

# World Politics and Ethiopia

By WILLIAM L. PATTERSON

THE *Crisis*, official organ of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the leading American Negro reformist organization, carries in its May issue an article by George Padmore, entitled "Ethiopia and World Politics". Mr. Padmore was at one time a member of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. He was expelled from that Party and is now a renegade from Communism. His article purports to treat this question, which is so vitally important for the world in general and the Negro world in particular, honestly and squarely. It is recommended to us as a scientific, serious, and objective treatment of this very timely subject.

However, we find that the article is characterized by the omission of well-known facts concerning the Italo-Abyssinian situation. For example, we find missing the concrete demonstrations against this criminal adventure of Mussolini by anti-imperialist world forces, which include mutinies of large bodies of Italian troops. There is a complete and conspicuous failure to mention the role of American imperialism in this affair. One of the most significant features is the unscrupulous distortion of equally well-established, almost universally admitted facts, regarding the present alignment of class forces in Europe, their relation to the Abyssinian situation in particular and to the Negro liberation movement in general. This is augmented by such gross misrepresentations of historical facts that they can only be regarded as conscious and purposeful.

It is not alone for these reasons that issue must be taken with Mr. Padmore. His "analysis" of the Abyssinian situation must be subjected to a thorough examination because of the influential position of the periodical which airs his views and gives them an editorial endorsement and because of the timeliness of the subject. In view of the "indivisibility of peace" the attempt to raid Abyssinia is pregnant with the germs of a new world war in which the culturally, economically and politically backward, dependent Negro peoples can only be the pawns of the great imperialist powers. What must be done to prevent that war? How are the Negro people to be organized to fight for freedom? With whom are they to be allied? The article must be subjected to a thorough examination

because of the tremendous vitality the national independence struggle of Abyssinia has for the world revolutionary movement in general and the Negro emancipation movement in particular.

The analytical attitude is especially necessary in view of the fact that Mr. Padmore presents the developing conflict as a struggle of white against black, in an obviously conscious manner attempting to divorce it of all class content. He groups the world into white and colored races and nations, unalterably and inherently opposed to each other. Into the anti-colored grouping Mr. Padmore seeks to draw the picture of the Soviet Union as a dominant factor.

Since Mr. Padmore has at least an elementary knowledge of political and economic questions, such an infantile analysis on his part cannot be considered accidental. It is interesting to note also that only as a renegade from Communism and as a purveyor of anti-Soviet, anti-working class propaganda in his treatment of "world politics", does Mr. Padmore find entry into the columns of *The Crisis*.

The subject of Mr. Padmore's article has tremendous significance, especially for the Abyssinian people. The question of allies is of great importance for them. At least we would have expected from him, in dealing with Negroes and world politics, a clean-cut answer to the question: Who are the friends of the Negro people? To place the question on the basis of white against black is to deny the existence of friends and reliable allies outside their own ranks and therefore to leave Abyssinia in a seemingly isolated and hopeless position. In fact, Mr. Padmore says Abyssinia is single-handed in its struggle against Italian imperialism.

The Negro people alone, scattered and largely unorganized, are undeniably in no wise a serious force against world imperialism. A weak, dependent people fighting for independence against great odds *must* find allies. Mr. Padmore does not want to evade this question. He seeks to "cure" it by drawing a picture of Japanese imperialism as a friend of Abyssinia. But such a solution can only create serious doubts as to Mr. Padmore's honesty or the extent of his knowledge of world politics. The universally known record of Japanese imperialism denies the correctness of such a conclusion.

To place this question as one of white against black is to create doubts of the honesty of purpose of the white anti-imperialist forces at a very critical moment, thus creating confusion even in the ranks of those who are anti-imperialist among the Negro people, is to hide from the masses the bourgeois Negro elements which are rendering direct support to world imperialism, is to disrupt and retard the development of the anti-imperialist united front around this issue. Thus, Mr. Padmore's position objectively aids Mussolini, the im-

perialist world and gives objective support to the forces preparing a new imperialist war.

The question of allies is of decisive importance for the entire Negro liberation movement. The attention of the Negro people must be turned towards the concrete solidarity demonstrations and actions of all anti-imperialist forces that are fighting against a common enemy of mankind. The Negro masses have much to learn from these activities, particularly from those led by the Communist and Socialist Parties in Italy. With their slogan of not a man, not a penny for the African adventures of fascism, the Negro people must become an inseparable part of this movement, strengthening, deepening, broadening and initiating new and higher forms of struggle for it.

