and rightly so, to put in issue the merits of the views or policies of Respondent, which views and policies were placed in evidence by Petitioner to establish "nondeviation." For in applying the "nondeviation" criterion, the Board is required to view cumulatively the spread of the evidence relating to the nondeviation of views and policies without deciding the merits of any views or policies of Respondent.

Respondent has contended throughout that the term "nondeviation" as used in the Act should be interpreted to mean "following a course already established" and that since a substantial number of Petitioner's exhibits illustrating the view or policy of Respondent predated the exhibits expressing the Soviet view or policy, these exhibits did not show that Respondent adopted a previously established view of the Soviet Union but the contrary. Assertedly, this consideration was reinforced by the absence of proof by Dr. Mosely to establish that the announcement of the Soviet view had preceded the Respondent's expression on the same topic.

Petitioner, on the other hand, took the position at the outset of Dr. Mosely's testimony, and in advance of the raising of this objection by Respondent, that the exhibits under discussion were offered in evidence merely to illustrate the oral testimony of Dr. Mosely on the respective

international questions, in order to show a documentary basis for his testimony; and that the documentary evidence was not intended to establish the date of the first announcement thereon by either the Soviet Union or the CPUSA. Petitioner further argued that in many instances the Soviet view or policy must necessarily have come first, particularly since the first announcement of the Soviet Union's position may have taken the form of a fait accompli, as for example, its unexpected signing of the Hitler-Stalin nonaggression pact.

As stated by Petitioner, these exhibits were placed in evidence to afford a documentary basis for the testimony of Dr. Mosely and not to establish the first announcements of views and policies. Moreover, we have considered Dr. Mosely's testimony with other evidence of record,⁵² all of which establishes that Respondent invariably follows the views and policies of the Soviet Union. We do not believe, therefore, that the date sequence of the exhibits placed in evidence through Dr. Mosely is dispositive of whether Respondent's views and policies have deviated from those of the Soviet Union.

We now proceed to set forth our findings on the evidence established by Dr. Mosely and other witnesses relative to this criterion.

The nature of the evidence adduced through Dr. Mosely is illustrated by his testimony, and documents submitted through him, concerning the nonaggression Pact entered into by Hitler and Stalin, known as the Hitler-Stalin Pact of August 23, 1939. He established the identity of views between the CPUSA and the Soviet Union prior to the making of this Pact; the parallel attitude of the Soviet Union and the CPUSA toward World War II while this Pact was in effect; and the simultaneous change of policy on the part of the Soviet Union and the CPUSA after June 22, 1941, the date on which the Pact was abrogated by the German attack on the Soviet Union.

To further illustrate the evidence, it is established that prior to the making of the Hitler-Stalin Pact, Respondent, conforming to the position taken by the Soviet Union, had denounced Fascism in Nazi Germany as the main threat of aggression in the world and as the foremost danger to peace and democracy notwithstanding that the signing of the Pact by the Soviet Union on August 23, 1939, constituted a reversal of the anti-Fascist line and caused considerable consternation and defection among Respondent's leaders and members, Respondent immediately switched to the Soviet Union's position and hailed the nonaggression agreement as an important contribution to peace; when Germany invaded Poland, Respondent echoed the Soviet assertion that the Pact continued to be an important contribution to peace as it would limit the spread of war; and, further, that opposition to this territorial expansion was the work of warmongers; after the defeat of Poland, the Soviet Union and Respondent both took the position that England and France were guilty of prolonging the war; that the war was an "unjust"⁵³ and imperialistic war and that no country which hoped for peace should assist England and France. Respondent, like the Soviet Union, strongly opposed lend-lease aid by the United States to Great Britain. Immediately after the German attack on the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941, the latter reversed its position, and, almost simultaneously, Respondent did the same; both suddenly concluded that the character of the war had changed; World War II

⁵² This consists of documentary evidence, and oral testimony of witnesses Gitlow, Kornfeder, Markward, Matusow, Budenz and others, as illustrated later in this finding.

⁵³ See discussion of "just" and "unjust" wars, pp. 126 to 127, *infra*.

became in the eyes of both a "just" war; they urged that the "Allies" should have the support of the United States and of all freedom-loving people; they advocated aid by the United States to Great Britain and to the Soviet Union, and Respondent branded those in the United States who opposed such aid as agents of Hitler. Soon after the German attack on the Soviet Union, Respondent joined with the Soviet Union in demanding the opening of a second front "now," with the United States participating therein.

The views of the Soviet Union and Respondent likewise coincided on the trials and executions in the Soviet Union in 1937; Respondent echoed the statements of the Soviet Union concerning the Russo-Finnish War; the same situation prevailed in regard to the absorption of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania by the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union and Respondent assumed the same position in 1947-1949 with regard to the internal crisis in Greece in that they both favored the actions of the Greek guerrillas; and they coincided in their views on the change in the Czech government in February 1948.

The evidence relative to this criterion further established that, prior to the Cominform resolution which attacked the Tito government, Respondent paralleled the Soviet Union in giving approval of the course of post-World War II developments in Yugoslavia and of the Tito government. On June 28, 1948, however, the Cominform issued a resolution, initiated assertedly through an exposure by the Soviet Union, which attacked Tito and his regime in bitter terms; among other charges, Tito and his leaders were derided for having entertained the hope that Yugoslavia could build "socialism" without "the support of the Soviet Union." One day later, on June 29, 1948, Respondent also reversed its position on the Tito government and issued a statement lauding this Cominform resolution and criticizing the Tito regime for showing hostility to the Soviet Union and for attempting to "curry favor with Anglo-American imperialism."

The views and policies of the Soviet Union and the CPUSA were identical on the question of the Berlin Blockade in 1948; they have likewise coincided on the course of events in post-World War II Germany.

The views and policies of the Soviet Union and the CPUSA have been substantially the same with regard to the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, ECA, and the North Atlantic Pact, namely, that the United States participation and leadership in these measures are for the aggressive purpose of domination of the world; whereas, the views and policies of the Soviet Union and Respondent, on the other hand, allegedly support peace and democracy.

The Soviet Union and Respondent took the same position in regard to the Stockholm Peace Petition in 1950 ⁵⁴ in asserting that all true proponents of peace should support the petition, which was issued by a committee of the World Peace Congress. Respondent supports the Soviet Union's position, as opposed to that of the United States, concerning control and inspection of atomic energy. The same situation prevails regarding the seating of Yugoslavia in the United Nations Security Council, with Respondent supporting the Soviet Union's opposition to the United States on this question. The Soviet Union and the United States Government have taken opposite positions with

⁵⁴ Respondent again expressed this view regarding the Stockholm Peace Petition in December, 1951 (Pet. Ex. 488, p. 28).

respect to the representation of China in the United Nations; Respondent maintains the Soviet position which favors the seating of the representatives of the Chinese Democratic Peoples Republic and the exclusion of representatives of the Chinese Nationalist Government. Respondent concurred with the views of the Soviet Union in opposition to the United States peace treaty with Japan.

The CPUSA's position in support of the conduct of the Czechoslovakian government in the William Oatis case (American correspondent) coincides with the Soviet Union's position thereon.

The testimony and documentary evidence also established that the CPUSA and the Soviet Union express the same views regarding Korea; both maintain that the Syngman Rhee government is a reactionary "puppet regime"; both vigorously condemn the hostilities in Korea as the direct result of American imperialism and aggression; both insist the United Nations police action is illegal and aggressive toward North Korea; both maintain that this war constitutes a threat to the Chinese Peoples Republic which justifies the Chinese Communist intervention in the conflict; both assert that the Chinese intervention in support of North Korea aids the struggle of "peace-loving" peoples of the world, which are led by the Soviet Union, against the program of the American imperialist aggressors; both charge that the United States desires continuation and expansion of the Korean War; both insist that the United States has disrupted and delayed cease-fire negotiations and blocked peace in Korea; and both demand acceptance of the proposals for cease-fire and "peace" made on behalf of the North Korea Peoples Republic. In short, Respondent and the Soviet Union, regarding Korea and the Korean conflict, coincide completely in their condemnation of the policies of the United States Government in its support of the United Nations in Korea.

In addition, other witnesses established that, during the existence of the Communist International, Respondent did not deviate from Comintern instructions in a single instance; further, that a CPUSA member could not disagree with a position taken by the Cominform and continue to remain a Party member;⁵⁵ that in those instances in which the policies of the United States and the Soviet Union appeared to be in conflict, Respondent at no time expressed sympathy with the policy of the United States Government; that the Soviet Union was never criticized in Party circles, but, on the contrary, it was a cardinal rule to praise the Soviet Union at all times; that in 1941 and prior thereto, a Moscow news agency supplied Respondent with political and other news dispatches which were distributed to Respondent's leaders so that they could keep informed of the "party line" and its interpretations; and that the aforementioned dispatches were regarded by Respondent as being directives from the Soviet Union on positions to be taken, and were implemented accordingly. It was stated in Respondent's 1942 Constitution (Pet. Ex. 328, Art. VI, Sec. 15) that no CPUSA member was permitted to have a personal or a political relationship with "Trotskyites," a term used in CPUSA and Soviet Union circles in an odious sense to signify persons sympathetic to a system of deviation from the official "line" of the Soviet Union.

⁵⁵ There have been instances of internal deviation within the CPUSA. Such instances usually resulted in dismissal from the Party, as in the cases of Gitlow and Browder. This, of course, in no wise detracts from these findings. In fact, these instances lend even greater weight to the findings, in that they highlight the intolerability with which any deviation is regarded by both Respondent and the Soviet Union.

It is also shown by evidence, in addition to that adduced through Dr. Mosely, that throughout the entire existence of Respondent, including the present, it has agreed with the view of the Soviet Union to the effect that the United States is an imperialistic nation which seeks world domination and whose government should be overthrown, whereas the Soviet Union is a true democracy in search of peace and its aims should be fostered.⁵⁶ When the United States was a potential or actual ally of the Soviet Union this chant was not sung by either the Soviet Union or the CPUSA.

Respondent made no effort to rebut the condition clearly shown to exist by Petitioner's evidence. It offered no evidence to establish a conflict between the policies of the Soviet Union and the CPUSA at any time or on any occasion. Nor is there any evidence to show that, where the views or policies of the United States as officially announced conflicted with the views of the Soviet Union, the CPUSA in any instance took a position thereon in harmony with the views of the United States, though its witnesses were repeatedly invited on cross-examination to show such an occasion. Each of Respondent's witnesses evaded a direct answer to the question and, curiously enough, each gave a similar circuitous and equivocal answer stating that Respondent's policies reflect what it conceives to be the true national interest of the American people; that if the views or policies of Respondent and the Soviet Union are similar or identical, this proves only that the national interests of the people of the two nations are the same; that Respondent takes the view that the true national interests of all people are identical; and that Respondent arrives at its views independently.

These platitudes do not negate Petitioner's evidence. Respondent's witnesses were unable to cite a single instance throughout its history where, in taking a position on a question which found the views or policies of the Soviet Union and the United States Government in conflict, the CPUSA had agreed with the announced position of the United States; nor could they show a single instance when the CPUSA had disagreed with the Soviet Union on any policy question where both Respondent and the Soviet Union have announced a position.

The testimony of Dr. Mosely and documents submitted through him embraced a tremendous area of international problems on which the positions of Respondent and the Soviet Union coincide. We have pointed out a representative portion of them. The uniformity is constant and on a wide variety of questions, and is corroborated by other evidence of record.

In evaluating the foregoing evidence we have taken into consideration that during the early history of Respondent, when it was openly a member of the Communist International and less secretive about its objectives, it accepted and effectuated the principles and tactics of the Comintern pursuant to an express condition of membership in the Communist International which required Respondent so to do (Pet. Exs. 8, 6 (c)). Moreover, in weighing the evidence set forth herein we have considered Respondent's adherence to Marxism-Leninism,⁵⁷ which in its essence requires acceptance by it of any position that the Soviet Union determines will advance the world Communist movement.

⁵⁶ See "Imperialism," pp. 44 to 54, *supra*; and "Allegiance," pp. 118 to 128, *infra*.

⁵⁷ See "Marxism-Leninism," pp. 21-44, *supra*.

The record precludes the conclusion which Respondent would have us draw, i. e., that the uniformity of views results from "sharing a common scientific outlook" and independent application of principles by it and the Soviet Union. The great weight of the evidence is to the contrary.

We find on the entire record that the views and policies of Respondent throughout its history invariably coincide with the views and policies of the Soviet Union. Moreover, Respondent conforms immediately to each reversal in the Soviet Union's views and policies.

We conclude and find that Respondent's views and policies do not deviate from those of the Soviet Union.

D. FINANCIAL AID

We are directed by the Act to consider "the extent to which it [Respondent] receives financial or other aid, directly or indirectly, from or at the direction of such foreign government or foreign organization" (Section 13 (e) (3)).

The petition alleges:

The Communist Party now receives and from time to time in the past has received financial aid, from or at the direction of the government and Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Communist International and the Communist Information Bureau * * *.

The CPUSA sent members to the Soviet Union to attend schools located there, notably the Lenin Institute in Moscow. The expense for their travel and subsistence was borne by the Communist International.

In the 1920's and 1930's the Communist International financed the travel of CPUSA officials and members to and from the Soviet Union and on missions to other countries for the purpose of orientation and the conduct of official business on behalf of international Communism, such as fulfilling representative functions in the Communist International; in addition to their subsistence, salaries were paid them in some instances by the Communist International for the duration of their stay in the Soviet Union.

During the period from 1920 to 1934, the CPUSA received financial assistance from the Soviet Union, often in the form of subsidies, which are described more fully in subsequent findings under this heading.

The Communist International contributed the sum of \$50,000 to Respondent for the purpose of financing the 1924 campaigns of William Z. Foster and Benjamin Gitlow, the Communist Party candidates for President and Vice President of the United States, respectively; and the Communist International likewise contributed a substantial sum to Respondent to finance the campaigns of these candidates on the same ticket in 1928.

The Communist International directed the establishment of the *Daily Worker* and contributed the sum of \$35,000 to Respondent in 1924 for this purpose. During the period of 1936 to 1938 the expenses of the *Daily Worker* were reduced because international news was received from the International Press Correspondence, an organ of the Communist International.

In 1929, a delegation of ten CPUSA officials went to Moscow to appeal a decision of Stalin on a faetional dispute within the Respond-

ent organization. The Communist International paid the travel expenses of the members of this delegation.

The Communist International in Moscow announced the decision on the 1929 factional dispute within the CPUSA. Thereupon, the Communist International gave a substantial sum of money to the Chairman of the new Secretariat of the CPUSA, which had been formed by the Communist International. These funds were to be used to establish a new newspaper, loyal to the Communist International, in the event that the CPUSA lost control of the *Daily Worker* because of the factional dispute; further, the Chairman of the newly formed Secretariat was given a substantial additional sum to finance enforcement among the members of the CPUSA of the decision reached in the Soviet Union regarding the leadership of the CPUSA.

The Trade Union Educational League (TUEL) was formed in the early 1920's pursuant to instructions from the Communist International; the latter also furnished a subsidy for the initial financing of this newly formed organization.

In 1928, a Trade Union Delegation was organized in this country by the CPUSA at the direction of the Communist International, to visit the Soviet Union. A member of this delegation's technical staff, who was a secret member of Respondent, eventually wrote the delegation report. The Communist International partially financed the organization and expenses of the delegation's visit to the Soviet Union.

About 1928, the Communist International subsidized, by grants of substantial sums of money, a campaign by the CPUSA among the members of the United Mine Workers to defeat John L. Lewis for the union presidency.

During the early period of Respondent's existence in the United States, paid functionaries of the CPUSA were permitted to purchase books at $\frac{1}{2}$ discount from the International Publishers, the latter being a Soviet Union publishing organization in the United States.

In 1929, or shortly thereafter, the Communist International directed that Respondent form Port Bureaus at leading ports in this country. The purpose was to facilitate recruiting and organizational work on the waterfront on behalf of the CPUSA. The establishment of these bureaus was facilitated by funds furnished by the Communist International.

In 1927, a representative of the Communist International requested that the CPUSA send a delegate to the International Miners Conference at Moscow. Respondent's Political Committee voted unanimously to reply that it would send a delegate but that funds for the delegate's fare should be cabled to the Respondent organization.

Amtorg is a trading corporation of the Soviet Union which was organized in the United States in 1924. From its inception until 1929, Amtorg rendered financial assistance to Respondent by: (a) paying excessive rates to Respondent publications for placing advertisements therein, and (b) making it possible for the Communist Party School of Business Relations to realize money from insurance and other activities.

During the period from 1919 to 1934, members of the CPUSA were sent to other countries to assist in Communist Party activities there, in many instances under specific instructions from the Communist International; the Communist International financed these missions.

A member of Respondent organization, who was specializing in labor activities in the United States, was sent to the Soviet Union in 1934 to serve as a representative of the Trade Union Unity League at the Red International of Labor Unions at Moscow; the latter was a section of the Communist International. Funds for the trip were furnished by Jacob Golos, a representative of the Soviet Union in the United States. Subsistence while in Moscow was borne by the Red International of Labor Unions.

In 1927, the International Red Aid sent Russian films to the United States, free of any charge. The films were delivered to the International Workers Aid. The CPUSA determined the distribution of profits realized from the showing of the films in the United States.

In the 1920's, the Communist International sent a show troupe to the United States called the "Blue Blouses." This troupe operated under the auspices of the Workers International Relief. The funds realized from their tour in this country were distributed to various organizations by Respondent, including itself and the *Daily Worker*.

During the years 1930 to 1934 the Communist International provided subsidies for *Labor Unity*, a labor magazine operated under the direction of the CPUSA.

In 1939, the Treasurer of the CPUSA stated that it was impossible to put additional CPUSA funds into the *Midwest Daily Record*, a CPUSA controlled paper, because at that time communications to their sources of funds abroad, i. e., the Soviet Union, had been disrupted.

During the late 1930's, the *Daily Worker* received political news dispatches free from the Runag news service in Moscow. These dispatches were used by the editorial staff of the *Daily Worker* and, also, were distributed to the Party leadership for scrutiny and study. After the passage of the Foreign Agents Registration Act in 1938, these dispatches were sent to *The Intercontinent News*, a corporation which had been formed by the CPUSA in New York City to handle the service in a manner that to all appearances would be independent of the *Daily Worker*. This medium in turn relayed the dispatches to the *Daily Worker* at a nominal cost.⁵⁸

In or about 1949, Respondent, through International Publishers, received from the Soviet Union book plates and English translations of books, such as an edition of *The Selected Works of Lenin*, as well as actual page proofs for books, with no charge.

After the passage of the Voorhis Act in 1940, with the consequent nominal disaffiliation of Respondent from the Communist International,⁵⁹ evidence of such financial aid does not appear in the record with one exception, this being the above instance of financial aid to Respondent in or about 1949.

Respondent denies that it receives financial aid from or at the direction of the Soviet Union or the Communist International; and denies the relevancy of the above findings to any issue in this proceeding.

