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PEACE TO THE PEOPLE

MANIFESTO OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL ON THE
TWENTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE OCTOBER
REVOLUTION, NOVEMBER 7, 1939.

Proletarians and working people throughout the world!

On November 7 the working people of all lands greet the twenty-second anniversary of the great October Socialist Revolution. On November 7 the peoples of the U.S.S.R. take account of the epoch-making results of the victories of socialism won under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, the glorious Party of Lenin and Stalin. The Soviet people, completing the building of a classless socialist society, are advancing to communism.

The land of Soviets has made great achievements. Every day, every hour, sees the continued growth of socialist industry. The socialist foundations of the collective farm countryside are becoming more and more stable. The well-being of the masses of the people is rising with each new socialist victory. The joyous and happy life of the peoples of the Soviet country is in full swing. The young generation looks with confidence into its bright future. Vigorous talents are being brought to the surface by the Soviet land. Miracles are being worked by the Stakhanov movement. New detachments of the Soviet intelligentsia are coming up which serve the cause of socialism with fullest devotion.

The Stalinist friendship of the peoples inhabiting the U.S.S.R. is gathering strength. The Soviet people are united as never before, they are inseparably bound up with their Communist Party and their Soviet government. The military strength of the land of socialism is growing at a steady pace. The frontiers of the Soviet land are more and more unassailable. The weight of the Soviet Union in the international arena has increased immeasurably. The Soviet people, by their great achievements, are opening a new page in their history, a brilliant page in the life of all mankind.

The working people of the capitalist countries greet this noteworthy anniversary in absolutely different conditions. They greet it in the midst of the second imperialist war begun by their governments.

For more than two years now the Japanese imperialists have been tearing at the flesh of China, which is fighting for its independence.

War is being waged in the very heart of Europe. The ruling circles of Britain, France and Germany are waging war for world supremacy.
This war is the continuation of the many years of imperialist strife in the camp of capitalism.

Three of the richest states, England, France and the United States of America, hold sway over the most important world routes and markets. They seized the main sources of raw materials. Vast economic resources are in their hands. They hold more than one-half of mankind in subjection. They cover up the exploitation of the working people, the exploitation of the oppressed peoples, with the false phantom of democracy in order to deceive the masses more easily.

Fighting against their world supremacy and for their own mastery are the other capitalist states, which entered the arena of colonial expansion at a later period. They want to divide anew, to their own advantage, the sources of raw materials, food, gold reserves and the huge colonial populations.

This is the real meaning of this war, which is an unjust, reactionary, imperialist war. The blame for this war falls on all the capitalist governments, and primarily on the ruling classes of the belligerent states.

The working class cannot support such a war. The Communists have always fought against such a war. They warned the working people again and again that the ruling classes were preparing a destructive and bloody slaughter for hundreds of millions of people.

The bourgeoisie prepared this war for years. They prepared it by their intrigues and provocations against the land of the Soviets. They prepared this war by the attack on Ethiopia, by the intervention in Spain, by the invasion of China. They directly prepared this war by the Münch Pact.

The bourgeoisie began this war because they became hopelessly entangled in the insurmountable contradictions of the capitalist system and are trying to solve these contradictions by means of new wars.

For more than two decades the Soviet Union has fought an increasing struggle for the preservation of peace. It displayed supreme restraint and firmness in the face of constant acts of provocation on its frontiers. It proposed general and partial disarmament and the organization of collective security. It did everything in its power to help the establishment of a stable peace front.

But the bourgeois governments rejected all its proposals. They continued their fanatical policy of isolating the U.S.S.R.

However, in spite of all these machinations, the Soviet Union continued to uphold the cause of peace. And even when it became clear to everyone that war was already inevitable, the Soviet Union made a last effort to save peace. It undertook negotiations with the governments of Britain and France.

But the provokers of war were aiming at something different. They were striving to utilize the negotiations to lull the vigilance of the masses, to throw off the responsibility of the war they had prepared. They were inciting Poland against the land of Soviets.
While engaged in negotiations with the U.S.S.R., they were surreptitiously trying to incite Germany against the U.S.S.R.

By concluding a non-aggression pact with Germany, the Soviet Union foiled the insidious plans of the provokers of an anti-Soviet war. By this pact it removed its people from the confines of the bloody slaughter and narrowed the arena of the European war conflagration.

And when the Polish state, a real prison of the peoples, fell apart, the Soviet Union gave a helping hand to the brother peoples of the Western Ukraine and Western Byelo-Russia. It wrested 13,000,000 from the quagmire of war, liberated them from the oppression of the Polish landlords and capitalists. It gave them the right themselves to determine their political and social order and guaranteed them freedom of national self-determination.

The U.S.S.R., by its mutual assistance pacts with Esthonia, Latvia and Lithuania, defended these countries from the predatory designs of the imperialist states. It has given all its might to defense of their independence and strengthened the security of the Soviet frontiers. By handing to Lithuania the city of Vilna, which had been seized twenty years ago by the Polish generals, the U.S.S.R. gave an unparalleled example of respect for the national rights of small nations.

The Soviet Union, by its call for cessation of the war and its amity and frontier pact with Germany, has made a new contribution to the cause of peace. It is hindering the provokers of war from drawing the Danubian states and the Baltic countries into the war. It is frustrating the machinations of those who are striving to transform the European war into a world war. The working people of all countries will never forget this great service by the Soviet Union.

However, the sinister forces of war continue to rage. They want war "to a victorious conclusion," they want war until their imperialist aims are achieved. It is for this that they are driving the peoples to the slaughter.

But, proletarians and working people, what do you stand to gain from this war?

Now, reaction is already undertaking a furious offensive everywhere. Now the bourgeois dictatorship is already cynically casting aside the "democratic" mask, it is crushing the movement of the working people and is establishing a regime of military terror. Now the bourgeoisie are already worsening your conditions both in the warring and the non-warring countries. Now they are already taking from you the remnants of your rights and achievements.

They are shamelessly plundering you by lengthening the working day, cutting wages, raising the price of articles of mass consumption. They are throttling millions of peasants with still higher taxation. They are laying villages waste, leaving the fields uncultivated, by taking the peasants' sons away to the war. Your blood and your sufferings are a source of profits for the parasitic gang of speculators and war freebooters. They are brazenly revelling in the rear while compelling you to rot and die in the trenches at the front.

The bourgeoisie of the so-called
neutral states are also warming their hands at the fire of war. Under the pharisaical mask of "neutrality" they are growing rich on war orders.

The American bourgeoisie are interested in the spread of the war, they are repealing the embargo on the export of arms to the warring countries because war orders guarantee enormous profits to the uncrowned kings of the war industry, the manufacturers of guns, planes and other types of military supplies.

The Italian bourgeoisie are only waiting for a suitable moment to hurl themselves on the vanquished and snatch their share of the booty. All the governments of the "neutral" countries are using the war to plunder the masses of the people, to intensify reaction and to crush the working class movement.

Workers! Do not believe those who summon you to the war under the flag of national unity. What can there be in common between you and those who trade in guns and human blood? What unity can there be between the exploited and the exploiters?

Do not believe those who are dragging you to the war under the false pretext of the defense of democracy. What right have those who oppress India, Indo-China, the Arab countries, who hold half of the world in the chains of colonial slavery, to speak of democracy? The bankers of London and Paris have in the past by their loans saved, and they continue to save, the worst reactionary regimes in Europe.

The lords of Britain maintain reaction on all the five continents of the earth. The boasted democrats of France throw Communist deputies into jail, suppress the Communist press and abolish political liberties.

_It is not for the freedom of the nations that they are fighting but for their enslavement. Not for the preservation of democracy from fascism, but for the triumph of reaction. Not for a stable peace, but for new imperialist conquests fraught with new wars._

But the bourgeoisie could not have begun or have waged this war had it not been aided by the treacherous top leaders of the Social-Democratic parties. These leaders are now taking their place as the vanguard of reaction.

It is they who are taking up the bankrupt anti-Comintern banner. It is they who are now calling on the workers to die to restore the reactionary regime of the Pilsudski clique. It is the Blums who disrupted the united working class and People's Front in France at the instructions of reaction. It is on the demand of Blum that the members of the Communist parliamentary group are being court-martialled, that Communist municipal councils are being disbanded and that Communists are being arrested by the thousands. It is Blum who, with Jouhaux, is splitting the French trade unions on orders from the magnates of finance capital. It is the Blums who, together with the British Labor leaders, prevented united action of the international proletariat.

Proletarians and working people! More than ever before you need fighting unity for the struggle against war, reaction and the capitalist offensive. But now this unity is possible only separate from and against the leaders...
of Social-Democracy, who have wholly
and completely gone over to the ser-
vice of the imperialists. There can be
neither a united workers' front nor a
people's front with them, or with the
leaders of the other petty-bourgeois
parties that are supporting the war.

Now working class unity and the
united people's front must be estab-
lished from below, in a struggle
against the imperialist bourgeoisie,
against the top leaders of the Social-
Democratic and other petty-bourgeois
parties who have gone bankrupt and
joined the camp of the imperialists,
in a struggle to halt the imperialist
war which is bringing ruin, starvation
and death to millions of working
people.

Hundreds of thousands of Social-
Democratic workers now stand at the
parting of the ways. Where is their
place, in the camp of imperialist re-
action or with their class brothers
waging a struggle against it? With the
instigators of imperialist war or with
the millions of workers and peasants
who yearn for peace? With the stran-
glers and butchers of liberty or with
those who are self-sacrificingly defend-
ing it? Their place is in the common
fighting front of the great army of
labor which is fighting for peace,
bread and freedom.

In a ruthless struggle against the
bourgeoisie, against the treacherous
Social-Democratic leaders, the Com-

munist and Social-Democratic workers
will hammer out unity in their ranks.

The working class, at the same time
that it is exposing the predatory char-
acter of the present war and mobiliz-
ing the widest masses against it, comes
forward as the defender of the vital,
fundamental interests of all working
people of the city and the countryside,
who bear on their backs all the bur-
dens and sacrifices of the imperialist
war begun by the ruling classes. The
working class by coming forward as
the basic force of the united people's
front of struggle against war and re-
action thereby upholds the interests
of all working people, of the entire
people, for whom the war means
countless hardships and the intensifi-
cation of capitalist oppression.

By conducting a struggle against
the enemy in its own country, the
working class hammers out unity be-
tween the proletariat of all lands,
hammers out the most unfailing in-
strument of its victory.

Brother proletarians! The Commu-
nist International calls you to the
struggle against the imperialist war.
It calls on you "to be true to the
end to the cause of proletarian inter-
nationalism, to the cause of the fra-
ternal alliance of the proletarians of
all countries." (Stalin.)

The Communist International calls
you to its ranks under the great ban-
er of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

The Communist International calls
on you to strengthen the fraternal
alliance with the toilers of the city
and the countryside, with the enslaved
peoples of the colonies. It calls on you
to defend the Chinese people against
the imperialist bandits.

Proletarians, working people! By
your joint efforts, halt the nefarious
crime which is being committed. Take
a stand against those who favor con-
tinuation of the war! Expose them as
abettors of the imperialists who are
hurling millions of people into de-
struction for the sake of their mer-
cenary interests, their criminal aims!
Demand the release of the imprisoned vanguard fighters of the working class! Demand the arrest of the war freebooters and profiteers! Fight for the freedom of your organizations, for freedom of assembly and for your honest working class press! Defend every inch of your rights and your achievements. Do not allow the bourgeoisie to throw all the burdens of the war on your backs. Wives, mothers, sisters, do not furtively wipe the tears from your eyes but demand—so that all can hear—that your husbands, sons and brothers are returned to you from the trenches.

Rally closer, working people, around the great land of socialism, give supreme support to its socialist peace policy directed towards the welfare of all nations.

Let your battlecry ring out to the whole world:

Down with the imperialist war!
Down with capitalist reaction!
Down with the instigators of war, the profiteers and the freebooters!
No support for the policy of the ruling classes directed toward continuation and spread of the imperialist slaughter!
Demand the immediate cessation of the predatory, unjust, imperialist war!
Peace to the people!
Bread, rights and freedom for the working people!
Long live the fraternal alliance of the workers of the entire world!
Long live the U.S.S.R., the bulwark of peace, freedom and socialism, the fatherland of the working people of all lands.

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.
REVIEW OF THE MONTH


The toiling masses of all countries want the war stopped, while the imperialists want the war continued and extended. This is evident from everything that transpired in the past month. It is also becoming evident that:

“... it is the British and French imperialists who now come forward as the most zealous supporters of the continuation and further incitement of war.”

Upon hearing this said, some of the spokesmen of American imperialism become very much excited, almost blue in the face. One would think that they were already in alliance with the Anglo-French imperialist bloc. Or is it merely a guilty conscience?

The apologists of American imperialism have been working up considerable moral indignation. They demand to know whether it isn't true that Germany was the aggressor and that England and France are merely defending themselves. To which one could answer briefly by asking: defending what? Not their national freedom and independence, which are not at stake, but their colonial possessions, their rights to exploit and oppress other peoples and nations, their world domination. And since this is exactly what England and France are “defending,” does this make their side of the war any more just than is the German side which is fighting to acquire all these privileges?

Said Dimitroff:

“The character of a war, as Lenin taught, depends not on who attacked and on whose side the “enemy” is, but on which class is waging the war, what policy is being continued by the given war.”


* Ibid., p. 5.
And to these questions, there is only one answer possible. The class that is waging the Anglo-French war is the imperialist bourgeoisie, continuing by warfare the policy of imperialist robbery, exploitation and aggrandizement. Substantially the same as on the German side.

It is insisted that Germany started it. Sure it did. And so did Italy and Japan. This was in the first stage of the war, when these powers took the offensive,

"... while the other capitalist states—England, France and the U.S.A.—retreated, in the endeavor to avoid a decisive clash with their rivals and to turn their expansion in another direction, against the land of socialism." •

Now, however, the war is in a second stage. Now, as Dimitroff correctly points out,

"... the imperialists of Britain and France have passed over to the offensive, have hurled their peoples into war against Germany, endeavoring in every way to win a number of other states to their side." •

Now, the imperialists of Britain and France, "... having taken the path of war, do not want to leave it." They seek to continue the war, to expand it, to transform it into a world slaughter. These are the plain facts of the situation.

Anglo-French imperialism is desperately seeking to draw other peoples into the war. This is the meaning of their "diplomatic" activities in Turkey, in the Balkans, in Finland, in the Scandinavian countries, in the Far East and in the Americas. We must therefore fully realize that the present war threatens to become a world war, a world slaughter, and to drag our country into it. Hence, the vital importance of rallying the masses around the slogans issued by the Communist International in its manifesto on the twenty-second anniversary of the October Revolution. The slogans:

"Down with Imperialist War"; "No Support for the Policy of the Ruling Classes Aimed at Continuing and Spreading the Imperialist Slaughter"; "Demand the Immediate Cessation of the Plunderous, Unjust, Imperialist War"; "Peace to the Peoples." •

Thus and only thus can the American people fight successfully for keeping America out of war.

And this fight, the fight to keep America out of the imperialist war, is just beginning. This too has to be fully realized. The lifting of the arms embargo is transforming this country into an arsenal for the Anglo-French bloc, enabling Big Business to fatten on blood money while creating new dangers for this country's involvement. Some of these new dangers arose almost immediately upon the passage of the new "Neutrality Act." We have in mind the maneuver to transfer American ships to foreign registry. This seemingly innocent little trick aims to accomplish at least two things. If allowed to succeed, it would place American ships (minus American seamen) directly in the service of the Anglo-French bloc with all the consequent dangers of involvement. It would also open up a new chapter of imperialist rivalry for markets, sea routes and spheres of influence, as part of the objective of American finance capital to strengthen its imperialist positions and to consoli-

• Ibid., p. 7.

•• See p. 1091 of this issue.
date its domination of the seas and oceans. No wonder, therefore, that Thomas McGowan, Boston representative of the National Maritime Union, felt moved to speak of the ship transfer as “gambling with America’s peace by Big Business,” placing upon it and the government the responsibility for the consequences.

We also have in mind another immediate result of the embargo lifting. It became publicly known through a report in The New York Times from its Washington correspondent, which said:

“The French government has completed arrangements to finance the construction of additional domestic aircraft factories in this country in order to speed production and give the powers opposed to Germany decisive control of the air.” (Nov. 3)

Superficially, this might look like a genuine attempt to make the Anglo-French bloc finance its own war production needs in this country, thus obviating the danger of subsequent American credits. But it may very easily produce the opposite effect. French and American capital will become integrated in aircraft production and auxiliary services; and as this process develops, it will become a simple matter for American big bankers actually to finance the Anglo-French war under the guise of financing something else. Thus another avenue will be created for circumventing the cash and carry provisions of the “Neutrality Act,” establishing another danger point for American involvement.

