

*John Gates:* Comrades, I wish to support the motion of the committee. In saying this, I wish also to state that I continue to advocate my views. In fact, everything including the discussion at this convention has convinced me all the more that the transformation of our Party into a political action association is necessary and desirable in the best interests of our Party. But I support this motion because I consider it necessary to subordinate my views to the need for unity in our Party. The need for unity arises because there are some comrades in our Party who favor the continuation of our Party in its present name and form and there are other comrades who oppose it. And we are trying to unite those comrades who both advocate and oppose these ideas.

What is the essence of this motion? In my opinion it has been one of the most harmful things in our Party discussion of the past year and the discussion within this convention that we have divided our Party into comrades who are for the Party and comrades who are against the Party. I believe



that all of us are for the Party. I believe that it is arrogant and conceited on the part of some comrades to set themselves up as the self-appointed saviors of the Party and that they are to be considered Party patriots, while others who oppose their views are to be considered enemies of the Party.

All of us want to save the Party. Some of us have different points of view as to the best way to save our Party. Let me remind you comrades that after we dispose of this the chief problem that concerns our Party will remain the chief problem—and that is the isolation of our Party which has been the main issue in this discussion.

We will still be isolated when this convention is over no matter what we do on this question. It remains to be seen what we will do after the convention to overcome our isolation. We saved our Party in 1945 when we reconstituted our Party and some comrades thought that's all that had to be done.

But we reconstituted our Party in 1945, and look where we are now! So it is not so simple, comrades, that all you have to do is retain the name and form of the Communist Party, and that solves all of our problems.

It is my view, which is shared by many comrades in the Party, that life and reality will determine this question. I believe we will come to see, as time goes on, that it will be necessary to make changes in the name and in the structure—the form—of our Party. And I think it flows out of the policies we will adopt at this convention, the policies I am confident we will adopt.



I have never been one who has said that this question is the main question before the Party. I have always said that we should subordinate it to policy. And I still believe that. But it is just from this point of view that I wrote about and advocated a change in the name and form of the Party. In my article which you read in the November issue of *Political Affairs*, the overwhelming bulk of that article is devoted to the policy and program of our Party, and only a small part of it was on the question of change in name and form, which in my opinion was a logical continuation of what I thought were correct policies for our Party.

I think, in connection with what is the main aim of our Party in the coming historical period—helping to build an anti-monopoly coalition in our country—given the level of development of the labor movement in our country and the people's movement and the necessity to bring about a political realignment along these lines, we have to consider the existence of our Party as to how best to function, how best to assist this new political realignment. It is my opinion that this can best be done by a change of name and form.

Now, to conclude, it is all right to say, as many comrades have said, that discussion on this issue will not be foreclosed. Comrades, given the understanding of some of the comrades who present this question here at this convention, it would be a brave soul indeed who would dare to discuss this question after the convention. If one is to be branded a revisionist, a liquidationist,

and all of the names under the sun because you advocate these things, how can we have a proper discussion in the Party on this question? It is just because of this kind of atmosphere that we have not had a proper discussion up until now on this question! (Applause.)

*Ch.:* We now have one comrade speaking against the motion.

*Bill S. (New York):* I think the question of liquidation has been answered by the previous speaker. He deplores the fact that there hasn't been sufficient discussion. Yet there was a majority in the State Board who had adequate time to hand down literature to the county, to the districts, and what have you, for us to have a discussion on it. We didn't have a discussion on it out in the streets, and we could have no discussion because, if we upheld it, we couldn't even have meetings—we couldn't even have meetings. And the reason that we had meetings is because we walked the streets and got the people together. Because we weren't getting any direction. That's why we're here. I've never been to a National Convention before as a delegate in my life, and it's only because the rank and file sent me here. (Applause.)

We have Communist Parties all over the world that call themselves something else, but that form is the main thing, and when you start to fooling with the form, then you fool with the content. You just can't have one type of building and form it into the form of another. It's basic.

And I am independent—sure, I'm in-