We find a preponderance of the evidence in the record establishes numerous instances of substantial financial aid which flowed to

⁵⁸ This news service from Moscow ceased in 1941 when the Department of Justice ordered *The Intercontinent News* either to label its news material as propaganda or to discontinue its service. Thereafter, the *Bulletin* of the Soviet Embassy was used as a news source. We have reviewed Respondent's Exhibits 70-75, incl., but we do not credit them for the purpose offered in view of the testimony of Petitioner's witness Budenz concerning them, which we accept.

⁵⁹ This is discussed fully hereinbefore.

Respondent from and at the direction of the Soviet Union and the Communist International; and we conclude that the above findings are relevant to the ultimate issue in this proceeding in the light of the whole record.

E. TRAINING AND REPORTING

Sections 13 (c) (4) and (5) of the Act provide that in determining whether or not an organization is a "Communist-action organization," the Board shall take into consideration:

(4) the extent to which it [Respondent] sends members or representatives to any foreign country for instruction or training in the principles, policies, strategy, or tactics of such world Communist movement; and

(5) the extent to which it [Respondent] reports to such foreign government or foreign organization or to its representatives; * * *.

The petition alleges inter alia:

The Communist Party regularly reports and has reported to the government and Communist Party of the Soviet Union and to the Communist International and the Communist Information Bureau, and has sent members and representatives to the Soviet Union and other foreign countries for instruction and training in the principles, policies, strategy, and tactics of the world Communist movement * * *.

Respondent denies the foregoing allegations of the petition, but states in its amended answer that during the period of its affiliation with the Communist International, members and representatives of Respondent attended and participated in Communist International Congresses and certain of its committees; that members of Respondent have from time to time visited foreign countries, including the Soviet Union; and that, in the past, certain members of Respondent studied in the Soviet Union.

In its amended answer and again in its exceptions, Respondent denies the relevancy of any of these conceded facts to any issue in this proceeding. Upon consideration of the record, we do not agree with this contention.

The evidence pertaining to "training" and "reporting" is somewhat interwoven and we have, therefore, consolidated these subjects in this section of our report.

Since Respondent admits that its members have studied in the Soviet Union, that it has participated in meetings of the Communist International, and that it has sent representatives to the Soviet Union, it is unnecessary to set forth in this part of our report the considerable amount of detailed evidence establishing these points, except to the extent it may be necessary for an understanding of the findings under these criteria.

An elaborate world-embracing school system was established in Moscow for training Communists and preparing them for leadership roles in the world Communist movement. The Western University taught trainees from the semi-agrarian areas, such as the Balkan and Baltic countries; the Eastern University schooled trainees from the Asiatic countries, such as China, Siam, and Korea; the Academy of Red Professors was a training school for theoreticians for the world Communist movement; a special section of the Frunze Military Academy was devoted to training students sent from foreign countries; and the Lenin School took in trainees from the "more advanced" countries, such as Germany, France, England and the United States. Petitioner's witness Honig was an American instructor at the Lenin

School in 1934-35 where he taught labor subjects to a select group of Respondent's members. In the main, however, the school's instructors were Russians.

To qualify for training in Moscow a CPUSA member had to be recommended by Respondent and approved by the Communist International, which had established as qualifications for selection that the student be less than 36 years of age, have 5 years of active Party work, and be above average in ability.

Petitioner's witness Crouch, during the period 1928-30, studied material at the Frunze Academy pertaining to civil war, guerrilla tactics, and sabotage.

From 1928 to 1936, many of Respondent's outstanding members were sent to the Lenin School for varying periods where they received training and instructions in the strategy and tactics of the world Communist movement. Among them were Gus Hall,⁶⁰ Steve Nelson, Irving Potash,⁶⁰ Charles Krumbein, Joseph Kornfeder, George Siskind, Morris Childs, Ray Hansborough, Roddie Lester, Admiral Kilpatrick, Abraham Lewis, Margaret Unjus, Rudolph Baker, Sclar, Harry Haywood, Odel Nowell, Charles White, Leonard Patterson, Timothy Holmes, William Patterson, Hutch Hutchinson, George Hewitt, Sam Nessin, Beatrice Siskin, Philip Raymond, John Marr, William Brown, Claude Lightfoot, William Taylor, Bill Kruse, and Bell. Many of the aforementioned persons held high positions in Respondent,⁶¹ including Nowell and Kornfeder who testified for Petitioner in this proceeding.

The evidence establishes that in the early 1930's Respondent's students in the Lenin School were taught such subjects as Marxism, Leninism, the history of the labor movement, trade-union and strike strategy, history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, history and organizational structure of the Communist International, the national and colonial problem, including the concept of a Negro nation in the "black belt" of the United States;⁶² the history of the CPUSA, international propaganda, the theory and practice of Soviet economy, revolutionary tactics and the science of civil warfare. These subjects at the school were adapted to the peculiar conditions in the countries of the students, including the United States. For instance, the course given Respondent's members on civil warfare included political and economic conditions in the United States, the culture of the people, the terrain, the histories of the United States and the CPUSA, and the degree of political maturity in the United States. Students in the course were taught also how to convert economic strikes into political strikes, and then into general strikes that might precipitate revolution. They also were taught how to disassemble and reassemble the guns and small arms of the major nations.

For the actual carrying out of the revolution, Red Army officers taught military details in both legal and guerrilla warfare, how to erect barricades, snipe, throw grenades, use gas masks, sabotage, take over the system of transportation, seize food supplies and persuade army units to fight with the insurgents and guerrillas. They were taught how to capture and hold hostages, capture arsenals, arm Communist supporters, utilize and destroy food and water supplies, and, in general, how to carry on a total revolution for the seizure of power.

⁶⁰ Convicted in 1949 of conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow of the United States Government.

⁶¹ Gus Hall signed Respondent's amended answer in this proceeding as National Secretary of the CPUSA. Claude Lightfoot was an alternate member of Respondent's National Committee in 1950.

⁶² See pp. 74-77, *supra*, for a full discussion of this subject.

All this was taught with the object of destroying the economic system in the United States, and establishing a dictatorship of the proletariat here.

Concerning strategy and tactics, students at the Lenin School were taught, among other things, that "partial demands," i. e., demands within the framework of democratic procedure dealing with limited grievances on everyday problems, served as a tactical means, "a cutting edge," for the Party in mobilizing for the long range objective of the general strategy, this being the overthrow of capitalist governments everywhere through proletarian revolution. This tactic has been utilized constantly by Respondent in this country.

On the subject of "just" and "unjust" wars, the students were taught that any war in which the Soviet Union becomes involved is a "just" war for the Soviet Union, regardless of whether the Soviet Union is the aggressor or defender; that any war between a colony and its mother country is a "just" war for the colony; and conversely, any war against the Soviet Union, regardless of who is the aggressor, is "unjust" for the Soviet Union's adversary. In the event of war between two "imperialist powers" the students were taught to work for the destruction of both and thus leave to the Soviet Union a clear field for future conquest.⁶³

Concerning the ultimate aim of the Party regarding capitalist-imperialist nations, students were taught that the class struggle prevailed throughout the capitalist world; that internal contradictions within these states were becoming sharper; and that their international imperialist policies toward colonial peoples were becoming more oppressive. They were further taught that, in view of these political and economic conditions, it was the duty of the CPUSA, as a part of world Communism, to cultivate revolutionary movements in colonial countries; and, in striving for world socialism, to work for the overthrow and complete abolition of capitalist states and imperialism.

In conformance with the foregoing, students from the United States were taught that the proletarian revolution was necessary and that it was their major duty to work under the leadership of the Communist International and Respondent for the overthrow of the United States Government.

The texts used by Respondent's members at the Lenin School included Lenin's *State and Revolution* (Pet. Ex. 139); *Left Wing Communism; Military Revolution; Imperialistic War; What Is To Be Done* (Pet. Ex. 417); *How It Is To Be Done; Imperialism* (Pet. Ex. 140); *Infantile Leftism*; a modern treatment of Lenin's works by Leontov entitled *Leninism by Leontov*; Stalin's *Foundations of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 121); and *Problems of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 138); Marx's *Capital*; the *Communist Manifesto* (Pet. Ex. 31); Engel's *Scientific Socialism*; the *Programme of The Communist International* (Pet. Ex. 125); the *Theses and Statutes of the Third (Communist) International*, including the 21 conditions for membership therein (Pet. Ex. 8); a number of writings by Soviet authors concerning political policies and the economy of the Soviet Union; and other works.

The purpose of Lenin School instruction as explained by Earl Browder, then leader of Respondent, was to develop Party leaders and through them to raise the political and ideological level of the

⁶³ An illustration of adherence by the Soviet Union and Respondent to this principle is found in the portion of this report dealing with their policies regarding World War II (see p. 83, *supra*).†

Party membership as required by the development and intensification of revolutionary situations developing in countries throughout the world, including the United States.

In addition to the formal institutionalized schooling in the Soviet Union, many of Respondent's highest functionaries have received training through serving abroad in various positions of the international Communist organization. Honig, while functioning as CPUSA representative to the Red International of Labor Unions, was sent to various places in the Soviet Union to study Soviet operations and the activities of Soviet trade unions. William Z. Foster,⁶⁴ Earl Browder,⁶⁵ Gilbert Green,⁶⁶ Charles Ruthenberg, and Alexander Bittelman,⁶⁶ functioned for various periods during the 1920's and early 1930's in Moscow as members of the Soviet-controlled Executive Committee of the Communist International. In addition to the aforementioned position, Foster also served on the Presidium of the Communist International and Green was a member of its Young Communist League Secretariat. William F. Dunne served as an alternate member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International in the 1920's. Bosse functioned in the Information Department of the Communist International in 1926 and 1927. In the early 1930's, Clarence Hathaway functioned as representative of Respondent to the Communist International and also served as a member of the Anglo-American Secretariat of the Communist International in Moscow. Robert Minor succeeded Hathaway as Respondent's representative to the Communist International. Other members who served as the Party's representatives in Moscow include Louis Farina, John Reed, Nicholas Horawich, Israel Amter, Louis Engdahl, Max Bedacht, Harrison George, and H. M. Wicks. Morris Childs was a member of the Lander Secretariat of the Comintern. Harry Heywood served on the International Negro Bureau of the Communist International.

The record establishes that following their return to the United States, members of Respondent who had been trained and indoctrinated in the Soviet Union taught in Respondent's schools, and put into practice, where circumstances permitted, that which they had learned in the Soviet Union.

There is no substantial evidence of record showing training of Respondent's members in the Soviet Union subsequent to the outbreak of World War II. However, it is established that the extensive foreign training set forth above is still being effectuated in this country by Respondent. This training was clearly a program initiated by the Soviet Union to indoctrinate while there outstanding workers and leaders of Respondent so as to have a cadre for imparting such training to Respondent's membership in the United States.

It is apparent that World War II, and what Respondent has termed the "political situation" in this country subsequent to the war, have made travel to Moscow to obtain such training inexpedient or impossible. It is reasonable to conclude that this foreign training is no longer imperative to the functioning of Respondent as a Marxist-Leninist Party because its outstanding members and leaders, having received Soviet indoctrination, are able to educate, similarly, students

⁶⁴ Presently leader of Respondent.

⁶⁵ Leader of Respondent 1929-35.

⁶⁶ Recently convicted of conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow of the United States Government.

at Party schools in this country and to dispense their previous training through Respondent's publications and activities.

We find that Respondent has sent its members and representatives to the Soviet Union, at the latter's insistence and with its financial assistance,⁶⁷ for instruction and training in the principles, policies, strategy and tactics of the world Communist movement, as determined by the Soviet Union, for the purpose of adopting and effectuating such principles, policies, strategy and tactics in the United States, which it does.

There is considerable evidence of record that Respondent reports to the leadership of the world Communist movement, as we now establish.

In 1926, William Z. Foster and Alexander Pittelman were in Moscow and made a written report to the Communist International covering Respondent's activities during the year 1925 with reference to the economic and political situation in the United States, trade unions, Socialist Parties, Bolshevization of Respondent, Leninist education, United Front campaigns, Negroes, farmers, women, anti-imperialism and internal Party developments.⁶⁸ The witness Gitlow went to Moscow in 1927, 1928 and 1929 to discuss similar matters with the Comintern officials. In 1929, Gitlow and other members of Respondent traveled to the Soviet Union to participate in a hearing held in Moscow by the Communist International to resolve the factional dispute then raging within Respondent. (The details of the settlement of this factional dispute are discussed *infra*, pp. 101-102, *supra*, pp. 13-14.)

Respondent's youth organization, the Young Workers League, was in continuous communication with the Young Communist International. The witness Crouch visited Moscow in 1928, where he met with general staff officers of the Red Army and reported to them concerning activities designed to increase Communist infiltration in the American armed forces. He presented a tentative draft for future work, posed questions, and received answers and detailed directives. Reports of Respondent's work on the Negro question, including the work of the Party-controlled American Negro Labor Congress, were sent in the 1920's to the Eastern Department of the Communist International, which then had jurisdiction over this phase of Respondent's activities. The witness Nowell reported on behalf of Respondent in Moscow in 1930, on matters concerning the Trade Union Unity League (TUUL) in the United States. During his stay in Moscow, Nowell received instructions in various aspects of the world Communist movement including the Negro question in the United States.

The witness Honig went to Moscow in June 1934, and remained there until November 1935 as "referent" and official representative of the Trade Union Unity League and Respondent to the Red International of Labor Unions, a creature of the Communist International. Honig, representing Respondent, attended meetings of representatives from various Communist parties throughout the world that were held in Moscow not less than once a week. At these meetings, the representatives reported on the activities in which their parties were

⁶⁷ See findings under "Financial Aid," pp. 86-89, *supra*.

⁶⁸ Their report also contains various statements as to Respondent's activities in carrying out "decisions" and "main lines of policy" dictated by the Communist International and, therefore, constitutes additional evidence to that reviewed in support of our finding and conclusion that Respondent acts pursuant to directives and to effectuate policies of the Soviet Union as covered *supra* at pp. 78-79.

engaged among trade unions in their respective countries, and discussions based on their reports followed. Leaders of the Comintern were always present at these meetings and registered approval or disapproval of the work being carried out in the various countries; they also determined whether such work was being carried out according to the instructions of the Comintern and gave directions as to how it should be conducted. Honig, while functioning in the Communist International's labor organization (RIU) in Moscow, received reports from Jack Stachel,⁶⁹ then acting head of the Trade Union Unity League, and Earl Browder, then head of Respondent, concerning the failure of the San Francisco general strike of 1934. Reports which Honig received at the Red International of Labor Unions were generally mimeographed or typed when not of a confidential nature and were sometimes sent through the mails. Confidential reports were taken to Moscow by American Party leaders and by Respondent's students going to the Soviet Union for training.

Minutes of meetings of Respondent's Central Executive Committee and its Political Committee were sent to Moscow during the 1920's and 1930's. Reports also were sent by various departments of Respondent's national headquarters and by individual CPUSA leaders. As positions of leadership in Respondent could not be held without the approval of the Soviet Union, advancement in the Party depended in part upon the reflection of a member's work in these minutes and reports. In addition to the foregoing, the minutes of Respondent's Political Committee covering official actions of Respondent during the years 1925 to 1928 reflect many instances of reporting to the Communist International through representatives sent to Moscow and through other channels of communication.

The Information Department of the Communist International collected and digested for the Comintern's Executive Committee, all information sent from the American Party. The Anglo-American Secretariat of the Communist International received reports from the English speaking Communist Parties, including Respondent; and during witness Kornfeder's membership on this Secretariat in the period 1927 to 1930, he received reports and recommendations from Respondent concerning the situation then existing in the United Mine Workers Union.

In 1932, Earl Browder reported to the Communist International on behalf of Respondent's Central Committee concerning economic developments in the United States as they related to the world situation at that time.

It is reasonable to conclude that Respondent has reported more recently to the Soviet Union through representatives of the World Communist movement from evidence furnished by the witness Matusow. While he was state literature director of the New York State Labor Youth League, Matusow attended a meeting in the fall of 1949 at which Lou Diskin (a member of the CPUSA) gave a report on a recent trip that he (Diskin) had taken to Budapest, Hungary, where he met with J. Peters⁷⁰ at a World Youth Festival. Diskin remained to report on and discuss the American youth movement of Respondent, and the American Communist Party movement generally, with officials of the World Federation of Democratic Youth, and with

⁶⁹ Convicted in 1949 of conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow of the United States Government.

⁷⁰ See pp. 60-61, *supra* re Peters.

representatives of the Communist Information Bureau (Cominform). Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, a member of Respondent's highest governing body and a witness for Respondent herein, visited France in 1945, 1949, and again in 1950, where she met with Communist Party leaders of other countries, including, in 1945, the Soviet Union. At the 1949 meeting, there was discussed the question of the "imperialist war" which the conferees claimed was being fomented by the United States, and they considered the steps to be taken and the role of Respondent with reference to this question.

The record discloses an instance where, by means unknown, the contents of an important letter written by William Z. Foster concerning Respondent's affairs were communicated to Jacques Duclos, General Secretary of the Communist Party of France and a former member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. The letter in question played a decisive part in Respondent's reconstitution in 1945, as elsewhere herein covered.⁷¹ The record further shows that Respondent has reported its program and activities to the Soviet Union through representatives of the Communist International and other agents of the Soviet Union in the United States,⁷² who exerted influence and control over the leadership and programs of Respondent.

In addition to Respondent's reporting in the aforementioned ways, the record establishes the existence of another form of reporting through the issuance and exchange of significant, detailed and timely information in the form of "greetings," which are generally reprinted in Communist publications.

This exchange of messages contained in "greetings" commenced early in Respondent's history. We will cite typical examples of the numerous "greetings" so exchanged. The following "resolutions were adopted at Respondent's convention in 1921 and sent to the Soviet Union:

* * *

2. Greetings to the Third World Congress of the Communist International.

The delegates of the Communist Party of America and the United Communist Party of America, in joint Unity Convention, send fraternal greetings to the Third World Congress of the Communist International. In the name of the revolutionary proletariat of America, we affirm our determination to fight under the banner of the Communist International for the overthrow of the American imperialism and for the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship. Hail to the International Soviet Republic! Long live the Communist International! (Pet. Ex. 13 (a)).

3. Greetings to the Soviet Republic.

* * *

The unified party, the Communist Party of America, declares that it will render all possible assistance to the Russian Soviet Republic in its struggle against the counter-revolutionary bands of the world imperialism. The Communist Party of America declares that only by the overthrow of world imperialism will the safety and mastery of the Soviet Republic over its enemies be definitely assured. The Communist Party of America pledges itself to rally the revolutionary proletariat of America for the annihilation of the most formidable stronghold of world imperialism: the American capitalist state, and to struggle for the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship. Down with world imperialism! Hail to the universal Soviet Republic! Long live the international solidarity of the workers! (Pet. Ex. 13 (a)).

4. To the Third World Congress of the Communist International.

⁷¹ See pp. 15-16, *supra*.

⁷² See pp. 59 to 61, *supra*, re activities of these representatives in this country.