Equally, if not more threatening to America’s peace, is the activation of the foreign policies of our imperialists. We are quite definitely witnessing a spreading out of imperialist activities and interventions by American finance capital in practically all parts of the world. What is the meaning of it?

All of a sudden the government becomes tremendously interested in Finland, to the point of actually intervening in the current negotiations between that country and the Soviet Union. And what kind of intervention was that? Obviously to stiffen the resistance of the ruling circles of Finland to the peace and friendship proposals of the Soviet Union. This cannot be successfully disputed or hidden. The question, therefore, is: why should the American government be interested in preventing the peaceful co-existence of these two countries? What particular American interest demands that this be done?

We know, of course, that there are various imperialist theories trying to justify such interventions. One of these is peddled around by The New York Times. Its roving correspondent, Otto D. Tolischus, reporting from Helsinki, Finland, on October 29, says this, for instance:

“Having darkened the Baltic, the shadow of Russia’s bolshevist imperialism now is spreading to Scandinavia, where it approaches the Atlantic and therewith begins to encircle America’s continental side of the world.”

One should not miss the deliberate fraud of this correspondent’s geography, in which Finland becomes Scandinavia, the Gulf of Finland is made out to be the Atlantic, and the huge expanse of the Atlantic becomes identical with “America’s continental side of the world.” It would almost appear as though the Soviet-Finnish
negotiations directly involve the safety of the Atlantic coast of the United States. Which is, of course, sheer nonsense. But nonsense with an ominous purpose. The purpose is to misrepresent the Soviet Union as an enemy of America, as a country which threatens the security of the United States.

Considering this fraudulent play with geography and the equally dishonest attempt to picture a socialist state as being nationalist and imperialist (something it cannot be by its very nature), it is evident that Wall Street, for some reason, is very anxious to make the American people believe that the socialist Soviet Union is a "national" enemy of America. Why? What is that reason?

Raymond Clapper, who often speaks loudly the quiet thoughts of government circles, may help us shed some light on the matter. In one of his columns in the World-Telegram (Nov. 4), he gives expression to the following:

"When the President moved into the negotiations between Moscow and Finland, it seemed on the surface something addressed entirely to the European situation."

Yes, that's what many Americans thought. They were led to believe that the President's intervention was motivated by sheer love of Finland and peace. But, says Clapper, this only seemed so "on the surface." In reality there may have been other reasons. And he continues:

"... it is possible that one thought behind this sudden American interest in Russia had to do not primarily with Europe but with the Pacific."

So it is not Europe, nor Scandinavia or the Atlantic, but the Pacific. The plot thickens and the situation evidently becomes more confused. But only for a brief moment. Because we are soon told by the same Clapper that:

"... If Moscow and Tokyo succeed in forming some working arrangement, the balance in the Western Pacific will be drastically altered and our problems in the Far East will become more difficult."

"Perhaps that possibility is in the back of official minds here as they take swings now at Moscow."

Again, therefore, it is not Finland we are trying to serve but "ourselves," and we shall see in a moment that this means American imperialism, not the American people. And that's why Washington officials are taking "swings now at Moscow."

Very well. What do we want in the Far East? According to Clapper, official Washington does not want Moscow and Tokyo, the Soviet Union and Japan, to live in peace. This is a terrible admission to make, but he did it in the above-cited quotation. It follows that official Washington seeks to prevent the establishment of good and peaceful relations between Japan and the Soviet Union, which means working against peace in the Far East. And this is diametrically opposed to the wishes of the American people, who desire peace in the Far East as well as in the rest of the world. It follows, furthermore, that official Washington is interested, according to Clapper, not in peace, but in the maintenance of some sort of "balance in the Western Pacific," which means world power, imperialist domination, Wall Street aggrandizement. The thing is obviously becoming clearer.

It is worth noting that Clapper says
nothing in his piece about the national interests of China. And for good reason. American imperialism, whose objectives official Washington is trying to realize, is opposed to the national interests of China. The United States has been and still is supplying Japan with the means of warfare against China. That does not mean that Wall Street is indifferent to China. Not at all. What it means is that,

"... under the flag of neutrality the American imperialists are inflaming war in the Far East, so as to enfeeble Japan and China, and then, basing themselves on their might, to dictate their conditions to the belligerent countries and firmly to establish themselves in China."*

One of our most brazen imperialist war inciters, the World-Telegram, almost admits that much itself. In an editorial dealing with Japanese-American relations (Nov. 11), this paper makes a plea to Japan for improving her relations with the United States, on these grounds:

"Various Senators, including Pittman, Borah and Schwellenbach, have advocated various forms of embargoes on shipments to Japan. And in view of the European war, Japan would have a hard time finding a supplier if we clamped down. Without our oil, scrap metal, cotton and other necessities, her effort to consolidate her China conquest and to keep Chiang Kai-shek in the back country—and Russia at bay—would be very much embarrassed."

This confirms Dimitroff's analysis with a vengeance. It tells Japan, in so many words, to go ahead, make war on China, keep Chiang Kai-shek in the back country and Russia at bay, but remember that we alone can continue to supply you with oil, metal, cotton and other necessities of warfare.

Does one need a clearer admission of the war-inflaming, predatory imperialist policies of Wall Street in the Far East? No, that is clear enough. And when we know this, we can also know why American imperialism is so anxious to present the Soviet Union as a "national" enemy of America. As a socialist state, the Soviet Union is interested in peaceful relations with its neighbors, in this case, with Japan. The Soviet Union is interested in world peace, also in peace in the Far East. Finally, the Soviet Union is interested in a free and independent China. And the policies of the Soviet government clearly pursue these objectives. But Wall Street imperialism, as we have just demonstrated, pursues policies that are radically different. American imperialism works for war in the Far East. It seeks to weaken and exhaust both China and Japan so it can step in later and take charge. Naturally and inevitably the imperialist war-inflaming policies of Wall Street come into conflict with the peace policies of the socialist Soviet Union. The peace policies of the Soviet Union become an obstacle to the designs of all imperialists to continue and extend the war. Hence, the imperialist anti-Soviet incitements.

The New York Times calls these incitements "the present unpleasantness of diplomatic attitude" (Nov. 12) and tries to explain it by the Soviet theory of government which is "unfriendly to any genuine democracy." But this is obviously an attempt to hide the real reason. The Soviet government is more than twenty-two years old and its "theory of government" is

---

much older. So, whether this theory is friendly or unfriendly to Wall Street's ideas of "genuine" democracy, this cannot explain the imperialist anti-Soviet incitations of recent weeks. There must be some more recent reason.

It is true, of course, that Wall Street has always hated the Soviet state because it is a socialist state and a workers' state—a true democracy of the people. For the same reason, ever larger numbers of American workers, farmers and middle class people have come to regard the Soviet Union with the greatest affection. Yet it was not always so that Wall Street and its agents would seek deliberately to create "unpleasantness of diplomatic attitude" with the Soviet government. And this is exactly what they have been doing since the beginning of the big war. Why? The answer has already been indicated.

With the beginning of the war, American imperialism has become "activized." Under the flag of neutrality, the imperialist bourgeoisie seeks the spreading of the European war for the sake of profits and power. It aims to utilize the war in order to drive its rivals out of the world markets (say, in Latin America, in the Far East and in other parts of the world), to strengthen its imperialist positions generally and to consolidate its domination on the oceans and seas. In the Far East, American imperialism is definitely seeking to prolong the war so as to weaken China and Japan for the purpose of establishing its own domination in China.

In the pursuit of these predatory objectives, Wall Street imperialism encounters the peace policies of the Soviet Union. Where Wall Street and its agents work for war, the Soviet Union works for peace. And the growing influence of the Soviet Union in international affairs naturally makes the Soviet peace policy ever more effective. All imperialist powers, belligerents as well as neutrals, feel that. So does Wall Street imperialism. Hence, the changed "tone" towards the Soviet Union in American imperialist circles. Hence, official Washington's diplomatic "swings" at Moscow. Hence, the deliberate effort of the imperialist press to sharpen the relations of this country with the Soviet Union.

From this it is clear that a worsening of relations with the Soviet Union is only in the interests of the American imperialists, warmongers and war inciters. It is in the exclusive interests of those who, under the flag of neutrality, are seeking to drag this country into imperialist adventures and war. It is, therefore, not in the interests of the American people. It is against the interests of the American workers, toiling farmers and exploited middle classes. It is against the interests of all those who genuinely and sincerely wish to keep America out of war and who want to see the war brought to an end. And these are the overwhelming majority of America.

To the masses of the American people it should become evident that the imperialists and war-inciters are as much the enemies of the American people as they are the enemies of the Soviet Union. Wall Street imperialism, the chief promoter of the anti-Soviet campaign, is the worst enemy and exploiter of the masses in the United States. And the Social-Demo-
cratic warmongers are serving Wall Street. Contrariwise, the peace policies of the Soviet Union are in the best interests of the American masses. The interests of the Soviet peoples and of the American people are the same. Far from quarreling, as Wall Street desires, they have every reason to be close friends and collaborators. The socialist peace policy of the Soviet Union is aimed at promoting the well-being of all nations and peoples. That's why we say: Support the socialist peace policy of the Soviet Union. Give no support to the Wall Street policies of continuing and spreading the imperialist slaughter. Work for the immediate cessation of the plunderous, unjust, imperialist war.

Although this country is not a belligerent, its economy is being geared to war needs, tending to assume many characteristics of a developing war economy. This is something to think about and act upon because the consequences of this process, if not combated, will be everything but favorable to the well-being and social security of the American people.

Certain things are already visible. Due to the war orders of the English and French governments, and to the military preparations of the American government, an expansion is taking place in such industries as aircraft, arms and munitions, and shipbuilding. As the war continues, these industries will continue to expand, consuming tremendous amounts of raw materials which are ordinarily available for housing, road building, rural electrification and similar public welfare projects. In the face of such developments, what is likely to happen to housing, electrification and other socially useful and progressive projects, in which the people are so vitally interested? What is going to happen to the building of new schools, hospitals, to the improvement of sanitary conditions in the cities as well as rural communities? How are we going to tackle the tremendous problems of the people's health? In short, how are the people going to promote all these projects—all of them requiring building materials—in the face of rapidly expanding war industries which are eating up all these materials?

This is, first of all, a question of rising prices, which means rising costs. But not only that. After a while, always provided the war continues, essential raw materials may become subject to rationing and allocation by the government in conjunction with Big Business. Rationing and allocation on the basis of certain "priorities" determined by the war needs of England and France and by the war preparations of the American government. Under such circumstances, even without an actual shortage of raw materials, the tendency will be to keep raw materials in reserve for war needs. With what consequence? With the consequence that, either through a rationing priority system or through the working of the "price mechanism," industries producing for peace time needs will find the supply of their raw materials seriously curtailed and, above all, public projects designed to meet essential needs of the masses (housing, health, sanitation, rural electrification) will find themselves so down on the list of "prior-
ities" as to become virutally eliminated.

What are the people going to do to combat these tendencies towards a war economy which spell the sacrifice of the most vital needs of the masses? That much can be done goes without saying. But this requires a clear understanding of the task. It is the task of energetic struggle against all attempts of the imperialists and Big Business to place the burdens of a developing war economy upon the masses of the people.

Another side of the same problem is the danger of this country being manipulated into granting large-scale credits to England and France. Already the ground is being prepared for such credits. It is pointed out with a certain show of objectivity that England is compelled to curtail importation from the United States of many peace time commodities (tobacco, automobiles, women's apparel, shoes, hosiery, dried fruits, barley, etc.) because it needs all the money at its disposal in this country to buy arms and munitions. The November issue of the Guaranty Survey, organ of the Guaranty Trust Co., states flatly that "in the absence of unforeseen changes in credit conditions, these restrictions will place limitations on any large-scale movement of American goods abroad."

This plainly suggests the idea that if we want large-scale movements of American goods abroad we must do away with existing credit "restrictions." It suggests the abolition or circumvention or both of the so-called "cash" provisions of the "Neutrality Act." Should this be done, as is very likely, the tempo towards a war economy in the United States will be greatly accelerated. And a war economy, in the words of Stalin, means:

"... giving industry a one-sided, war direction; developing to the utmost the production of goods necessary for war and not for consumption by the population; restricting to the utmost the production and, especially, the sale of articles of general consumption—and, consequently, reducing consumption by the population and confronting the country with an economic crisis." *

Still another danger arising from war economy tendencies, now becoming more imminent, is rising prices and war profiteering. Most disturbing in this connection is the evident tendency in New Deal administration circles to take a rather "liberal" and tolerant view of the growing trend towards rising monopoly prices and monopoly in general. Recent hearings before the Temporary National Economic Committee on monopolistic practices in the oil and steel industries plainly indicate that influential members of President Roosevelt's Administration in charge of the hearings (Henderson, Frank, Arnold), while differing on some important details, are adopting a somewhat new attitude on monopolies. "More flexible," is the way the Wall Street Journal calls it, or more "realistic," as Mr. Henderson himself does.

If this is the position that is going through, there will most certainly be increases in steel prices with consequent rises in the prices of all other commodities. War profiteering will begin pressing on us from all directions. And the growth and strength-

---

ening of the monopolies and monopoly exploitation of the workers, farmers and middle classes will go on with governmental blessing in the form of governmental "supervision" and "direction."

We now come to the most crucial question posed by the "war boom." What will it do to unemployment? There are now about eleven million unemployed in the country. Already it is seen that the rapid increase in steel production has had a totally disproportionate effect on the rise in employment. The Department of Labor (Bureau of Labor Statistics) "cautions" American workers not to expect large-scale employment as a result of war orders, for the reason, among others, "that there are now improved machines and techniques that have been thoroughly tested and are readily available for vastly increasing the productivity of labor." Officials of the Steel Workers' Organizing Committee (C.I.O.) have demonstrated recently that the introduction of new machinery, such as the high speed sheet and strip mills, has prevented the employment of 75,000 to 100,000 men.

Here we are dealing, not only with increasing productivity of labor, but also with increasing intensification of labor (speed-up), which means greater capitalist exploitation.

But these are not the only factors that militate against a substantial reduction in the army of unemployed. What will be the effect on employment of the one-sided developments in the national economy, the expansion and over-expansion of war-industries at the expense of consumers' goods and public projects? Naturally, a relative rise of employment in the industries working for war and war preparations accompanied by a lag and eventual curtailment of employment in the other industries.

Hence the problem of jobs, wage standards, relief and social security will become aggravated, not mitigated. Correspondingly, the struggle of the masses for the solution of these problems will become, is becoming, more urgent and more necessary.

What about agriculture? Certain branches will probably benefit by increased foreign demands for their products (lard, pork, cotton, some canned fruits), but offsetting this, as The New York Times points out, will probably be smaller sales abroad of other products (fresh fruits, barley, tobacco, feeds and wheat). As to the home market, no considerable increase in mass purchasing power is to be expected, as shown in the foregoing.

But this is not all. Large masses of farmers would benefit little, if at all, even if there were a serious improvement in agriculture, for which there is no outlook. We speak of the millions of small owners, poor tenants and sharecroppers who have little or nothing to sell. For them there is certainly no perspective of improvement through the "free" processes of economic development, especially as it is going in the direction of a war economy. Consequently, farm relief and rehabilitation will be needed more in the coming period, not less. Hence, the alarming nature of the intimation that comes from Senator Byrnes, Democrat, of Alabama, who said, according to a report of The New York Times, "that there would be a pop-
ular demand for the reduction of all expenditures except those for defense.” (Nov. 5.)

Senator Byrnes, it should be noted, has been functioning lately as the Administration's chief legislative strategist. Furthermore, according to the same report, "most legislators believe that any major cuts in spending will have to be made on such items as relief and farm subsidies." Farm organizations, the unemployed and labor must take notice at once of these ominous intimations.

Military and war preparations are already becoming the excuse for scuttling farm and unemployment relief, and for abandoning the improvement and further development of social security and public works. Moreover, proposals for new and increased expenditures for so-called defense (the naval authorization bill for $1,300,000,000) are being represented also as measures for building up and sustaining economic recovery. But this is in large measure misrepresentation. Expenditures for military and war preparations, running into billions of dollars, will neither help build nor sustain real economic recovery. They will only intensify all existing tendencies toward a one-sided war economy, some of the dire consequences for the masses we have discussed in the foregoing.

The slogan of "national defense" is used by the imperialists for predatory and war-like purposes. They want a bigger navy, army and air force in order to back up Wall Street's imperialist activities and designs in all parts of the world. It has nothing to do with the national security of the American people. Wall Street wants more powerful armed forces also for "internal" reasons, to be used for the suppression of the masses of the American people themselves who are forced to struggle ever more energetically for peace, for their lives and well being, for their standards and rights. Finally, the imperialist bourgeoisie and its political spokesmen are using the defense issue in order to curtail and destroy the hard-won gains of the people in the vital field of progressive social legislation.

