

C. P. Repudiates Revolutionary Aims

PREFERS TO STRENGTHEN EXISTING SOCIAL ORDER

By Harold Draper

The outstanding result of the hearings was the openness of the C. P. repudiation, not only of a revolutionary position on war and a host of other questions, but on the elementary question of the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism versus the peaceful introduction of Socialism through the ballot. This repudiation itself is certainly not new, but the frankness in stating it is.

The chief witnesses for the CP were Phil Frankfeld and Earl Browder. Right off, both objected to the investigation on the ground that the legislative order really didn't apply to them. They weren't "subversive."

"Strengthen Present Economic Democracy"

"The CP," said Frankfeld, "does not believe that this order—investigating Communist, Nazi and other subversive propaganda within the state—applies to it. We do not wish to overthrow the Government from its foundations, nor to overthrow existing society by force. In fact we seek to strengthen the present economic democracy on a firmer, more equitable foundation..." (Globe, Sept. 30.)

Pressed further, Frankfeld shouted: "I never said I believed in the overthrow of the government by force or otherwise..." (Ibid.)

The senators kept coming back "to this time" and again, wringing literally dozens of more and more unequivocal statements from the two C. P. leaders. The Herald, October 1, reports:

"Stoutly denying Communists are plotting to overthrow the government by violence, he (Browder) insisted the revolution, which is inevitable in his opinion, will reach its climax with the communists taking over control of the government through the process of elections."

For "Peaceful" Changes

"Frankfeld said the agitation of his party is a peaceful agitation and does not seek the overthrow of the government." (Post, Oct. 1.)

The "Confession" (pamphlet issued by C.P.) states: "We Communists believe in accomplishing great social changes peacefully and through democratic processes." (Page 24.)

Although the Stalinists made no qualifications to these statements, the senators suspected mental reservations. "Rep. Julian asked Frankfeld if he did not believe some 'form of force and violence is unavoidable.' 'No, sir,' was the reply." (Globe, Oct. 5.) Just to make sure, the senators stuck before him a quotation from Browder's old writings that "history does not show a single instance where governmental power has been transferred by peaceful means." Nothing daunted, Frankfeld replied, "We hope that all historical precedents will be broken." (Herald, Oct. 5.)

Skeletons from C. P. Closet

As further evidence of their reading, the senators pulled out another skeleton in the C.P. closet, and rattled it before Frankfeld: "Specifically he denied a passage from a pamphlet by

William Z. Foster, American leader, which gave a vivid but imaginary description of the overthrow of the Government, culminating in the arrest of the President and his cabinet. The passage, Frankfeld said, was written ten years ago during the infancy of the party. It would not come from the pen of Foster now, the party having reached either adolescence or maturity. Communists, he said, have toned down a bit." (Globe, Sept. 30.) Which puts it mildly.

Browder too said that Foster had changed his mind since letting his third-period imagination run riot; it was "outmoded doctrine, written in the heated infancy of the party," that is, including the time when the movement was led by that enfant terrible, Lenin.

Only Allegiance to American Flag

Browder, in addition, swore by Washington and Jefferson, "that he owed his allegiance only to the American flag." (Post, Oct. 1.)

While Browder said that he expected to achieve socialism through the process of elections, it seemed that this did not necessitate even the election of Communists. "Frankfeld went so far as to say the party only ran its own candidates when it was unable to support a liberal candidate of some other party..." (Globe, Sept. 30.)

One of the legislators was an internationalist. "Rep. Philip Sherman of Somerville asked Browder if Communists advocate world revolution. 'No,' replied the witness." (Post, Oct. 1.)

What if the C.P. and its activities were illegalized by the government? Would they resort to illegal methods? The Commission wanted to know.

A Party Fit for Red-Baiters

The "Confession" had stated that "We have never believed in working as a conspirative organization and never will accept the position of conspirators." In effect the Commission asked, "What, never?" and at the hearings Frankfeld answered...