The Unity Convention of the Communist (sic) of America and the United Communist Party of America fully upholds and endorses the firm and uncompromising stand of the Executive Committee of the Communist International against the opportunistic and centrist elements in various countries—in Italy (Serrati), and in Germany (Levi). The convention instructs its delegates to the third world congress to uphold and defend the stand of the Executive Committee of the Communist International * * * (Pet. Ex. 13 (a)).

* * *

In September 1927, on the occasion of its Fifth Convention, Respondent received "greetings" from the Comintern that were read to the Convention by acting chairman Gitlow, after which the governing body of Respondent was instructed to draw up a reply. The Comintern "greetings," in part, follow:

In the country of the most powerful imperialism and a most brutal capitalist class the Communist Party can fulfill its duty and can become the leader of the working class against imperialism and capitalist aggression only if it is united and if it is not torn to pieces by factional struggle.

The Comintern considers as one of the central tasks of the Party the *extermination of all factionalism* and the *unification* organizationally as well as ideologically. It will be the duty of the newly elected Central Executive Committee to lead the Party in a nonfactional spirit and it will be the duty of the whole Party membership to rally around the Central Executive Committee which it itself shall have chosen. * * * [Italics supplied.] (Pet. Ex. 23.)

This "greeting" elicited a response which Respondent openly declared to be a "reply" and in which it gave assurances to the Communist International that it would comply with what were, in effect, the directions contained in the Comintern "greeting." This reply is as follows:

The Fifth Convention of the Workers (Communist) Party greets the International leader of the working class, the Communist International. Under its leadership and with our own firm and unanimous determination to unify our Party, we will overcome the tremendous difficulties in the path of building a mass Communist Party in America. The Convention recognizes fully as Party's task the winning of the American proletariat for the revolutionary struggle against American imperialism.

In the execution of this task we are inspired and guided by the principles of Marxism and Leninism, by the experiences of the victorious struggles of the Russian proletariat and the heroic battles of the exploited and oppressed masses of Europe and Asia. The Convention and the incoming Central Executive Committee pledge themselves speedily to *eliminate all remnants of factionalism* and to unify the Party as a prerequisite for the further success of our work. [Italics supplied.]

We pledge the *unification of our Party* and to fight more effectively for the defense of the Soviet Union and the Chinese revolution and against the war danger as well as to resist more effectively the offensive of the capitalist reaction and the reactionary trade union bureaucracy against our Party and the militant section of the American working class. [Italics supplied.]

The Convention is spurred by a full consciousness of its duty to recruit the toiling masses of America for relentless struggle against American imperialism.

Long live the Soviet Union!

Long Live the Communist International!

Fifth National Convention.
Workers (Communist) Party.
(Pet. Ex. 24.)

On the occasion of the Sixth Convention of Respondent, in 1929, a "greeting" was sent to the Communist International in Moscow which contained the following:

We greet our Communist International leadership and pledge our Convention and our Party to prepare itself, to strengthen itself, to clarify itself, for its share of this task. It will close its ranks, it will cleanse its ideology from the poison of opportunism, it will defeat Trotskyism, it will mobilize against and lead the Ameri-

can proletariat for the struggle against the imperialist war; *it will mobilize the American workers for the defense of our Soviet Union and for the final defeat of American imperialism by the revolutionary overthrow of American capitalist rule.* [Emphasis supplied.]

Long Live Leninism!

Long Live the Communist International! (Pet. Ex. 28).

On December 21, 1949, the *Daily Worker* reprinted a telegram "greeting" sent by Respondent to Joseph Stalin on his 70th birthday which states, among other things:

Like the Communists and other true partisans of peace, democracy and progress in all lands, we hail your more than 50 years of sterling leadership in the interest of the international working class and humanity.

* * * * *

Under a Hitler-like anti-Soviet and anti-Communist smokescreen, the American imperialists launched their predatory and aggressive Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan, and North Atlantic Pact.

* * * * *

Undaunted by the threats of the war instigators, the USSR steadfastly pursues its Stalinist peace policy and promotes cooperation with all who strive for peace. And the mighty world camp of peace, democracy and socialism headed by the Soviet Union, daily becomes more powerful and is destined to triumph.

* * * * *

In our country, too, the organized peace forces, among the workers, the Negro people, men and women of science and culture, are growing and will continue to grow in unison with the peace forces of the world.

After stating that the American people "favor acceptance" of Stalin's proposals for a "Pact of Peace, for demilitarizing and democratizing Germany and Japan, * * * outlawing the atom bomb", the telegram declares that the American people envy and admire the Soviet Union's peaceful harnessing of atomic energy and that they rejoice at the victory of the Chinese Communists and their bond with the Soviet Union. The so-called telegram "greeting" closes by stating:

With full confidence in the American working class and people, the Communist Party of the USA exerts every effort to assure that by their united action they will check and help defeat the fascist-minded monopolists and warmongers. As this united action grows in influence and scope, it will bring its full weight to bear for the achievement of an American-Soviet pact of peace and friendship—the cornerstone for world peace.

Long life to you, Comrade Stalin, and to your great and enduring contributions to world peace, democracy and Socialism (Pet. Ex. 375).

Petitioner's witness Lautner establishes that the primary significance of this "greeting" lies in Respondent's reaffirmation of loyalty to Stalin as the acknowledged leader of the world Communist movement.

That such "greetings" actually convey significant messages between members of the world Communist movement when the wording appears comparatively innocuous to the uninitiated is made clear by both testimonial and documentary evidence of record. The following quotation from the August 1, 1948, issue of *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*, official organ of the Communist Information Bureau, demonstrates the significance given to a simple statement of solicitude by Stalin:

Comrade Stalin's telegram to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Italy said: "The Central Committees of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) is grieved that Comrade Togliatti's friends failed to protect him from this foul and cowardly attack."

The reply sent by the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party to Comrade Stalin is worthy of this well-tested Party. *In their answer the Italian comrades assure Comrade Stalin that the solidarity of the heroic Soviet people and*

Stalin's warning about vigilance will be for the Italian Communists "a spur to strengthen and develop the struggle of the united international front of peace, democracy and socialism."

All the Communist Parties took Comrade Stalin's message to the Italian Communist Party as the expression of his great solicitude for the international working class movement and its leaders.

Increased struggle against remnants and revivals of fascism, the welding of all supporters of democracy and progress into a single socialist camp will be the best answer of the Communists of all countries to Comrade Stalin's solicitude. [Emphasis supplied.] (Pet. Ex. 264.)

To show further the significance attached by the initiated to these "greetings", Lautner explains in this light the import of "greetings" received by Respondent at its 15th Convention in December 1950 from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), which follow:

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union extends fraternal greetings to the 15th Convention of the Communist Party of the U. S. A. We wish the Communist Party of the U. S. A. successes in its *struggle against reaction*, for the vital interests and rights of the working class and all toilers of the United States of America, for the *ideological strengthening of the Party ranks*, for lasting peace between the peoples.

May the international solidarity of the toilers in the *struggle for peace, democracy and Socialism* gather strength. [Italic supplied.]

Long live the friendship between the peoples of the United States and of the Soviet Union!

Long live the Communist Party of the United States!

CENTRAL COMMITTEE
Communist Party of the Soviet Union
(Pet. Ex. 376, p. 229.)

Lautner, from his experience as a former high official of Respondent (until January 1950) and as a student of Marxism-Leninism, establishes that this greeting from the CPSU was a political document of the highest importance to Party members since in a concise way it raised all the key problems confronting Respondent. Specifically he interpreted some of the various terms used by the CPSU as follows: "struggle against reaction" as basic Marxist-Leninist opposition to imperialism and monopoly capitalism, i. e., the basic line of the Party; "struggle for peace, democracy, and socialism" as the new tactical approach since the end of World War II on which a new tactical united front is to be built; "ideological strengthening of the Party ranks" as a reference which the Soviet Party used to call the attention of the rank and file Party members to the "Browderite" disaffection and other opportunist deviations.

It is reasonable to conclude, and we do so, that the language used by Respondent in its "greetings" to the Soviet Union is likewise possessed of veiled content through which Respondent reports in this manner to the Soviet Union.

Respondent's witnesses deny categorically that Respondent reports or has reported to the Soviet Union or its representatives. The clear weight of the evidence is to the contrary.

Upon the basis of the foregoing and the entire record, we conclude and find that Respondent reports to the Soviet Union and its representatives.

F. DISCIPLINARY POWER

Section 13 (c) (6) of the Act provides that the Board shall take into consideration:

the extent to which its [Respondent's] principal leaders or a substantial number of its [Respondent's] members are subject to or recognize the disciplinary power of such foreign government or foreign organization or its representatives;

The petition alleges:

From the inception of the organization to the date of the filing of this petition, the principal leaders of the Communist Party have been and are subject to and recognize the disciplinary power of the Soviet Government, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Communist International and the Communist Information Bureau and other spokesmen of the world Communist movement. This power has been exercised principally through the Communist doctrine of "democratic centralism" which binds all Communists to execute the decisions of the leaders of the world Communist movement.

Respondent's witness Gates says the leaders of the Party do not recognize and do not consider themselves subject to the disciplinary power of the Soviet government, the CPSU, the Comintern, the Cominform or any agencies of these organizations. He stresses that Respondent's leaders are subject only to the discipline of the Party. He maintains the leaders of Respondent do not recognize any disciplinary power over them by the Soviet Union any more than the fact that he loves his wife indicates that she has disciplinary power over him.

On the other hand, the record shows that under the rules and conditions governing the world Communist movement as promulgated by the Soviet Union and accepted and followed by Respondent there is prescribed a party of iron discipline on an international as well as a national scale.⁷³ This "iron discipline" borders on "military discipline" and implies "the establishment of authority, the transformation of the power of ideas into the power of authority, the subordination of lower Party bodies to higher Party bodies" (Pet. Ex. 121, pp. 113 and 114; 120).

The requirements of discipline in the world Communist movement as formulated by the Soviet Union are, as previously noted, twofold. First, on an international scale the decisions of the leadership of the movement—the Soviet Union—are made binding and obligatory upon the various Communist Parties and their members through the concept of democratic-centralism and through policies and rules issued by organizational instrumentalities such as the Communist International; and the various Parties as well as their members are prohibited from any deviation from the line laid down by the Soviet Union. Secondly, the individual parties are required to maintain similar discipline within their own organizations and to guard against factionalism or division of authority in the Party—to purge themselves of dissident elements.⁷⁴

The record shows that the principle of strict international discipline in the world Communist movement is basic and has for its purpose unity in the struggle against imperialism, in order that the "revolutionary work and revolutionary action may be coordinated" and "guided most successfully" (Pet. Ex. 125, p. 84). In other words, it is a fundamental of the world Communist movement that in order to accomplish the establishment of dictatorships of the proletariat and the defense of the Soviet Union there must exist in every country a "compact Communist Party, hardened in the struggle, disciplined,

⁷³ See the section of this report under the heading "Marxism-Leninism" and the sections covering the Communist International and the Communist Information Bureau.

⁷⁴ See, for example, Pet. Exs. 8 and 125.

centralized, and closely linked up with the masses" (Pet. Ex. 125, p. 75).⁷⁵

We proceed, in the light of the foregoing, to examine the evidence concerning Respondent's recognition and acceptance of the disciplinary requirements of the world Communist movement as laid down by the Soviet Union.

One of Respondent's present top leaders, Bittelman, in his pamphlet "The Communist Party In Action," published in 1932, says:

* * * But our World Communist movement always presented an iron front against any such weakening of international discipline, fighting for the Leninist principle that the Communist Party is a monolithic and homogeneous body of revolutionary workers functioning as the vanguard of the working class (Pet. Ex. 144, pp. 34-35).

Speaking of deviations from theory and policy as well as in the daily practical work, the article observes:

* * * We observe, however, among certain Party members, a tendency to be easygoing, tolerant and conciliatory towards opportunist deviations. This is a dangerous attitude which is very harmful to the interests of the working class and to the growth of our Party. It is this attitude that Comrade Stalin attacked so sharply, branding it as "rotten liberalism" and calling upon every communist to demonstrate in practice in his everyday revolutionary work true Bolshevik intolerance of an irreconcilability with all opportunist deviations from the Leninist line (*ibid.*, p. 48).

In 1934, Respondent defined the executive committee of the Communist International as "the general staff of the world revolutionary movement giving unity and leadership to the Communist Parties of the world" (Pet. Ex. 136, p. 18). Respondent's *Manual On Organization*, issued in 1935, notes that Communists attach "so much importance" to discipline because "without discipline there is no unity of will, no unity of action" (Pet. Ex. 145, p. 28). Henry Winston, a present top leader of Respondent, told the 14th National Convention of the Party in 1948 that:

* * * We do not shrink from the hammer blows of reaction. Under them we will steel our Party in Communist discipline, loyalty and unity, develop its Marxist-Leninist understanding, and temper our cadres and leadership * * * (Pet. Ex. 418, p. 856).

The foregoing is indicative of a continued recognition and acceptance by Respondent of iron discipline in the world Communist movement, particularly when viewed in the light of the facts set forth in the section of this report covering Respondent's operation pursuant to directives of the Soviet Union and to effectuate the policies of the Soviet Union in the world Communist movement.

Particularly significant of the operation and enforcement of discipline by the Soviet Union in the world Communist movement and of Respondent's recognition of this discipline and subjection to it, is the evidence concerning the requirement that the Communist Parties and their members "follow the line" laid down by the Soviet Union. Those who do not follow the line are branded as "opportunists," "revisionists," "factionalists," "renegades," "stool-pigeons," etc., and are purged from the Party.

We have previously herein noted Respondent's present use of such Marxist-Leninist material as the *History of the Communist Party of*

⁷⁵ This principle was a requirement of the Communist International and is also stated in *Strategy and Tactics of the Proletarian Revolution* (Pet. Ex. 343, p. 62), which was used and referred to many times by Respondent during the seven years ending in 1919 that Petitioner's witness Philbrick was a member and held official position in Respondent.

the *Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* and a pamphlet entitled: "Resolutions—Seventh Congress of the Communist International"⁷⁶—Including The Closing Speech of G. Dimitroff." The following excerpts from these documents show what Respondent is teaching its members and is practicing as well, concerning the necessity to "follow the line."

In the *History* it is stated:

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 of organizer and leader of the proletarian revolution, nor its role as the builder of the new Socialist Society (Pet. Ex. 330, p. 359).

And Dimitroff's speech as contained in the aforementioned document says in part:

Championing, as we do, working class unity, we shall with so much the more energy and irreconcilability fight for *unity within our Parties*. There can be no room in our Parties for factions, or for attempts at factionalism. Whoever will try to break up the iron unity of our ranks by any kind of factionalism will get to feel what is meant by the Bolshevik discipline that Lenin and Stalin have always taught us. [Applause.] Let this be a warning to those few elements in individual Parties who think that they can take advantage of the difficulties of their Party, the wounds of defeat or the blows of the raging enemy, to carry out their factional plans, to further their own group interests. [Applause.] *The Party is above every thing else!* [Loud applause.] *To guard the Bolshevik unity of the Party as the apple of one's eye is the first and highest law of Bolshevism!* [Emphasized in text.] (Pet. Ex. 137, p. 13.)

Respondent's *Manual On Organization*, to which we have referred in various places in this report, points out that basic principles and decisions, such as the necessity for the proletarian dictatorship, the correctness of the line "laid down" by Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, and the necessity for the forceful overthrow of capitalism, cannot be questioned (Pet. Ex. 145, p. 26). Respondent's publication *The Way Out* covering its 8th Convention held in 1934, says "Renegades are those who were formerly members of the Communist Party but were expelled from it for failure to follow the correct revolutionary line and who now fight against the revolutionary movement and against the Soviet Union" (Pet. Ex. 136, p. 17). John Gates, one of Respondent's present leaders and a witness for Respondent in this proceeding, told the 15th Convention held in 1950 that the struggle of "the renegades from Marxism against the Communist Party inevitably and logically leads to struggle against the Soviet Union and to becoming outright agents of the imperialist bourgeoisie," and that the Party needs "to be alert to the danger of factionalism" (Pet. Ex. 376, pp. 79 and 86). Also pertinent are Respondent's *Discussion Outline for Lenin Campaign*, issued in 1929 (Pet. Ex. 108), of which a considerable portion is devoted to discipline; and Respondent's publication *Why Every Worker Should Join The Communist Party*, issued in the mid-1930's (Pet. Ex. 143).

We treat now with specific incidents of record related to the purging of those who have not "followed the line." The record shows that from the beginning of Respondent's existence in the United States, the Soviet Union has exercised disciplinary power to enforce adherence to the revolutionary line. We have hereinbefore noted the foreign direction concerning the settlement of the factional dispute in Respondent

⁷⁶ William Foster and others were present and represented Respondent at the 7th Congress of the Comintern. See *supra*, p. 20 of this report.

in 1929 whereby, under Comintern "authority and wisdom," ⁷⁷ the Party was purged of factional elements and opportunists pursuant to Stalin's solution, in which he said:

* * * And when a revolutionary crisis develops in America, that will be the beginning of the end of world capitalism as a whole * * *. For that end the American Communist Party must be improved and bolshevized. For that end we must work for the complete liquidation of factionalism and deviations in the Party * * *. ⁷⁸

Stalin's speeches before the Comintern on the settlement of the aforementioned factional dispute, which speeches were subsequently published in Respondent's official organ,⁷⁹ refer to the conduct of Respondent's members who questioned the decisions of the Executive Committee of the Communist International as "insubordination" and apply the term "enemies of the working class" to the factional group. We find on the record that this expression covers so-called renegades, revisionists, reformers, opportunists, etc., and that the expression and words it covers are current in Communist use to denote one who deviates or does not follow the correct revolutionary line.

The record shows that Trotsky, who was expelled from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and Lovestone, who was expelled from the CPUSA,⁸⁰ became descriptive of "enemies of the working class" who must be purged. We consider it significant, therefore, that Respondent's constitution as amended in 1942 provided: ⁸¹

No Party member shall have personal or political relationship with confirmed Trotskyites, Lovestoneites, or other known enemies of the Party and of the working class (Pet. Ex. 328).

And that the present constitution provides:

Personal or political relations with enemies of the working class and nation are incompatible with membership in the Communist Party (Pet. Ex. 374).

We have noted in other sections of this report that Paul Crouch, an early official of Respondent, was denied election in 1929 to the position of national secretary of the Young Communist League because of his previous support of Lovestone and upon instructions from Moscow. We have also noted that Nowell, while a student from Respondent to the Lenin School in Moscow, was disciplined by the Communist International for disagreeing with the policy on the "Negro question," and that Kornfeder was expelled in 1934 for failure to heed the instructions of a Soviet Union representative in the United States. Petitioner's witness Johnson was expelled by Respondent in 1940 for having exhibited opportunistic tendencies, and all members were warned not to have anything to do with him.

In many respects the reconstitution of Respondent under the name Communist Party in 1945, after having existed for about 13 months as the Communist Political Association, is similar to the 1929 settlement of the factional dispute which existed at that time. We have previously herein noted the foreign participation in the 1945 reconstitution and in the 1929 factional settlement. With respect

⁷⁷ Pet. Ex. 126, p. 246.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Pet. Ex. 109.