It has to be said very plainly that the government's influence, in the present processes of development toward a war economy, is thrown in the direction of accelerating these processes. The Federal government helps it along. In doing so, it evidently is being guided by many of the ideas of the industrial mobilization plan—the "M Plan"—prepared by the War Department for a war emergency. Senator McCarran of Nevada made public the 1939 version of this plan, from which it becomes clear that most of the agencies of the Administration are already steering their various activities in the direction of the "M Plan" which provides for a full-blown war economy supervised by a reactionary imperialist dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

* * *

We have discussed the major economic tendencies of the war economy process, their effect upon the economic needs and struggles of the masses. But these cannot be separated from the political tendencies and tasks which are equally evident. Political reaction is becoming intensified, bourgeois democrats and leading New Deal
administrators being pushed and drawn to the reactionary camp. This is the result of the activized imperialism of the American bourgeoisie and of its present aims of prolonging and extending the war to grab profits and strengthen its world domination. The tendencies towards a war economy, with the “M Plan” as a point of orientation, are deliberately accelerated to serve these predatory imperialist and war purposes. So are the reactionary attacks upon the civil rights and liberties of the masses, in which the Communists, as usual, are attacked first and most recklessly. It is now clear to the widest circles of the people that this is precisely the meaning of the indictment and persecution of Comrade Browder.

However, other things too are becoming clearer. It is reported (The Nation, Nov. 11) that representatives of the Army have been sounding out the leaders of the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. on their attitude to the “M Plan.” The report has it that labor was confronted with “a Hobson’s choice between what amounts to at least temporary self-extinction should this country go to war, and the risk of forcible extinction at the hands of a war-time government.”

It is in the light of these soundings that labor must view the latest attempts of the Administration “to help” bring about labor unity. Considering the nature of the present domestic and foreign policies of the government—active imperialist interventions, war preparations, intensified political reaction, orientation on a war economy and its development towards the “M Plan”—considering all of this, the question arises whether or not the President’s intervention in the relations between the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. carries with it the threat of actually placing the trade union movement under government control for the realization of Wall Street’s imperialist policies? Whether or not an attempt is being projected to make labor impotent for the defense of its interests and positions?

Certainly, this possibility is there. And so, far from such government efforts being a help to labor unity, they may actually turn out a menace to the very existence of free labor unions. The least, therefore, that has to be said is that labor must be on its guard—both the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O.—as it never was before, to defend the freedom and independence of the trade union movement. Its rights to organize, to strike, to collective bargaining. And only in the struggle for these rights, and on the basis of defending these rights, the American trade union movement will become united. Consequently, labor unity today is more needed than it ever was before, unity to protect and defend the freedom and independence of the trade unions.

The major conclusion from all these considerations is the need of building and strengthening the mass organizations of the workers and toiling farmers. The primary need of organizing the unorganized into the unions and of cementing more firmly the bond of collaboration with the toiling farmers and exploited middle classes. The primary need of daily struggle against the consequences of the developing war economy upon the masses, against the rising political reaction, against the imperialist and
war-inciting policies of the bourgeoisie.

All of these tasks are bound up inseparably. It is a dangerous illusion—a trap set by the enemy—that labor will maintain its economic and trade union positions if "only" it acquiesces in, and gives up opposition to, the imperialist, war-inciting, war-preparing policies of Wall Street. On the contrary, by falling into this trap, labor would not only sacrifice its most fundamental class interests, which demand opposition to imperialism and imperialist war; labor would also be surrendering its free and independent trade unions, thus giving up its most elementary and basic weapon for the protection of its daily and immediate interests and needs. Remember that Gompers fooled and sold out American labor in the first world imperialist war precisely with the argument that, if we support the war and the government's imperialist policies, we shall save our unions. This treachery proved very costly to American labor. Its effective recurrence must therefore be prevented.

Only by fighting against imperialism and imperialist war, by fighting against Wall Street's policies of seeking to prolong and extend the war, by fighting to keep America out of war, by helping to bring the war to an end, by fighting unitedly for the freedom and independence of the trade unions, by fighting consistently against every attempt to shift the burden of the developing war economy on the shoulders of the masses, by fighting against every expression of political reaction and every attack upon the rights and liberties of the masses and their organizations—only thus will labor and its allies be able to protect their fundamental interests, their future, as well as their most immediate and burning economic and political interests.

The appearance of a new and popular mass edition of Stalin's Foundations of Leninism will be greeted with enthusiasm by all who have come to appreciate the importance of revolutionary theory for the working class and its progressive movements. The job is to give it the quickest and widest distribution. Its publication during the month that marks Stalin's sixtieth birthday should be an added incentive for the broadest distribution and study of this basic Marxist-Leninist classic.

Foundations of Leninism is one of Comrade Stalin's earlier and perhaps greatest theoretical works. Originating from a series of lectures delivered some fifteen years ago, Foundations of Leninism is the first work, we believe, that presents Leninism as the continuation and further development of Marxism, in fact, as the Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and the socialist revolution. We are given in this work a beautiful presentation and development of Marxism-Leninism as a complete, scientifically consistent theory and philosophy of communism and the Communist Party. And in doing so, Stalin already enriches and develops further the scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism, inspired by a profound sensing of the new problems and tasks more definitely associated with the subsequent period of the unfolding and victory of socialist construction.
and with the newer developments of the world situation.

One can't help admiring the economy of words, the scientific precision of dialectical formulations, the masterful simplicity which has always been recognized as the true mark of depth and profundity. By its very nature, it is a work of broad generalizations on matters of theory, strategy and tactics; and yet it is always concrete, alive with the problems and struggles of the working class and its allies for the dictatorship of the proletariat, with not a trace of academic abstractness which so often vitiates worthwhile theoretical efforts of less expert Marxists. It is truly in the best traditions of the theoretical works of the giants of our movement—Marx, Engels, Lenin.

As one studies and restudies this work, one is impressed also with its tremendous power of stimulation to theoretical effort. It is clear that this work was produced by the same Stalin who, on some particular occasion, made this far-reaching remark. He said, in effect: There is a dogmatic Marxism and a creative one; I believe in the creative Marxism. This work is testimony not only to Comrade Stalin's belief in creative Marxism but also to his powers to create, to enrich with new ideas, propositions and laws the golden treasure of advanced human thought, of the science of Marxism-Leninism.

Many of us have felt the powerful stimulation to theoretical effort emanating from Stalin's works. More of us should respond to it and follow his guidance. The new edition of *Foundations of Leninism* should contribute greatly to that end.

It should also contribute to a wider and more intense study of Stalin's other works. A good deal of them are found of course between the covers of the two-volume edition of *Leninism*, not to mention his earlier writings on the national question. But many of the newer things are not yet there and these include some of the most outstanding products of his genius during the last several years. These are today available in individual pamphlets. We have in mind such jewels as *Mastering Bolshevism* and most particularly his report to the Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, *From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union*. Of the latter, it is no exaggeration to say that there is no better and safer guide to the present world situation, let alone the newer developments contained there of the Marxian theory of the state and the laws governing the transition from socialism to communism.

Then there is the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* which, as is known, was produced with the collaboration and direct supervision of Comrade Stalin. In fact, one couldn't miss Stalin in this book, even if one did not know of his collaboration and supervision. Moreover, it transpires that one particular section of this book, the one which develops the principles of dialectical and historical materialism, is completely Stalin's. That too was evident from the contents and style of the work. One now feels gratified to know that this is actually so.

Well, let us make a thorough and effective mass distribution of the new edition of *Foundations of Leninism*,
encouraging in the process the study of other Marxist-Leninist works. Millions of Americans already know and admire Stalin the political leader, the great working class strategist and tactician—the guide of the peoples of all countries. It might be well to help these millions understand that Stalin does greatly because he thinks greatly and—vice versa.

* * *

Aside from their own importance for the various localities and states, the results of the November elections this year contain several significant indications of national trends and perspectives for 1940. Changes in these trends are, of course, still possible. The course of the war and the relations of this country to it may assume forms and tempos which will deeply affect the internal political situation and hence the next Presidential elections. With this in view, one can profitably examine some of the national implications of the last elections.

1. What will be the position of the two capitalist parties on the fundamental questions of war and peace? The manner in which the candidates of these two parties carried on the election campaign in November indicates the pressure of strong influences against making the war question a party issue in 1940. The fact is that in the recent election struggle both Republicans and Democrats have studiously avoided dealing with the questions of war and foreign policy. As far as these two parties were concerned, these issues did not exist.

Can we assume, therefore, that the same will be the policy of the two bourgeois parties in 1940? Subject to some very important reservations, the answer would seem to be: yes. For these reasons: (a) the ruling circles of the two major parties have no fundamental disagreements on questions of foreign policy. Both parties, as parties, are moved by the imperialist interests of the bourgeoisie. Both are inclined, for the present, to sail under the “neutrality” flag, to use America’s power for prolonging and extending the war, to enable Wall Street to amass profits and to strengthen the domination of American imperialism. Hence, there would seem to be nothing very serious to fight about, as far as the dominating forces of these two parties are concerned; and (b) the pressure of Big Business is quite evidently being directed towards preventing the “politicians” in the major parties from making foreign policy a party issue in 1940, but to treat this question on the basis of some sort of “national unity.”

If these were all the forces at work, one could say definitely that foreign policy will be no serious issue between the two capitalist parties in 1940. But there are other important forces. There are elements in and around both parties—not in the dominating circles—that are very susceptible to the vague anti-war and anti-imperialist attitudes of the farmers and of sections of city middle classes. Furthermore, some of these elements in the two major parties depend upon labor votes and have political ties with labor, and will therefore find themselves under considerable pressure from the more conscious and militant anti-imperialist attitudes of
large sections of workers. Consequently, as the anti-imperialist and anti-war movement gathers strength among the masses, especially as it achieves a certain modicum of organization, we may find considerable forces in the two major parties seeking to give partial expression to the moods of the masses, thus raising the question of foreign policy as a major issue in the elections.

This will undoubtedly precipitate serious internal fights in the two parties. It will also raise the possibility of a third party anti-imperialist and anti-war movement. Should such a development assume serious proportions, it is safe to say that the ruling circles of the Republican Party—as the party of “opposition”—may find themselves compelled to execute a maneuver. They may decide to seize the anti-war issue from the mass movements and from their opponents within the party and to make it the issue of the Republican Party against the Democratic Party. In other words, they may try to present the Republican Party as the party of peace, especially as the bulk of the Republican delegation in Congress, having voted against the lifting of the embargo, has established a “record” of opposition to Roosevelt’s foreign policy. This is a practical possibility. But what would it really mean? It would mean that the ruling circles of the Republican Party, safely dominated by Wall Street, would carry through in 1940 a sham battle with the Democrats, in order to “appease” the anti-war forces in their own party and to prevent the crystallization of a third party on the issue of anti-imperialism and peace.

2. What about the so-called domestic issues? On these also it was not easy to find much serious division and struggle between Republican and Democratic candidates in the November elections. Especially on questions affecting the economic needs, civil liberties and social security of the masses. Here too, with some slight exceptions, it seemed as though an extraordinary effort was being made to avoid every national implication even of those local questions that did become an issue.

Can we say, therefore, that this will be carried over to 1940? It is certain that the same thing could not be repeated in 1940, for the simple reason that, in a national election, the two major parties have to bring forward national issues, even though their intrinsic worth for the masses may be negligible. They can’t fight a national election without issues. If they tried it, in the present situation, they would throw the door wide open to third party movements. Hence, the two major parties will have issues on domestic questions. This is certain. But how deep-going will they be? Will they, at least, continue along the lines of New Deal and anti-New Deal?

The answer to this last question, seems to us, no. As far as the ruling circles of the two major parties are concerned, the present trend, also demonstrated in the November elections, is to keep in the background all those domestic issues which tend to line up the bulk of the people against Big Business and the bourgeoisie. This means to reduce to a minimum—within the requirements of a “two-party” system—divisions and struggles on such domestic questions as are of real importance to the masses. This
means also to build up into major issues such questions as will be least likely to arouse the masses and precipitate class divisions and class struggle.

We already see President Roosevelt’s Administration swinging away from the New Deal, as understood and fought for by the masses. We have shown in the foregoing the changing attitude towards monopolies on the part of New Deal administration circles, and on civil liberties, and on the importance of continuing the program of social security. We have also seen the new “tone” that is being adopted towards labor. Clearly, the political division between the Administration and its opponents from the Right, in the Republican Party as well as in the Democratic Party, is continually narrowing. And it may become very thin, almost invisible, by 1940.

What will the Republicans do? They can build up a new type of election issue, or revert to old issues in new forms. For example, the tariff. That is not wholly dead, as is seen from the smoldering friction around Secretary Hull’s “Reciprocity Treaties.” Monetary issues can be projected in such a form as to limit the fight to division of interests within the bourgeoisie itself. Even the acute farm questions could be brought down to the same level, as they used to be treated in elections prior to 1929.

In other words, there will be domestic issues between the two capitalist parties in 1940. And the more vocal and active the progressive elements in these two parties will be, the more real will be the importance of these issues to the masses. However, as far as the dominating forces of the two major parties are concerned, they will undoubtedly seek to give the 1940 campaign, as much as possible, the same or similar character as in the “good, old times.” Namely, a campaign between ins and outs, basically along the lines of the traditional two-party system, adjusted to the peculiarities of the new situation. These “adjustments” will be very important; but they couldn’t change the fact that both parties will be standing substantially for the same things, as far as labor and its allies are concerned.

3. It therefore follows, as a matter of perspective and orientation, that the working class and its allies (the toiling farmers, the exploited middle classes, the Negro people) cannot look forward to a situation in 1940, in which they would be able to support the national platform and presidential candidates of either the Republican or Democratic parties. They couldn’t do so without seriously compromising and sacrificing, not only their future, but their most immediate and burning interests. It follows further that the forces of the anti-imperialist front of the people have to orientate on the creation of new political instrumentalities—an anti-imperialist party of peace—which alone can check the imperialist warmongering of the bourgeoisie, help bring the war to an end, protect the social gains of the masses and continue them further, save the people from the heavy burdens of war preparations and war economy, save the civil liberties and rights of the masses, keep America out of the imperialist war.

This means active daily struggle on
such a platform, also in preparation for the next session of Congress. It means building and strengthening all the independent progressive mass organizations—especially the unions. It means struggle for labor unity to preserve and further develop free and independent trade unions. It means building Labor's Non-Partisan League into a democratically organized mass political power. It means extending labor's ties with the toiling farmers and exploited middle classes, encouraging and supporting all forces and elements which give expression (no matter how inadequately as yet) to the people's struggles against reaction, imperialism and monopoly exploitation. It means, finally, as in the case of the American Labor Party in New York, to free this political labor organization of all imperialist and warmongering influence in policy and leadership (Waldman and Co.), as the only way to united labor action and to a united people's anti-imperialist, anti-war front.

A. B.

"Under the capitalist system the exploited masses do not, nor can they, really participate in the administration of the country, if for no other reason than that even with the most democratic system under capitalism, the governments are set up not by the people, but by the Rothschilds and Stinneses, the Morgans and Rockefellers. Democracy under the capitalist system is capitalist democracy, the democracy of an exploiting minority based upon the restriction of the rights of the exploited majority and directed against this majority. Only under the dictatorship of the proletariat is real 'freedom' for the exploited and real participation in the administration of the country by the proletarians and peasants possible. Under the dictatorship of the proletariat, democracy is proletarian democracy—the democracy of the exploited majority based upon the restriction of the rights of the exploiting minority and directed against this minority."—J. V. Stalin, *Foundations of Leninism*, page 52.
DEFEND THE CIVIL RIGHTS OF COMMUNISTS!

Hungry for huge war profits, the barons of Wall Street are speeding to involve the American people in the imperialist war raging in Europe. The blackout of civil liberties is part of Wall Street's war drive. Capitalist reaction is intent upon depriving the Communists of their civil rights as the preparation for an attack on the economic standards and civil rights of the trade unions, of the working class, of all who oppose American involvement in the imperialist war. Immediate and powerful defense of the civil rights of the Communists is, therefore, of the utmost urgency for the entire labor movement and all who stand for progress and peace.

The Communist movement is the product of the historic struggle of the working people for emancipation from capitalist exploitation and oppression and for the establishment of socialism. Marx and Engels developed the basic theory of this struggle, and ninety-two years ago founded the Communist Party to organize its consummation. The utopian dream of many generations was transformed into scientific theory and practice. The living realization of the scientific truths discovered by Marx and Engels almost a century ago and brilliantly advanced by the genius of Lenin and Stalin is embodied in the glorious achievements of the Soviet Union and in the whole world Communist movement. The banner of socialism waves triumphantly over one hundred and eighty million people, and enjoys the love and devoted support of millions and millions more in the capitalist and colonial world.

