

Reading Communist Biographies: The Birth of American Communism, International Communism through the Cold War's Early Years and the New Communist Movement

Victor G. Devinatz—*Illinois State University*

Bob Avakian, *From Ike to Mao and Beyond: My Journey from Mainstream America to Revolutionary Communist* (Chicago: Insight Press, 2005).

Bryan D. Palmer, *James P. Cannon and the Origins of the American Revolutionary Left, 1890-1928* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2007).

Kevin Morgan, Gidon Cohen and Andrew Flinn eds., *Agents of the Revolution: New Biographical Approaches to the History of International Communism in the Age of Lenin and Stalin* (New York: Peter Lang, 2005).

From its founding late in the twentieth century's second decade through the early twenty-first century, American communism can be divided into four historical periods. The first stage lasted from the formations of the Communist Party of America and the Communist Labor Party (CLP) in 1919 through 1929 when the Stalinization of the Communist Party USA (CPUSA)¹ was virtually complete as indicated by the expulsions of the Trotskyists² in 1928 and the Lovestoneites³ in 1929. The second phase, beginning in 1929, includes the CPUSA's history during Third Period Communism, the Popular Front period and Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy's return in 1946 until the crisis engendered by Khrushchev's Twentieth Soviet Communist Party Congress secret speech and the Hungarian events in 1956 through 1958.⁴ The third era incorporates the orthodox Marxist-Leninists retaining Party control after massive membership loss by 1959, the rise and decline of the New Communist Movement (NCM) during the 1970s and 1980s, through the Soviet Union's collapse in 1991.⁵ Finally, the fourth period begins with the Committees of Correspondence's split from the Party in 1991 through the twenty-first century's first decade.⁶

Most American Communist research has spanned the first two periods with little work having been done during the field's last two stages. The books discussed in this essay cover the first three stages as outlined above. Palmer's book deals with an American Communist movement leader in the 1920s who became a foremost Trotskyist; Morgan, Cohen and Flinn's volume covers biographies of individuals (including Americans) who remained within the official international Communist movement from the October Revolution through the Second World War while Avakian's autobiography discusses his political development as a Maoist

and a leader of perhaps the most important NCM organization. Thus, all three books are united in their coverage of individuals who were committed to Marxism-Leninism, viewing the proletariat as the historical force necessary for socialism's implementation. However, these volumes also demonstrate a tremendous complexity and heterogeneity in the beliefs and actions of individual communists tempered by various developmental, historical, cultural, psychological and political factors.

Palmer's biography of James P. Cannon is clearly the best, and the most intellectually ambitious, of the three books. Cannon, one of American Trotskyism's founders upon his expulsion from the United States Communist Party in 1928, has not received the scholarly attention of other key individuals active in American Communism's first decade such as William Z. Foster, Earl Browder and Jay Lovestone.⁷ Even Max Shachtman, a co-organizer of the US Trotskyist movement, found an erudite biographer nearly fifteen years ago.⁸ Present at American Communism's birth in 1919, Cannon was as major a figure as Foster, Browder and Lovestone in shaping an ostensibly revolutionary party whose purpose was to lead the US proletariat in overthrowing capitalism. Covering virtually the same era as Theodore Draper's two landmark works, Palmer differs analytically from Draper in not viewing the CPUSA's subsequent Stalinization as necessarily inevitable and incipient at the two parties' Leninist founding.

The first two chapters chart Cannon's life through his high school graduation, presenting much original material. Born and raised in the working-class town of Rosedale, Kansas, part of the Greater Kansas City area, Cannon's childhood was one of carefree adventure. Although his father, John, proclaimed himself a socialist upon voting for Eugene Debs in the 1900 presidential election, his mother, Ann, attempted to shield young Jim from what she considered to be dangerous political views. Subscribing to socialist periodicals such as *The International Socialist Review* and *The Appeal to Reason*, John Cannon formed a Socialist Party (SP) local in Rosedale with a dozen other stalwarts and actively promoted left-wing politics in the area.