⁸⁰ Respondent's official declaration on the expulsion of Lovestone, Gitlow, and others who had refused to be bound by certain demands of the Comintern in 1929 calls their conduct "unprecedented warfare against the Party," and states that "any association with the expelled, any support given them is incompatible with the duties of membership in the Party" (Pet. Ex. 117, p. 2).

⁸¹ We note that although Respondent had previously announced "disaffiliation" from the Comintern, its constitution as amended in 1942 included the Comintern, together with Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin as the enunciators of the principles according to which Respondent seeks to establish "socialism."

to the 1945 episode, William Foster reported to the convention that the only way he could have gotten his letter to the membership, which letter opposed the formation of Respondent under the name Communist Political Association, was by facing expulsion, and that since his letter would have caused disunity, anyone who attempted to discuss it would have been denounced as a Trotskyite by Browder. Following the reconstitution in 1945, Earl Browder was expelled as a "revisionist" for seeking to abandon basic Marxism-Leninism principles and for opposing the re-emphasis thereof which was part of the 1945 reconstitution following the Duclos and Manuilsky pronouncements.

In 1950, Lautner, without advance warning, was subjected to a severe inquisition by officials of Respondent and forced to sign a statement that he was a spy and agent in the ranks of the Communist Party and had received a fair hearing. He was not, and had not been, a spy or agent. His efforts to get a hearing or review by Respondent's National Review Commission were ignored. His only notice or information about his expulsion came from an article in the *Daily Worker* stating that he was expelled as a "traitor and enemy of the working class." Indicative of the disciplinary program in the world Communist movement is the fact that the notice of Lautner's expulsion from the CPUSA was printed in the Cominform journal *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*, and that the same issue contained a similar notice as to the expulsion of a member from the Communist Party of Italy, both under the heading "Rooting Out Traitors from the Ranks of the Communist Parties" (Pet. Ex. 362). Also in this connection, the record shows that in 1948 the Communist Information Bureau adopted a resolution that the leaders of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia were pursuing an unfriendly policy toward the Soviet Union and the CPSU (B), that this anti-Soviet attitude was incompatible with Marxism-Leninism, and that the Yugoslavia Party had failed to accept the criticism and measures set forth by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The resolution suggests the Yugoslavia Party leaders be replaced if they did not "recognize their mistakes" and rectify them. This resolution was printed in the August 1948 issue of *Political Affairs* (Pet. Ex. 344) and was discussed in meetings of Respondent's groups. It was praised by Foster and Dennis. In 1949, the Cominform adopted another resolution concerning Tito and other leaders of the Yugoslav Party which brands them as "enemies of the working class" for becoming agents of "Anglo-American imperialism," conducting a "campaign of slander and provocation against the Soviet Union," and being disloyal to the principles of Marxism-Leninism. This resolution states the struggle against the Tito clique is the international duty of all Communist and Workers' Parties.

Finally, with respect to specific instances of discipline, in 1951 one Warwick Thompkins was expelled by Respondent for trying to organize Communist members to support in the distribution of leaflets containing "slandorous" remarks about the Soviet Union.

In addition to the foregoing, we have also taken into consideration in connection with Respondent's recognition of and subjection to the disciplinary power of the Soviet Union, the facts elsewhere herein set forth concerning Respondent's following of the concept of democratic-

centralism, the nature of the *Daily Worker*, and the activities of foreign Communist representatives sent to supervise Respondent. Regarding this latter aspect, the record shows that some of the foreign representatives or agents sent to the United States have been members of the Soviet secret police who instructed Respondent on underground and espionage work. Petitioner's witnesses Gitlow, and later, Budenz, knew and dealt with Jacob Golos as a resident agent of the Soviet secret police. Elizabeth Bentley was designated by Golos as a trusted go-between in his relations with Budenz.

Further, the record shows that Communists who took the three-year training course in Moscow, and were considered qualified, were sent as representatives or instructors into other countries. Petitioner's witness Kornfeder after completing training in Moscow as a member of Respondent was sent in 1930 to South America to reorganize the badly functioning Party in Colombia and to organize an underground Party in Venezuela. Kornfeder identifies Charles Crumbein and Rudolph Baker as other United States Communists who were sent as representatives outside of the United States. While in Moscow before going to South America, Kornfeder had daily meetings with Palmiro Togliatti⁸² who briefed him on South American policies.

Earl Browder, high official of Respondent until his purge following Respondent's reconstitution in 1945 as above noted, came back to the United States as an official of Respondent in 1929 as part of the settlement of the factional dispute. He was first summoned to Moscow from a position as Soviet representative in Shanghai, China, and after being instructed as to what was required of him, was assigned as General Secretary of Respondent. Other members of Respondent are identified in the record as receiving foreign assignments on instructions of the Communist International.

Summarizing, we find that the Soviet Union has established a requirement of iron discipline throughout the world Communist movement which imposes upon the Communist Parties and their members in the various countries the duty of following with unquestioned devotion the line laid down by the Soviet Union; that Respondent herein has recognized and accepted the requirement of iron discipline, has not repudiated it and has acted in accordance therewith; that officers and members of Respondent have been expelled by Respondent upon instructions from the Soviet Union; that Respondent has subjected itself to Soviet discipline by expelling officers and members for failure to follow the line laid down by the Soviet Union, or for conduct of the type proscribed by the Soviet Union such as so-called revisionism and opportunism; and that Respondent has followed policies and activities designed to carry out the disciplinary policies of the Soviet Union.

Upon consideration of the foregoing and of the entire record, we find and conclude that Respondent's principal leaders and a substantial number of its members are subject to and recognize the disciplinary power of the Soviet Union and its representatives, and that by its recognition and subjection to the disciplinary power of the Soviet Union, Respondent seeks to advance the objectives of the world Communist movement.

⁸² Presently leader of the Italian Communist Party and at the time he instructed Kornfeder, head of the Latin American Secretariat of the Communist International.

G. SECRET PRACTICES

Section 13 (e) (7) of the Act provides that the Board shall take into consideration:

the extent to which, for the purpose of concealing foreign direction, domination, or control, or of expediting or promoting its objectives, (i) it [Respondent] fails to disclose or resists efforts to obtain information as to, its membership (by keeping membership lists in code, by instructing members to refuse to acknowledge membership, or by any other method); (ii) its [Respondent's] members refuse to acknowledge membership therein; (iii) it [Respondent] fails to disclose, or resists efforts to obtain information as to, records other than membership lists; (iv) its [Respondent's] meetings are secret; and (v) it [Respondent] otherwise operates on a secret basis;

The petition alleges:

For the purpose of expediting and promoting its objectives and concealing its foreign direction, domination and control, the Communist Party from its inception has adopted a multitude of clandestine practices. While the degree of secrecy has varied from time to time, there has been a strict adherence to the practice of secrecy during the period from July 1945, to the time of the filing of this petition. * * *

The petition further sets out 12 specific types of such practices allegedly engaged in by Respondent. For convenience, the evidence relating to these and other activities is set forth in this section under appropriate head notes which in the main correspond to the aforementioned alleged practices. Evidence relating specifically to the purpose for which the subject activities were undertaken, aside from that of the nature and character of the acts and practices themselves, is summarized under the heading *Purpose of Secret Practices* at the end of this section.

1. Secret and Open Members

It is conceded by Respondent and the evidence establishes that some portion of its membership was and is concealed. Party members active as labor union leaders, mass organization leaders, members of professions, and others have concealed their party membership from the general public or from the organizations in which they worked or in which they were members. The degree of concealment varies with Respondent's current policy regarding its activities.

A higher degree of secrecy generally applied to members of the Respondent who were important civil servants, members of the armed forces, teachers, and those individuals engaged in espionage and other illegal and confidential activities for the CPUSA or the Soviet Union. Such members were known only to the leading officials of Respondent or to a limited number of the members thereof.

Open members of the CPUSA have been those who by reason of their position in the Party or because of the type of their operations need not be concealed. For the most part, these were the national, state and district officials of the CPUSA or candidates for public office on the Communist Party ballot.

New Members upon entering the CPUSA were instructed generally not to reveal their Party membership. In 1928, members of the staff of the Daily Worker were instructed to deny their CPUSA membership in the event of a police raid. Similar instructions were given to Party members attending CPUSA schools in 1932. Party members in trade unions were ordered in 1948 not to reveal their CPUSA membership.

It is thus that Respondent engages in the practice of maintaining a membership of both concealed and open members.

2. *Refusal to Reveal Information*

Respondent's organ, the *Daily Worker* for February 17, 1930, stated:

It is the duty of Communists to throw every possible obstacle in the way of conviction of their fellow Party members in the courts, to defend these members by all possible means, and absolutely to refuse to give testimony for the state in any form. Testimony of Communists can only be given for the defense of Communists, not for the state, and then it must be based upon uncompromising defense of the Party and its program. And any one who trades his testimony to the State for personal immunity from prosecution, should be unhesitatingly kicked out of the movement (Pet. Ex. 496).

CPUSA members were taught in Respondent's schools and at meetings during the late 1930's and early 1940's that the moral basis of all acts by a Communist is the determination of whether such acts do or do not help in the achievement of the victory of the classless society; that no oath, or statement in court, or consideration of any kind can take precedence over the question of whether or not his act helps or harms the CPUSA. The record discloses a number of other instances, wherein CPUSA members, several of whom testified for Petitioner in this proceeding, were instructed while members to deny their Party membership in the courts and to government agencies, e. g., to the Federal Bureau of Investigation in connection with the Loyalty Program of the Federal Government. Respondent has instructed its members to refuse to talk to FBI agents. In answer to a question in this proceeding as to the whereabouts of certain members of the CPUSA National Committee, who are fugitives from justice, the Respondent's witness Gates stated, "if I knew, I wouldn't tell you in a million years."

The CPUSA, in the early 1940's caused documents to be filed with the Department of State which stated that the Intercontinent News Agency was an independent agent, when, in fact, it was formed by the Respondent for the purpose of circumventing the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938.

Plans were discussed by Party leaders together with agents of the Soviet Secret Police in 1928, whereby blank American passports might in some manner be obtained illegally from the Department of State. CPUSA members (Kornfeder, Honig and Arbona) have used detached visas which were issued by Soviet Union sources here and abroad in 1927 and 1934, as a device to conceal from agencies of the United States Government visits to the Soviet Union. In 1937, Respondent's witness Gates did not list Spain as one of the countries to be visited when he applied for an American passport, since the United States Government did not issue passports for travel to Spain at that time; actually, it was his purpose to go to Spain and he did so. In 1949, Eugene Cubues Arbona, head of the Communist Party youth movement of Puerto Rico, in collaboration with members of Respondent, submitted to the Department of State an application for a passport which falsified the answers to questions concerning the countries to be visited abroad, and other matters. At that time, CPUSA members assisted this official in making arrangements to obtain a detached visa in France in order to visit Hungary, thereby concealing knowledge of the Hungarian destination from the United States Government.

Hence it is clear that members of Respondent are trained to and do refuse to reveal information to proper governmental agencies and

tribunals concerning Respondent and its membership as a matter of basic Party policy.

3. Destruction and Secretion of Records

In periods of strict secrecy, the Party has issued directives to destroy records and such literature as would identify members with Respondent. Such orders were issued throughout the period of the Hitler-Stalin Pact from 1939-1941 and also during the period from 1946-1951. During the latter period, records in CPUSA headquarters were burned by Party leaders while the individual members were instructed to burn Party lists and literature kept in their homes. During the 1946 Congressional campaign, a CPUSA member, Herbert A. Philbrick, was instructed to destroy his Party membership card for security reasons while participating in the campaign of a non-Communist candidate for public office. Pursuant to the orders of CPUSA officials, Party membership books were destroyed in 1947 and membership cards were destroyed in 1948. In 1949, a system was established at New York county headquarters of Respondent whereby all messages containing names, addresses and phone numbers were to be burned as soon as read. This system was still in effect in January 1951.

In addition to the steps taken to destroy records and other material during the aforementioned periods, Respondent adopted the practice of keeping no records which would divulge information concerning its members and activities. In situations where it was thought absolutely necessary to keep records, however, secret devices such as charts and code systems have been used. Records have been kept at a minimum by such varied practices as engaging in cash financial transactions, issuing oral directives without ever reducing them to writing, and requiring club leaders of Respondent to memorize the names of members of their respective clubs. In 1949, instructions were given to a club official of Respondent, which he followed, that dues and "sustainers" were not to be collected from any member in the presence of other members.

CPUSA membership cards are not issued when the Party operates under conditions of strict secrecy. In this connection, no membership cards were issued to members for one of the years during the Hitler-Stalin Pact period from 1939-1941 because Respondent believed it would have to go underground, i. e., operate completely clandestinely. Membership cards have not been issued for the years 1949 to date as a security measure to conceal the identity of CPUSA members.

Records of the CPUSA pertaining to its membership and other affairs have been maintained secretly. The Party has selected carefully concealed places in which to hide its records. Such hiding places have consisted of homes and business offices of secret or concealed members of the Party or of other persons who would be least suspected of being identified with the CPUSA.

Thus, during periods of strict secrecy Respondent has engaged in the practice of destroying or secreting records, and of not maintaining membership records, or of maintaining them in code.

4. Deceptive Language in Party Writings

The CPUSA, as recommended by Lenin, has used deceptive language in its Constitution (Pet. Exs. 328, 329, 374) and other writings to conceal the real aims, purposes and objectives of the Party. A decisive clause in the preamble to the CPUSA Constitution of 1942,

viz., “* * * by the establishment of socialism, according to the scientific principles enunciated by the greatest teachers of mankind, Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, embodied in the Communist International * * *” was taught in Party schools as equivalent to the statement, “in accordance with the principles of Marxism-Leninism,” as defined hereinbefore. Notwithstanding any other language to be found in other sections of the preamble, this clause controls the interpretation which CPUSA members place upon the Constitution. Similarly, statements in the preambles of the 1945 and 1948 Constitutions of the CPUSA to the effect that Respondent’s functions are founded “upon the principles of scientific socialism, Marxism-Leninism” cannot be reconciled with subsequent statements which refer to the Constitution of the United States. These direct and implied references to Marxism-Leninism control the interpretation which Communists must place upon the subject matter found in the Party Constitution. Such reference to Marxism-Leninism is intended to override any other matter contained therein which may be conflicting in any manner. Marxism-Leninism is defined fully elsewhere in⁵³ this report.

Deceptive language has been used in other statements and documents of Respondent for the purpose of concealing its true aims, purposes, and objectives. Lenin explained the necessity for the use of such language in *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (Pet. Ex. 140). During the period 1935-1945, the witness Budenz used such language in his writings as a staff member of the *Midwest Daily Record* and of the *Daily Worker*.

That Respondent uses deceptive language, even in the most basic Party documents, such as Constitutions, to conceal its real objectives is established in the record.

5. Use of Party Names, Aliases, etc.

By direction of Respondent, Party names or aliases were used by its members in 1927 and 1934 on American passports, which had been obtained illegally in order to conceal from the United States governmental agencies the knowledge that trips were being or had been made to the Soviet Union. By similar direction, CPUSA leaders have at other times, for the same reason, used false names in connection with their trips to the Soviet Union as have Respondent’s students en route to the Lenin School at Moscow. Pursuant to instructions from CPUSA leaders, the students were not to use their real names while on board ship but were to conceal their identity and destination. Also, Respondent’s leaders and members, acting on instructions, have used Party names or aliases to conceal their activities on behalf of the CPUSA in labor circles and in other organizations, as well as in the conduct of strikes and labor disputes. Concealment of Party membership from law enforcement agencies, by the use of Party names, has been practiced by Respondent’s members throughout the existence of the Party. False or Party names have been used on CPUSA membership cards at various times. In the 1930’s, Respondent’s leaders were instructed to use Party names in order to conceal their identity in the event of police raids. In the years immediately following the conclusion of World War II, membership books were issued in blank. Party members were directed to enter

⁵³ See pp. 21 to 44, *supra*.

a false name or, in some instances, were given the option of entering a false name, of entering only their first name, or of entering no name at all on the books.

The rigidity of the concealment measures which commenced in the late 1940's, is indicated by the employment of certain practices in the Party whereby the names of Party members were not disclosed to each other, even at conventions and meetings, Party names or aliases being used by members as a substitute.

During the present period, the payment of dues and other contributions to the Party is recorded by the use of a system whereby the members are designated by number at the club level. Also, numbers and symbols have been used by the Party in order to identify its members on mailing lists. Students at Respondent's Marxist-Leninist Institute in Oakland, California, during the period 1949-1950 were enrolled by numbers instead of names, and students at the former were directed to refer to each other by their enrollment numbers rather than by their correct or Party names.

The use of Party names or aliases for the purpose of concealing membership and activities in the CPUSA has been a widespread and continuous practice by the CPUSA leaders and the rank-and-file members throughout the existence of the Party. The record is replete with instances of such practices.

6. Use of Codes, Couriers, etc.

In the early history of the CPUSA, its leaders received training in the secret department of the Communist International in the use of codes for the transmittal of Party messages, as well as training in the operation of short wave communication. In the "Arcos" raids which took place in Great Britain during 1927, British authorities seized codes, documents, letters, and files which revealed the identity of certain CPUSA leaders who had received confidential letters, reports, cables, and sums of money in the United States from the Soviet Union. As a result, new codes for the CPUSA were delivered in Moscow by a Comintern official to a leader of Respondent who in turn brought them into the United States.

During the 1930's, the CPUSA established and used various code systems in transmitting confidential messages between its units and its leaders in the United States. Instructions were received by Respondent in code from the Comintern in connection with the 1934 general strike in San Francisco.

In the summer of 1949, instructions were given and steps were taken by Respondent's leaders to establish a national system of radio communication for use by the Party on a standby basis. The establishment of this system involved the acquisition of radio receivers, familiarization with the use of radio equipment, plans for the location of mobile transmitters and receiving equipment, and a search to find amateur radio operators among CPUSA members. In addition, leaders of Respondent sought to establish this system in such a manner as to avoid detection by the Federal Communications Commission of illegal transmissions.

At a secret meeting of the CPUSA held in Toledo, Ohio, in July 1947, Respondent's witness Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, then Chairman of the Women's Commission of the CPUSA, told Party members pursuant to instructions of the CPUSA National Committee that Party

leaders should not use the telephone for communicating with Party members; further, that Communist documents and directives should not be sent through the mails, that names of Communists should not be used over the telephone, and that lists of names of Communists should not be carried on one's person. The record shows that these instructions were carried out in general by Party members.

Secret devices for concealing the transfer of members from one Party unit to another have been used within the CPUSA, notably during the periods of strict secrecy, which includes the present. After the reconstitution of the CPUSA in 1945, transfer cards in certain units of the Party were sent to destination points by couriers instead of being forwarded through the mails as theretofore.

Prearranged code words or phrases have been used by CPUSA members in communicating with each other, particularly with respect to underground activities since 1947. A telephone code was devised in 1949 and used through 1950 to transmit information about meetings and other Party affairs in California.

Extensive use has been made of confidential mailing addresses by the CPUSA and its members through 1949. Such addresses have included those of members least suspected of being affiliated with the Party.