To halt the steadily moving current toward socialism is the compelling motive of capitalist policy throughout the world today. To this end, capitalism resorts with increasing fury and violence to "the branding reproach of Communism" against all progressive measures and movements, trade unions and peace organizations. Behind this smokescreen there is a plan with these definite objectives: to plunge the U.S.A. into the second imperialist war; to deliver the country to the reactionary candidates of Big Business in 1940; and to smash the Communist Party as the condition precedent for the fulfillment of these aims.

It is neither new, strange, nor accidental that the Communist Party, the only party of socialism in the United States, should be the object of the most vicious attacks by the reactionary bourgeoisie and its apologists. Born in the anti-war struggles of the American people against the first imperialist World War, the Communist Party today is the main organizer of
mass resistance against America's involvement in the second imperialist war. The Party is in the very forefront of the struggle to expose the predatory, reactionary nature of the war, the anti-Soviet aims of Anglo-French imperialism; and to defeat the plans of the American monopolists to reap billions in bloody profits from the war as the prelude to America's actual participation in it.

The pack of the master class is baying over the radio and in the press, trying to win sympathy for the hypocritical "anti-Hitler" slogans of Anglo-French imperialism, and to create prejudice against the Land of Socialism. Increasingly, reaction is directing its attacks against the Communist Party. The indictment of Earl Browder, General Secretary of the Communist Party, on petty passport charges long dropped as untenable by an earlier administration, and the barrage against him and the whole Party in the entire capitalist press; the barring of the Communist councilmanic candidates in New York City on the flimsiest of technicalities; extradition proceedings against Sam Adams Darcy, State Secretary of the Communist Party of Eastern Pennsylvania, for prosecution on equally flimsy grounds; denial of the use of the radio to the Communist Party; the refusal of Harvard and Princeton Universities to permit Comrade Browder to deliver scheduled addresses and the deliberate press distortion of his recent speech at Boston; the organized hooligan attack upon the Detroit meeting addressed by William Z. Foster, National Chairman of the Party; the revival of criminal syndicalism laws and the arrest of Party leaders in Iowa—these are evidences of an organized attack, which, if not checked now, will be directed, before long, against the democratic rights of labor and the entire people.

The Defense Committee for Civil Rights for Communists, consisting of Robert Minor and myself, are authorized to receive contributions for the defense of the legal existence of the Communist Party under the Bill of Rights. We call upon all members of the Communist Party, all workers, friends, sympathizers and others who believe in democratic rights and civil liberties to contribute. We appeal for loans for a Bail Fund necessitated by the refusal of bonding companies to make bail. Threats of further arrests make it imperative for us to raise a large People's Bail Fund. If one thousand persons will lend us $100 each we can have such a reserve bail fund for all emergencies. Address: Room 524, 799 Broadway, New York City.

Help defend the right of the Communist Party to educate and organize the American people against involvement in the imperialist war, for the protection of their living standards and civil rights from reactionary attacks, and for the transition to socialism, for which America's material productive forces are riper than in any capitalist country, and upon which depends the permanent prosperity, peace, and well-being of our people.

Elizabeth Gurley Flynn
JOSEPH STALIN'S SIXTIETH BIRTHDAY

By EARL BROWDER

JOSEPH STALIN is sixty years of age on December 21, 1939. This anniversary is of exceptional interest to the entire world, but above all to those who have found in his words and his works the sure guide to the building of the new world, the World of Tomorrow.

In the United States, the mercenary press carries on an unprecedented campaign of calumny against Stalin, as their particular contribution to this anniversary. That is but the inexorable product of the struggle of the decaying old world against the new world of socialism that is being born. In the volume and intensity of the rage against Stalin that erupts from all the ideological servants of monopoly capitalism, we have presented to us, in negative form, a measure of Stalin's greatness. With this characterization we may dismiss the whole mass of calumny, which has the same historical significance in principle as the attacks against all great leaders and thinkers produced by mankind. The higher the waves of calumny mount, all the more conclusive is the evidence of the stature in history of the personality against which it is directed.

It is one of the most glaring contradictions of bourgeois society that its ideology glorifies the individual at the expense of the masses, but that it has lost the capacity of producing great individuals even on its own terms. No philosopher or statesman of the bourgeois world is able to command the respect and allegiance of more than a fraction of his world, nor even this for long. There are no more "great men" in the world of capitalism, except in the most pitifully transitory and fragmentary sense, nor even a "great tradition" being upheld and continued by men of lesser stature, in anything more than empty phrases. Senile and decaying monopoly capitalism has poisoned the society it dominates so thoroughly that greatness of the individual in thought and achievement is no longer possible, except in the struggle to free society from its incubus—a struggle that engages more and more the working class, and together with it everything healthy and decent from the other classes that can escape from the universal decay of the old order.

Joseph Stalin emerges before the whole world as the greatest figure of our time. This fact is attested alike by friend and enemy.

When one looks for an explanation of this historic stature of Stalin, this is found, first of all, in his role as continuator of the work of Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, and Vladimir Len-
in. The thought and work of these four giants of the proletariat, extending over more than ninety years, is one monolithic whole. It arises in history as the mighty synthesis of all previous human wisdom which is raised to new levels, and represents mankind in the process of mastering its own fate, society becoming captain of its own destiny, through socialism, the first stage of communism.

It is found, secondly, in his close identification with the masses, the broadest many-million masses, upon whom Stalin always bases himself in thought and action, and who always find in Stalin their most consistent and steadfast representative, guide and teacher.

It is found, thirdly, in Stalin as the leader of the Party, the vanguard of the working class, which realizes the potential power of that class, and gathers its allies around it in unshakable solidarity; the Party which finds in Stalin the embodiment of all its best and strongest qualities.

Communism, the science of social development, the final step by which man becomes master of his fate; the working class, at the head of the broadest toiling masses of the population, which is “mankind” in the concrete, the fundament of society and the bearer of its future; the Party, which unites science with the masses, thought with action, consciousness with will—these are the three great pillars which have raised Joseph Stalin to his eminence at the head of humanity in its struggle for that self-realization which is freedom.

The system of capitalism, of the bourgeoisie, which has dominated the world for hundreds of years, is today in the throes of its deepest and sharpest crisis, of which the second great imperialist war is the most dramatic expression. All its resources, material and spiritual, are thrown into the game of mutual mass destruction, to decide which members of the “family” of capitalist powers shall have the privilege of carving from the living bodies of the others, in the attempt to solve the insoluble problems of a moribund capitalist system. From this bourgeois world there are rapidly disappearing the last pretences of sustained rational thinking about the major problems of the world, and the last illusions of hope that the bourgeoisie can bring anything better to the world.

Even the United States, the “giant” of the capitalist world and its greatest stronghold, while still technically neutral in the war, shares fully in the world crisis of capitalism. For over ten years it has been partially paralyzed, one-third of its population must be maintained by extraordinary measures outside its orthodox principles and at a scandalously low and declining level; the more it accumulates wealth and productive resources the more insoluble become its difficulties. And now, when the imperialist war breaks out, this United States, ruled by Wall Street, can see in it nothing but the opportunity to seize without war some of the profits and booty, for which it prepares later to enter the war, when the easy pickings are exhausted. Capitalist America, while protesting its “peaceful” nature, has already become the most war-minded of all nations of the world; it is feverishly adjusting its entire economy and political resources to serve
the war and prolong it; nothing ro­

rous its hysterical denunciation so fiercely as a serious demand for the cessation of the war, and movements among the people to that end.

But the world of socialism, the So­
viet Union, headed by the Com­
munist Party and Stalin, emerges above the chaos of the capitalist world, calm and confident in its great and rapidly multiplying strength, a fortress of prosperity and peace for its peoples, an example to the oppressed masses of all lands.

While the capitalist world has been closing down its factories, destroying its own economies, throwing millions upon millions of its population into unemployment and starvation, the social­ist Soviet Union has multiplied its national production by ten-fold, brought employment and security to all its people, raised living standards many hundred per cent, created a cultured life for its masses, and forged an invincible wall of protection against a hostile world around it.

While the capitalist world has de­
stroyed the foundations of orderly rel­
lations between nations and reduced these relations to the basis of naked force, the Soviet Union has welded its own great family of nations in the unbreakable unity of peaceful collabor­
ation, and given the only example among great powers of a government which observes to the end every inter­
national pledge and responsibility.

While the capitalist world is rapidly discarding all the remnants of democratic self-government, which was its proudest achievement of the past, and is going over to open military and fascist dictatorships, a trend fully realized in the belligerent countries and rapidly rising also in the U. S.—the socialist Soviet Union celebrates its great Stalinist Constitution, the most democratic of all history, which has placed one-sixth of the earth ir­
revocably in the hands of its entire one hundred and eighty-three million people.

While the capitalist nations can not or dare not inform their own peoples and the world about their aims, pol­
cies and commitments, for fear of popular uprisings and revolutions from outraged masses—the socialist So­
viet Union confidently and calmly in­
forms the whole world of all its aims and policies, thereby confounding the diplomacy of the capitalist world which is based upon falsehood, trick­ery and deception, knowing full well that the more intimately the world knows all about the Soviet Union, the stronger will be its support among the toiling and oppressed peoples of all lands.

Less than twenty years ago, Lenin evaluated the relation of forces be­tween the world of socialism and the world of capitalism in the following words:

"We are, from the military and economic standpoint, infinitely weak. We have not one-hundredth of the forces of the combined imperialist states, and yet they are unable to stifle us."

Compare that relationship of forces to the one that exists today. From the military and economic standpoint the Soviet Union has emerged as the mightiest power in Europe. What the imperialist powers gained, in their post-War recuperation, they have largely lost in the protracted crisis and the new war. Even before the new imperialist war is well under way,
the capitalist class is already faced by a mass of workers and peasants who are against the war and who demand peace. Behind the capitalist powers are disillusioned and rebellious populations; behind the Soviet Union the unexampled enthusiasm of peoples without oppression or class divisions, rising rapidly in economic and cultural advancement, new men and women boldly masters of their own destiny.

Thus the relation of forces between the socialist and capitalist worlds is infinitely more favorable to the Soviet Union than it was in 1920, when Lenin noted the inability of imperialism, a hundred-fold stronger, to stifle the socialist world.

All capitalist leaders and statesmen, with their Social-Democratic, Trotskyite and Lovestoneite hangers-on, are dreaming about how to transform the present imperialist war into a general assault of all the capitalist world against the Soviet Union. They abjectly beg Hitler to “come back home” and head this holy crusade for them. But their dream has lost the material foundations for its realization.

Thanks to Stalin and to the Communist Party which he heads, as its outstanding guide, the world of socialism is invincible.

Thanks to Stalin, and to the genius which he inherited and developed further from Marx, Engels and Lenin, the working class and oppressed peoples of all lands have a mighty example and ally in their struggle against capitalist exploitation, oppression and war.

The whole world enters the period in which the transition to socialism is being placed on the order of the day. The words and deeds of Joseph Stalin and the Communist Party furnish the only clear guide to the world for the most orderly and efficient mastering of the world crisis, and the inauguration of socialism.

That is why the sixtieth birthday of Joseph Stalin will be noted by all men in all lands. The capitalists, reactionaries, monopolists and all their servants will continue to rage against and calumniate this man. The working class and the oppressed peoples greet his name with joy and hope, as the harbinger and beacon of a new and better world.
LENIN AND STALIN AS MASS LEADERS

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

The great revolution of October, 1917, which abolished Russian capitalism and landlordism and set up the Soviet government, resulted in the establishment of socialism throughout one-sixth of the earth, and is now surging forward to the building of communism, constitutes the deepest-going, farthest-reaching, and most fundamental mass movement in all human history. The two chief figures in the Communist Party heading this epic struggle—Lenin and Stalin—have continuously displayed, in its course, unequalled qualities as political leaders of the working class and of the toiling people generally.

Lenin and Stalin have evidenced their outstanding brilliance as mass leaders in every revolutionary requirement: in Marxian theory, political strategy, the building of mass organizations, and in the development of the mass struggle. The characteristic feature of their work is its many-sidedness. Both men of action as well as of thought, they have exemplified in their activities that coordination of theory and practice which is so indispensable to the success of the every-day struggles of the masses and the final establishment of socialism. Both have worked in the clearest realization of the twin truths that there can be no revolutionary movement without revolutionary theory, and that revolutionary theory unsupported by organized mass struggle must remain sterile. Like Marx and Engels before them, Lenin and Stalin have shown superlative capacities in translating their socialist principles into successful mass action.

The work of Lenin and Stalin, so graphically portrayed in the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, is full of urgent and vital lessons for the Communist Party of the United States and the whole popular mass movement in these days of imperialist war. This article will undertake to point out some of these lessons, paying special attention to the organizational aspects of the work of Lenin and Stalin.

GREAT MARXIAN THEORETICIANS

The main foundation of the brilliant successes of Lenin and Stalin as the leaders of the Russian Revolution lies in their deep mastery of Marxian theory. With unmatched ability, they analyzed the innumerable objective and subjective complexities of decaying capitalism and growing socialism, and drew the necessary practical conclusions therefrom. Better than anyone else, they pointed out clearly to the Communist Party and the broad masses, both in the Soviet Union and throughout the world, the unfolding path to prosperity and freedom.

Lenin's great theoretical work advanced and expanded Marxism in
many fields. His major achievements include his analysis of imperialism as parasitic, decaying capitalism; his survey and evaluation, in the light of dialectical materialism, of many branches of current science; his elaboration of the theory of the uneven development of capitalism and its effects upon imperialist war, proletarian revolution and the realization of socialism in a single country. He elaborated the method of transforming imperialist war into civil war; he analyzed the capitalist state and the dictatorship of the proletariat; he presented a deep theoretical work on the national question; he clarified the role of the peasantry in the revolution. His annihilating polemics against the Narodniks, Economists, Mensheviks and the whole network of international Social-Democracy, Socialist-Revolutionaries, Anarchists, Syndicalists, Trotskyists, and other pseudo-revolutionary groups; and his solution of innumerable additional theoretical and practical problems were of the utmost significance in welding the theoretical and organizational strength and unity which charted the Bolshevik Party on the course of victory.

Stalin has further developed Marxism-Leninism through many invaluable theoretical accomplishments. His principal contributions to Marxist theory lie in indicating the path of the actual building of socialism in the U.S.S.R. Thus, his powerful polemics against Trotsky, Zinoviev, Bukharin and their counter-revolutionary affiliates comprised the greatest ideological struggle of our times. They clarified every aspect of the vast and unique problem of building socialism in one country, and surveyed the whole position of international capitalism. They resulted in a decisive victory for the leadership of the Communist Party and, thereby, of socialism.

Marx and Engels laid the foundations of socialism by establishing its main scientific principles. Lenin was especially the theoretician of the revolutionary seizure of power and the establishment of the fundamental institutions of socialism. He further developed the profound Marxian analysis of the capitalist system and the class struggle, carrying it into the epoch of imperialism. Stalin has raised the whole Marxist-Leninist structure still another stage higher by revealing the path to the actual building of socialism and the development toward communism.

Without the profound work of Lenin and Stalin, the Party and the masses could not have found their way through the maze of thorny problems that beset them. The mastery of Marxism-Leninism is Stalin's great mainstay in piloting the Soviet Union through the present complicated world situation.

BRILLIANT POLITICAL STRATEGIST

As masters of Marxian theory, Lenin and Stalin could develop their profound ability as political strategists. The Marxist method of analysis, enabling them to gauge accurately the relationship of classes and the general economic and political forces at work in a given situation, equipped them to determine when, how and where the Party and the masses could strike the most effective blows.

Lenin was bold, resourceful and flexible in his political strategy. Time and again he outlined separate mass
actions or general courses of policy upon the initiation and success of which the very life of the revolution depended. So original and startling were these policies that they often astounded the world. Lenin on several occasions had to convince opposing majorities of the Central Committee of the Party as to the correctness of his proposals, as well as smash through the sabotage of alien elements like Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin, Trotsky and others.

Among Lenin's great achievements in political strategy were his leadership in the transformation of the 1905 post-war struggle of the masses into armed insurrection; in the successful boycott of the first Duma; in the transformation of the imperialist World War into civil war within Russia; in the Party's resolute stand against the Provisional Government in 1917 and the bold development of the Soviets into the mass organs by which that capitalist, war-making regime was overthrown; in the mobilization of the masses to defeat the Kornilov revolt, while at the same time continuing the struggle against Kerensky.

Lenin's greatest achievement, however, as a political strategist was in determining the precise time and manner for achieving the October Revolution. In this supreme moment of history he gave the Party and the masses correct Marxian leadership.