Could Mr. Padmore overlook these phenomena by accident? Will not such an oversight obscure, rather than clarify, for the Abyssinian people, the danger threatening their country from world imperialism in general and Italian fascism in particular? Does "world politics" not include the class struggle as a dynamic factor? Can Mr. Padmore's presentation by any clear concept of world politics be called "a clear picture in simple straightforward language of the plight of Abyssinia?"

Before dealing more concretely with these and other questions raised by Mr. Padmore's article, some comment could be made of the "slight" inaccuracies in *The Crisis* Editorial Board's introduction and endorsement of it.

This introduction speaks of Mr. Padmore's former position on *The Black Worker*. There is no such publication. Although this is a mistake of no great importance, I call attention to it merely for the purpose of informing those who may want to read *The Negro Worker*, which continues to be published and may be secured by writing to 2162 Seventh Avenue, New York City. *The Negro Worker* has never been a publication of Soviet Russia nor of the Soviet Union, of which the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic (Soviet Russia) is a part. Nor has Mr. Padmore ever worked for either the Soviet Union or the R.S.F.S.R., or, for that matter, for the Communist International.

Therefore, the statement that "he was ousted by Soviet Russia as editor of the *Black Worker*, although a very insidious attempt to trump up a case of "Soviet interference in the internal affairs of other countries", is manifestly false.

And will *The Crisis* editors please tell us concretely when and where Mr. Padmore ever honestly "protested against the failure of Communists to rally to the aid of the African workers"? Turn where you will, gentlemen, and you will find Communists, black

and white, as leaders of the Negro liberation movement. It is only they who have scientifically approached this question. It is only they who have given to it theoretical clarity and on the basis of this clarity worked out a concrete program of action for the Negro people.

Mr. Padmore holds that the Italo-Abyssinian conflict is "but a reflection of world politics, and of new groups and alliances taking place among the European powers for a new world war". This is, of course, an extremely superficial approach to the question. It entirely ignores the basic economic causes which are driving the imperialist powers to seek a re-division of the world. But even this attempt at definition completely contradicts Mr. Padmore's later thesis that "the pact of Rome [the agreement of January 7 whereby France and England seemingly gave Italy a free hand in Abyssinia—W.L.P.] is the most glaring example of united front of white Europe against black Africa".

Let us note in passing the change in attitude, particularly of England, towards this agreement of blood and iron. She undoubtedly underestimated the repercussions of this adventure, especially in the anti-imperialist and in the Negro world. Unrest is ripe in Africa. In recent days we have had a series of articles in the French press commenting thus: "French prestige has been damaged in the eyes of *our* Moslem population. [Emphasis mine—W.L.P.]

"If we want to stay in Africa we must be prepared to use our superiority" (*Bulletin Quotidien*).

"In Algiers competent and responsible men point out that a certain insurrectionist mentality is developing" (*Daladier Oeuvre*).

"Very serious political and economic uneasiness exists. . . . Do we want to keep North Africa?" (*Republique*).

Mr. Padmore assures us that the imperialist press of France is "not as a rule hostile toward the Negroes". Towards what Negroes is it not consistently hostile? When has there ever been a lack of hostility on the part of the oppressor towards the oppressed? Mr. Padmore, the gentleman of leisure in Paris, has conveniently forgotten the atrocities in the French Congo and in the other French black colonies. That press which does not demand complete freedom and full equality for the Negro people anywhere and at all times is hostile, Mr. Padmore.

To understand why Italian fascism moves towards war at this particular moment, "it is necessary", says Mr. Padmore, "to get a complete picture of the present-day European political situation", which even Mr. Padmore, as decidedly political bankrupt as he shows himself to be, recognizes in other sections of his article as

extending far beyond any struggle of white races against colored races, of any united front of white Europe against black Africa.

Mr. Padmore then proceeds to give us this "complete picture", beginning "*briefly* [emphasis mine—W.L.P.], present-day Europe can be described as fascist, for England, France and the small Scandinavian countries are the only nations in Europe still adhering to democratic institutions".