Couriers have been used extensively by Respondent as a concealment measure in the transmission of documents and other material over a period of many years. Until 1940, CPUSA members served as couriers for the transmission of documents between the United States and the Soviet Union and also on behalf of the Communist International in Moscow for the purpose of transferring funds and documents between the Soviet Union and other foreign countries. Communist International representatives to the CPUSA have acted as couriers in exchanging documents between the United States and the Soviet Union. One objective of the Red International of Labor Unions in carrying on Communist activities in the maritime industry was to create an unlimited courier service throughout the world.

In February 1952, a CPUSA member who testified in this proceeding for Petitioner was told by a Party official that the former was to receive instructions as to the performance of the Party's underground activities; and, further, that this member would act largely as a courier between certain Party units.

It is thus clearly shown that Respondent uses codes, couriers, confidential mailing addresses, and other secret devices to conceal its membership and activities.

7. False Swearing

On instructions from Respondent, a Party Leader, Joseph Kornfeder, swore falsely when he applied to the Department of State in 1927 for a passport.

Jack Stachel, a member of the CPUSA National Committee, instructed a member in the 1930's to testify falsely in an injunction suit brought against the Shoe and Leather Industrial Union, concerning the issue of whether this union was Communist-controlled.

A Party member, in early 1948, falsely denied his membership in the Party before a court in Virginia. At a meeting of a Party Committee held in Washington, D. C., following that occasion, his resignation from Respondent was so dated as to enable him to say that

he was not a CPUSA member on the date that he denied such membership.

In order to circumvent the non-Communist affidavit provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, CPUSA members holding positions in labor unions were instructed by Respondent's officials in 1948 and 1949, to "resign" formally from the CPUSA, but nevertheless to continue functioning as members of the Party. In this connection, Gus Hall, a CPUSA official thereafter convicted under the provisions of the Smith Act, instructed a member in 1948, to sign a letter of resignation back-dated to a time prior to the effective date of the Taft-Hartley Act in order to protect the member from prosecution under the provisions of that Act. In 1949, a member was given Party instructions that a formal "resignation" from Respondent, but an actual continuation of his functions as a Communist, was the procedure to follow if he must sign a non-Communist affidavit as required under the Taft-Hartley Act.

Party members are impressed by Respondent with the necessity and desirability of making false statements to conceal Party information and to forward Party objectives.

8. Secret Meetings of Trusted Members

Throughout its history Respondent's meetings generally have been restricted to Party members, although on occasions authorized "public" meetings have been held. Election rallies held when Respondent supported candidates for public office have been open to the public, as have expressly authorized meetings of certain Party street units. At various periods important meetings of Party Committees have been held secretly in private homes instead of in Party offices. During periods of strict secrecy all Party meetings generally are held on a secret basis.

Meetings of national, state, and regional committees and commissions of Respondent, as well as other trusted Party units, such as the highly concealed professional clubs, have been held on a clandestine basis. Members of the Ohio State Committee were criticized in July 1947 by Gus Hall, a high Party official, for having violated rules promulgated by the National Committee pertaining to concealment in attending meetings. A CPUSA leader attended secret Party meetings held in Cleveland, Ohio, during 1948 and 1949. He was notified of the meetings by courier in Toledo, and upon arrival at Party headquarters in Cleveland he received final instructions as to the locations of the meetings. A district committee met in Baltimore in March of 1949 under conditions of extreme concealment. During 1949 and 1950, meetings of Party Commissions were held in places acquired in the names of nonexistent groups, in order to conceal and mislead as to the identity of the parties meeting therein.

Extraordinary care has been exercised during certain periods to conceal the actual meeting place and to restrict attendance at plenary sessions and executive board meetings of the CPUSA National Committee to only those selected members who had been given proper identification and credentials.

Respondent's schools have been conducted under varying degrees of secrecy. During periods of strict secrecy within the Party, including the periods of 1939 to 1941, and from 1948 to 1950, extraordinary precautions were taken to conceal the existence of these schools and

the names of the trusted Party members selected to attend them. Students at Party schools have carried out instructions to observe stringent concealment regulations in order to preserve the secrecy shrouding the operation of these schools. As an example, both the Marxist Institute in Los Angeles, California, and the Marxist-Leninist Institute in Oakland, California, were so conducted in the summer of 1950 as to conceal their existence and purpose. Students at the former school attended classes secretly at a changed location after the Korean hostilities had begun. The nature of the curriculum of these schools (see pp. 41-43, *supra*), clearly shows the illegal purpose behind the extensive measures adopted to conceal their existence.

Stringent concealment measures have accompanied the holding of conventions by the Respondent during periods of strict secrecy. Only the most trusted members of the Party have been permitted to attend such conventions. At the Massachusetts State Convention of the Communist Political Association held at Boston, Massachusetts, in 1945, and at the National Convention of the CPUSA at New York City in 1948, only those persons were admitted who could present proper credentials and, after elaborate security procedures, could establish their identity.

The location of the Ohio State Convention, held in December 1950, was not disclosed to the delegates for concealment reasons until shortly before the convention was held. Extensive precautions were taken to conceal the holding of a local convention in 1948 in Los Angeles. Like efforts surrounded the holding of the West Oakland (California) Section Convention in December 1950. Similar precautions surrounded a State Regional Convention of the CPUSA in California in January 1951. As at the other conventions held in California specified above, delegates to this January 1951 convention arrived at the convention hall in small groups after having been led there by a member who had been entrusted with knowledge of its location. The delegates remained at the hall during the entire session before being allowed to make their departure in small groups at intervals. Prior to departure the delegates were directed not to take a direct route home. On the following day, the second session of the convention was held at a different location under similar circumstances of secrecy.

Thus, it is clear that throughout its history, Respondent, for purposes of concealment and to promote its objectives, has held secret meetings restricted to trusted members.

9. Reduction of Committee Membership for Security

During the period of the Hitler-Stalin Pact, a period of strict secrecy, Respondent reduced the membership of its National Committee, state committees, and section committees for concealment purposes.

In 1948, the National Committee of Respondent issued a directive pursuant to which the size of all committees within the Party was reduced. In announcing this directive, Gus Hall, then Chairman of the Ohio Party, stated that the reduction of the State Committee of Ohio from approximately 50-odd members to about 11 members was being effected for "security" purposes. At the same time, the National Committee was reduced in number from about 55 to approxi-

imately a dozen members. At the National Convention of the CPUSA held in December 1950, the size of the National Committee was fixed at 13 members.

Respondent thus strives to conceal its activities through limiting the number of persons having access to vital information by reducing the size of its leading committees during the periods of strict secrecy.

10. Assignment of Members in Small Groups

During the mid-1930's, when less extensive concealment measures were in force within the Party, its clubs had memberships which generally averaged from 12 to 20 members. A number of these clubs joined together in neighborhood or industry branches, to form units of from 50 to 100 members. After the signing of the Hitler-Stalin Pact in 1939, Peters and Stachel, the former a Communist International representative and the latter a CPUSA leader, directed that a number of concealment measures be instituted, including the division of large branches of the Party into groups and the readying of the group system for functioning. Peters issued instructions to set up units of not more than five men with one man in charge, in preparation for the Party's going underground, and these instructions were substantially carried out. Units within the Party were enlarged after Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union in June 1941, in accord with the change which occurred on the political scene.

Beginning in 1948, the CPUSA operated under conditions of strict secrecy, dividing the membership in its basic clubs throughout the United States, including those of professional people, into groups of about five members. Greater precautions were taken to conceal the meetings of the professional groups than theretofore. Instructions were issued to all groups that members should not communicate with others outside their own particular group. Names of members in other groups were never to be mentioned at group meetings. Communication between the groups and other CPUSA units were to be made through group captains directly to section leaders. However, members have met in somewhat larger bodies on a few occasions since the establishment of the group system beginning in 1948, e. g., in connection with conventions within the Party, even though these conventions were themselves held under circumstances of great secrecy as discussed heretofore. A tightening up of the concealment system, including a more efficient operation of the group system, was announced at the West Oakland Section Convention in California during December 1950. The record shows clearly that the group system continued to function after this date in connection with the strict concealment measures which have been employed by Respondent. Respondent has thus formed members of its organization into smaller groups during periods of intense secrecy to conceal more effectively their identity and activities.

11. Underground Plans and Operation

Respondent has at all times maintained an underground or secret apparatus, even when the Party was operated on a comparatively open basis. The underground apparatus has been kept in readiness to assume leadership and to direct the functions of the Party during the periods when its leaders determine that underground operations are necessary in order to carry out Party activities. Extensive plans have been devised and great quantities of materials have been gathered

in preparation for underground operations. Reserve sums of money have been set aside. Hideouts and secret storage space have been acquired. Mimeograph and printing equipment and materials have been assembled in secret hiding places. Reserve officials have been designated to perform, if the situation so demands, as leading functionaries of the Party. As related above, the membership of Respondent at various times has been divided into groups of five or even fewer persons, and confidential mailing addresses, couriers, and other secret devices have been employed in connection with the preparations for underground activities. During periods when Respondent's activities have been conducted with greater secrecy, preparations for underground operations have been intensified correspondingly, along with a like increase in the employment of many of the secret practices described herein.

Respondent went underground for several years in the early 1920's, maintaining a secret headquarters, holding secret meetings, and otherwise conducting its affairs on a secret basis. As its "legal" expression, it organized and dominated the Workers Party, an "open" organization consisting of both Party and non-Party members. The underground party was referred to as the No. 1 party while the "open" party, which the former controlled and dominated, was known as the No. 2 party. Pursuant to instructions received from the Communist International, the underground party was liquidated as such but the underground apparatus still remained. The "open" party, or Workers Party, was merged with the underground party and thereafter adopted the name Communist Party of the United States of America.

During the remainder of the 1920's as well as in the 1930's, various steps were taken to maintain and to extend the underground apparatus, including the establishment of code systems. J. Peters, a Comintern representative, directed the underground apparatus in the United States during much of this period. At a secret CPUSA school in 1932, Peters instructed the underground members on the subject of illegal apparatus and its operation. His lectures were based upon a document in which the author, Lazar Kaganovich,⁸⁴ made suggestions based upon the experiences of the Bolsheviks under the Czarist regime in Russia. Peters returned to Hungary in 1949 by agreement with the Federal Immigration Authorities after a prolonged hearing following his arrest on a deportation warrant.

When the Party entered a period of strict secrecy after the signing of the Hitler-Stalin Pact in 1939, which continued until the invasion of the Soviet Union by Germany in June 1941, it undertook to strengthen the underground apparatus in preparation for taking the entire Party underground. Eugene Dennis, a high Party official, declared at a meeting of Party functionaries in late 1939 or early 1940, while the Soviet Union was an ally of Germany, that the secret measures then being placed into effect must be completely established and adhered to so that, if the United States joined Great Britain in the war against Hitler, the Party would be prepared to turn such an "imperialist" war into a civil war, as Lenin advocated. These measures were intended to place the Party on a complete war basis when put into effect. Various degrees of secrecy prevailed, some

⁸⁴ Now a Deputy Premier of the Soviet Union.

national leaders going partially underground. After the attack by Germany on the Soviet Union, many of these measures were relaxed.

During the 1930's, the World Travel Agency, of which Jacob Golos was for a period purportedly the head, arranged for visits of CPUSA members to the Soviet Union. Golos procured the tickets and expense money for such trips. In addition, Golos and the World Travel Agency were connected with a Soviet espionage agency during the period of 1936-1943. He acted as the liaison for communication between Respondent's members and the Soviet Secret Police agents operating in this country.

Extensive preparations for taking the Party underground were commenced in 1948 and are being carried out. Various measures were taken by the Party to strengthen its underground apparatus. By January 1950, Respondent had placed in effect throughout New York State a plan for the integration of about 10 percent, or about 3,000, of its members into a seven-level, vertical underground organization, known in the Party as "a system of threes" and patterned after the three-system of organization in effect in most of the countries in Europe when Communist parties there were underground. Thompson, a high Party official who has been convicted under the Smith Act, stated that this organizational setup was intended to function even if the Party as such should be declared illegal. In addition, portions of the New York State Party budgets for 1948 and 1949 were assigned to underground work.

Since 1948 and continuing on into early 1952, a large number of Party members have been severed from regular Party units and were either transferred to underground organizations, in order to assist in underground planning and to receive instructions in underground activities, or placed in a reserve leadership status.

Hence the record shows that throughout Respondent's existence it has undertaken elaborate measures to maintain an underground apparatus which makes and executes plans and assembles materials for underground work as a means of effectuating Respondent's objectives.

12. Infiltration of Other Organizations

Respondent has sent its members into various organizations in the United States for the purpose of gaining control of such organizations and influencing the policies of these organizations to support the CPUSA program. This policy has been employed by Respondent throughout its history. Pursuant to Respondent's directives its members have pursued this infiltration policy with respect to professional organizations, cultural organizations, fraternal organizations, and trade and industrial unions.⁸⁵ Secret Communist factions were planned or formed in these organizations for the ultimate purpose of obtaining control and making the policies of the organization subservient to those of Respondent. Students at Respondent's schools were taught the importance of infiltrating mass organizations as a means of acquiring mass support for the Party program. Party members designated to carry out infiltration work in mass organizations were instructed to use care not to expose the Party in these organizations. Members in such organizations were instructed to, and did, conceal their Party membership while in these organizations. At a

⁸⁵ See 67-71, *supra*, for more detailed discussion of trade union activity.

regional party convention held in California in January 1951, speakers emphasized the need for Party members to infiltrate other organizations through which the purposes of the Party could be carried out.

13. Purpose of Secret Practices

Respondent in its amended answer and through its witnesses acknowledges that it engages in certain clandestine practices, but it contends that such activity is not for the purpose of concealing foreign direction, domination, or control. Respondent's witness Gates testified that such practices have "nothing whatsoever to do with concealing the views or the program of the Communist Party" and further that they are the response to repressive measures taken against the Party and its members and are intended merely to "protect the constitutional rights of members of the Communist Party."

It is patent that these secret practices are not adopted by Respondent for the purpose which it asserts. This conclusion is inevitable when the secret practices are examined in the light of the whole record and all the surrounding circumstances under which they were and are performed. A short recapitulation of pertinent evidence will demonstrate this.

The underlying philosophy of the Communist movement is contained in the doctrine of Marxism-Leninism, the real nature of which is described in other portions of these findings. Implicit therein are secrecy and concealment to effectuate attainment of its objectives. It is the aim of Respondent to bring about the dictatorship of the proletariat by violent means if necessary and to help the Soviet Union in the event of a war between that country and the United States. (See pp. 118-128, *infra*.) Members were taught in Party Schools that "there is no moral law for a Communist Party member except the success of that to which he has dedicated himself, that is to say, the classless society * * *, no oath, no statement in court, no consideration of any kind can come before the question of whether it helps or hurts the Party * * * they were to testify or to make affidavit or whatever it may be in accordance with the needs of the Party at that time and irrespective of the actual truth." Instances are shown wherein certain of Respondent's members swore falsely in court; false statements were made by CPUSA members in passport applications; and a high Communist official, J. Peters, was hidden by members of Respondent from Government authorities who were seeking him in a deportation case. It was basic in the *Theses and Statutes of the Third (Communist) International*, to which Respondent has adhered, that both open and secret nuclei be formed to carry on the work of propaganda and education under the control and discipline of the Central Committee of the Party; and that members were required to join in unlawful work and unlawful organizations if necessary for the Party's purposes. In addition, the conspiratorial nature of the Party must be considered. Stalin in the pamphlet, *Stalin's Speeches on the American Communist Party* (May 1929), in discussing the disruptive effect of factionalism, states: "as a result of which the whole internal life of our Party is robbed of its *conspirative* protection in the face of the class enemy," [*italic supplied*] (Pet. Ex. 109, p. 29). There is also evidence that in the 1939 to 1941 period "the whole organization was on a conspiratorial basis" and the schools were conducted "in accordance with the rules

of conspiracy." It was taught by Respondent in 1939 that "the purpose of this secrecy was to prevent the law-enforcement agencies" from getting information concerning the CPUSA "because it destroys the conspiratorial nature of the Party movement itself."

In 1940, in order to conceal its true status registration statements were filed by the *Daily Worker* under the Foreign Agents Registration Act which falsely made it appear that it did not come within the provisions of that Act.

Secrecy and concealment have been continuous and have not been limited to the period when Respondent felt it was under particular stress. There was, however, a fluctuation in the degree of secret activity. Thus, during the period of the Hitler-Stalin Pact, Eugene Dennis stressed the underground activity of the CPUSA and the necessity for attaining readiness for civil uprisings in the event the United States joined the Allies against Germany. After 1945, there was an intensification of secret practices. In July 1950, members were told that the world situation had created considerable alarm in Respondent and that consequently the Party was adopting stricter "security" measures. Shortly afterward, a reorganization took place for that reason; Respondent's clubs were divided into small groups and its members were identified by numbers instead of names. The Marxist Institute in Los Angeles, California, and the Marxist-Leninist Institute in Oakland, California, were conducted during late 1949 and part of 1950, with great secrecy. A regional convention was held in January 1951 in California, under conditions of extreme secrecy. At this convention there were speeches on the so-called peace campaign, on world conditions and on the necessity for stricter security measures.

Viewed against this background, it is established that such practices as secret memberships, hidden meetings of small groups, the acquisition of easily transported mimeograph machines, cryptically wording constitutions, the use of couriers and the restricted use of the mails and telephone, are not undertaken for the innocent purpose which Respondent seeks to ascribe to them. Nor can the infiltration of organizations, such as labor unions, be regarded as having a bona fide purpose. The evidence shows that the reason for such infiltration is to dominate such organizations for the Respondent's purposes. That this is basic can be seen from a book by Lenin entitled "*What Is To Be Done*," which Respondent's members read and studied. In this book, Lenin declares that Trade Unions are "a very useful auxiliary to the political, agitational, and revolutionary organizations" and that they can be controlled by "a small compact core" of agents "connected by all the rules of strict secrecy with the organizations of revolutionists" (Pet. Ex. 417, pp. 109-112).

We conclude that the secret practices undertaken by Respondent are for the purpose of concealing the true nature of the Party and promoting its objectives. We cannot accept Respondent's contention that its secret practices are merely devices utilized to protect the rights and liberties of its members.

Upon the basis of the foregoing and on the whole record, we find that Respondent engages in extensive secret practices, within the meaning of the Act, for the purpose of promoting its objectives and thereby to advance those of the world Communist movement; and for concealing its direction, domination, and control by the Soviet Union.

II. ALLEGIANCE

Section 13 (c) (8) of the Act requires that the Board consider: the extent to which its [Respondent's] principal leaders or a substantial number of its members consider the allegiance they owe to the United States as subordinate to their obligations to such foreign government or foreign organization.

The petition alleges:

From 1919 to the date of the filing of this petition, the leaders of the Communist Party and a substantial number of its members have considered the allegiance they owe the United States as being subordinate to their loyalty and obligations to the government of the Soviet Union.

