

[2]

**TIM BUCK ANALYSES
DUCLOS CRITICISM OF BROWDER**

The awaited reaction of the Labour Progressive Party over Jacques DUCLOS' criticism on the BROWDER "line" has so far manifested itself most prominently in the form of an article by Tim BUCK. This article entitled "Jacques DUCLOS on the Revision of Marxism" appeared in the July-August issue of "National Affairs Monthly". As usual with articles of

this nature the manner of presentation was cleverly subtle so as not to lay too much blame on the Labour Progressive Party leaders for any action they may have taken.

It is well to note that the vehicle which carried this article by Tim BUCK is an official journal of the Labour Progressive Party and is published by its National Committee. It can be accepted then, that where the article in question supports a certain policy, or where it attacks or criticizes individuals, groups, etc., it has the support of Party members.

“Monthly” Eulogized BROWDER

It is significant to note that “National Affairs Monthly” in its September, 1944 issue carried a review of BROWDER’s book “Teheran Our Path in War and Peace”. This review described BROWDER’s book as a “most concise, luminous and authoritative statement on the position of Marxism and the problems of the post-war world”. It also stated that this book was by no means “for the American movement only”. This latter statement was emphasized to avoid any failure of utilizing

“to the full the arsenal of facts and arguments of clarifying analysis and Marxist understanding, with which this book is filled. The Labour Progressive Party will derive the utmost benefit...from a full utilization of this Marxist hand-book.”

The review ended by referring to BROWDER’s book as “a precious source of clarity and strength”.

Further examples of how “National Affairs Monthly” supported BROWDER’s writings are the many times it enthusiastically carried articles and excerpts of articles by the U.S. Communist leader. This would indicate previous full Labour Progressive Party support for Earl BROWDER’s Teheran “line” and an agreement for its development in full and offers a neat comparison with the present stand it has taken. A view of the inevitable effect the DUCLOS statement has had on the Party in Canada is to note Tim BUCK’s treatment of the situation, even in the face of substantial proof that until Jacques DUCLOS was moved, of his own volition or otherwise to criticize the BROWDER interpretation the Labour Progressive Party fully supported what they now term the “revision of Marxism”.

Interesting Comparison

In reading Buck’s article it is interesting to compare one of his statements with another made by Earl BROWDER. The statement by BROWDER which was made in his book “Teheran Our Path in War and Peace” and was printed as an excerpt in the September 1944 issue of “National Affairs Monthly” remarked that:-

[3]

"The highest contribution Marxism has to make to American life is the introduction of science into policies. It is the substitution of the method of blind trial and error by the method of scientific theory which projects the new and unknown out of the old and known. It is the understanding of the world in motion, and of the laws of motion, which makes possible the anticipation of that which has not yet come into existence, so that the human mind is not confronted with a constant succession of surprises for which it has no preparation."

In contrast Tim BUCK opened his article by declaring:-

"Once again Marxism has proved itself the unfailing 'guide to action' for the working-class movement and its allies in the struggle for democratic progress."

Then follows by echoing DUCLOS' criticism of BROWDER's mistakes. Thus we see two leading Communists, basing an original line on Marxist theories to prove its correctness, then using the same Marxist theories to prove it was not correct.

Introspection

BUCK mentions in his article that many Labour Progressive Party members have inquired as to the validity of DUCLOS' criticism and its bearing upon the Labour Progressive Party. In answer he states that the National Executive discussed the questions raised in Comrade DUCLOS' article and subjected the recent activities of the Labour Progressive Party to critical re-examination.

"Revision of Marxism": BUCK

BUCK listed five conclusions reached by DUCLOS, one of which was that BROWDER interpreted the Teheran Agreement, a diplomatic document, as a platform of class peace in the post-war period and BUCK referred to studies made of BROWDER's publications and writings, to show that this criticism was correct. He then explained how BROWDER excluded problems of class relationships in the monopoly-capitalist state, etc. Continuing along similar lines he quoted from BROWDER, then made the statement that this was "clearly a revision of Marxism". According to him, BROWDER had contradicted Lenin's fundamental teachings.