"The principal features of fascism are aggressive nationalism, and the desire for territorial expansion," Mr. Padmore continues. "Italy's territorial designs are in two directions, Central Europe and Africa"; and the conclusion he draws therefrom is that "It is clear that all the big powers on the League of Nations Council—Great Britain, France and Soviet Russia—would rather prefer Mussolini to make war in Africa than disturb the *status quo* in Europe." Even for Mr. Padmore this "complete picture" is extremely incomplete. From this "complete picture" of the present-day European situation Mr. Padmore moves to "examine the relationship of forces in Europe at the moment".

Here Padmore, the renegade, gets himself badly mixed up, gives himself away entirely, exposing the rapid progress he has made as a lackey of the imperialist bourgeoisie, and incidentally, the real purpose of his article. For, alongside of the above-stated slander against the Soviet Union, he says, "While the imperialists look upon the world as divided into two camps—Versailles and anti-Versailles, the Soviet leaders look upon the world as divided into *two different kinds* of camps" [my emphasis—W.L.P.]—the imperialist camp, and the anti-imperialist, represented by the Soviet Union".

Mr. Padmore, of course, leaves no doubt as to where he stands. He cynically takes his stand with all who are ranged for attack upon the Soviet Union.

"The present Soviet leaders," he goes on, "have changed their foreign policy, as they no longer have any faith in the ability of the workers of Europe and America to defend Russia if attacked. . . . The Kremlin has made an alliance with France . . . and since they are also afraid of losing what they have, they all find it possible to collaborate in defending *the status quo*, or to use diplomatic language, 'peace'; for the *status quo* can only be changed by war. *Russia can therefore be considered a member of the Versailles camp.*" (Emphasis mine—W.L.P.)

To clinch the question, Mr. Padmore assures us that "the early leaders [of the Soviet Union] Lenin and Trotsky, refused to enter into any alliances or diplomatic entanglement with capitalist states". We can only conclude from this that the present line of the Soviet

leaders is a complete departure from Leninism. Indeed, world imperialism owes much to the Padmores for this inside information.

Any scientific examination of "the relation of forces in Europe at the present time" must be based upon a clear understanding of the historical moment. A tremendous change has taken place in the relation of forces between the Socialist and imperialist worlds, due to the growing economic strength of the Soviet Union and its consequent tremendously increasing political strength.

The days of apparent peace and security of capitalism have ended. We have entered a period of gigantic class struggles, of new wars and revolutions; the forces of revolution face the forces of counter-revolution. The world of the Soviets with its supporters—all the class-conscious workers and toilers—is arrayed against the world of anti-Soviets, the imperialist world. This latter group includes both the pro and anti-Versailles camps. As for the relation of the Soviet Union to the Versailles Treaty, Comrade Litvinov openly stated at the Extraordinary Session of the Council of the League of Nations that the U.S.S.R. "not only is not responsible for the Versailles Treaty, but has never concealed *its negative attitude to this treaty*". (*International Press Correspondence*, April 27, 1935) [Emphasis mine—W.L.P.].

For degeneracy, Mr. Padmore could not have sunk deeper. Neither the stupid or astute agents of imperialism, nor the imperialist blood hounds of Hitler himself, nor the "liberal" Mr. Roosevelt, nor the conservative Mr. Baldwin, would permit themselves to bring forward such a preposterous line of argument.

One may hate and vilify the Soviet Union but one cannot place it in the same camp where fascism rules or where fascist tendencies and ruthless capitalist dictatorship leave industrial ruination, political bankruptcy, cultural backwardness and feverish war preparation on every side. The Soviet Union has, with unparalleled heroism, beaten back the combined forces of both the imperialist Versailles victors and vanquished; it has established a fatherland for the world's oppressed; it has granted the right of self-determination to scores of former oppressed national minorities and dependent nations, now a part of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics on a basis of complete equality; it has forcibly suppressed the former exploiters of the land as a class, and is gloriously building Socialism under the dictatorship of the proletariat; it is going forward from one victory to another on the industrial field, in the political world, and on the cultural front.

One cannot place the Land of the Soviets in the camp with those who have only unemployment and starvation, martial law and pogroms, for their workers and toiling masses, the camp which has

only ignorance, poverty and slavery for millions of colonial, semi-colonial peoples and those of dependent nations. One cannot place the Soviet Union in the camp of the warmakers. The history of the Chinese Eastern Railway, the disarmament proposals of the Soviet Union at Geneva, the definition of the aggressor formulated by the Soviet Union, the present Franco-Soviet pact of mutual assistance, the proposed Eastern Pact, the Soviet-Czech agreement, and other proposals of regional pacts, are proof of the peaceful aims and purposes of the Soviet Union.