The petition further contains six specific allegations⁸⁶ which, if true, would show that Respondent's principal leaders and members consider the allegiance they owe the Soviet Union to be paramount to that owed the United States. Since the evidence of record which pertains to allegiance is broader in scope than Petitioner's specific allegations, we will not confine our findings of fact to the form of these specific allegations.

The evidence shows that a basic aim of Marxism-Leninism is the establishment of dictatorships of the proletariat in all non-Socialist countries of the world, and that Respondent adheres to and works to attain this goal in the United States.⁸⁷ The Marxist-Leninist Classics define dictatorship of the proletariat and demonstrate that it must be established by the forceful overthrow of existing non-socialist governments.

Stalin in *Problem of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 138, pp. 26-27) defines the dictatorship of the proletariat according to its fundamentals:

Hence there are three fundamental aspects of the dictatorship of the proletariat .

(1) The utilisation [sic] of the power of the proletariat for the suppression of the exploiters, for the defense of the country, for the consolidation of the ties with the proletarians of other lands, and for the development and the victory of the revolution in all countries.

(2) The utilisation of the power of the proletariat in order to detach the toiling and exploited masses once and for all from the bourgeoisie, to consolidate the alliance of the proletariat with these masses, to enlist these masses in the work of socialist construction, and to assure the state leadership of these masses by the proletariat.

(3) The utilisation of the power of the proletariat for the organisation [sic] of socialism, for the abolition of classes, and for the transition to a society without classes, to a society without a state.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a combination of all three aspects. None of these three aspects can be advanced as the *sole* characteristic feature of the dictatorship of the proletariat. On the other hand, it is sufficient for but one of these three characteristic features to be absent, for the dictatorship of the proletariat to cease being a dictatorship in a capitalist environment. * * *

In the following quotation, Stalin, with Lenin's help, reveals that the dictatorship of the proletariat must be installed through use of force by Communist minorities, independently of the will of the majority of the population, and that attempting to utilize peaceful means to do so is not to be considered:

⁸⁶ These allegations are to the effect that the Soviet Union is the fatherland of the world Communist movement which all Communists are obligated to support and defend; the Red flag has been and is the flag to which Communists owe allegiance; all American Communists must support and defend the Soviet Union in war with any nation; in event of war between the United States and the Soviet Union, they must work for the defeat of the United States; some of Respondent's present leaders took an oath to Stalin at the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern; and, to leaders and members of Respondent, "patriotism" means solidarity with the Soviet Union.

⁸⁷ See Marxism-Leninism, pp. 21-44, *supra*.

To think that such a revolution can be carried out peacefully within the framework of bourgeois democracy, which is adapted to the domination of the bourgeoisie, means one of two things. It means either madness, and the loss of normal human understanding, or else an open and gross repudiation of the proletarian revolution.

It is necessary to insist on this all the more strongly, all the more categorically, since we are dealing with the proletarian revolution which has for the time being triumphed in only one country, a country surrounded by hostile capitalist countries, a country the bourgeoisie of which cannot fail to receive the support of international capital.

That is why Lenin states that “* * * the liberation of the oppressed class is impossible not only without a violent revolution, *but also without the destruction of the apparatus of state power, which was created by the ruling class* * * * (*Collected Works*, Vol. XXI, Book II, p. 155. Also *State and Revolution*, Little Lenin Library, p. 9).

“First let the majority of the population, while private property is still maintained, that is while the power and oppression of capital are maintained, declare itself for the party of the proletariat. Only then can it, and should it, take power. That is what is said by *petty-bourgeois democrats who call themselves “socialists” but are really the henchmen of the bourgeoisie.* [My italics—J. S.]

“*But we say:* Let the revolutionary proletariat first overthrow the bourgeoisie, break the yoke of capital, break up the bourgeois state apparatus. Then the victorious proletariat will speedily gain the sympathy and support of the majority of the toiling nonproletarian masses by satisfying their wants at the expense of the exploiters. [My italics—J. S.] (*Collected Works*, Vol. XXIV, p. 647, Russian edition.)

“In order to win the majority of the population to its side,” Lenin continues, “the proletariat must first of all overthrow the bourgeoisie and seize state power and, secondly, it must introduce Soviet rule, smash to pieces the old state apparatus, and thus at one blow undermine the rule, authority and influence of the bourgeoisie and of the petty-bourgeois compromisers in the ranks of the non-proletarian toiling masses. Thirdly, the proletariat must *completely and finally destroy* the influence of the bourgeoisie and of the petty-bourgeois compromisers among the *majority* of the nonproletarian toiling masses by the *revolutionary* satisfaction of their economic needs *at the expense of the exploiters,*” (ibid, pp. 20–21).

Stalin also emphasizes that it is false for Communists to consider that such a thing as “peaceful evolution” from “bourgeois democracy” into a “proletarian democracy” is possible:

Marx’s qualifying phrase about the Continent gave the opportunists and Mensheviks of all countries a pretext for proclaiming that Marx had thus conceded the possibility of the peaceful evolution of bourgeois democracy into a proletarian democracy, at least in certain countries outside the European continent (England, America). Marx did in fact concede that possibility, and he had good grounds for conceding it in regard to England and America in the seventies of the last century, when monopoly capitalism and imperialism did not yet exist, and when these countries, owing to the special conditions of their development, had as yet no (sic) developed militarism and bureaucracy. That was the situation before the appearance of developed imperialism. But later, after a lapse of thirty or forty years, when the situation in these countries had radically changed, when imperialism had developed and had embraced all capitalist countries without exception, when militarism and bureaucracy had appeared in England and America also when the special conditions for peaceful development in England and the United States had disappeared—then the qualification in regard to these countries necessarily could no longer hold good (*Foundations of Leninism*, Pet. Ex. 121, p. 55).

The following quotation is a reaffirmation by Stalin of the necessity of overthrowing “bourgeois” governments by forcible means:

Therefore, Lenin is right in saying:

“The proletarian revolution is impossible without the forcible destruction of the bourgeois state machine and the substitution for it of a *new one* * * *” (*Selected Works*, Vol. VII, p. 124) (ibid, at p. 56).

The foregoing is but an illustrative portion of the abundant utterances of the Classics relating to the nature and means of effectuation of the dictatorships of the proletariat throughout the world. They have not been taken out of context; they are embedded in the sense of these writings and mean what they say.

Although we have heretofore set forth under the heading "Marxism-Leninism" a review of the evidence and our finding that Respondent's adherence to Marxism-Leninism has implicit in it complete subservience to the fundamental principles thereof—that the Classics are binding upon Respondent in all fundamentals; it is desirable, because of the principles and policies of the Classics concerning allegiance to the Soviet Union, and particularly the necessity for the overthrow of existing "imperialist" governments, including, *inter alia*, the United States, to summarize here, by way of review, some of the evidence establishing Respondent's present adherence to the Classics.

In 1945, when Respondent reverted to the name Communist Party of the United States of America (maintaining the basic organizational form under which it presently operates), William Z. Foster announced to the membership, in substance, that the Classics assumed an even greater importance, and said that "as never before, we must train our Party in the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism" (Pet. Ex. 372, p. 788). Alexander Trachtenberg in 1949 declared to a group of Respondent's members meeting in Washington, D. C., that Party leaders must know the Classics and be able to apply their principles to any current situation at any time. Petitioner's witness Matusow shows that in the Party the *Communist Manifesto*, though 100 years old, "is just as relevant today as it was in 1848 when it was written." The Classics were in use by the Party, to Matusow's knowledge, in December 1950. Marxism-Leninism, as embodied in the Classics, provided the basis of what Petitioner's witness Lautner taught and was taught at Respondent's National Training School. The Classics were used in the Marxist-Leninist Institute in Los Angeles which Petitioner's witness Evans attended until it was discontinued in June 1950.

It is established that the above Classics have been used in study courses during the years 1945-1950, for use in teaching Respondent's members.

A recent article by Alexander Bittelman, a CPUSA leader, states:

A theoretical contribution of Stalin which, like the *Foundations of Leninism* and his other theoretical works, ranks with the fundamental theoretical and philosophical works of Marx, Engels and Lenin, is the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*. The *History* is a fountainhead of Marxist-Leninist knowledge—theory, ideology, strategy, tactics, principles of organization. It is a guide to Marxist-Leninist action. It embodies the theoretical and programmatic positions of Marxism-Leninism (*Political Affairs*, December 1949, Pet. Ex. 373, p. 8). [Italic supplied.]

The same highly placed author, in January 1952, states:

Lenin's teachings are triumphing because they are true. The teachings of Lenin, further developed by Stalin, demonstrate their creativeness and cogency in all the great progressive struggles of our day and epoch. Lenin's teachings inspire the actions of the vanguard fighters for peace and democracy. Peoples fighting for equal rights and national independence find their advance fighters and leaders guided by the teachings of Lenin, so brilliantly continued and further developed by Stalin. And the magnificent historic fight of our epoch—the fight for socialism, for Communism—whose grandeur overshadows all of the great previous achievements of mankind, crowning them with the realization of the noblest aspirations and dreams of the human race—this historic fight, we are

proud to say, is guided by the teachings of Lenin and of his great continuer Stalin. It is led by parties of Marxism-Leninism, by Communist and Workers Parties (*Political Affairs*, Pet. Ex. 489, p. 1).

In addition to the documentary evidence, it was established through the testimony of Petitioner's witnesses Gitlow, Kornfeder, Nowell, Crouch, Honig, Johnson, Meyer, Hidalgo, Matusow, and Budenz, among others, that the CPUSA in reality advocates the overthrow of the government of the United States by force and violence. The membership of the above witnesses in the CPUSA spanned the entire existence of the Party until January 1951. Their various positions therein ranged from high offices to rank and file Party membership. All were in a position to know whereof they spoke.

Respondent engaged in extensive cross-examination of these witnesses on their testimony concerning force and violence and also examined its own witnesses at some length on this subject, thus joining issue thereon.

In essence, Respondent's witnesses testified that the CPUSA does not seek to overthrow the government of the United States by forcible means but rather it seeks to establish its program by peaceful means within the framework of the United States Constitution; that "force and violence" as referred to by Respondent comes into play only in the event that the duly elected "socialist" government is subject to "counter revolutionary" force by the unseated capitalist-monopolists; it then advocates meeting such an attempt by force to maintain their position. Respondent points to language in its 1945 and 1948 Constitutions (Pet. Exs. 329 and 374, respectively) which embraces the United States Constitution. On the other hand, Petitioner's witnesses establish that the principles of "scientific socialism, Marxism-Leninism," as used in Respondent's Constitution and other writings, have a definite meaning to CPUSA members,⁸⁸ i. e., that the basic goal of Respondent, founded on the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, namely, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, can be attained only by the violent shattering of the "bourgeois" state, and this includes the government of the United States.

It is established that such language in these Constitutions of Respondent, and other similar statements embracing the Bill of Rights and the United States Constitution, are irreconcilable with Marxist-Leninist principles, and are devices to clothe a conspiracy against the United States Government in the habiliments of legality. The testimony of Respondent's witnesses, as set forth above, is likewise rejected as being irreconcilable with the great weight of the evidence.

The testimony of Petitioner's witnesses establishes that, pursuant to the preachments of the Classics, the CPUSA seeks to overthrow the existing government in the United States, and its institutions, by forcible means, and to establish a dictatorship of the proletariat in proceeding to establish socialism.⁸⁹

We are also mindful that the evidence in this proceeding discloses, and we officially notice, that most of Respondent's foremost leaders, despite contentions like those made by Respondent in this proceeding, were recently convicted under the statute known as the Smith Act (Title 18, Secs. 11 and 13, United States Code) of conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow of the United States government by force and violence; and that the convictions of eleven such leaders

⁸⁸ See Secret Practices for further details re "protective language," pp. 107-108, *supra*.

⁸⁹ See Marxism Leninism, pp. 21-44, *supra*.

which have been reviewed by the Supreme Court of the United States have been upheld (341 U. S. 494; Rehearing denied, 342 U. S. 842).

Respondent's adherence to and implementation of a concept requiring the overthrow of the United States Government by any means, including force and violence, is completely incompatible with, and the exact antithesis of, allegiance to the United States. This becomes even more clear when we examine additional international aspects of Marxism-Leninism from which this concept flows.⁸⁹

The Classics reveal that the requirement of paramount allegiance to the Soviet Union is but the natural corollary of the Soviet Union's position as leader of the world Communist movement and fatherland of the world proletariat. Consequently, the basic postulates of Marxism-Leninism, (a) protection of the Soviet Union, and (b) destruction of capitalist states and the establishment, ultimately, of world Communism, impinge directly upon allegiance. In the infancy of the Soviet Union, Lenin, as cited by Stalin in *Problems of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 138, p. 19), evaluated its international position as involving inevitable clashes with imperialist states and proclaims the necessity for the Soviet Union to call forth the world revolution:

The second enormous difficulty was * * * the international question. If we were able to cope so easily with Kerensky's bands, if we so easily established our power, if the decree on the socialisation of the land and on workers' control, was secured without the slightest difficulty—if we obtained all this so easily it was only because for a brief space of time a fortunate combination of circumstances protected us from international imperialism. International imperialism, with all the might of its capital and its highly organized military technique, which represents a real force, a real fortress of international capital, could under no circumstances, under no possible conditions, live side by side with the Soviet republic, both because of its objective situation and because of the economic interests of the capitalist class which was incorporated in it, it could not do this because of commercial ties and of international financial relationships. A conflict is inevitable. This is the greatest difficulty of the Russian Revolution, its greatest historical problem: the necessity to solve international problems, the necessity to call forth the world revolution (*Collected Works*, Vol. XXII, pp. 315-317, Russian Edition).

That protection and security of the Soviet Union is fundamental to the world Communist movement is clear from Stalin's statement:

The final victory of socialism is a complete guarantee against attempted intervention, and that means against restoration, for any serious attempt at restoration can take place only with support from outside, only with the support of international capital. Hence the support of our revolution by the workers of all countries, and still more the victory of these workers in at least several countries, is a necessary condition for completely guaranteeing the first victorious country against attempts at intervention and restoration, a necessary condition for the final victory of socialism. (A quotation of Joseph Stalin cited by him in his *Problems of Leninism*, *supra*, at p. 64.)

The Classics make it plain that the Soviet Union, fostering its own security, will work toward the destruction of capitalism by developing revolutions in all countries. Stalin quoting Lenin:

Lenin expressed this thought in a nutshell when he said that the task of the victorious revolution is to do the utmost possible in one country for the development, support and awakening of the revolution in all countries (*Selected Works*, Vol. VII, p. 182) (*Foundations of Leninism*, Pet. Ex. 121, p. 46).

Stalin elaborates on this international aspect in setting forth the "absolute law" of capitalist development and of world revolution:

⁸⁹ See Marxism-Leninism, pp. 21-44, *supra*.

Uneven economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism. Hence, the victory of socialism is possible, first in a few or even in one single capitalist country taken separately. The victorious proletariat of that country, having expropriated the capitalists and *organized its own socialist production* [my italics—J. S.] would rise against the rest of the capitalist world, attract to itself the oppressed classes of other countries, raise revolts among them against the capitalists, and in the event of necessity, come out even with armed force against the exploiting classes and their states (*Collected Works*, Vol. XVIII, p. 272) (*Problems of Leninism*, *supra*, at p. 69).

Stalin in *Foundations of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 121, pp. 90–91) states in capsule form the strategy applicable to the various stages of the revolution, which depicts the Soviet Union as the “base” for the overthrow of “imperialism”:

Our revolution already passed through 2 stages, and after the October Revolution it has entered a third stage. Our strategy changed accordingly.

* * * * *

Third stage. Commenced after the October Revolution. Objective: to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country, using it as a base for the overthrow of imperialism in all countries. * * *

The hegemony exercised by the Soviet Union over the world Communist movement is that of originator and founder:

Is it surprising, after all this, that a country which has accomplished such a revolution and possesses such a proletariat should have been the birthplace of the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution?

Is it surprising that Lenin, the leader of this proletariat, became the creator of this theory and tactics and the leader of the international proletariat? (*ibid*, p. 19).

The leadership of the Soviet Union is openly lauded in the *Programme of the Communist International* (Pet. Ex. 125, p. 27):

Thus, the system of world imperialism, and with it the partial stabilization of capitalism, is being corroded from various causes: First, the antagonisms and conflicts between the imperialist states: * * * and lastly, the hegemony exercised over the whole world revolutionary movement by the proletarian dictatorship in the U. S. S. R. The international revolution is developing.

In view of the fact that the U. S. S. R. is the only fatherland of the international proletariat, the principal bulwark of its achievements and the most important factor for its international emancipation, the international proletariat must on its part facilitate the success of the work of Socialist construction in the U. S. S. R. and defend her against the attacks of the capitalist powers by all the means in its power (*ibid*, p. 65).

The Soviet Union being the fatherland or home base of the world revolution, the leaders of the Soviet Union serve also as leaders of the organized world Communist movement. Hence, the Communist International, the Soviet Union, and Stalin were given pledges of allegiance by Respondent's leaders and members as shown by the evidence which we now set forth.

Nowell, a former CPUSA official who testified for the Petitioner in this proceeding, took an oath upon joining the CPUSA (in 1929) to carry out the Party line and to adhere to the principles of the Comintern at all times.

Earl Browder read a pledge to 2,000 workers who were initiated into the CPUSA in the New York District in 1935. Part of this pledge read as follows:

I pledge myself to rally the masses to defend the Soviet Union, the land of victorious socialism. I pledge myself to remain at all times a vigilant and firm defender of the Leninist line of the Party, the only line that insures the triumph of Soviet Power in the United States (Pet. Ex. 145, p. 105).

At Madison Square Garden in New York City in 1937, about 3,000 new recruits to the Party pledged, among other things, to uphold and advance the program of the Communist Party, as well as their "complete devotion to the Leninist struggle for socialism—for a Soviet America."

At the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International at Moscow in 1935, delegates from the CPUSA, including some of the present leaders of the Party, took an oath of fealty, "To Comrade Stalin, leader, teacher, and friend of the proletariat and oppressed of the whole world" whom they assured that "the Communists will always and everywhere be faithful to the end and to the great and invincible banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin" and that "under this banner, Communism will triumph throughout the world."

The delegation of Respondent to this Congress approved this oath of fealty to Stalin and two of the delegates, Browder and Foster, were elected at this Congress to the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. Subsequently, the decisions of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International and the work of the CPUSA delegation at that Congress were fully approved by the Central Committee of Respondent.

Of the nine members of the delegation to the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International who took and approved this oath to "Comrade Stalin," six, namely, William Z. Foster (National Chairman), John Williamson (Labor Secretary), Gilbert Green, Jack Stachel, William Schneiderman, and Martha Stone, are presently leaders of the CPUSA. At the 15th National Convention of the CPUSA, held between December 28–31, 1950, the Party elected these six members or alternate members of its National Committee.

After this 1935 Congress of the Communist International, all Communist leaders and functionaries had to take a basic pledge or oath of loyalty to Stalin.

Foster, as the principal speaker at the 1948 Ohio State Convention of Respondent, stated that the CPUSA in Ohio should elect as leaders only those individuals upon whom they could depend in the event of a war between the Soviet Union and the United States.