During the following years of desperate revolutionary struggle in the U.S.S.R., there was Lenin's political masterstroke of the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty, which gave the revolution a "breathing-spell" from imperialist attack, saving it from defeat. There was his leadership in the terribly difficult Civil War and in the complicated development of War Communism. There was his tremendous work of outlining and clarifying the New Economic Policy as the means to get economic reconstruction under way in the devastated country. There was his brilliant attack upon the infantile Leftism of those revolutionaries who refused to work within the reactionary trade unions and bourgeois parliaments.

Stalin, "the best pupil of Lenin," also displays a high genius of political strategy. He has Lenin's boldness, flexibility and clear-sightedness. It is significant that, in the many difficult strategical moves Lenin worked out, Stalin always found himself in agreement with him, although at times many Central Committee members were initially uncertain or in opposition. This quick grasp of the true meaning of Lenin's policies was an indication of that great strategical ability which Stalin himself has shown so often since his accession to the chief Party leadership after Lenin's death in 1924.

Stalin's greatest masterpieces of political strategy, like his main theoretical work, have been directly connected with the building of socialism. They were notably expressed by his leadership in the intense drive to industrialize the U.S.S.R. and to collectivize its agriculture. That history-making movement, which the Party initiated in the First Five-Year Plan beginning in 1929, has already made the Soviet Union the second industrial country of the world, with the most advanced agricultural organization. That tremendous movement involved Marxist-Leninist evaluation, organizational work, and strategical considerations
of deep complexity. Vital complementary features of this great task of socialist construction (every phase of which was ridiculed and declared impossible by bourgeois economists the world over) were the timely economic and political liquidation of the Nepmen, (small traders) and the kulaks (rich farmers).

A strategic move of great importance was Stalin's bold purge of spies and wreckers from Soviet life, which gave fascism its biggest defeat, upsetting Chamberlain's and Hitler's plan of a united attack upon the Soviet Union. Leninism-Stalinism also was the theoretical basis of the international policy of the people's front, the historically imperative tactic to unite the masses of workers, farmers, professionals and small business people in the capitalist and colonial countries in effective struggle against fascism and for democracy. The people's front policy was connected with the Soviet world peace policy which sought to create an international front of the democratic peoples to stop the fascist aggressor powers. This policy would undoubtedly have been successful in preventing war, but primarily because the Social-Democratic leaders of England and France did not support it, Chamberlain and Daladier were able to reject it. Undeterred by this defeat of the international peace front and the outbreak of the war, the Soviet Union, guided by the brilliant strategy of Stalin and the Communist Party, has developed a new policy in the struggle for world peace and democracy. As it has rapidly unfolded, this policy has amazed the world with its boldness, some of its major aspects being the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact, the smashing of the fascist Axis, the liberation of the White Russian and Ukrainian minorities in Poland, the armistice with Japan, and the mutual assistance pacts with the Baltic nations.

OUTSTANDING MASS ORGANIZERS

Lenin and Stalin proved themselves to be not only great Marxian theoreticians and brilliant strategists, but also highly gifted builders of the mass organizations necessary to give flesh and blood to their Marxian theory and strategy. Lenin said, "The proletariat has no other weapon in the struggle for power except organization." The writings of both Lenin and Stalin are saturated with a profound appreciation of the decisive political significance of organization, and their work is full of organizational tasks carried out to their remotest detail.

Lenin was a superlatively great organizer. He worked out, in practice as well as in theory, the fundamental organizational principles of the Communist Party, the most advanced and complicated form of political organization yet forged by mankind. He organized to the smallest details the publication of the first all-Russian Marxist newspaper in Russia, the Iskra, within whose columns were published outstanding contributions to Marxist literature, and which enormously assisted the ideological and organizational unity of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party. In sharp conflict with opportunists of various brands, he hammered out the conceptions of the Party's vanguard role, of iron discipline, democratic

* The word is derived from N.E.P. (New Economic Policy).
centralism, monolithic unity, self-criticism, factory unit form of organization, legal and illegal methods of work, the role of the professional revolutionist, etc. This made the Communist Party of the Soviet Union a party of the new type and enabled it to lead the Russian Revolution successfully.

Lenin personally led in organizing the Communist International. He not only laid down its basic theoretical groundwork and indicated the key moment of its launching, but he also, in the midst of his stupendous activities as leader of the Russian Revolution, worked out the main lines of its program and much of its detailed structure and procedure. The guiding hand of Lenin can be seen through the fibre and being of the Communist International.

Lenin applied himself closely to organizational tasks in many other forms of mass activity, with the usual brilliant results. Thus, he developed the theory of the role and structure of the Soviets, following up personally their many complicated organizational problems. He also turned his powerful intellect and gigantic energies upon organizing the Red Army which militantly defended the country during the three years of bitter civil war. He, furthermore, was the main authority in setting up the unique and difficult forms of socialist economic organization, labor discipline, financing, etc., in Soviet industry. His work also in solving the complexities in the relations of the trade unions to the Party, to the state, to industry, and to the workers' interests generally, was of inestimable value; his writings on trade unionism remain classics. One of the last achievements of Lenin's fruitful life was his profound article upon the organization and tasks of the cooperatives.

Stalin, like Lenin, also possesses surpassing merit as a mass organizer. At the Seventeenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, he stated that one of the Party's basic tasks was "to raise organizational leadership to the level of political leadership." This principle has guided his active political life.

Stalin was a close collaborator with Lenin in all his brilliant organizational work; and since Lenin's death, he, as leader of the Party, has been called upon constantly to exercise his great mass organizing talent. His main organizing work, like his theoretical and strategical contributions, related chiefly to carrying through socialist construction. This vast task involved rearing millions of skilled workers and engineers out of an industrially backward population, building up unique economic organs, developing new methods of mass work, and a thousand other grave organizational problems. A gigantic feature of this work was the historic collectivization of Soviet agriculture. In all this socialist construction Stalin was the chief organizer, leader and teacher of the Party and the masses.

Under Stalin's leadership, too, the Red Army has been built into the most formidable military force in the world. Every detail of organization has been under his constant surveillance. Stalin has also led the Party in that basic aspect of social organization, the elaboration and crystallization of growing socialist democracy. This highly political development, like all other features of Soviet life, has its complicated organizational
LENIN AND STALIN AS MASS LEADERS

The expanding Soviet democracy has given birth, as its legal expression, to the new Constitution, most advanced in the world, fitly named after Stalin.

PEERLESS MASS ACTIVIZERS

In our foregoing analysis of Lenin and Stalin as mass leaders, we have briefly reviewed their great genius as Marxist theoreticians, as political strategists and as builders of mass organizations. They also display no less brilliance in that other fundamental requirement of effective leadership: the ability to bring into struggle the broadest masses and to animate them with an invincible fighting spirit. This requires a thoroughgoing coordination of Marxist theory, sound strategy and tactics, solid organization, good methods of work, boundless militancy and resoluteness. The final test of good political generalship in the class struggle is to be able to mobilize to the utmost all available and potential fighting forces. This requires the closest contact with, and understanding of, the masses. Lenin and Stalin have always been completely identified with the working class and its natural allies. They have excelled in their knowledge of how the people have felt and thought at any moment. Their ear at all times has been close to the ground. They have been able to voice at any given time the deepest aspirations of the masses and to point the way for realization of their most basic needs.

Lenin and Stalin have been master mobilizers of the people. Never were they mere "cabinet" generals, but functioned directly on the firing line. Thus, Stalin was head of the committee that prepared the revolutionary seizure of power in Petrograd; and on the night of October 24, just before the decisive action began, when Lenin arrived in the city, Stalin was assigned personal leadership of the uprising.

Time and again during the Revolution these two leaders developed veritable miracles of mass activation and struggle, with few organized resources and in the face of gigantic obstacles. By realizing in struggle the identity of interest of the Party and the people, they could bind the Party to every fibre of the working and peasant masses and convey to these masses a high degree of the Party's clear-sightedness, systematic methods of work, resoluteness, unflinching courage, firm unity, iron discipline and unbreakable fighting spirit.

The October Revolution itself furnished the best illustration of Lenin's great activizing ability; of his capacity, by the coordination of theory and practice, to involve huge masses in struggle around a relatively small organized force. When this gigantic movement was carried through, the Communist Party which headed it had hardly more than 300,000 members in a population of 160,000,000. But the Party, clear-headed and capably led, with a sound policy, using practical methods of work, and infused with the tireless and dauntless fighting spirit of Lenin, was able by prodigious effort to reach the masses. It educated them, set them in motion, and led their millions in successful revolutionary struggle against capitalism.

Another brilliant example of this supreme ability of Lenin and the Party to mobilize and activate the whole people in struggle was shown
in the bitterly fought Civil War. When the Revolution took place in October, 1917, the Russian army, betrayed by its tsarist officers and defeated by the Germans, was rapidly disintegrating and about to fall to pieces. World military experts declared it impossible for the war-weary, starving Russian people to be re-organized to fight against the imperialist intervention, launched by England, France, Japan and the United States. But the job was done. The Communist Party, led by Lenin, in the fire of civil war, with industry and agriculture prostrate and with daily rations as low as two ounces of bread per person, was able to build the Red Army into an invincible force of 5,000,000 soldiers who victoriously drove the counter-revolution from Soviet Russia's borders. To perform this "impossibility" required a tremendous mobilization of the people, and to bring this about taxed all the understanding, tenacity and fighting spirit of the Party.

Stalin, like Lenin, is distinguished by high ability as a mass activizer. His great capacity in this key phase of leadership was graphically shown, among other major campaigns, by the Party's great drive to carry through the First Five-Year Plan. When this plan became known internationally, it evoked a chorus of sneers from bourgeois economists and statesmen. These wiseacres pronounced the whole thing fantastic, a mere propaganda stunt. Many declared it would require, not five, but fifty years to fulfil, because the Soviet government was deeply deficient in capital, industrial experience, engineers and skilled workers. These people especially ridiculed the section of the plan dealing with farm collectivization, and declared that the individualistic peasants could never be organized to carry it out.

But the Communist Party, headed by Stalin, was undeterred by this pessimism, by the sabotage of Trotskyites and other wreckers. It proceeded to a tremendous mobilization and activization of the whole Soviet people. The pessimists said the Plan could not be accomplished in five years; very well, the Party resolved to make it in four. The result is now history, a glorious page in the life of the Russian Revolution. By superhuman efforts, based upon the education of the masses; by organizing, inspiring, and straining every resource of the people to the limit, the Five-Year Plan was carried through in four and one-quarter years. Huge plants sprang up almost like magic; the farms were collectivized in a vast sweeping movement; multitudes of workers and technicians were rapidly trained. Never before had the world seen such a swift advance in industry and agriculture, such a tremendous energizing of a vast people. The Soviet Union leaped into second place among the world's industrial countries. Stalin stood forth as a superlative mass organizer.

In the present troubled world the practical political significance of this rapid progress (continued under the Second and Third Five-Year Plans) is that it made the Soviet Union an invincible fortress of peace in the path of war-makers. Should the U.S.S.R. be drawn into the present war, in spite of all efforts to keep out, this Bolshevik ability to mobilize and activize the masses in struggle will play a role fatal to the program of the im-
perialists who seek the downfall of the Soviet Union.

**SOME GENERAL CONCLUSIONS**

The above-presented brief indications of Lenin's and Stalin's activities as mass leaders do not constitute a complete picture of their work, but serve at least to throw some highlights upon the four major aspects of their leadership: Marxian theory, political strategy, mass organization, and mass activation. The work of these leaders has many lessons for the Communist Party and for the American toiling masses. If we are to profit from them, however, we must not mechanically apply here the methods used by Lenin and Stalin in Russia, but adapt them to the particular needs and special problems of our American movement.

Lenin and Stalin themselves have given the clearest examples of how to apply international Marxism to specifically national conditions. They have always stressed the need for the Communist Parties of the various lands to know their peoples well; to analyze the national traditions and peculiarities of their countries; and to apply Marxism, not mechanically but specifically, to their native conditions. Let us, therefore, briefly indicate a few of the major applications to our American situation.

First, in the matter of Marxian theory, the leaders of American trade unions, farm organizations, and other mass bodies are, with rare exceptions, extremely weak. There is deep confusion among them as to what is actually happening to capitalism. They do not clearly understand the economic, political and social forces at work undermining the capitalist system; nor do they realize that only socialism can solve the problems that are wrecking the present social order. Their estimation of the relationship of classes is unclear; their conception of the class struggle and the growth of fascism and reaction is superficial. This theoretical weakness hinders the working class from developing the necessary class consciousness; it affects adversely all phases of its strategy, organization and struggle.

The theoretical confusion of trade union and other popular mass leaders is now climaxed in their wrong attitude toward the war. With few exceptions, they are accepting the capitalist contention that Great Britain and France are defending democracy against Hitlerism. Thus they walk straight into the trap of the imperialist war-makers and try to draw the masses in after them. Reactionaries like Green and Woll, lieutenants of capitalism in the ranks of labor, take a pro-war position as a matter of policy; but there are also many honest mass leaders, especially of the lower categories, who follow the war-makers simply through ignorance and inability to analyze the complex clash of social forces.

A wider knowledge of Marxism-Leninism, both among the leadership and the rank and file, is essential to the success of the whole class struggle. It is a supreme task of the Communist Party to advance this knowledge throughout the broad mass movement.

Secondly, in the matter of political strategy, organically related to theoretical understanding, the mass organizations would also do well to absorb some lessons from Lenin and Stalin. Gross weaknesses are evident among
them; for example in the lack of any plan for actually building an alliance of workers, farmers, professionals, and small business elements, the movement largely drifting in that direction under pressure of events and with much confusion and lost motion. Then there is the lack of anything that might definitely be called labor's political or economic program in the war situation. Next, there is the bad generalship which causes the workers to approach the crucial 1940 elections with a split trade union movement. Again, there is little conception of labor's necessary independent role politically. Then there is confusion in labor and progressive ranks on how to meet the vicious red-baiting campaign of the reactionaries, especially the Dies Committee and its attack upon the Communist Party. Although obviously the red-baiters' aim is to destroy, not only the Communist Party, but the whole labor and progressive movement, even the most progressive trade union leaders fail to fight these reactionary demagogues. All such confusion and weakness is remote indeed from the brilliant political strategy of Lenin and Stalin.

Thirdly, in the matter of mass organization, our movement has likewise much to learn from those expert organizers, Lenin and Stalin. Observe the generally haphazard, lackadaisical methods of work and administration in American mass organizations of all kinds. The classic example of this is the way A. F. of L. leaders desperately cling to the outworn craft form of trade unionism in a highly industrialized country like ours. The present split in the labor movement was caused by the A. F. of L. officials' failure to adopt obviously necessary advances in organizational forms and methods. Then there is the lack of mass political organization of labor, aside from such beginnings as Labor's Non-Partisan League. In each recurring election we see the deplorable spectacle of organized labor, without organization of its own, trailing along after the capitalist party candidates.

Such organizational backwardness is, of course, based upon conservatism in political theory and strategy. It cries out for an application of the brilliant lessons given by Lenin and Stalin.

Fourthly, in the matter of mass activization, also, highly profitable lessons can be learned by American progressives from the work of Lenin and Stalin. Contrast the latter's tremendous mobilization of the Soviet people with the desultory activization of the masses in the American class struggle. There is, for example, the A. F. of L.'s clumsy inability to mobilize its big membership for united action in political elections, in strikes, or in organizing campaigns. This great, lumbering movement is incapable, with its present leadership and policies, of concerted motion in any direction.

Other examples were the recent failures of the trade unions and other mass organizations to act militantly in the Congressional fights over the Supreme Court, government reorganization, W.P.A., the lending bill and neutrality. In these important struggles only the most sketchy efforts were made to rouse the masses and swing them into action behind the New Deal program, so that the popular cause was repeatedly defeated, although the majority was on its side.
At present we are being given an exhibition of characteristically weak activization of the masses by the straggling way the trade unions are fighting against the rising cost of living and for the organization of the unorganized.

The general effect of these weaknesses in activization (as well as in the spheres of theory, strategy, and organization) is dangerously to restrict the political fighting power of the mass movement. This cannot be tolerated in these days of well-organized and militant reaction. All sections of the American mass movement could profit from studying the work of those expert mobilizers of the people, Lenin and Stalin.

It is not simply a case, however, of applying these lessons to the trade unions, farmers' organizations, and to the mass movement generally. We Communists, above all, must learn from Lenin and Stalin to equip ourselves for our role of vanguard. Our Party is still weak in theory; our political strategy often leaves much to be desired; our organizational methods need drastic improvement, and in mobilizing the members of our Party for specific struggle, as well as activizing the mass organizations generally, we still display many deficiencies. Thus, our Party building resolution of the Tenth Convention urged:

"The leading bodies of our Party have the task to assimilate and master more consciously and systematically the lessons of Comrade Stalin's leadership so gloriously exemplified in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its world-historic building of socialism."