No more can one take any of the imperialist powers out of the war camp. Not since "the war to end wars", has the world seen a day of peace. Mr. Padmore will have difficulty in convincing world imperialism that the Soviet Union sits in the Versailles camp. Nor are the pacts mentioned above, either those proffered or those accepted, attempts at the diplomatic isolation of the Third Reich, as Mr. Padmore would have us believe. Time after time, the Third Reich has been invited to participate in organizing peace.

Present day Europe can be described as fascist, says Mr. Padmore, exempting England, France, and the Scandinavian countries which, he informs us, are ". . . the only nations in Europe adhering to democratic institutions". Our learned commentator should have studied his geography a little better. The Soviet Union, Mr. Padmore, is the largest country in Europe. Surely neither Mr. Padmore nor the editors of *The Crisis* would dare to declare it to be a fascist country. Neither in form nor in content does the Soviet politico-economic structure fit even Mr. Padmore's definition of fascism. No other country in the world has relatively or absolutely so large an electorate. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the democracy of the entire toiling population. It is no less true that the democracy of the bourgeoisie is the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie—whether it takes the form of a republic, a monarchy, or any of the fascist forms of dictatorship. The Soviet government is infinitely more democratic than any other in the world. Only one who deliberately serves the ruling class or who is politically blind, can fail to see this. Certainly, no serious student of world politics could miss this fact. The national minorities and dependent peoples of the tsarist empire, whose position was comparable to that of the Negro people today, now have the ballot and their own government due to the Soviet policy on the national question which granted them the right of self-determination.

Lenin, from whom Mr. Padmore at another moment seeks to support his slanders on the present leaders, says:

"Is there a single country in the world, even among the most democratic bourgeois countries, in which the average rank-and-file

worker, the average rank-and-file *village laborer*, or village semi-proletarian generally (*i.e.*, the representatives of the oppressed masses, the overwhelming majority of the population), enjoys anything approaching such *liberty* to hold meetings in the best buildings, such *liberty* to use the best printing works and largest stocks of paper, to express his ideas and to protect his interests, such liberty to promote men and women of his own class, to administer and to 'run' the State as in Soviet Russia?" (*The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kausky*, p. 31.)

Since this was written (November, 1918), the democracy of the dictatorship of the proletariat has been considerably broadened. The recent reforms of the Soviet Constitution eloquently attest to this.

We must now deal the learned Mr. Padmore some body blows. We cannot finish this fine fellow for all time, but we can expose his hypocrisy, his degeneracy, and his renegacy from the Negro liberation struggles. Let us invoke Lenin's aid to correct him, since, ranting against the Franco-Soviet Past, he assures us that Lenin "refused to enter into any alliance or diplomatic entanglements with capitalist states".

In 1918 the same Lenin, the greatest of internationalists, gave a report to the American workers on the course of the Russian Revolution. He spoke of the tasks of the oppressed white and Negro masses of the United States, now wage slaves of a handful of billionaires, in developing international working class solidarity and in defending the Soviet Union which had become the fatherland of the oppressed workers the world over. Touching on the Brest-Litovsk Treaty and the role of the British, French, and American bourgeois press, which was heaping calumnies upon Russia, for seeking "a just peace, a peace without annexations and indemnities, a peace fully guaranteeing rights to all nations", just as the most reactionary, most imperialistic minded press is doing today while the Soviet Union seeks to "organize peace", Lenin said:

"The beasts of prey of Anglo-French and American imperialism 'accuse' us of coming to an 'agreement' with German imperialism.

"O hypocrites! O scoundrels, who slander the workers' government and shiver from fear of that sympathy which is being shown us by the workers of 'their own' countries! But their hypocrisy will be exposed. They pretend (Mr. Padmore and gentlemen of the N. A. A. C. P. leadership take notice—W. L. P.) not to understand the difference between an agreement made by 'Socialists' with the bourgeoisie (native or foreign) *against the workers*, against the toilers, and an agreement for the safety of the workers who have defeated their bourgeoisie, with a bourgeoisie of one national color *against* the bourgeoisie of another color, for the sake of the utilization by the proletariat of the contradictions between the different groups of the bourgeoisie. . . .