In 1949, the CPUSA published a message to Stalin in which the Party accused the United States Government of violating the commitments made at Yalta and at Potsdam and referred to the existing government as "American imperialists." This message, in effect, constituted a reaffirmation by the CPUSA of its loyalty and a further acknowledgment of Stalin's leadership of the world-wide Communist movement.⁹⁰

Twelve of the thirteen members of the National Committee of the CPUSA, who were elected at the 15th National Convention of the Party held December 28–31, 1950, and three of the alternates have been convicted under the Smith Act as heretofore noted. Four of those convicted, namely, Williamson, Green, Schneiderman, and Stachel, were among those leaders of Respondent who took an oath of fealty to Stalin at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International at Moscow in 1935. The record does not disclose that any of these CPUSA leaders who have taken oaths of fealty to Stalin have ever repudiated the oaths, or that Respondent has repudiated their action.

⁹⁰ See Training and Reporting, pp. 89-98, *supra*.

That the allegiance owed the Soviet Union by Respondent's leaders and members is paramount to that owed to the United States is further borne out by the record. The evidence establishes numerous instances in the past where Respondent and its leaders have urged its members to defend the Soviet Union, even in the event of a war between that country and the United States of America. The slogan "Defend the Soviet Union," has been used in this regard.

Respondent's students at the Lenin School in Moscow, in the period between 1927 and 1937, were taught that the role of the CPUSA, in the event of war between the Soviet Union and the United States, is to support and defend the former and to labor for the defeat of the latter.

Early in its history, the CPUSA regarded as one of its purposes or duties the defense of the Soviet Union as the fatherland of the working classes all over the world. All new members of Respondent were instructed between 1927 and 1939, that the first and only allegiance of a Party member is to the workers' fatherland, namely, the Soviet Union, and not to any capitalist government.

A Red flag, brought from Moscow in 1929 by one of Respondent's members, was displayed at lectures on the Soviet Union. The use of the flag of the Soviet Union at a Communist camp in Michigan during the early 1930's, and up to 1936, was intended to signify the fatherland of the working class, or Communism as practiced in the Soviet Union, as well as to make friends for the Soviet Union, and to draw the American people nearer to Communist ideology and the CPUSA.

Two members of Respondent's Central Committee criticized a Party official for authorizing the flying of the American flag in a Fourth of July parade in 1934.

In 1935, Dimitri Z. Manuilsky, then head of the Communist International, told Respondent's delegates to the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International in Moscow, at a meeting immediately prior thereto, that the first allegiance of all CPUSA members was to the workers' fatherland, the Soviet Union. Manuilsky demanded that the subject of allegiance again be stressed throughout the lower ranks of Respondent. Students at Respondent's schools in the United States, particularly in 1932 and 1936 to 1941, were taught that the first and only allegiance of a Party member is to the Soviet Union, the fatherland, rather than to the United States.

A document in which the defense of the Soviet Union is urged, *The Communist Party: A Manual On Organization*, by J. Peters, was used during the 1940's as reference material by CPUSA officials.

Students at the Communist Midwest Training School in Chicago were taught in December 1945, that the Communist forces throughout the world owe their allegiance to the Soviet Union. Party members were taught at Respondent's meetings in 1948 that they owe allegiance to the "democratic forces" of the world and that the Soviet Union represents such forces.

Petitioner's witness Lautner, a former high official of Respondent, learned from his varied experience in the Party from November 1929 until January 17, 1950, that the primary duty of a CPUSA member lies in the defense of the Soviet Union. A CPUSA leader in November 1950 denounced the United States for inciting war against the Soviet Union. He urged Party members to respond to "imperialist slanders and war incitements" by an "ideological and political offen-

sive in the defense of the Soviet Union as the leader of the world camp of peace, democracy and Socialism," as well as "to support and defend the peace policy of the Soviet Union."

This evidence takes on clearer meaning when it is viewed against the Marxist-Leninist concept of "imperialism", and its corollary "just and unjust wars."⁹¹

The Classics are specific on the question of war as is exemplified by the following quotation from the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* (Pet. Ex. 330, pp. 167-168):

It was not to every kind of war that the Bolsheviks were opposed. They were only opposed to wars of conquest, imperialist wars. The Bolsheviks held that there are two kinds of war:

(a) *Just wars*, wars that are not wars of conquest but wars of liberation, waged to defend the people from foreign attack and from attempts to enslave them, or to liberate the people from capitalist slavery, or, lastly, to liberate colonies and dependent countries from the yoke of imperialism; and

(b) *Unjust wars*, wars of conquest, waged to conquer and enslave foreign countries and foreign nations.

Wars of the first kind the Bolsheviks supported. As to wars of the second kind, the Bolsheviks maintained that a resolute struggle must be waged against them to the point of revolution and the overthrow of one's own imperialist government.

In applying this basic concept, it was taught at the Lenin School in Moscow, and by Respondent at its schools and meetings during its entire existence, that a "just" war is any war in which the Soviet Union has as an adversary an imperialist power, regardless of whether the Soviet Union is the aggressor or the defender; and that any war between a colony and its mother country is a "just" war for the colony. Conversely, any war against the Soviet Union, regardless of which nation might be the aggressor, is an "unjust" war for the Soviet Union's adversary.

In the event of war between two capitalist countries, the Communist role is to work for the destruction of both, thus leaving to the Soviet Union a clear path for future conquest.⁹² In the event of a war between the Soviet Union and the United States, however, CPUSA members are to work for the defeat of the United States.

The students at the National Training School of the CPUSA in New York City in about 1932, were taught that in the event of such a war, it was the duty of every Communist to help defeat the United States and to secure the victory of the Soviet Red Army; and that Communist cells in the American armed forces should work for the demoralization of such forces.

Browder stated in 1938, that in the event of a war between the Communist and non-Communist worlds, the task of the Party is to work for the victory of the Soviet Union, and world Communism.

The CPUSA, adhering to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, has consistently characterized the United States as an "imperialist" and a "capitalist" nation which by definition can participate only in "unjust" wars. Any war among capitalist countries or by a capitalist nation against a "socialist" country, such as the Soviet Union, is considered by Respondent to be an "unjust" war. However, the Soviet Union or any other "socialist" countries are upheld as "anti-imperialist" nations which cannot possibly start an "unjust" war; any war participated in by "socialist" nations is considered by

⁹¹ See Marxism-Leninism, pp. 21-44, *supra*.

⁹² It is interesting to advert here to the history of the Nazi-Soviet Pact as related in our findings herein under Nondeviation, pp. 82-83, *supra*.

Respondent to be a "just" war from the standpoint of such nations. In fact, in 1949, Foster and Dennis, leaders of Respondent, wrote in the Party publication, *Daily Worker*, that Respondent would oppose a "Wall Street" war as "unjust, aggressive, and imperialist." Thus, the war in Korea is considered by Respondent to be a "Wall Street" war. In this connection, the United States has been portrayed by Respondent as the leader of all the imperialist nations bent on world conquest, while the Soviet Union is pictured as the peace-loving leader of the anti-imperialist nations.

In 1940, Eugene Dennis discussed with witness Budenz the steps to be taken by Respondent to turn the "imperialist" war into a civil war in this country, should the United States join with Great Britain against the Hitler-Stalin combine.

Students were taught in CPUSA schools in 1941 and 1947, that imperialism is worldwide and that a worldwide organization is necessary to bring about its downfall; further, that the world Communist movement is such an organization.

In December 1948, Henry Winston, National Organizational Secretary and a member of Respondent's National Committee, stated that the question of industrial concentration and placing of members of the CPUSA youth movement in the basic industries was particularly important at that time because, in the event of an "imperialist" war, their presence would be necessary in order to mobilize workers against this war, to slow down production, and to do whatever possible to make certain that such an "unjust" war is not successful. Winston is one of those convicted of a violation of the Smith Act, referred to earlier.

The position the CPUSA stressed in 1949⁹³ was that there were two camps in the world: one, the "imperialist" camp led by the United States, and the other camp of the "forces for peace and democracy" led by the Soviet Union; and, that everything must be done to support the latter as against the former. In order to accomplish this objective, Respondent took the position that it should build and expand its Marxist-Leninist ideology.

At a secret meeting of Respondent in Baltimore in 1949, it was agreed that its members would not bear arms for the United States in the event of any conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Students at the Marxist-Leninist Institute in Los Angeles from April 1949 to June 1950, were taught that the Soviet Union could at no time start an "unjust" war while the United States could start an "unjust" war but never a "just" one; further, that a good Communist must support a nation engaging in a "just" war and oppose an "unjust" war.

The position of the CPUSA at the present time is that the Korean War is an "unjust" war which the United States and her allies are waging as aggressors against the North Korean and Chinese peoples.⁹⁴

From the evidence contained in this record, we find that Respondent exists in this country fundamentally for the purpose, which it constantly seeks to accomplish, of overthrowing the Government of the United States by force and violence, in order to install "socialism" under the dictatorship of the proletariat, after the manner of the Soviet Union; this is the very antithesis of allegiance to the United States.

⁹³ See also Imperialism re this position of Respondent, p. 49, *supra*.

⁹⁴ See Nondeviation, p. 84, *supra*.

We find upon the whole record that the evidence preponderantly establishes that Respondent's leaders and its members consider the allegiance they owe to the United States as subordinate to their loyalty and obligations to the Soviet Union.

II. LEGAL DISCUSSION

Respondent attacks the Recommended Decision asserting it does not fulfill its function, and that it cannot be relied upon by the Board because it allegedly misstates the record, fails to present relevant matters, and confuses the record and issues. Respondent sets forth specific instances which it contends are illustrative of the above alleged errors.

We have heretofore reviewed these matters, along with Respondent's overall exception to the Recommended Decision (No. 310), in disposing of its motion of November 24, 1952, to strike the Decision. As indicated in our Memorandum Opinion and Order of February 24, 1953, denying Respondent's motion, we have completely analyzed and evaluated anew all the evidence in this proceeding, considering all exceptions and contentions of the Parties. Our findings in this report contain only that substance from the Recommended Decision, which we, after an independent evaluation of the record, have confirmed as being supported by a preponderance of the evidence.

Respondent next contends that the Panel admitted both oral and documentary evidence of Petitioner without a proper foundation of competency. It cites examples which it claims are egregious. Respondent argues that while allowing boundless latitude to Petitioner, the Panel erroneously curtailed its cross-examination of all of Petitioner's witnesses, as well as the submission of its proof. It asserts that the Panel erred in refusing to require production of reports and memoranda turned over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation by Petitioner's witnesses, in restricting its cross-examination designed to show that Petitioner's witnesses were not credible, in excluding "various" exhibits offered by Respondent, and in its rulings regarding the evidence relating to the nondeviation criterion of the Act.⁹⁵ We have considered each of these specific allegations and we find no substantive error regarding the matters alleged by Respondent. Nor can we find any reasonable justification for Respondent's assertion that the Panel restricted its proof and its cross-examination of witnesses. It is noteworthy that Respondent cross-examined Petitioner's witnesses exhaustively and at great length. It was afforded every opportunity to present all material and relevant evidence, to the fullest. Any shortcomings in this respect must lie with Respondent.

Respondent further contends that the Recommended Decision does not rest on evidence of its activities subsequent to the effective date of the Act, but rather that it rests on certain "props" which assertedly are contrary to the evidence and the law. Respondent defines these "props" as the Panel's suggestion that the dissolution of the Comintern in 1943 was not real and that there is some relationship between Respondent and the Cominform; the Panel's conception (a) of Marxism-Leninism, (b) of the Comintern, (c) that Respondent's disaffiliation therefrom in 1940 was not real, and (d) that the formation

⁹⁵ We have disposed of this latter contention in our discussion concerning nondeviation, pp. 79-82, *supra*.

of the Communist Political Association and the reconstitution of the CPUSA were on orders from Moscow.

Specifically with respect to the Panel's concept of Marxism-Leninism and its reliance thereon, Respondent argues that the decision in *Schneiderman v. United States*, 320 U. S. 118, "held that the principles of Marxism-Leninism, as expressed in classical Marxist-Leninist literature, could reasonably be understood so as to be consistent with being 'attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same.' " Further, it contends that it is a violation of the First Amendment and the holding in *Dennis v. United States* (339 U. S. 162), to consider as evidence of "guilt" under the Act the belief in, or discussion of, Marxist-Leninist principles and literature (p. 57). After due study and deliberation of the foregoing decisions we conclude that they are in no sense *res judicata* of, or applicable to, the issues in this proceeding, nor do they in any way preclude the findings and disposition we have made herein. After consideration of these decisions we made detailed findings regarding Marxism-Leninism, which have been set forth above; they are based upon a preponderance of the evidence of record and we deem it unnecessary to discuss them further. Respondent's position with respect to the so-called "props" of the Recommended Decision is untenable. We have, however, considered these propositions and to the extent, and in the form, they appear in our findings in this report they are not subject to the infirmities alleged.

Respondent has repeatedly urged that the issue of whether it is a Communist-action organization must be resolved by evidence of its activities and status during the period between the effective date of the Act (September 23, 1950), and the date of the petition (November 23, 1950). Proceeding on this basis, it has continually attacked the reception and use of evidence pertaining to its activities and status prior to the Act. Initially, it raised the question concerning pre-Act evidence in its motion to dismiss the petition. In disposing of this contention we ruled in our Memorandum Opinion and Order of January 24, 1951, denying the motion, that evidence of conduct or activities which occurred prior to the passage of the Act may be of probative value to establish issues coming into existence after the effective date of the Act and, if so, could be received. Respondent now argues that the Panel, in its Recommended Decision, while giving "lip service" to the Board's ruling, completely "negatives" it by relying on a legal presumption of continuation of a condition. Respondent further argues that no such legal presumption exists when, as here, there has been a change of law (enactment of the Act) which attaches sanction to previously innocent conduct. It stresses that, if such a presumption existed, it was nevertheless "illegitimate" for the Panel to rely thereon in the face of the uncontradicted testimony of its witnesses. It further argues in this connection that the use of pre-Act evidence by the Panel amounted to an unconstitutional "*ex post facto*" application of the Act and was contrary to its provisions.

As is apparent, evidence relating to periods throughout Respondent's entire history has been received and properly so under our aforementioned ruling on this point. In order to resolve the issues presented here, it is advisable, if not necessary, to consider Respondent's entire existence.

In reaching our conclusion herein we have considered and weighed commensurately, therefore, such pre-Act evidence as reasonably tends to establish or illuminate the present nature, activities, character, and status of Respondent in connection with the issues presented for decision. We believe that in so doing there has been no violation of the Act itself or any *ex post facto* or other unconstitutional application thereof. As the Supreme Court of the United States has stated "present events have roots in the past." This is particularly true in this proceeding where consideration thereof brought to light facts, and raised presumptions and inferences tending to show Respondent's true current purpose, as well as the nature of its present conduct. We have been able to trace Respondent's operations over more than thirty years into the present and have found that at no time during this period has Respondent changed its fundamental objectives, or its nature and purpose. There are no protestations of repentance and reform; and, though Respondent continually points to its "disaffiliation" from the Communist International, for example, as a severance of its relationship with international Communism, a study of its pre-Act existence properly enabled us to adjudge that this was, at most, only a superficial act designed in the interest of domestic political expediency to circumvent adverse legislation (Voorhis Act).

It would have been unwarranted by law to compel Petitioner to restrict its proof to fragmentary evidence confined to a relatively minute portion of Respondent's existence, i. e., the two-month period between the passage of the Act and the filing of the petition. Our determination on this question is supported by the authorities. *United States v. Schneiderman et al.* (106 Fed. Supp. 892, 898-900); *United States v. Dennis et al.* (183 F. 2d 201, 231-32); *F. T. C. v. Cement Institute et al.* (333 U. S. 683, 704-706); *N. L. R. B. v. Pacific Greyhound Lines* (91 F. 2d. 458, 459).

The law assumes in the absence of proof to the contrary, which Respondent did not establish to our satisfaction, that a condition or set of facts shown not too remotely in the past (all circumstances considered) to have existed, still continues. In the circumstances here presented we do not consider that the passage of the Act, in and of itself, affects this presumption respecting Respondent. In addition thereto, the record contains ample post-Act evidence which, when illuminated, supports our finding.

It should be noted in the latter connection that Respondent further contends that there is insufficient post-Act evidence in the record to support the Panel's finding against it. As this contention is really part and parcel of the foregoing, we shall not consider it further.

Suffice to say, our finding herein, that Respondent is a Communist-action organization, is clearly supported by a preponderance of the probative evidence of record.

Respondent also takes the position that Petitioner is required to prove the existence of a world Communist movement having the characteristics described in Section 2 of the Act, and that it has failed to do so. It asserts the finding made by the Panel concerning the objective of the world Communist movement is irrelevant and unsupported by the evidence. In view of the fact that we have heretofore found on this record that a world Communist movement exists, substantially as described in Section 2 of the Act, it is unnecessary to discuss whether such a finding is required. The evidence stated in our

findings on the world Communist movement⁹⁶ as well as the other findings in this report plainly establish the existence of an international Communist movement organized and directed by the Soviet Union, which conforms substantially to that described by the Congress in Section 2 of the Act. Respondent does not contend that there is more than one world Communist movement in existence and it is incorrect to state that the movement found herein is not sufficiently identified with that described in Section 2.

Throughout this proceeding Respondent has attacked the constitutionality of the Act and has contended that it was being administered in an unconstitutional manner. As we have previously ruled, the constitutionality of the Act is not properly an issue before us; and we presume that the Act is constitutional. We shall, therefore, address ourselves to the latter group of contentions. In this connection Respondent, during the hearing, in its briefs, exceptions, and supporting memorandum has persistently charged violations of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution. It contends that it violates the First Amendment to use as evidence, to base findings on, or to draw conclusions from its conduct and various statements relating to what it teaches in its schools, materials used in connection therewith such as books, study outlines and reading lists, statements by it or its leaders as contained in various publications including the *Daily Worker*, *Political Affairs*, and *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy* and the Marxist-Leninist Classics, and other important documents. On this basis it takes exception to statements in the Recommended Decision which, among others, are quotations from its various publications or Marxist-Leninist Classics, and to findings concerning the source, nature, and content of Marxism-Leninism, the world Communist movement, its leader and its objective, as well as the finding that it is a Communist-action organization.

Respondent further contends that the various findings of the Recommended Decision together with the recommendation that the Board enter an order requiring it to register as a Communist-action organization violate the Fifth Amendment. As best we can ascertain, this contention, that due process of law has not been accorded it, has a dual aspect. The first is a corollary to Respondent's assertion that much of the evidence in this proceeding violates the First Amendment, and the other, that irrespective of this it is none the less violative of the Fifth Amendment to find against Respondent on this record. Moreover, Respondent argues that the testimony of Petitioner's witnesses who were "planted in the CPUS as FBI informers, should have been [sic] excluded under the First, Fourth, and Fifth Amendments."