Today our Party confronts gigantic problems of teaching the masses that this is an imperialist war, in mobilizing them to struggle for peace and to keep America out of the war, in organizing them to defend their civil rights, living standards, and social legislation; in enlightening them in the principles of socialism. Our Party can fulfill these difficult tasks only if it learns and practices the profound lessons that Lenin and Stalin have to teach us in Marxian theory, political strategy, mass organization, and mass activization.

Those workers and other militants determined to learn the most effective ways of battling against imperialist war in the fight for democracy and socialism must study the great principles of analysis and struggle outlined and applied by Lenin and Stalin, and adapt them to the American class struggle. To this end we are fortunate in having at our disposal the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union,* which contains the whole instructive and dramatic story of the lives and struggles of these leaders. This great book should not only be read and studied, but also used as a practical Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist guide in shaping the struggles of the masses for freedom, democracy and socialism.

* Published by International Publishers, New York.
**EARLY WRITINGS OF STALIN**

These are times when the great figure of Stalin rises ever more distinctly before working men and women. His wisdom is reaching the proletariat; for it is the wisdom of one who knows the secrets of the enemy and the might of its gravedigger, the proletariat. For Communists, the writings of Stalin, like those of Marx, Engels and Lenin, are the Bolshevik arsenal, storing the highest-calibered theoretical weapons, which, when grasped by the masses, become the force to uproot the old and build the highways to the new world order of socialism.

The greatness of Stalin today has its roots in the Stalin who taught and fought, organized and led, in Transcaucasia from 1896 to 1910.

The eventful book by L. Beria,* Stalin's Early Writings and Activities,** gives us this early Stalin, his role as theoretician and as founder of the Transcaucasian Bolshevik organizations. It gives us some of Stalin's early writings, which are of highest importance for Communist theory, writings which are architectural in their solidity and mobile like an ever-living, steady flame.

In 1905, Stalin wrote the illegally published pamphlet, *A Glance at Party Disagreements,* and the article “An Answer to a Social-Democrat,” which subjected the Menshevik theory of spontaneity to devastating criticism. It developed the ideas, so brilliantly propounded by Lenin in *What Is to Be Done?*, concerning the combination of theory and practice and the introduction of socialist consciousness into the labor movement.

Stalin's attack was directed primarily at the Georgian Mensheviks who were at this time endeavoring to prevent the revolutionary upsurge of the Batum and Tiflis workers. But Stalin's formulations are classic and universally applicable wherever capitalism exists.

We quote from *A Glance at Party Disagreements*:

“A spontaneous labor movement, a movement without socialism, inevitably becomes petty and takes on a craft-unionist complexion, subordinates itself to bourgeois ideology.

“But may the conclusion be drawn from this that socialism is everything and the labor movement nothing? Certainly not! Only idealists can claim this. Ultimately, economic development will surely lead the working class to the social revolution and liberate it from bourgeois ideology, but the point is that it is a path of zigzags and digressions.

“On the other hand, socialism outside the labor movement remains a phrase and loses its meaning, no mat-

---

* Formerly Secretary of the Communist Party of Transcaucasia, now a leading member of the Soviet government.
ter on what scientific grounds it stands. But may it be concluded from this that the labor movement is everything and socialism nothing? Not in the least. The only people who can think so are those quasi-Marxists for whom an idea loses all meaning and has no meaning just because it has been worked out by life. But socialism can be introduced into the labor movement and transformed from an empty phrase into a powerful weapon.

“What is the conclusion? The labor movement must unite with socialism; practical activity must be closely bound up with theory, and so give the spontaneous labor movement a Social-Democratic meaning and character. . . .” (Quoted in Stalin's Early Writings and Activities, pp. 53-54.)

And from Stalin's article, “An Answer to a Social-Democrat”:

“. . . what meaning has mere socialist consciousness if it is not disseminated among the proletariat? It will remain an empty phrase and nothing more. Matters will take an entirely different turn if this consciousness spreads among the proletariat: the proletariat will realize its position and will press on towards a socialist life at a more rapid pace. . . .” (Ibid., pp. 55-56.)

Lenin thought so highly of Stalin's article that he wrote a summary of it in the central organ of the Party, Proletary. He valued it because it was “an excellent formulation of the question of the famous "introduction of consciousness from without."” Lenin and Stalin, possessing this highest type of socialist consciousness, were able to build the Bolshevik Party with its powerful principle of democratic centralism.

Stalin was with Lenin the greatest proponent of democracy in the Party and in the Soviet state. In the following passage from an article written in 1906, he sets forth the reality of democracy and rejects all fetishism of it.

“Real democracy means that the Party membership functions in the Party organization, that the Party membership decides Party questions and general practical questions as well, that the Party membership passes its own resolutions, and obliges its organizations to put these resolutions into effect.

“Democracy does not consist only in democratic elections. Democracy in elections cannot yet be called real democracy. Napoleon III was elected by universal suffrage; but who does not know that this elected emperor was one of the greatest oppressors of the people?

“What we are referring to is democracy in action, whereby the Party membership decides questions itself and acts itself. And we must say that this is just the kind of democracy that must be fundamental in our Social-Democratic organization.” (Ibid., p. 57.)

Democracy of deed and word, inseparably combined—such is the Communist principle embodied in the highest type of political document—the Stalin Constitution.

Stalin, whose whole life has been a sharp struggle against all enemies of
the working class, knows how to characterize their class essence and to tear off their disguises. This ability enabled him to expose the Trotskyites, Bukharinites, Mensheviks, bourgeois-nationalist deviators, etc., who wound up their miserable careers as fiends of counter-revolution.

In 1906, in an article exposing the nationalist Georgian Federalist Party, which sought to divide the working class of Transcaucasia by subordinating it to the nationalist bourgeoisie, Stalin devastatingly generalized the characteristics of such political chameleons. The article is sharply relevant to those “liberals” today who have lowered their sails to ride with the “wind of reaction.”

“. . . The chameleon’s distinguishing feature is that he is forever changing his color. It is a well-known fact that every animal has its own particular coloring; but the chameleon’s nature is not satisfied with this; he assumes a lion’s color when he is with the lion, a wolf’s when he is with the wolf, a frog’s when he is with the frog, depending on which color is more to his advantage at the time; like a man who is hypocritical and unprincipled, he is mine when with me, yours when with you, a reactionary with a reactionary, a revolutionary with a revolutionary, provided he can somehow creep into a loophole and get what he wants. . . .

“Time was when the party of the proletariat roared and shook the country. How did these anarchist-Federalist babblers act then? They looked at this party with envy, coveted its lot for themselves, and, hiding round corners, applauded it discreetly. Why did they act this way? Because it was more to their advantage at the time; everyone knows that it is not so easy to ridicule or abuse a victor. Now that the wind has veered to reaction and turned the wheel back, these gentrify have changed their color and are reviling the party of the same proletariat for all they are worth. Why? Because today it is apparently more advantageous for them—they know that they will ‘get away’ with this filthy demagogy. And what else can they do but bark? . . . Of course the tail-wagging bourgeoisie has nothing left to do but play the chameleon, the consequence being that they will always try to change the people into a chameleon too so as to get the political reins into their own hands. That is why our bourgeois gentlemen have completely assimilated the chameleon’s art in politics—blood is thicker than water.

“But all this means that the proletariat must watch the field of battle soberly, it must not be deceived by outward glitter but must fight relentlessly both against the pillars of reaction and against the chameleon tricks of the bourgeoisie.

“The interests of the proletariat demand this.” (Ibid., pp. 58-59.)

Stalin’s admonition to “fight relentlessly both against the pillars of reaction and against the chameleon tricks of the bourgeoisie” points out the task of the working class today, so sharply emphasized by Dimitroff in his recent article on the imperialist war and the Party’s role in breaking down the varied influences of imperialist social-democracy. Today the fundamental issue in the capitalist world is the
struggle for socialism. The workers in the course of struggling against the war will realize, in Stalin's words, that "The proletariat will not be able to achieve socialism by conciliating the bourgeoisie—it must without fail enter upon the path of struggle, and this struggle must be a class struggle, the struggle of the whole proletariat against the whole bourgeoisie." (Ibid., p. 104.) Then Stalin reminds those who reveal tendencies of Leftist sectarianism: "The socialist revolution is not an unexpected and instantaneous blow—it is the prolonged action of the proletarian masses, who attack and capture the positions of the bourgeoisie." (Ibid., p. 104.)

This theory of proletarian revolution is critical and revolutionary, a dialectic theory of social development.

Stalin's writings, like those of Marx, Engels and Lenin, are brilliant illustrations of his mastery of the science of dialectical materialism. Indeed, precisely because dialectical materialism is the theory of development of the emergence of the new and the struggle with the old, it is impossible to understand it without constantly studying Stalin's works. For Stalin reveals the essence of the turns of history, the essence of shifting class and political relations, the essence of revolutionary strategy and tactics in the epoch of imperialism and the victory of socialism. Thereby he deepens and extends dialectic theory.

Thirty-three years ago Stalin revealed this superb skill. The solidity and mobility of his style, its directness and simplicity, rivet the reader's attention upon the heart of theory. The young Stalin wrote what is now a vital supplement to the masterly exposition of dialectical and historical materialism by Comrade Stalin today in Chapter Four of the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

We present from Stalin's writings in 1906 the following passages:

**On the connection between Marxist philosophy and scientific communism:**

"Marxism is not only a theory of socialism; it is a complete world outlook, a system of philosophy, from which the proletarian socialism of Marx logically ensues. This philosophical system is called dialectical materialism."

**On the dialectical method:**

"What is the dialectical method? . . . It is said that life consists of constant growth and development, and this is true. Social life is not something that is immutable and set, it never stays on the same level—it is in perpetual motion, in a state of coming into being and passing away. Not for nothing did Marx say: 'Perpetual motion, perpetual coming into being and passing away—such is the essence of life.' Therefore in life there is always the new and the old, the growing and the dying, revolution and reaction—in it something is always dying and at the same time something is always being born. . . .

"The dialectical method states that life must be considered exactly as it exists in reality. Life is in uninterrupted motion; it is our duty therefore to consider life in its motion, in its coming into being and passing away. Where is life going, what in life is dying and what is being born, what is passing away and what is coming
into being—these are the questions that must interest us primarily. This is the first deduction of the dialectical method.

"Whatever in life is born and grows from day to day is invincible, it is impossible to stop its forward movement, its victory is inevitable; that is to say, if, for instance, the proletariat comes into being and grows from day to day, then no matter how weak and small it may be today, in the end it will nevertheless be victorious. And, conversely, whatever in life is dying and heading towards the grave must inevitably suffer defeat; that is to say, if, for instance, the bourgeoisie is losing ground and retrograding from day to day, then no matter how strong and numerous it may be today, in the end it must nevertheless suffer defeat and pass to its grave. From this arises the well-known dialectical postulate: All that really exists, i.e., all that grows from day to day is rational.

"This is the second deduction of the dialectical method.

"In the 'eighties of the nineteenth century, an interesting dispute arose among the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia. The Narodniki said that the main force which could undertake the 'liberation of Russia' was the poor peasantry. Why? they were asked by the Marxists. Because, they said, the peasantry is more numerous and at the same time poorer than all others in Russian society. The Marxists replied: It is true that today the peasantry constitutes the majority and is very poor, but is this really the point? The peasantry has long been in the majority, but up to now, without the assistance of the proletariat, it has not shown any initiative in the struggle for 'freedom.' And why? Because the peasantry, as an estate, is being destroyed from day to day, is breaking up into the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, whereas the proletariat as a class is growing and becoming stronger from day to day. Nor is poverty of decisive importance here: 'tramps' are poorer than the peasants, but no one can say that they will take upon themselves the 'liberation of Russia.'

"The only point is: who in life is growing and who is ageing? Since the proletariat is the only class which is constantly growing and striving for life, our duty is to stand side by side with it and to recognize it as the main force of the Russian revolution—this is what the Marxists answered. As you see, the Marxists regarded the question from the dialectical point of view, while the Narodniki reasoned metaphysically, because they regarded life as something 'congealed at one point' (Cf. Engels' Anti-Duhring.)

"This is how the dialectical method looks at the dynamics of life.

"But there is motion and motion. The 'December Days,' when the proletariat straightened its back, stormed the arsenals and attacked the reaction, constituted motion, movement in social life. But the movement of the preceding years, when the 'appeased' proletariat established small unions and went on strike here and there, must also be called motion, movement in social life. It is clear that motion has various forms. The dialectical method says that motion has a dual aspect: evolutionary and revolutionary. A movement is evolutionary when the progressive elements spontaneously continue their everyday work and
introduce small, quantitative changes in the old order. A movement is revolutionary when these same elements unite, become imbued with a single idea, and with hastened step rush upon the hostile camp in order to destroy the old order with its qualitative features from its very roots, and establish a new order. Evolution prepares and provides the ground for revolution, whereas revolution crowns evolution and facilitates its further work."

On the contradiction between form and content in the process of dialectical development:

"Consciousness and being, idea and matter, are two different forms of one and the same phenomenon, which, speaking generally, is called nature. Therefore, they do not negate one another, and at the same time do not represent one and the same phenomenon. . . .

"This in no way contradicts the idea that there is a conflict between form and content. The point is that the conflict exists not between content and form in general, but between an old form and new content which is seeking a new form and striving towards it."

On the materialist theory:

"What is the materialist theory? Everything changes in the world, everything in the world is in motion, but the question is how this change takes place, and in what form this motion proceeds. . . .

"Some say that nature and its development were preceded by a cosmic idea, which afterwards became the basis of this development, so that the course of natural phenomena is an empty form of the development of ideas. These people were called idealists. Subsequently they divided into several trends. Others say that two mutually opposed forces—idea and matter—have existed in the world from the beginning, that accordingly phenomena are divided into two groups: the ideal and the material, between which a constant struggle is going on. Thus, according to this view, the development of natural phenomena represents a constant struggle between ideal and material phenomena. These people are called dualists, and, like the idealists, are divided into various trends.

"The materialist theory of Marx absolutely rejects both dualism and idealism. It goes without saying that ideal and material phenomena actually exist in the world, but this does not at all signify that they negate one another. On the contrary, ideal and material phenomena are two different forms of one and the same phenomenon; they exist together and develop together; there is a close connection between them. Therefore, we have no grounds for thinking that they negate one another. Thus so-called dualism falls to pieces. Nature, single and indivisible, expressed in two different forms—the ideal and the material—this is how we must regard the development of nature. Life, single and indivisible, expressed in two different forms—the ideal and the material—this is how we must regard the development of life.

"Such is the monism of the materialist theory of Marx.

"At the same time Marx also rejects idealism. The conception that the
idea, and, in general, the spiritual side of its development, precedes nature, and the material side in general, is false. . . .

"It follows that for the development of the spiritual side itself, a certain structure of the organism and development of its nervous system are indispensable. It follows that the development of the spiritual side, the development of ideas, is preceded by the development of the material side, the development of being. It is clear that the external conditions change first, that matter changes first, and that then consciousness and the other spiritual phenomena change accordingly—the development of the ideal side lags behind the development of material conditions. If we call the material side, the external conditions, being, etc., the content, then the ideal side, consciousness and similar phenomena, must be called the form. Hence arises the well-known materialist postulate: in the process of development content precedes form, form lags behind content. The very same holds true for social life. Here too material development precedes ideal development, here too the form lags behind its content. Capitalism existed and a fierce class struggle was going on before scientific socialism was even thought of; socialist thought had not yet arisen anywhere when the process of production had already acquired a social character.

"Therefore Marx says: 'It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness.' Thus, in the opinion of Marx, economic development is the material basis of social life, its content; and legal, political, religious and philosophical development is the 'ideological form' of this content, its 'superstructure'; therefore Marx says, 'With the change of the economic foundation, the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed.'

"In life, also, the external, material conditions change first, and then the mentality of people, their world outlook. The development of content precedes the rise and development of form. Of course, this in no way means that in the opinion of Marx content is possible without form, as S.G. considered. (Cf. Nobati,* No. 1, 'A Criticism of Monism.') Content is impossible without form, but the point is that because a particular form lags behind its content, it never fully corresponds to this content, and thus the new content is often 'compelled' to be temporarily clothed in the old form, which evokes a conflict between them. Today, for instance, the social character of production does not correspond to the private character of the appropriation of the commodities of production, and it is precisely on this ground that the present social 'conflict' is taking place. On the other hand, the conception that idea is a form of existence does not at all mean that in its nature consciousness is the same as matter. Only the vulgar materialists (for instance, Büchner and Moleschott), who fundamentally opposed the materialism of Marx, and whom Engels justly ridiculed in his Feuerbach, reasoned thus. . . .