Palmer corrects inaccuracies concerning Cannon's father's background and James Cannon's first marriage. Cannon portrayed, later in his life, his father as a radical proletarian, blacklisted for his Knights of Labor membership. Rather, Palmer reveals that the elder Cannon was a building trades worker who experienced major spells of unemployment, later becoming a struggling real estate and insurance agent. Cannon's first wife, his former high school teacher, was just seven years older rather than 13 years as has been erroneously reported.

Although Cannon's SP affiliation began in 1908, he considered that he joined the revolutionary movement in 1911 upon becoming an Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) member. Cannon, an active IWW militant for years, participated in the mass strike of Akron rubber workers in 1913, among others. Rejoining the SP in 1917, Cannon was undeniably in the organization's left wing and in 1919 with tumult encompassing the Party; he became concerned that the revolutionaries

might be forced to split prematurely from the SP. Although he did not attend the Chicago SP emergency convention in late summer 1919, when the rift finally came, Cannon joined the CLP with the other Kansas City leftists.

The bulk of the book, spanning more than 200 pages, details Cannon's major role within the American Communist movement through 1928. In 1920-1921, Cannon focused on constructing an American Communism that would translate the Bolshevik's achievements into a language that could be understood by the US working class. At the end of 1922, while still in the Soviet Union, Cannon ascended to the American Party's highest levels, through his election to the Central Executive Committee and the Executive Council. In 1925, Cannon organized, and led until 1928, the Communists' International Labor Defense which defended US class-war prisoners on a nonsectarian basis including the anarchists Sacco and Vanzetti.⁹ Thrown back into factionalism from 1926-1928, Cannon despaired of constructing a collective leadership for the Party when Lovestone obtained stronger organizational control after defeating the Foster-Cannon faction at the late summer convention in 1927. While feeling uneasy with the American Party's burgeoning Stalinization throughout the 1920s, reading Trotsky's document criticizing the Communist International (Comintern) while attending the Comintern's Sixth World Congress in the summer of 1928, led Cannon to decisively reject Stalinism and to become committed to building a Trotskyist opposition.

But Palmer's book does more than merely document Cannon's life up to 1928. It analyzes the history of US Communism's first decade in an extremely clear and lucid manner. Contra Draper, Palmer views the US Communist Party's theory and praxis emerging from a politically volatile combination of indigenous American radicalism and Moscow control. Furthermore, he acknowledges the Party's positive contributions, particularly its important nonpartisan labor defense and antiracist work, even after its total Stalinization and subordination to Moscow. Thus, Palmer's viewpoint differs from the traditional¹⁰ and revisionist¹¹ positions found in US Communist historiography.

Palmer's biography is destined to become a classic in the historiography of US Communism. It is the most serious treatment of the Communist movement's history in the 1920s since Draper's two volumes appeared approximately 50 years ago. But while Draper's works sought to demonstrate the devastating impact of Stalinization on the CP, Palmer's book is written from a perspective of hope, one that views the necessity of understanding previous revolutionary struggles as the key for launching new ones. Palmer's politics calls for the revolutionary left's rebirth based on the best and most relevant traditions of Leninism, Trotskyism and Cannonism. Palmer is currently preparing the second volume of his Cannon biography, chronicling his subject's Trotskyist years. I can hardly wait to read it.

Agents of the Revolution is a collection of 14 essays that uses a prosopographical approach to shed insights on international Communism primarily from the Bolshevik Revolution through the Second World War. Prosopography can be

described as studying history through a methodical treatment of individual and group biography.¹² The book, divided into sections labeled Methodologies, Leaders and Cultures, is largely Eurocentric with eleven essays dealing with European Communist Parties (CPs). Of the remaining three essays, two concern the United States and one with New Zealand.