Although it is extremely difficult in many instances to determine from Respondent's general allegations exactly the specific bases of its contentions, we have reviewed these contentions with great care and have examined their many aspects as they apply to our report herein. We find that no violation of Respondent's constitutional rights has been committed in this proceeding. To adopt Respondent's theory of what comprises constitutionally protected conduct and expression would result in closing to Petitioner legal avenues of proof.

In conjunction with its contentions respecting violations of the Fifth Amendment we have also examined Respondent's general asser-

⁹⁶ Pp. 4 to 9, *supra*.

tion, often repeated, that a fair and impartial hearing has not been accorded it. From our analysis of the record, we find that Respondent has been accorded a fair and impartial hearing, and a full measure of due process of law.

CONCLUSION

The evidence in this proceeding discloses the history and activities of the Communist Party of the United States (Respondent herein) over the period of its entire existence. From its inception in 1919, it has been a subsidiary and puppet of the Soviet Union.

Since the late 1930's, when it was faced with adverse legislation, Respondent has become increasingly diligent and resourceful in its efforts to appear as a domestic political party while continuing its subservience to the Soviet Union. Many of its practices were contrived to conceal its revolutionary objectives. Thus, it continues as an avowed Marxist-Leninist organization but, except to initiate, disclaims so much of Marxism-Leninism as would endanger its continued legal existence to espouse. As in the present proceeding, this frequently entails disavowing the core of Marxism-Leninism.

Consequently, Respondent is met with the dilemma of appearing to reject but yet maintain its reason for being. As our findings in this report reveal, this dual role is so fundamentally incongruous as to be incapable of fulfillment under scrutiny. It is so innate in Respondent's nature that it seek and accept Soviet Union direction and control that, in actuality, it does not function as the purely domestic political party whose role it would, de jure, assume. Rather, nurtured by the Soviet Union, it labors unstintingly to advance the world Communist movement.

With consummate patience, the Party strives for the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat in the United States; a goal which would rob the American people of the freedoms they have forged. While using the cloak of the United States Constitution, it struggles unremittingly to synthesize from the complexities of our time a condition in this country which would enable it to shackle our institutions and preside over a Soviet America, under the hegemony of the Soviet Union.

Upon the overwhelming weight of the evidence in this proceeding, we find that Respondent is substantially directed, dominated, and controlled by the Soviet Union, which controls the world Communist movement referred to in Section 2 of the Act; and that Respondent operates primarily to advance the objectives of such world Communist movement.

Accordingly, we find that the Communist Party of the United States is a Communist-action organization and required to register as such with the Attorney General of the United States under Section 7 of the Act.

An appropriate order will be entered.

By the Board:

(Signed) PETER CAMPBELL BROWN,
Chairman.

(Signed) KATHRYN McHALE,
Member.

(Signed) WATSON B. MILLER,
Member.

Dated: April 20, 1953, at Washington, D. C.

CODDAIRE, *Member* (concurring):

On the basis of the testimony, the documentary material, and the Recommended Decision, all of which I have carefully read and studied, I am fully in accord with and concur in the findings and in the determination that the Respondent herein, the Communist Party of the United States of America, is a Communist-action organization under subsection (3) of Section 3 of the Act and required to register as such under Section 7. Since the Respondent has attempted by its briefs and arguments to eviscerate the Act and this proceeding, and since issues of far-reaching importance have been raised, I deem it desirable to set forth my understanding as to the nature and scope of the Board's Order issued herein. Proper understanding of the nature and scope of the Board's Report and Order does much to eliminate Respondent's contentions against the Act and the application of the Act to the Respondent.

The Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 marks the beginning of a new stage in the development of public policy against un-American and subversive activities. The Board has been launched as a quasi-judicial agency for the carrying-out of the fact-finding and resultant adjudicatory aspects of a statutory scheme for, *inter alia*, identification of foreign dominated and foreign controlled organizations which operate in the United States primarily to carry out the evils found by Congress to be present in the world Communist movement.

Of particular importance are the facts that, in my opinion at least, registration proceedings before the Board are not criminal proceedings and reasonable registration in the public interest is not punishment. The result of the Board's order is not to outlaw the Communist Party nor is it punitive for past conduct. This proceeding is concerned solely with what amounts to the determination of a status. The order has, in effect, a forward-looking function aimed at registration or identification, as do many regulatory measures.

Respondent's main legal objections involve what it calls an improper use of pre-Act evidence, and a "built-in verdict" whereby under the Act the Board has no discretion other than to find as it has. These contentions, particularly when viewed against the nature and scope of the Board's Order as set forth above, are devoid of merit. The Board's Report treats with the question of pre-Act evidence and further elaboration is not necessary other than to emphasize that it is clearly proper, in my opinion, to base the determination of a status, or of characteristics, upon past and current facts whose weight we have strictly weighed.

Regarding the many arguments advanced by the Respondent in connection with its "built-in verdict" contention, the short answer is that the facts which have been ascertained in our Report, as established upon the formal record made in this proceeding, clearly and unequivocally show the Respondent to be a Communist-action organization as defined in the Act. Although there is no need for the Board to express an opinion on the constitutional questions raised by the Respondent, and I do not presume to do so, I can see nothing illegal *per se* in that the proofs in this proceeding establish the Respondent to be characteristically just the type of organization which the registration provisions of the Act cover.

(Signed) DAVID J. CODDAIRE,
Member.

Dated: April 20th, 1953, at Washington, D. C.

APPENDIX A

THE WITNESSES

Twenty-two witnesses appeared for Petitioner, nineteen of whom were former members of Respondent. Three witnesses appeared for Respondent, all of whom are members of the CPUSA. The periods or membership appear in parentheses after the names of witnesses. An asterisk appears after the names of witnesses who joined or rejoined Respondent as a result of conference with the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

PETITIONER'S WITNESSES

A. PETITIONER'S WITNESSES—FORMERLY MEMBERS OF THE RESPONDENT

- BERENIECE BALDWIN* (1943-1952): Membership director of Party Club in 1943; delegate to Michigan State Communist Party Convention in 1944; handled registration and membership records for Michigan District in 1947-1948; secretary of Party Section 1947-1950.
- JOHN VICTOR BLANC* (1934-1936; 1944-1949): Attended CPUSA schools in 1947 and 1948; dues secretary of Party Club in 1944; press and literature director for Party Club; organized and was chairman of Party Club 1947-1949; attended Ohio State Communist Party Convention in 1945, 1947 and 1948.
- LOUIS FRANCIS BUDENZ (1935-1945): Member, New York State Trade Union Committee, 1936-1937; labor editor of the *Daily Worker*, 1936-1937; member of Respondent's National Committee, 1936-1940; member of Illinois State Committee, 1937-1940; editor, *Midwest Daily Record*, 1937-1940; member of New York State Committee, 1940; president of Freedom of Press Company, Inc., 1940-1941; managing editor, *Daily Worker*, 1941-1945; alternate member, National Committee of Communist Political Association, 1944-1945.
- PAUL CROUCH (1927-1942): Member of Young Workers League; chairman, CPUSA National Anti-Military Commission, 1928; member, National Young Communist League Secretariat, 1929; editor of the *Young Worker*, 1929; delegate, CPUSA National Convention, 1929, 1934, 1936, 1938 and 1940; National Secretary, Anti-Imperialist League; instructor in various CPUSA schools; CPUSA organizer in various Districts and officer in various District organizations.
- WILLIAM GARFIELD CUMMINGS* (1943-1949): Press director, secretary, vice chairman, and chairman of Party Clubs; member, Ohio State Communist Party Committee; delegate to Ohio State Communist Party Convention, 1945 and 1948; delegate to CPUSA National Convention, 1948.
- TIMOTHY EVANS, JR.* (1948-1952): Chairman of Party Club; delegate to CPUSA regional convention in 1951; group leader and section educational director in 1951; assigned as "underground" member of CPUSA in summer 1951.
- BENJAMIN GITLOW (1919-1929): Helped organize Respondent in 1919; member of Labor Committee and National Committee of Communist Labor Party; member of Political Committee (governing body) for most of time as member of Respondent; member of Secretariat, 1927-1929; General Secretary, 1928-1929; member, Executive Committee of Red International Trade Union, 1928-1929; present at conferences in Moscow, 1927, 1928, 1929; member, Executive Committee of the Communist International, 1928-1929.
- BALMES HIDALGO* (1946-1949): Membership director of Party Club; financial secretary of Party Club; press director of Party Section; attended Party leadership school, 1947.
- NATHANIEL HONIG (1927-1939): Discussion leader in Party Unit; employed by *Daily Worker*; editor, *Timber Worker*, 1937-1938, also editor of *Labor Unity*, 1930-1934; attended CPUSA National Convention, 1929-1934; teacher at Lenin School in Moscow, 1934-1935; representative of Trade Union Unity League to Red International of Labor Unions (Profintern) in Moscow; managing editor of *Western Worker*, 1936-1937.
- JOHN EDWARD JANOWITZ* (1943-1952): Member of various Party Clubs and Shop Units; alternate delegate to CPUSA Ohio State Convention, 1950.
- MANNING JOHNSON (1930-1940): CPUSA district organizer and district Agitation and Propaganda director; National Negro organizer for Trade Union Unity League; member, CPUSA National Committee Trade Union Commission; member, Negro Commission of National Committee; member, CPUSA National Committee, 1936-1938; student at CPUSA schools.

- JOSEPH KORNFEDER (1919-1934):** Helped organize Respondent in 1919; Branch organizer, 1919-1920; member, Central Committee, 1920-1924 and 1926-1928; labor union activities director, 1921-1922, eastern area director, 1920-1927; member, district committee and district bureau of Ohio, 1932-1934; general secretary, Trade Union Unity Council of New York; member, district bureaus and district committees; attended Lenin School in Moscow 1927-1930; Communist International representative in South America, 1930 and 1931.
- JOHN LAUTNER (1929-1950):** District Secretary of CPUSA National Hungarian Bureau in various States during 1930-1941; organizer in CPUSA sections and districts 1933 and 1936; director, CPUSA National Training School for Hungarian members, 1932; head of New York State Communist Party Review Commission, Fall 1947; member of CPUSA National Review Commission and in charge of security for New York State Party, 1948-1950.
- MARY STALCUP MARKWARD* (1943-1949):** Chairman, Party Club in 1944; membership director and treasurer for City of Washington, 1944; City Committee for Washington, D. C., 1945; member, District Committee, 1945 and 1948; visitor at Party National Convention in 1944.
- HARVEY M. MATUSOW (1947-1951):** Member of various Party youth clubs; employee of Jefferson School and manager of Camp Unity Book Store in 1948; Press Literature and Educational director of youth club, 1948-1949; employed at New York County Party headquarters in 1949; acting National Literature Director of the Labor Youth League and member, N. Y. State Executive Committee of the League during 1949 and early 1950; State literature director, New York Labor Youth League.
- FRANK STRAUS MEYER (1934-1945):** Transferred from British Communist Party; worked in Paris for British Communist Party in 1934; associated with British Young Communist League's Secretariat of the Central Committee; active in youth work in United States and Canada while a member of CPUSA; Area secretary, youth section, American League Against War and Fascism; Educational Director of Party Section, 1935-1937; Director, Chicago Workers' School and District Educational Director, 1938-1941; District Membership Director and Assistant Organizational Secretary, 1941-1942; instructor at Jefferson School, 1944.
- WILLIAM ODELL NOWELL (1929-1936):** Student, instructor, and director in Communist Party School in Detroit, Michigan; member and secretary of District Negro Commission, 1929; member of Michigan District Bureau and District Secretariat, 1930; member and later President of the Detroit Chapter of the Anti-Imperialist League, 1929; member, International Labor Defense, 1929; organizer, American Negro Labor Congress, 1929; Communist Party organizer in Auto Workers Union and Union representative to founding convention of Trade Union Unity League, 1929; manager, Workers' Book Store, Detroit, 1930; circulation manager of *Daily Worker* and Education Director in Michigan District; attended Lenin School, Moscow, 1931; Communist Party delegate to a celebration of Russian Revolution in Moscow, 1929; representative of Trade Union Unity League to Profintern.
- HERBERT A. PHILBRICK* (1944-1949):** Joined Massachusetts Youth Council in 1940 and was later chairman; joined Young Communist League in 1942 and American Youth for Democracy in 1943; member, Communist Party State Education Commission of Massachusetts; chairman, Massachusetts Communist Party leaflet production; alternate delegate, Massachusetts Communist Political Association Convention, 1945; State treasurer, American Youth for Democracy, 1943-1945; Cell Organizer, 1944; attended Communist Party Training School, 1945; District Educational Director, 1947; Professional Group Literature Director, 1947-1949.
- DANIEL SCARLETT* (1947-1952):** Member of various Communist Party Clubs in 1947-1948; Press Director, El Sereno Club, 1948; Club organizational secretary, Mexican Concentration Club, 1948-1951; transferred to "underground" January 1951.

**B. PETITIONER'S WITNESSES—NEVER MEMBERS OF OR CONNECTED WITH
RESPONDENT**

JOHN W. CARRINGTON: Clerk of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives. This witness was subpoenaed by the Attorney General in this proceeding to produce and authenticate, in his official capacity, certain documents from the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

ALEXANDER LOGOFET: Born and educated in Russia. Formerly employed by the Czarist government. Presently Russian interpreter for International Conferences for the Department of State. This witness was subpoenaed by the Attorney General in the instant proceeding to translate a document in the Russian language. (Petitioner's Exhibit No. 3.)

PHILIP E. MOSELY: Director of the Russian Institute; Professor of International Relations, Columbia University. Dr. Mosely testified as an expert for the Attorney General in regard to the allegations of the Petition under Section 13 (c) (2) of the Act.

RESPONDENT'S WITNESSES

HERBERT APTHEKER (1939 to present): Dr. Aptheker testified as an expert on Marxism-Leninism. Member of a Brooklyn Communist Party Club, 1940-1941; teacher, Jefferson School of Social Science, 1946 to present; editor, *Masses and Main Stream*, 1948 to present; managing editor, *Political Affairs*—about 1950 to present; trustee, Jefferson School, New York City, 1950 to present.

ELIZABETH GURLEY FLYNN (1937 to present): Member, National Committee, 1938 to present; chairman of Women's Commission of Communist Party, 1945 to present; chairman of Defense Commission, CPUSA, 1948 to present; columnist for *Daily Worker*, 1937 to present; delegate to Congress of Women for Peace, Paris, 1945; member, Political Bureau, later called National Board, 1941-1946, 1948; representative of *Daily Worker* at 80th birthday party for Marcel Cachin in Paris, 1949; representative of CPUSA to French Communist Party Congress, 1950.

JOHN GATES (1933 to present): Member of Young Communist League, 1931; organizer for the League, 1932-1937; organizer of various clubs in Youngstown and member of the Section Committee, 1933-1937; member, International Brigade in Spanish Civil War in 1938 and rose to rank of Brigade Political Commissar (Lt. Col.); National Executive Secretary, Friends of Abraham Lincoln Brigade, 1939; National Education Director of Young Communist League, 1939-1940; "Head", Young Communist League for New York State, 1940; United States Army, December 17, 1941-January 17, 1946; elected member, National Council Communist Political Association *in absentia*, 1944; elected member of National Committee of Communist Party *in absentia*, 1945; National Vets Director Communist Party, 1946-1947; member National Committee, Communist Party, 1946 to present; chairman, National Legislative Commission, 1947-1951; member, National Board, Communist Party, 1947 until it was discontinued; editor, *Daily Worker*, 1947 to present; chairman, National Review Commission, 1951.

APPENDIX B

A list of publications of major importance in this proceeding which were received in evidence in whole or in part, follows:

Pet. Ex. 8: *Theses and Statutes of The Third (Communist) International*, published officially by the Communist International in Moscow in 1920. Reprinted by the United Communist Party of America (a former designation of Respondent).

Pet. Ex. 31: *The Communist Manifesto*, by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Copyrighted in the United States in 1948, the 100th Anniversary edition published by International Publishers Company, Inc.⁹⁷

Pet. Ex. 121: *Foundations of Leninism*, by J. Stalin, copyrighted in the United States in 1939, published by International Publishers Company, Inc.

Pet. Ex. 125: *Programme Of The Communist International*, copyrighted in the United States in 1929, published by the Workers Library Publishers, Inc.

Pet. Ex. 137: *Resolutions, Seventh Congress Of The Communist International*, published in 1935 by Workers Library Publishers.

Pet. Ex. 138: *Problems of Leninism*, by J. Stalin, copyrighted in the United States in 1934, published by International Publishers Company, Inc.

Pet. Ex. 139: *State and Revolution*, by Lenin, copyrighted in the United States in 1932, published by International Publishers Company, Inc.

Pet. Ex. 140: *Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, by Lenin, copyrighted in the United States in 1939, published by International Publishers Company, Inc.

⁹⁷ International Publishers Company, Inc., New York City, is headed by Alexander Trachtenburg, a leading member of Respondent.

- Pet. Ex. 141: *Working Class Unity-Butwark Against Fascism*, by Georgi Dimitroff, published by Workers Library Publishers in 1935.
- Pet. Ex. 145: *The Communist Party, A Manual On Organization*, by J. Peters, published by Workers Library Publishers, July 1935.
- Pet. Ex. 149: *The United Front, The Struggle Against Fascism And War*, by Georgi Dimitroff, copyrighted in the United States in 1933, published by International Publishers Company, Inc.
- Pet. Ex. 330: *History Of The Communist Party Of The Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)*, edited and authorized by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, copyrighted in the United States in 1939, published by International Publishers Company, Inc.
- Pet. Ex. 335: *Mastering Bolshevism*, by J. Stalin, published in 1946 by New Century Publishers.
- Pet. Ex. 343: *Strategy and Tactics Of The Proletarian Revolution*, copyrighted in the United States in 1936, published by International Publishers Company, Inc.
- Pet. Ex. 417: *What Is To Be Done?* by Lenin, copyrighted in the United States in 1929, published by International Publishers Company, Inc.
- Pet. Ex. 422: *The Theory Of The Proletarian Revolution*, copyrighted in the United States in 1936, published by International Publishers Company, Inc.
- Pet. Ex. 423: *The Dictatorship Of The Proletariat*, copyrighted in the United States in 1936, published by International Publishers Company, Inc.

BEFORE THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Docket No. 51-101

HERBERT BROWNELL, JR., ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, PETITIONER, v. THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, RESPONDENT

ORDER OF THE BOARD

The Board having this day issued its Report in which it finds and determines that the Communist Party of the United States of America, respondent herein, is a Communist-action organization under the provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950;

IT IS ORDERED that the said respondent, the Communist Party of the United States of America, shall register as a Communist-action organization under and pursuant to section 7 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if the Communist Party of the United States of America fails to comply with the registration requirements of said Act, pursuant to the above Order, then each and every section, branch, fraction, or cell of said respondent shall register in accordance with the requirements of said Act.

By the Board:

(Signed)	PETER CAMPBELL BROWN,	<i>Chairman.</i>
(Signed)	KATHRYN McHALE,	<i>Member.</i>
(Signed)	DAVID J. CODDAIRE,	<i>Member.</i>
(Signed)	WATSON B. MILLER,	<i>Member.</i>

Washington 25, D. C., April 20, 1953.

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05445 4630