"He said the Communists would not hesitate to employ 'semi-legal' methods to continue its activities in the event the state government should disregard the constitutional guarantees which now permit the Communist party to function openly and legally. Subsequently he asked that the record be extended to include his denial that the party would employ 'illegal' methods." (Herald, Oct. 5.)

No wonder Frankfeld said to the Commission, after testifying: "Perhaps some of you would like to join the party after hearing the discussion." (Globe, Sept. 30.)

(This is the second of a series of articles by comrade Draper on the Massachusetts Investigation. Another article will appear in a subsequent issue.)

TOWARD THE NEW PARTY!



'Robinson-Rubens' Frameup Part of G P U Spy-Scare Plots In U. S.

(Continued from page 1)

opposition to imperialist foreign policy must be silenced, the Kremlin is apparently busily rigging—not without help from some American newspapers including Hearst—the fanciest of its series of Oppenheim mystery frame-ups.

The chief goat, apparently, is to be the "Trotskyite" movement, but there is no lack of indications that Prosecutor Vishinsky will shortly "prove" in a Moscow court by the usual "confession" method that among the Japanese spies in this country are not only the Marxist opponents of imperialist war, but every opponent of collective security, Christian pacifists, and "objectively" even the two-hundred odd Congressmen who support the utopian Ludlow amendment.

As long ago as two weeks the New York World-Telegram stated that a Federal investigator on the "Robinson-Rubens" case (like the Soviet Embassy, whom this paper also quoted) had suggested that the prisoners in Moscow might very well be Trotskyites. The notion did not catch hold for some days, but early this week the New York Herald-Tribune echoed the allegation, again putting it in a Federal man's mouth. On Dec. 29 the Federal men turned up a Mr. Richard J. Ribbe of Jamaica, a cousin of Mrs. A.

A. Rubens. Interviewed by the Daily News, Ribbe was quoted as follows:

Hearst 'Correction'

"Relatives felt a little disturbed... and blamed Rubens for interesting Ruth in radical movements. I don't know which Communist group—the party in power or the Trotskyites—he was friendly with."

The Hearst reporter was not satisfied with this statement, and "corrected" it in a manner worthy of Hearst's only rival, the Daily Worker. Hearst's Mirror quoted Ribbe as follows: "The family didn't like the idea of her (Ruth) eloping with Rubens, who was thoroughly versed in Trotskyist ideas."

Just to make everything perfect, the Mirror's story on Dec. 29 included the following interesting "revelation":

"The Justice Department agents, it was learned, are probing reports that Rubens received a call to an anti-Stalinist conference in Latvia—a gathering, probably, of Trotskyist forces—and that it was imperative for him to attend."

Authoritative Denial

Interviewed by an Appeal reporter, the New York spokesman of the Department of State of the U. S., declared that neither the Department nor its men had

made or authorized any statements suggesting that they had reason to think that the "Robinson-Rubens" people were Trotskyites. Asked whether he was prepared to make such a statement at this time, the spokesman declared he had no basis for making any such statement and that he would not make it.

The New York press seemed pretty well convinced that the "Robinsons" were, in fact, the Rubens couple, and that they had sailed for Europe on Oct. 16 on the Rex, using the Rubens passport. Then, according to the press, they went to Russia, presumably as Rubens, since the Soviet government denies it issued any visas to Robinsons. When they registered at the Moscow hotel, however, they used the Robinson name and passports.

What has not been explained yet by the New York reporters is why these people, who had two sets of pretty phony passports, chose to use the one in the name of Robinson—a name which as early as July had been labeled in the world press as "wanted by the police" in Moscow. Unless, of course, they were helping Vishinsky in his little arrangements. The official Soviet explanation, given jointly by the prosecutor and the "confessing" prisoners will surely be juicy—unless the surprise edge is taken off by more preliminary announcements in the Hearst press.