After thus finding fault BUCK wrote that BROWDER had made no mistake in emphasizing national unity for the purpose of winning the war and carrying out post-war policies based on the Teheran perspective long-term collaboration between the USSR and capitalist countries, etc.

Apprehension

The article then made a few comments respecting the Teheran Accord and declared that the government of the USSR would live up to its agreements, BUCK was it seemed, a little doubtful that the other signatories would do so for he expressed the opinion that "the extent to which the government of capitalist countries will continue to live up to them will reflect the extent to which they consider the terms of the agreements to coincide with their own interests, i.e., 'their aims'".

[4]

"Democratic Struggle" not "Class Peace"

BUCK stated that DUCLOS was "obviously right" when he said it was wrong to estimate the Teheran Accord as a "platform of class peace after the war". He qualified this remark by saying that if the working class organizations were demobilized and ideologically disarmed, there would be little hope of carrying through policies based upon the possibilities of the Teheran and Yalta agreements. He concluded that the Teheran Declaration was "a platform of democratic struggle".

We Were Influenced

Referring to local Party activities, BUCK stated that a re-examination of the theoretical and practical activity of the Labour Progressive Party since the Teheran Conference, reveals plenty of ground for criticism. He attached some blame to the Party inasmuch as they did not challenge the validity of BROWDER's proposals but had gone so far as to urge Party members to use his book "Teheran Our Path in War and Peace" as a Marxist guide to the solution of post-war problems. BUCK also stated that "we" did not challenge the validity of much material published in the "Daily Worker" and other United States Party publications. The excuse he offered for this failure to question the correctness of BROWDER's proposals was the strong influence the United States Communist press had upon Labour Progressive Party members. He turned them to a criticism of Party members for reading more United States left-wing publications than Canadian and consequently basing their thinking upon what they read in the United States Communist press.

BUCK admitted that several of BROWDER's concrete proposals became integrated in Labour Progressive Party thinking of political problems, even to the extent that their point of view had appeared in several Labour Progressive Party articles.

He continued:-

"It must be recognized, frankly, that we identified ourselves with the Communist Political Association in support of Comrade Browder's 'new course' and our evaluation of the bearing that Comrade Duclos' article has upon our own Party work must start with this fact."

Having thus admitted that the Labour Progressive Party was guilty of being influenced by the BROWDER policy even to the point of following the pattern in some instances, BUCK attempts to make light of it by pointing out distinct differences between what was done in Canada and what was done in the United States. Said he, when referring to DUCLOS' criticism of BROWDER for interpreting the Teheran Accord as a platform of class peace, "we in Canada did not interpret it as a class peace but as a platform of democratic struggle."

Didn't Dissolve

The following rather interesting remark was made when pointing out the differences between the action of the C.P. of the U.S. and the Communists in Canada:-

"Comrade Duclos concluded that the dissolution of the Communist Party of the United States reflected Comrade Browder's erroneous estimation of the post-war perspective. We did not follow the American example; on the contrary, [5] the Communist Party being outlawed by the King government we established the Labour Progressive Party, with a Marxist program and utilized the possibilities and the widespread progressive sentiment to strengthen our party and extend its influence."

It is, of course, self-evident that the formation by the Communists of the Labour Progressive Party was not by choice.

Money for Great Britain? USSR Also

Showing his pronounced Communist views, BUCK in referring to the British Government seeking a credit of eight billion dollars from the United States stated, "If an eight billion dollar credit to Great Britain, why not a similar credit to the USSR?" He then attempted to show that such proposals were in accord with the Teheran perspective. BUCK referred to the Labour Progressive Party electoral program of defeating the Tories as an example as to how the Teheran Accord was interpreted as a platform of democratic struggle.

Eyewash

In arguing that the policies followed by the Labour Progressive Party were correct and suggesting that its only mistake was in not questioning BROWDER's theories, BUCK declared that this was due solely because

the Labour Progressive Party has a closer contact with the workers and has the priceless asset enjoying a great sensitivity to working-class opinion.

BUCK concluded by announcing that the task is to subject all Labour Progressive Party work both theoretical and practical to a critical and searching re-examination in the light of Comrade DUCLOS' article. In other words, BUCK accepts this article not as the friendly criticism of a Communist from another country but as Communist directive.