Unlike various Cold War studies of the Communist personality which argued that individuals attracted to Communism exhibited various psychopathologies or personality disorders, this books' essays demonstrate that all Communists were not cast from the same mold.¹³ While every international CP became bureaucratized, all Party members were not mass produced but were affected by their own nation's and Party's culture. For example, Wolfgang Weber demonstrates that Austrian Communist families in Vorarlberg, in spite of being militant anti-capitalists struggling for a Soviet Austria in the 1920s, fighting Austrofascism in the 1930s and Nazism in the 1940s, still married, baptized their children and conducted their funerals under the Catholic Church's auspices. In their essay, Gidon Cohen and Andrew Flinn conclude that there really is no such thing as a "typical" British Communist but that Party members were better characterized by "(d)iversity and difference" (49). The British Communists were united in their unswerving loyalty to the Soviet Union and the Comintern embedded within a broader international working-class solidarity. Nevertheless, shades of opinion were exhibited preventing the easy labeling of each Party member.

Not only did rank-and-file Communists differ but so did Party leaders. James Barrett cogently argues that the four-decade long CPUSA leader (and Soviet stalwart) William Z. Foster's nervous breakdown and depression in the early 1930s was the outcome of a dedicated revolutionary, incapable of separating his personal from his political life. While Foster never challenged Soviet wisdom, conversely, German Communist leader, Clara Zetkin, did towards the end of her life. Tania Unludag-Puschnerat demonstrates that Zetkin became critical of the Third Period Communism line of 'Class Against Class' while calling for greater intra-party democracy at a Comintern Executive Committee meeting in 1928. Nonetheless, Unludag-Puschnerat points out that Zetkin ultimately aided in constructing this undemocratic structure because of her authoritarian German environment.

But one Italian CP (PCI) leader in a moment of premature Eurocommunism challenged the Soviet line in the immediate post-Second World War period although he had to backtrack in order to remain in the Party.¹⁴ Aldo Agosti recounts how Umberto Terracini, a founding PCI member in 1921, criticized the Communist Information Bureau line that blame for the Cold War rested entirely with the United States in an interview with the International News Service, a US news agency. In response, the PCI Central Committee harshly condemned Terracini but invoked no disciplinary action against him. This event failed to silence Terracini who remained the Party's unyielding conscience. For exam-

ple, in 1956, after Khrushchev's secret speech, his examining of Stalinism was more thoroughgoing than any other PCI leader. During the 1970s, Terracini continuously condemned a nascent Soviet anti-Semitism. Finally, after 1973, the unapologetic Marxist became skeptical of Enrico Berlinguer's 'historic compromise' with the bourgeois Christian Democracy.

Two essays discuss how autobiographies of Party cadres were used by French and Finnish CP leaders for everyday organizational decisions involving the control, promotion, discipline and expulsion of Party activists. In France, Claude Pennetier and Bernard Pudal argue that the roots of these "institutional communist autobiographies" emanated within the Soviet system (21). With the abolition of economic capital as a standard for societal stratification and because educational capital also was marginalized, political capital became the organizing principle for evaluating a cadre's ultimate worthiness; the ideal being an industrial proletarian from working-class origins, who became active in trade unions and the revolutionary workers' movement. Those cadres whose biographies fit the above standard received approbation; others whose biographies did not may have had their Party careers limited.

In Finland, Pirjo Kaihovaara argues that writing Communist autobiographies from 1944-1955 aided the Finnish CP (SKP) leaders in distinguishing between cadres' "desirable" and "undesirable" traits, enabling them to identify "the nature of a good communist" (246). Besides being a major component in the SKP's molding of a collective and ideologically homogenous identity among the cadres, the practice also aided in assigning activists to appropriate SKP jobs.