It is not difficult to understand what significance the monistic materialism of Marx and Engels must have for the practical activity of men. Since our world outlook, our habits and customs are engendered by external conditions, since the unfitness of legal and political forms arises from the economic content, it is clear that we must work for the radical reconstruction of economic relations in order that the habits and customs of the people and the political system of the country may change from the roots up together with them." (Ibid., pp. 99-103.)

"Leninism is Marxism in the epoch of imperialism and of the proletarian revolution. Or, to be more exact, Leninism is the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution in general, the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular. Marx and Engels lived and worked in the pre-revolutionary epoch (we have the proletarian revolution in mind) when developed imperialism did not yet exist, in the period of the preparation of the proletarians for the revolution, when the proletarian revolution was not yet a direct, practical inevitability. Lenin, the disciple of Marx and Engels, lived and worked in the epoch of developed imperialism, in the epoch of the developing proletarian revolution, the epoch when the proletarian revolution has triumphed in one country, smashed bourgeois democracy and ushered in the era of proletarian democracy, the era of the Soviets.

"That is why Leninism is the further development of Marxism."—J. V. Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, page 8.
MOISSAYE JOSEPH OLGIN
MARCH 24, 1878—NOVEMBER 22, 1939

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A.

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A. records with the deepest sorrow the death of Moissaye J. Olgin on the morning of November 22, 1939.

Comrade Olgin was the outstanding and most beloved figure in the Jewish community, whose influence extended far beyond the borders of America, as well as a leading member of the Communist Party since 1922. As editor of the Morning Freiheit since its foundation, he was mainly responsible for its growing influence, and for the high literary quality which characterized its pages, reflecting his wide culture and his own distinguished talents as an artist, which attracted many worthy collaborators. Unexcelled as an orator, Comrade Olgin wore himself out meeting the demands upon his services as speaker, among the broadest masses as well as directly for the Party, whose candidate he was in many election campaigns in New York.

After almost two years' illness, during which Comrade Olgin continued from his sickbed a prolific literary work for the Freiheit, for the Daily Worker, and as special correspondent of the Pravda, Moscow, he had apparently improved in health so greatly that he appeared in Madison Square Garden, on November 13, for his first public speech since he was stricken. No one present at that meeting can forget the demonstration Comrade Olgin received on that occasion, which fittingly registered the deep mass affection for him that lives in the hearts of the workers, fruit of his long years of selfless devotion to their interests; the 22,000 workers in that audience did not realize that they were exchanging the final greetings with one of the most outstanding of their representatives, on behalf of the hundreds of thousands, yes, millions, who will mourn the great loss we have all suffered in his death.

Comrade Olgin would have asked no better setting for his last days than this active service in the cause of the working class, of socialism, of the Communist Party, which he carried on to his last hours, in which he found the fullest realization of his life-long aspirations.

Moissaye J. Olgin wrote his name indelibly in the hearts of the masses whom he served. The National Committee of the C.P.U.S.A. joins with these masses in their sorrow, and calls upon all who felt Olgin's inspiring influence to close their ranks, with the same enthusiasm he showed, for victory in the battles now beginning.

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER, Chairman
EARL BROWDER, General Secretary
THE WAR AND THE CANADIAN WORKING CLASS

BY TIM BUCK

Dominion Secretary, Communist Party of Canada

When Canadian troops were demobilized after the World War of 1914-1918 the majority of Canadians hoped that it marked the end of the era of automatic involvement of Canada in Britain's wars. As political leaders one after another promised that it should be so, this hope became confident conviction. The Conservative Party even abandoned its traditional "Ready, aye, ready" attitude during parliamentary debates on foreign policy. Individual tories continued to wave the flag and extol the glories of the Empire, but people became increasingly conscious of distinct Canadian interests not at all identical with those of British imperialism. Thus, for some years, the public speeches of tory party leaders, like the pronouncements of the Conservative Party's national convention in July, 1938, were noteworthy for their caution on Canada's role in future British wars.

Little if any difference has been noticeable between the present leaders of the Liberal and Conservative Parties on this issue. Dr. Manion, national leader of the Conservatives, maintained silence throughout the Munich crisis; to avoid, as he explained afterwards, making the government's task more difficult. The Liberal Prime Minister, Mackenzie King, reciprocated. He gave Chamberlain unqualified support throughout the period and endorsed the Munich betrayal. He thereby justified Dr. Manion's silence and satisfied Chamberlain's supporters in both parties.

Generally speaking, the leaders of both the parties of big capital have paid lip service to the line advanced by Mackenzie King in a House of Commons debate on foreign policy during May, 1938. The keynote of his speech on that occasion was contained in the following quotations:

"Our foreign and external policy is a policy of peace and friendliness, a policy of trying to look after our own interests and to understand the position of other governments with which we have dealings. "Canada cherishes no design of aggression or expansion or revenge. We have no ancient grudges, no envy for others' possessions, no ambition for controlling others' destinies... nor are we inclined to organize or join in crusades on other continents..." "There is no more likelihood of Canada of her own motion intervening in Europe today than there is of Sweden or Bulgaria or Switzerland intervening in America."

During the same debate, and as
though to underline the implied pledge of the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice, Ernest Lapointe, the leading French-Canadian Liberal, declared that Canada was completely autonomous in matters of foreign policy. To this he added a facile assurance that the main consideration of the Dominion government in matters of foreign policy was to "keep Canada out of war."

People welcomed these assurances, but there was always an element of unreality about them. Canada's membership in the British Empire and her allegiance to England's king gave grim reality to the words of Sir Wilfred Laurier: "When Britain is at war, Canada is at war also."

An effort was made to satisfy fears on this point in an elaborate debate in the House of Commons only a short time before the outbreak of the present war. In that debate, the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition and the Minister of Justice (the latter obviously speaking to French Canada) joined in identical assurances that, while Canada would in all probability be in the legal position of a belligerent in the event of Britain's going to war, Canadian military activity would be limited entirely to home defense. On that premise, all three of them gave emphatic assurances that, there being no question of Canada's again sending an expeditionary force across the sea, there need be no fear of conscription for overseas service.

Thus, parliament adjourned very shortly before war broke out, with what appeared to be the most complete assurances so far given that, come what might, Canada would not again be involved in war beyond the sea and that compulsory military service was a thing of the past.

THE VOLTE FACE OF MACKENZIE KING

Almost before the members of parliament were home, however, the attitude of the government changed. On August 22 the Minister of National Defense called for recruits to increase naval forces. On the 23rd, the Prime Minister proclaimed "an apprehended state of war" and invoked the powers of the War Measures Act.

The War Measures Act was enacted in 1914. It is entitled: "An Act to confer certain powers upon the governor in council* in the event of war, invasion or insurrection." Its provisions are sweeping. It gives the Dominion cabinet arbitrary authority to enforce any measure which it declares "necessary or advisable for the security, defense, peace, order and welfare of Canada," in regard to "all matters coming within the classes of subjects hereinafter enumerated, that is to say,

"(a) A censorship and the control and suppression of publications, writings, maps, plans, photographs, communications and means of communication;

"(b) Arrest, detention, exclusion and deportation;

"(c) Control of harbors, ports and territorial waters of Canada and the movement of vessels;

"(d) Transportation by land, air or water and the control of the transport of persons and things;

"(e) Trading, exportation, importation, production and manufacture."

Section two provides that orders and regulations made under the Act

*Meaning by advice of the Prime Minister without reference to parliament,
shall have the full force of law and may be enforced “in such manner and by such courts, officers and authority” as may be convenient to the powers that be, that they may be varied, extended or revoked, and that such variations shall not invalidate other rulings; “nor shall any right, privilege, obligation or liability acquired, accrued, accruing or incurred thereunder be affected by such variations, extension or revocation.”

The Act thus gives the government dictatorial powers. It suspends operation of the habeas corpus act and of those decisive sections of the British North America Act which give provincial governments authority over civil and property rights. The framers of the Act betrayed the scope of their purpose when they added to all its sweeping provisions a warning that nothing stated in it should be interpreted so as to limit the generality of its intent.

Mackenzie King, who boasts of being the grandson of the revolutionary, William Lyon Mackenzie, had hitherto always posed as an opponent of Canadian entanglement in imperialist war schemes. He had refused to commit himself to a definite policy on the plea that “parliament must decide.” At the same time, he always prevented a parliamentary decision against participation. “We are opposed,” he argued in May, 1938, “to making proclamations in advance of neutrality or abstention that would be used to encourage aggressive designs.”

On August 23, none of these considerations hindered Mr. King. He proclaimed “an apprehended state of war” and invoked the War Measures Act, without bothering to ask parliament to decide, eight days before Hitler invaded Poland. Using the powers of that Act, made possible by his declared “apprehended state of war,” he used the period before parliament met to such obvious advantage that when the members of parliament did come together, their task, if they had decided against war, would have been to get Canada back to a peace footing.

THE TECHNIQUE OF BETRAYAL

A proclamation was issued on September 1, calling parliament to meet on September 7, “in the event of the United Kingdom becoming engaged in war in the effort to resist aggression.” On September 3, within a few hours of the British declaration of war, Mackenzie King broadcast to the world solidarizing the government of Canada with the war aims of the Chamberlain government.

When parliament met, Canada was already, to all intents and purposes, at war. The militia had been called for active service and put on a war footing with the permanent forces. Naval services and air force were on active service, and consultations were proceeding hour by hour with the British government. A special British mission had just landed to place large orders for munitions with Canada’s profit-hungry manufacturers and to survey the entire field of Canada’s capacity to produce munitions and war supplies. A censorship was in full operation. No more could have been done by the most jingoistic Tory than had been done by Mr. Mackenzie King to gear Canada into Chamberlain’s war plans.

Even so, he insisted in the course of an extremely long speech to the
House that “parliament would decide.”

“I wish to make perfectly clear at this moment,” he emphasized, “that parliament is here today to decide that question.” But he immediately added the following significant warning to rank-and-file members who might be inclined to overestimate their own importance:

“The government have made their decision as to what their policy is, they have announced their policy,* and it is for the honorable members of this House to say whether or not they stand by the government’s policy as it has been announced and as it is being announced today.”

Thus, in effect, the members of parliament were not invited to decide for war or peace, but for war or a general election. Mackenzie King, whose main task had hitherto been to prevent decisions, now confronted them with a fait accompli.

CANADA AT WAR

Declaration of war was followed quickly by a series of measures aimed at intensifying the war effort. A “Foreign Exchange Control Board” was announced and elaborate regulations were promulgated. Holders of foreign exchange or securities of a value exceeding $1,000 were instructed to declare their holdings. Export of capital was prohibited. The amount of money that Canadians may carry out of the country at one time is limited to $100 and this amount can be carried out or transferred abroad only once in each month. The value of gifts that may be sent out of the country is limited to $25 a month.

* Referring to his statement issued to the press on Aug. 25 and his broadcast of Sept. 3.

The immediate reason for this was the slump in Canadian funds.* The more basic purpose is to aid in mobilizing Canadian resources to help finance Britain’s large-scale purchases in the United States.

Nationals of all territories now occupied by Germany were ordered to report. The press was advised not to publish the names of “enemy aliens” committed to concentration camps or their location. The French language working class weekly, Clarté, was suppressed, the only reason given by the censors being that its publication was “not in the public interest.”

During the first month, a score or more of workers were arrested and sentenced to varying terms for remarks of an anti-war character. The remarks varied. Some were simply contrasting the lavish manner in which the government was spending hundreds of millions for destruction with its stubborn refusal to feed hungry men. In one case, at least, workers were arrested for asking soldiers what they were fighting for.

While repression against workers who questioned the justness of the war was swift and harsh, no action whatever has been taken against the war profiteers. The only action so far taken or threatened has been against housewives accused of buying larger amounts of sugar than usual. Against the speculators who forced up the prices of sugar, potatoes, etc., while large stocks were available, nothing whatever has been done.

Almost hysterical efforts are being made to cultivate the idea that increasing participation in the war will

* U. S. funds were at a premium of 10 per cent within two weeks.
be "good for business" and that Canada is headed for abounding prosperity.

In the course of his lengthy speech to the House, Mackenzie King had intimated that the government had no immediate intention of proposing an expeditionary force. Almost as soon as parliament had adjourned, however, an expeditionary force was announced, and preparations commenced for it to sail overseas before the end of the year.

Preparations are under way to make Canada the headquarters of an "Imperial Air Training Plan." The plan is to establish large training fields in Canada, to which Britain, Australia and New Zealand* will send boys for training as pilots. It is announced that facilities will be extended rapidly to provide for twenty-eight weeks of training to 25,000 pilots per year. The scheme will cost seven hundred million dollars, and war contract sharks are already licking their chops in anticipation.

THE JINGOISTS AT WORK

The jingoists are in clover. The character of the war is well illustrated by the sudden metamorphosis of most of Hitler's erstwhile Canadian boosters into the most vociferous and chauvinistic proponents of the hypocritical pretense that this is "a war to smash Hitlerism."

The about-face of public men who were recently avowed admirers of Hitler was not without elements of humor,** but the concentrated effort now in progress to stir up chauvinistic passions is vicious in the extreme. Typical of this is the following from an editorial in the Toronto Globe and Mail for October 7:

"Prime Minister Chamberlain has been careful to explain that this is not a war against the German people. It is difficult, nevertheless, to consider Hitlerism as other than a new chapter of Germanism... The notion of German superiority and contempt for the inferiority of others is nothing new... sinking a passenger liner fits in with the policy of frightfulness."

This line was carried further in the same paper two days later by a columnist whose daily contribution is one of the war features of the paper. According to this specialist in hate, the "Cease fire" order on November 11, 1918, "was a horrible mistake."

"This time," he urged with gusto, "the error should not be repeated. Once the Hun is on his knees again, the boots should be put to him: without mercy and without end."

The crass chauvinism expressed in such propaganda is even exceeded in the venomous anti-Soviet propaganda by which the ultra-reactionary press strives to cultivate the idea that "the eventual enemy" is the U.S.S.R.

This started immediately after war broke out. The leader of the Ontario Tories, himself an avowed admirer of the Nazi regime, an enemy of democratic progress and a propagandist of Nazi ideology, harangued an audience of ex-servicemen on September 3, a few hours after the British declaration of war, urging them to "deal ruthlessly" with radicals. "We must be as stern as the occasion demands," insisted the gallant gentleman, apparently oblivious to the fact that

---

* South Africa refused to join in the scheme.
** Manion, the tory leader, so far forgot himself as to launch into a laudatory soliloquy on Hitler during his speech to the House supporting the declaration of war.
right at that moment, the government was checking up on his own friends, the Canadian Nazis. His line was seized upon by the reactionaries, and it is an exceptional day when the tory press fails to carry vicious anti-Soviet propaganda, of which the following, over the name of one of the editors of the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, is typical:

“Mr. Chamberlain has made it very plain that this is a war against regimes. . . . Indeed the persistence of the British propaganda drive in Germany and the constant leaflet ‘raids’ give life to the suggestion that, if Stalin’s Russia is to be the eventual enemy, a Germany shorn of Nazism will be harnessed to the Allied machine.”

The contrast between such bare-faced expression of the anti-Soviet dreams of Chamberlain’s most consistent supporters in Canada and Mackenzie King’s smooth assurance, “nor are we inclined to organize or join in crusades on other continents,” is explained by the fact that King was at that time defending Chamberlain’s strangulation of democracy in Spain by “non-intervention.”

WAR, THE TOUCHSTONE OF CLASS RELATIONSHIPS

War has sharpened class relationships tremendously. A new political redivision and realignment is already in progress. Attitude toward the war is its crux.

The bureaucrats of the A. F. of L. betrayed the working class immediately after war was declared. In their desire to split wider the Canadian labor movement, they seized upon the war as an opportunity to gain an advantage over the C.I.O. They hurriedly assured the government of their complete and unqualified support of its war aims, and promised that there should be no disturbance of industrial relations, without so much as a reservation on the question of conscription. They made no secret of the fact that they hoped, by this means, to receive favors in the way of closed-shop conditions in munitions plants, etc. To the surprise of the entire working class movement the national leadership of the C.I.O. in Canada, despite the militancy of their rank and file, followed suit with similar assurances. The leaders of the so-called “Canadian Unions,” the All-Canadian Congress of Labor, and the Canadian Federation of Labor, each followed the same line of betrayal.

On the other hand, several of the local leaders of the Catholic Syndicates in Quebec have taken a position frankly against the war.