"When the German imperialist robbers in February, 1918,



threw armies against defenseless, demobilized Russia, which staked its hopes upon the international solidarity of the proletariat before the international revolution had completely ripened, *I did not hesitate for a moment to come to a certain 'agreement' with the French monarchists* (Emphasis—W.L.P.). . . . To throw back the rapacious advancing Germans *we* made use of the equally rapacious counter-interests of the other imperialists, thereby serving the interests of the Russian and the International Socialist revolution."

"This," said Lenin: "weakens the bourgeoisie of the whole world". He added:

*"I would not hesitate a single second to come to the same kind of an 'agreement' with the German imperialist robbers, should an attack upon Russia by Anglo-French troops demand it." (A Letter to the American Workers.)*

Your rotten lie, Mr. Padmore, comes home to condemn you. Lenin was not against "agreements" with capitalist states when such agreements profit the toiling masses. What a powerful lesson there is here for the Negro peoples on the question of maneuvering! How well had little Haiti earlier applied the same policies!

The Franco-Soviet Pact of Mutual Assistance weakens world imperialism. It quickens the tempo of world revolution and hastens the downfall of capitalism. It serves the interests of Socialism, and of the toiling masses of every capitalist country, of every colonial and semi-colonial land, and therefore the interests of the oppressed Negro people everywhere. It was precisely for the purpose of saving humanity from the devastation and horror of a new world war that the Soviets entered the League of Nations.

Could any cause be greater? And peace in such a sense does not mean "defending the *status quo*". Nor is it true ". . . that the *status quo* can only be changed by war". That is, by the kind of war you refer to. For you are using the term war in the sense of an imperialist war. Otherwise, you could not have said

*" . . . it is clear that all the big powers on the League of Nations Council—Great Britain, France, and Soviet Russia—would prefer Mussolini to make war in Africa than disturb the *status quo* in Europe."*

You have forgotten about so small a thing as revolution—civil war—Mr. Padmore. Yet, "friend" of the Negro people, you should have told the Negro masses as did the heroic black Haitian revolutionists when they were making history, by leading a people from slavery to the establishment of a government of their own: "If you would have liberty, it must be bought with gun in hand." You have forgotten so small a thing as wars for national independence; but a

real leader, Mr. Padmore, does not forget the most essential factors in the salvation of his people.

The Soviet Union stands unqualifiedly against imperialist war. Certainly, none has more to lose through imperialist war than the Negro people. The Soviet Union stands unqualifiedly against the *status quo*. Certainly, for no one is the *status quo* so damnably enslaving as for the Negro people. Certainly, none has more to gain than the Negro people in the changing of the *status quo*, as the Soviet Union would change it.

The Soviet Union would "prefer Mussolini to make war in Africa than disturb the *status quo* in Europe", says Padmore. I say the Soviet Union would prefer that Mussolini does not make war. The Soviet Union's peace policy is based upon that profound truth expressed by its brilliant representative at Geneva, the People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs, Comrade Litvinov. "*Peace is indivisible.*"

War in Africa is pregnant with the germs of a new world war. Mussolini will not be "upholding the prestige of the white race in Africa", nor is the Pact of Rome "the most glaring example of united front of white Europe against black Africa." (France and Great Britain hoped to ease the European situation at the expense of Africa; they were willing that Hitler should have the Saar region for the self same reason.)

To place the question on the basis of white against black, is to divest it of its class contents and to hide completely its economic roots. To place the question so as to deceive and betray the Negro people. How profound an analysis Mr. Padmore has made of "Abyssinian and world politics"! How cleverly he has refrained from offering either clarity or concrete proposals to the distressed Abyssinian people and those who seek to aid them. By offering concrete proposals he could only expose himself further.

The African adventure of Mussolini is a desperate attempt on the part of the most reactionary, the most chauvinist and the most imperialist elements of the ruling class of Italy to divert the attention of the Italian masses at "home" from their misery. Imperialist Italy aims at a protectorate over Ethiopia and is preparing to achieve this object by a genuine war of conquest. It needs the cotton area now covetously sought by Japan. Italy recognizes that the Japanese robbers and murderers of colonial peoples have their hands more or less full in Manchuria today, due primarily to the activity of heroic partisan forces and the Chinese national-revolutionary, anti-imperialist movement; and while Japan is feverishly preparing to attack the Soviet Union, the Italian bourgeoisie are seeking to take advantage of this situation.