The least scholarly treatment is Bob Avakian's memoir of growing up in an Armenian family in Fresno and Berkeley, California during the 1950s before becoming radicalized at the University of California—Berkeley in the 1960s. For readers unfamiliar with Avakian, he has been (and still is) the Chairman of the Maoist Revolutionary Communist Party USA (RCP) since its formation in 1975.¹⁵ As such, the book provides a riveting account of a major leader connected to the New Communist Movement during the 1970s and the 1980s.¹⁶

The early years of Avakian's life were consumed with sports, primarily football and basketball, the latter activity continued to interest him passionately well into adulthood. In fact, had Avakian not become radicalized, he speculates that he probably would have become a basketball coach. There is nothing in Avakian's childhood that indicates his becoming a professional revolutionary; unlike others of Avakian's generation who became left-wing activists, he was not born a "red diaper" baby but to liberal parents who primarily voted for Democratic Party candidates.¹⁷ As a boy, Avakian became aware of societal segregation. Although Berkeley High, which he attended, was integrated, he notes that segregation existed *de facto* within the school's academic tracking system. Nevertheless, Avakian had many African-American friends during high school, raising concerns among his white pals.

Avakian's political trajectory emerged during college. In 1964, he participated in the Free Speech Movement, sitting in around the police car and even mounting the vehicle to speak before the assembled crowd, occupying Sproul Hall during the big sit-in, leading to his arrest.¹⁸ Also contributing to Avakian's growing radicalization was Malcolm X's assassination, the vicious attack on the civil rights marchers in Selma, Alabama and the Vietnam War's escalation, resulting in his becoming a full-time activist on the Vietnam Day Committee in 1965. Through his girlfriend Liz, who became his first wife in 1965, Avakian came in contact with the CPUSA, which he rejected as being too conservative.

Dropping out of Berkeley in 1966, Avakian found work at *Ramparts* as a researcher and writer. Through this connection, he met Eldridge Cleaver and eventually got to know Bobby Seale and Huey Newton intimately with the Black Panther Party's¹⁹ formation. Their influence pushed Avakian further to the left although he did not consider himself to be a communist. In 1967, Avakian met Progressive Labor Party activists but became disillusioned with the organization when he asked one member about China's Cultural Revolution who responded, "Don't ask me! I'm not a defender of the Cultural Revolution!" (153).²⁰

Towards the end of 1967, Avakian moved with other like-minded individuals to Richmond (California) taking a job in a small steel mill to help radicalize the city's indigent white working-class. He became active in the Peace and Freedom Party before forming, in late 1968, a Bay Area based-organization, the Revolutionary Union (RU), centered on revolutionary collectives. This group advocated for the creation of a unified, multiracial/multiethnic communist vanguard party in the United States.

Avakian states that, theoretically, the RU "upheld Stalin with historical perspective" (244). Its criticism of Stalin had nothing to do with the Soviet leader committing barbarous crimes but rather with his economism making "the model of a communist (as) a good militant trade union leader, who talks about socialism" (244). In fact after Stalin's death in 1953, the RU considered the Soviet Union to have become "social-imperialist," defined as being "socialist in name but capitalist and imperialist in deed and in essence" (224).²² After faction fights within the group and other sympathetic organizations over nationalism, the RU became the foundation of the RCP in 1975. However, shortly thereafter, in September 1976 Mao's death led to the sharpening of a bitter power struggle in China culminating in the "Gang of Four's" arrests.²³ This action, characterized by Avakian as a revisionist coup ultimately leading to capitalism's restoration in China, resulted in the Jarvis-Bergman group departing the RCP.

When Deng Xiaoping visited the United States in January 1979, the RCP organized a demonstration in Washington D.C. to protest China's revisionist coup. According to Avakian, as the march approached Lafayette Park, the police viciously attacked the demonstrators, arresting 80 people including Avakian. In 1981, confronted with possibly serving 200 years in jail if convicted combined with

increased governmental repression of the RCP, Avakian fled to France seeking political refugee status. For the last 25 years, Avakian has directed the RCP from abroad while churning out a prodigious amount of articles, pamphlets and books.

As these three biographical works demonstrate, the lives of communist leaders and rank-and-file Party members were necessarily complex and cannot be easily pigeonholed as some bourgeois critics would have us believe. Even within the official national CPs, not to mention the dissident communist movements, the diversity among the membership and leadership is striking. While Moscow undoubtedly called the shots and the CPs acquiesced, not every Communist automatically became a Stalinist automaton cut from the same bolt carrying out directives devoid of any human agency, thought, and feeling. It might seem ironic that communism, an ideology emphasizing community, obtains much historical information through examining life stories. Nevertheless, communist biography has revealed the multiplicity of individual experience and the process that leads to the forging of a collective communist identity, which often gets lost among institutional Party histories. Hopefully, future prosopographical research will continue to flesh out these nuances and subtleties, many of which have yet to be discovered.

Notes

1. Two classics concerning the history of US Communism's first tumultuous decade are Theodore Draper, *The Roots of American Communism* (New York: Viking Press, 1957) and Theodore Draper, *American Communism and Soviet Russia* (New York: Viking Press, 1960). A social-democratic treatment of this era is Irving Howe and Lewis A. Coser, *The American Communist Party: A Critical History, 1919-1957* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1957). Finally, a work emphasizing the Soviets' decisive influence in the US Communist Party's first decade is Harvey Klehr and John Earl Haynes, *The American Communist Movement: Storming Heaven Itself* (New York: Twayne, 1992).
2. A slim volume is Jack Alan Robbins, *The Birth of American Trotskyism, 1927-1929: The Origins of a Radical Marxist Movement* (Mount Vernon, N.Y., 1973). A more comprehensive, although many scholars believe an untrustworthy and error-filled, treatment is Constance Ashton Myers, *The Prophet's Army: Trotskyists in America, 1928-1941* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1977). One account providing important facts on US Trotskyism although largely devoid of analysis is Robert J. Alexander, *International Trotskyism, 1929-1985* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1991), 761-953.
3. See Robert J. Alexander, *The Right Opposition: The Lovestoneites and the International Communist Opposition of the 1930's* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1981).
4. Three books covering all or part of Third Period Communism and the Popular Front era include Fraser M. Ottanelli, *The Communist Party of the United States: From the Depression to World War II* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1991); Harvey Klehr, *The Heyday of American Communism: The Depression Decade* (New York: Basic Books, 1984) and Maurice Isserman, *Which Side Were You On? The American Communist Party During the Second World War* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1982). For information on the effects of the Cold War, McCarthyism, and Khrushchev's secret speech on the CPUSA, see

David A. Shannon, *The Decline of American Communism: A History of the Communist Party of the United States Since 1945* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1959) and Joseph R. Starobin, *American Communism in Crisis, 1943-1957* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972).

5. For CPUSA activities in the 1970s, see Jim O'Brien, "American Leninism in the 1970s," *Radical America* 11&12 (1977-78), 27-62. In addition, see Jon Wiener, "The Communist Party Today and Yesterday: An Interview with Dorothy Healey," *Radical America* 11 (1977), 25-45; Dorothy Healey and Maurice Isserman, *California Red: A Life in the American Communist Party* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 172-244; and Peggy Dennis, *The Autobiography of an American Communist* (Westport, CT: Lawrence Hill, 1977), 236-288.

Finally, for the CPUSA in the 1980s, see Harvey Klehr, *Far Left of Center: The American Radical Left Today* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction, 1988), 9-53. See note 16 for the NCM.

6. For articles on this split, see Max Elbaum, "Upheaval in the CPUSA: Death and Rebirth?" *Crossroads*, 17 (1992), 2; John Earl Haynes and Harvey Klehr, "The Communist Party of the USA and the Committees of Correspondence," *Problems of Post-Communism* 43 (1996), 54-61 and Irwin Marquit, "Ideological Basis of the Organizational Crisis of Marxism-Leninism in the United States," *Rethinking Marxism*, 7 (1994), 116-131.