Mr. Padmore is infatuated with the fact that ". . . the Ethiop-

ians were Christians" when many of the European white nations ". . . were running wild in the forests of north countries". What a prize bit of nonsense! What do the bourgeoisie of any country, what does the profit system care about who are, or were, or will be, Christians? This fact will not rally allies to the defense of the independence of Ethiopia. The imperialist world must have new markets, new sources of raw materials, new fields of exploitation, if it would live, and it cannot get them without war. Imperialist Japan, Mr. Padmore's "friend of the colored people", is proving its friendship in a sea of blood of Koreans, Formosans, Chinese, and Manchurians—all colored people. Japanese-Ethiopian friendship is the friendship of the lion for the lamb. Ethiopia, culturally and economically in the Middle Ages, is politically impotent. Only the strength of the united front of world anti-imperialist forces can save it.

Mr. Padmore, who would show us his great understanding of world politics, has shown us only that he has the political understanding of a faithful tool of the bourgeoisie. Yes, there is "danger of war in Africa", Mr. Padmore, and it is the duty of every honest "black man and woman to render the maximum moral and material support to Abyssinia". But Abyssinia is not "single handed" in its struggle against Italian imperialism. That is a vicious slander of the heroic Italian soldiers who have mutinied against bloody Italian fascism. That is a calumny against the Leagues Against War and Fascism which are supporting and rallying world wide support of all anti-imperialist forces on a world scale behind the Abyssinian people. That is a basic denial of the solidarity of the Negro liberation movements everywhere with the national liberation cause of the Ethiopian people.

The road to the aid of Abyssinia is the road of struggle against imperialist oppression at "home".

To sum up, Mr. Padmore has distorted the question of "Abyssinia and world politics" in the most incredible manner. He has omitted the most salient features. He has lied against and maligned the greatest anti-imperialist forces in the world today. He has concealed or denied the friendship of these forces for the Ethiopian people. He has dismally failed even to suggest one concrete proposal that will give aid to the Negro people in general and the Abyssinian people in particular. He has proven himself and his endorsers, the leadership of the N.A.A.C.P., as the ideological leaders of the Negro bourgeoisie and national reformists, and the tools of world imperialism. He has shown that one who slides down from the path of militant revolutionary struggle for national independence,

for freedom and equality, onto the path of national reformism, slides down into a swamp leading to the path of counter-revolution. A leader of Negro reformism can only be, by force of circumstances, a lackey of world imperialism.

The Negro reformists, forced into action by mass indignation, are everywhere attempting to prevent the masses from giving concrete aid to the Abyssinian people. They are seeking to prevent the Negro masses from entering into struggles against the "home" bourgeoisie. Yet, this is the only road by which the Negro people can support Abyssinia's liberation cause. The Negro people must be an inseparable part of every strike struggle for wage increases. They must be an inseparable part of every hunger march. They must struggle side by side with the white masses, for relief and unemployment insurance at the expense of the bosses and the State. In America they must link up these struggles with the struggle for the right of self-determination, the struggle for the confiscation of the land of the white landlords and its division among the poor white and Negro landless people. They must struggle for the State unity of the Black Belt. In South Africa they must struggle with the landless poor whites for relief. They must engage in strike struggles and desperately fight for a united front of Negro and white—on the economic as well as on the political field. Here they must link up the struggles for immediate demands with the struggle for an "Independent South African Native Republic".

The Negro peoples the world over must fight to have the "independent" Negro States, Abyssinia, Liberia, and Haiti, recognize the Soviet Union. The imperialist powers which have made the colonies and semi-colonies or are attempting to create protectorates, have been forced to recognize the Soviet Union. The masses of these Negro countries have everything to learn from the struggles of the Russian masses. They must learn to recognize the role of betrayal of the Negro bourgeoisie, of the Negro national reformists, and the Padmores who are seeking to hold them enslaved to imperialism.

It is not accidental that the leadership of the N.A.A.C.P. now utilizes Padmore, the renegade. Its course from a real struggle against the policy of Booker T. Washington has been one of constant degeneracy, until today, its leadership stands in the front ranks of betrayers. The road to the salvation of Abyssinia and the liberation of the Negro people is the road to struggle against world imperialism.