7. Comprehensive scholarly biographies on Foster include Edward P. Johanningsmeier, *Forging American Communism: The Life of William Z. Foster* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994) and James R. Barrett, *William Z. Foster and the Tragedy of American Radicalism* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999). A hagiographic account by Foster's former aide is Arthur Zipser, *Workingclass Giant: The Life of William Z. Foster* (New York: International Publishers, 1981). For Lovestone, see Ted Morgan, *A Covert Life: Jay Lovestone, Communist, Anti-Communist, and Spymaster* (New York: Random House, 1999). On Browder, see Philip J. Jaffe, *The Rise and Fall of American Communism* (New York: Horizon Press, 1975) and James G. Ryan, *Earl Browder: The Failure of American Communism* (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1997).

8. See Peter Drucker, *Max Shachtman and His Left: A Socialist's Odyssey Through the "American Century"* (Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press 1994).

9. For allegedly recent developments concerning the Sacco and Vanzetti case, see Jean Pasco, "Sinclair Letter Turns Out to Be Another Exposé: Note found by an O.C. man says The Jungle author got the lowdown on Sacco and Vanzetti," *Los Angeles Times*, 24 December 2005. However, this article's information already appeared in Leon Harris, *Upton Sinclair: American Rebel* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1975), 245-246. For further refutations of this article's claims, see Anthony Arthur, *Radical Innocent: Upton Sinclair* (New York: Random House, 2006), 219.

10. Traditionalist scholars argue that the CPUSA scrupulously followed Moscow's orders and controlled members autocratically while simultaneously participating in spying and espionage activities for advancing the Soviet Union's interests. As previously mentioned, Draper's two classics represent the traditionalist perspective. Other traditionalist works written prior to Soviet Archives access include Max M. Kampelman, *The Communist Party vs. the CIO: A Study in Power Politics* (New York: F.A. Praeger, 1957); Joseph R. Starobin, *American Communism in Crisis, 1943-1957* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972) and Harvey Klehr, *The Heyday of American Communism*. Important traditionalist books based on Soviet Archives material are Harvey Klehr, John E. Haynes, and F. I. Firsov, *The Secret World of American Communism* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995); *Red Scare or Red Menace? American Communism and Anticommunism in the Cold War Era* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee,

1996); Harvey Klehr, John E. Haynes and K.M. Anderson, *The Soviet World of American Communism* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998) and John Earl Haynes and Harvey Klehr, *Venona: Decoding Soviet Espionage in America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999).

11. Revisionist school scholars contend that the CPUSA transformed itself, at the local levels, during the Popular Front to an organization of genuine American radicalism in constructing the Congress of Industrial Organization unions and other self-help groups. Representative books from this perspective include Maurice Isserman, *Which Side Were You On?*; Harvey A. Levenstein, *Communism, Anticommunism, and the CIO* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1981); Fraser M. Ottanelli, *The Communist Party of the United States*; Mark Naison, *Communists in Harlem During the Depression* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1983); Paul Lyons, *Philadelphia Communists, 1936-1956* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982); and Robin D.G. Kelley, *Hammer and Hoe: Alabama Communists During the Great Depression* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990).

12. A major recent work in prosopography is John McIlroy, Kevin Morgan, and Alan Campbell, eds., *Party People, Communist Lives: Explorations in Biography* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 2001).

13. Perhaps the best known book from this perspective in the 1950s and 1960s is Gabriel Abraham Almond, *The Appeals of Communism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1954). Other relevant studies include Morris Leopold Ernst and David Loth, *Report on the American Communist* (New York: Holt, 1952); Herbert E. Krugman, "Appeal of Communism to American Middle Class Intellectuals and Trade Unionists," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 16 (1952), 331-355 and Frank S. Meyer, *The Moulding of Communists: The Training of the Communist Cadre* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1961).

14. Eurocommunism, a theory of socialist transition that rejects traditional Communist beliefs, had been embraced by the French, Spanish and Italian CPs by 1977. A classic work is Santiago Carillo, *Eurocommunism and the State* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1977). Further discussions are found in Carl Marzani, *The Promise of Eurocommunism* (Westport, CT: Lawrence Hill, 1980) and George Ross, *Workers and Communists in France: From Popular Front to Eurocommunism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982). For Trotskyist criticisms of Eurocommunism, see Ernest Mandel, *From Stalinism to Eurocommunism: The Bitter Fruits of 'Socialism in One Country'* (London: New Left Books, 1978).

15. For detailed information on the RCP during the 1970s and 1980s, see A. Belden Fields, *Trotskyism and Maoism: Theory and Practice in France and the United States* (New York: Praeger, 1988), 200-229, 275-284.

16. The New Communist Movement (NCM) was a Marxist-Leninist tendency (primarily Maoist) emerging within the US New Left during the 1970s and 1980s, inspired by the Russian, Chinese and Cuban Revolutions. Jim O'Brien surveys NCM organizations in "American Leninism in the 1970s," 27-62. A comprehensive, insider's account to the NCM is Max Elbaum, *Revolution in the Air: Sixties Radicals Turn to Lenin, Mao and Che* (London: Verso, 2002).

17. "Red diaper babies" were children born to CPUSA members or to those who were to become affiliated with the Party. For essays written by red diaper babies born from 1909 to 1974, see Judy Kaplan and Linn Shapiro (eds.), *Red Diapers: Growing Up in the Communist Left* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1998). The role of red diaper babies in the US New Left is discussed in Dick Flacks, "Making History Vs. Making Life: Dilemmas of an

American Left,” *Sociological Inquiry* 46 (1976), 263-280 and Winifred Breines, “Whose New Left?” *Journal of American History* 75, (1988): 528-545.

18. For essays on the “Free Speech Movement” (FSM), see Robert Cohen and Reginald E. Zelnik, eds., *The Free Speech Movement: Reflections on Berkeley in the 1960s* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002). One FSM leader’s account is Bettina F. Aptheker, *Intimate Politics: How I Grew Up Red, Fought For Free Speech, and Became a Feminist Rebel* (Emeryville, CA: Seal Press, 2006), 126-153.

19. The Black Panther Party (BPP) formed in October 1966, was an African-American group dedicated to advancing civil rights, social justice and self-defense. For three recent volumes of essays on the BPP, some written by former members, see Jama Lazerow and Yohuru Williams, eds., *In Search of the Black Panther Party: New Perspectives on a Revolutionary Movement* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006); Charles E. Jones, ed., *The Black Panther Party (Reconsidered)* (Baltimore, MD: Black Classic Press, 2005) and Kathleen Cleaver and George Katsiaficas, eds., *Liberation, Imagination, and the Black Panther Party: A New Look at the Panthers and Their Legacy* (New York: Routledge, 2001).

20. Basic information on the PLP can be found in Fields, *Trotskyism and Maoism*, 185-199 and Jackson, *Maoism in the Developed World*, 11-23. A comprehensive treatment of the PLP is David Leigh Benin, *The New Labor Radicalism and New York City’s Garment Industry: Progressive Labor Insurgents in the 1960s* (New York: Garland Press, 2000).

22. Two books attacking the “state capitalist”/ “social-imperialist” argument are Albert Szymanski, *Is the Red Flag Flying?: The Political Economy of the Soviet Union* (London: Zed Press, 1979) and Michael Goldfield and Melvin Rothenberg, *The Myth of Capitalism Reborn: A Marxist Critique of Theories of Capitalist Restoration in the U.S.S.R* (San Francisco: Line of March Publications, 1980). For the traditional Maoist economic analysis of the Soviet Union, see Martin Nicolaus, *Restoration of Capitalism in the USSR* (Chicago: Liberator Press, 1975).

23. The Gang of Four, consisting of Mao’s widow and her three close allies, were Communist Party of China leaders who were held responsible for the Cultural Revolution’s excesses. For two books on the Gang of Four, see Roderick MacFarquhar and Michael Schoenhals, *Mao’s Last Revolution* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006), and David Bonavia, *Verdict in Peking: The Trial of the Gang of Four* (New York: Putnam, 1983).