Employers and governments, Dominion and provincial, hurried to exploit the stand of the A. F. of L. The Hepburn administration in Ontario is urging employers not to sign agreements with unions of the C.I.O. A government regulation has been issued ruling that straight time only shall be paid for the first thirteen hours worked in any one day in the textile industry, and efforts are being made to illegalize strikes. “Codes” fixing wage rates and working conditions are being introduced in unorganized industries without so much as informing the workers in advance.

The workers are in no docile mood,
however. While the cost of living is going up and war-time conditions are rapidly being introduced with ill-disguised steps toward industrial regimentation, workers are organizing in places where hitherto trade unionism has been unknown. Wage demands are being presented in a dozen industries, including steel, coal, automobile, logging, textiles, and metal mining, while a wave of strikes developing from coast to coast illustrates the militant spirit of the working class. Coal miners, metal miners, steel workers and loggers, all in C.I.O. unions, are striking militantly. The bureaucrats who tried to sell the trade union movement down the river will not be able to keep their end of the bargain. The workers are not going to be sold out; they are going to fight.

There was no division in the House of Commons on the Address from the Throne. The members of parliament were not genuinely unanimous; but there was not enough backbone to the opposition sentiment to force a recorded vote. The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation group ran true to Social-Democratic form and gave official support to the government, as did the seventeen Social Credit members from Alberta. J. S. Woodsworth, national leader of the C.C.F., made a personal statement reiterating his opposition to war in general as a pacifist but explaining that his declaration did not represent the official position of his party. W. D. Herridge, whose advocacy of far-reaching reforms and united electoral effort under the name of the "New Democracy Movement" promised to bring an important addition to the growing democratic front until the outbreak of war, promptly abandoned all opposition to Mackenzie King's imperialist position.

Mackenzie King has discarded his previous role of heir to the Laurier tradition and opponent of imperialism. Instead, he now asserts his leadership of the imperialist camp. Such differences as may have previously appeared between himself and the Conservative leader, Dr. Manion, in their parliamentary maneuvers for party advantage, are now completely overshadowed by their unity in committing Canada to unqualified participation in the war. The imperialists, including the ultra-reactionary circles of big capital which recently condemned him most bitterly in their propaganda for a "national government," have rallied around King, and his war policies receive general and vociferous support from the most reactionary sections of the capitalist press.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE QUEBEC ELECTIONS

The general election in the traditionally anti-war and anti-imperialist province of Quebec provided the first major test of this new unity of the imperialists around King and illustrated perfectly the new political re-division and realignment that is taking place as a result of the war.

French-Canadian nationalism has made the name of Quebec synonymous with opposition to participation in Britain's wars. Maurice Duplessis, the reactionary, fascist premier of the province, playing upon this anti-Anglicism, did not join the other provincial premiers in assuring King of support on September 7. On the contrary, he "pulled a fast one" by calling a provincial election in protest against
the use of the War Measures Act to infringe upon the autonomy of the province.

Duplessis opened his campaign with a declaration that the election was "a fight by French Canadians on behalf of all Canadians in defense of provincial autonomy." He immediately made the danger of conscription a central issue of the campaign and accused the Minister of Justice, Lapointe, of betraying Quebec. The King government could neither ignore nor evade the challenge. Lapointe announced that he and the other two ministers from Quebec in the Dominion Cabinet would enter the election to defeat Duplessis and would all resign if Duplessis were returned to power.

Duplessis had seized upon issues that were well calculated to rally the French Canadian masses to his support; but the war had already reversed the interests of his erstwhile financial backers, the trusts and parasitical finance-capitalist interests. In time of peace these interests had demanded, and were willing to pay highly for, intransigent insistence upon a rigid and reactionary interpretation of "provincial rights" as part of their hard-boiled resistance to social legislation, such as unemployment insurance, and their obstruction of the St. Lawrence waterway scheme. Today, however, insistence upon any sort of provincial rights is anathema to those interests, since such rights might possibly be utilized by the workers and their allies in the fight against profiteering, in defense of civil liberties, and in preventing enforcement of conscription.

Thus, the positions of the King Lib-erals and Duplessis' alliance of English tories and French-Canadian nationalists were suddenly reversed. Duplessis, the profligate darling of big capital, was unable to secure adequate finances, while the King Liberals literally wallowed in campaign funds. The Conservatives, of whom Duplessis was the official leader, abandoned his "Union Nationale" and voted for Liberal candidates. The reactionary press, which had previously supported Duplessis and denounced the King government, reversed its position completely.

Duplessis, who had sprung the election as a means of re-establishing his badly shaken mass basis, was unable to carry through a consistent anti-war campaign precisely because of his political relationship to, and dependence on, reactionary big capital. Instead of arousing the French-Canadian masses by a dramatic mass campaign against Canada's participation in the war, he retreated in a futile effort to retain a measure of support from big capital.

Thus, the alternatives of which the Quebec masses were conscious were not those of support for the war versus a fight against Canadian participation. Rather they were deceitfully made to see it as a choice between, on the one hand, Ernest Lapointe, strong in the Laurier tradition and in his record of having helped lead Quebec's successful fight against conscription in 1917; and, on the other hand, the pro-fascist, labor-hating, pledge-betraying, Maurice Duplessis. Lapointe was equally vociferous in his hypocritical assurances that "there will be no conscription" as Duplessis had been at the
beginning of the campaign against the threat of conscription. With Duplessis retreating from his initial anti-war position and Lapointe making demagogic use of his anti-war past, the majority of French-Canadians saw little difference between the two on the question of the war.

Duplessis suffered an overwhelming defeat in a tremendous landslide for the King Liberals. The vote does not reflect a weakening of French-Canadian opposition to conscription. It does not even express definite support for Canadian participation in the war. It illustrates the lengths to which the King "Liberals" resort to confuse the masses; it illustrates the futility of estimating the political roles and relationships of bourgeois politicians on the basis of the position they occupied before the war.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY FIGHTS THE IMPERIALIST WARMONGERS

The Communist Party is the only organized political force in Canada which fights against the war from the standpoint of the interests of the working class.

Workers, along with the most progressive section of the Canadian people, were unable to keep pace with the swift-moving events and misunderstood the character of the war at its outbreak. As a result, there was a widespread tendency to view it as a genuine anti-fascist war and to support it accordingly. The Communist Party leadership also fell into this grave error. Despite the abundant evidence of the real character of the war and the clear guidance that Lenin and Stalin have provided us with, and despite the fact that the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union treats, with scintillating clarity, just such situations, we failed to give correct and timely leadership in orientating the working class.

The Party was able to correct its position, however. The class-conscious workers now see the war as it really is: a reactionary war of conquest between rival imperialist powers. It is waged with the objective of imposing a victorious robber "peace" bearing the seeds of still another predatory war; it is waged by Anglo-French imperialism to bring a defeated and subjugated Germany into the contemplated joint imperialist war against the Soviet Union.

While emphasizing that no working class interest is served by the imperialist combatants and that victory for either of the imperialist groups would mean a victory for reaction, the Communist Party also raises the issue of the betrayal of Canada's vital interests. The Party contrasts the tremendous role being played by the U.S.S.R. in keeping war out of a large part of Europe against the cynical manner in which the Anglo-Canadian imperialists are using Canada, in opposition to the vital interests of the Canadian people, as a vehicle with which to bring war to the American continent.

No vital interest of the masses of Canada's people was served by Chamberlain's imperialist schemes and no vital interest of Canada is being fought for in this war any more than are the vital interests of Argentina or the Scandinavian countries.

Canada's vital interests are those of an American nation. Her national unity will be assured only when Cana-
idian governments adopt foreign policies based squarely upon those interests and not upon the transitory tactical needs of a Chamberlain or other imperialist adventurer manipulating Empire policies for the profit of the "City."

Big capital in Canada, linked by bonds of sordid self-interest with British imperialism, seeks to make Canada a full-time partner in its imperialist wars. Canadian economy is being increasingly subordinated to the needs of imperialist Britain and strenuous efforts are made to persuade the people that Canada will profit richly by strengthening "the British connection."

The working class has other interests, however. Decimation of the flower of every generation, a national debt already so high that it hinders economic development and enables the capitalist class to keep working class living standards considerably below those of the United States, and periodic abrogation of all civil liberties are a high price to pay—especially in view of the rapid increase in the number and wealth of Canadian multi-millionaires. There is a growing realization that the real interests of Canadian workers are bound up with those of the workers of the Americas, particularly the United States, rather than with the further extension of British imperialism.

This unity of interests of Canadian and American workers is particularly evident in the sphere of trade union activity. The fight for organization, for wages and living conditions, and for the exercise of civil rights in Canada is inseparable from the similar struggles in the United States. Every gain thus achieved in either country is immediately reflected—to the advantage of the workers—in the other.

The working class struggle to keep the United States out of war and to bring about Canada's withdrawal from it is an integral part of the international struggle of the working class to defeat, each in its own country, "its own" warmongering bourgeoisie. To be effective, our struggle for this in Canada must be part of the struggle all along the class front in Canada and the United States. Right now, by giving aid to the struggling unions in the steel, nickel, copper and gold mining industries, and in the other war industries of Canada, the labor movement of the United States could at once strengthen the Canadian working class and the fraternal and organizational bond which unites the two movements. More frequent exchange of fraternal delegates, a more systematic application of organizational and financial resources to the task of unionizing the Canadian workers are urgent needs.

There is a large element of nationalism and isolationism, often mingled with pacifism, in the growing anti-war sentiment throughout Canada. The position of the Communist Party, of course, is the Leninist slogan: "A revolutionary class in a reactionary war cannot but desire the defeat of its own bourgeoisie."

As the Party's manifesto on the war, released on November 10, points out to the Canadian people, a just and durable peace is possible only "if imperialistic finance capital is stripped of its sinister power and its satellites are removed from governmental au-
At the same time, the Communist Party seeks to cooperate with all anti-capitalist forces and groups desirous of carrying on a genuine struggle to combat the schemes of the Anglo-Canadian imperialists for involving our country more and more deeply in the war.

The lines of the struggle are only in process of formation; but the experiences of the first World War justify a measure of confidence. The people’s fight against rising prices, and the developing demands for higher wages and living conditions, combined with the wave of strikes spreading across the country, already foreshadow extending working class struggles. The tradition of the great mass strikes, of which the Winnipeg General Strike was the outstanding example, is strong. Seventy-five ministers of the United Church of Canada have signed a manifesto against the war—even though only pacifist in tone. These happenings, in conjunction with the widespread and unconcealed opposition to the idea of compulsory service, augur that the nationwide fight against conscription will be repeated with increased strength and greater political understanding. It will be the task of the Communist Party to connect itself with all the working class and popular forces opposing the war, to unify these struggles, raise the political level of the entire anti-war movement, combat the reformist deceit and the disruptive adventurism of the Trotskyites, and develop a conscious systematic struggle to force withdrawal of Canada from the war and defeat the imperialist warmongering Canadian bourgeoisie.

[Since this article was written, repression has been intensified. Twenty-four workers, accused of participating in the Dominion-wide distribution of the Communist Party Manifesto against the war, are charged under a section which provides for a five-year sentence in case of conviction. Under the War Measures Act, the accused is stripped of the right to elect trial by jury. On November 18, the entire issue of the Toronto Clarion was confiscated and further publication prohibited by the Minister of Justice, its business manager is under arrest, and warrants are issued for its editor and other officers.—Editors’ Note.]
FOR THE VICTORIOUS OUTCOME OF CHINA'S WAR OF LIBERATION

STATEMENT OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA ON THE PEOPLE'S POLITICAL COUNCIL AND THE PRESENT SITUATION*


The People's Political Council was inaugurated on the first anniversary of the commencement of the war of resistance against the Japanese invasion, and has now been in existence one year.

When we accepted the invitation to participate, we issued a statement: "Our Views on the People's Political Council," in which we pointed out:

"In the present war urgency, the convocation of the People's Political Council clearly marks a step toward democracy in the political life of our country. This indicates advance in the unity of political parties, national groups, classes and regions. Although the Council is not yet quite satisfactory either in its manner of formation or in the definition of its duties and powers as a completely representative organ of the people, it does not thereby lose its role of further uniting the different forces of the entire country for the war of resistance to save the country. Nor does the Council lose its significance as a first step toward real democratization of the political life of the whole nation. Therefore we Communists, while continuing our efforts to bring about the early establishment of a universally elected, thoroughly representative assembly of the people, will participate actively and sincerely in the work of the Council."

During its year of existence the Council has held three sessions. Viewed as a whole, the greatest accomplishment of the Council's work is that it was able fully to reflect the demands of the greatest majority of the Chinese people on the most crucial political question of present-day China—on the determination to wage the national war of defense for the realization of final victory and to counteract tendencies toward compromise and treacherous criminal activity.

The Manifesto issued at the first session of the Council had solemnly declared: "This Council, on behalf of the entire people, proclaims that the Chinese people will resolutely mobilize their entire material strength and manpower for the prosecution of this protracted war of defense against the most vicious aggressor to our final victory."

The second session also unanimously adopted the resolution to "support the established policy of the govern-

* Published September 9, 1939, in the New China Daily News (Sin Xua Rhbao), central organ of the Communist Party of China; translated for The Communist.
ment for a nationwide protracted war of defense and for obtaining the initiative in this war, as announced by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek." It called on the people of the whole country "to stand unwaveringly against any capitulation in the fulfillment of the tasks of the war of resistance and the upbuilding of the nation."

The third session adopted a resolution reaffirming the national policy of resistance-war, and called on the people to "strengthen their confidence, march forward in unity and singleness of mind to regain our soil and national integrity, thus to complete the great work of the resistance-war and the upbuilding of the nation."

Besides these, the three sessions of the Council had received for deliberation more than three hundred proposals presented by its members concerning the concrete problems of the war and construction. These proposals were of various merit, some being of an urgent nature, while others were not. Yet utmost care and deliberation were exercised in the consideration of every one of these proposals in the hope that they would be of benefit to the war and reconstruction.

It is especially regrettable that most of the constructive measures adopted by the Council have not been fully and effectively enforced by the government, thus reducing the effect of the Council's work, and at the same time failing to satisfy fully the high expectations placed upon the Council by the people of the entire country.

We Communist members of the Council, basing ourselves on our joint declaration of July 8, 1938, in accordance with the instructions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China "for a clear political stand and in the spirit of sincere unity," and with the advice and encouragement of the advanced section of the people, have struggled together with the rest of the deputies in the work of the Council for the realization of the will and the demands of the Chinese people. We are certain that the supreme hope and demand of the Chinese people today are for victory in the war and for that strengthening and extension of national unity and progress which are necessary guarantees for the realization of victory. Therefore, we have proposed at the three sessions of the Council: "to support the government in carrying out the program for the prosecution of the war and the reconstruction of the country"; and "to support the propositions set forth by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek in his address of December 26, 1938, assailing the Konoye Statement, and to use them as standards for future national policy."

Thanks to the unanimous support given by the entire Council, these proposals have been adopted. Regarding all the basic questions relating to the conduct of the war, such as the upbuilding of the army, conscription, development of guerilla warfare in the rear of the enemy, the practice of political democracy, the protection of people's rights, etc., we have contributed opinions in our special resolutions.

In our work of the past year we have steadfastly adhered to our Declaration which stated:

"We participate in the Council as repre-
sentatives of the Communist Party of China. We are sincerely willing to work together energetically and in close cooperation with members of the Kuomintang and other parties and groups as well as those who are not connected with any political party or group, so that we may discuss and decide in the most friendly spirit and cordiality the concrete and practical measures for the enhancement of the program to attain victory in the war and the successful completion of the country's reconstruction.

At the same time, we have resolutely subjected to exposure and relentlessly smashed all arguments tending to capitulatory peace harmful to our cause.

At the first and second sessions of the Council, the traitorous words of Wang Ching-wei* and his followers, Li Sheng-wu and others, even when very skillfully disguised, were refuted and rejected by the great majority of the Council members. We feel that in our work in the Council we have faithfully adhered to our principled and clear stand for unity in the war, in compliance with the will and wish of the people. Not for a single moment have we departed from this.

Now that the government has issued an order to extend the term of office of the Council members for another year, we wish to state before our colleagues in the Council and the people of our country our views on the present situation and the future course to be pursued in order to obtain final victory for China.

THE NEW PROBLEMS FACING CHINA

The special point in the present situation of the war of resistance is that, on the one hand, the enemy after two years of war of aggression is faced with daily increasing difficulties, while the future of our victory in the war of resistance is more and more coming into view. On the other hand, the Japanese aggressors have not changed their course to subjugate and annihilate China, but more malignantly, more brutally, follow their fixed course for the dissolution of China as a nation. They are increasingly employing deceit to carry out their policy of controlling China through the Chinese, meanwhile using occupied territories to maintain their war in China. In the military sphere, the enemy is ceasing large-scale frontal attacks and concentrating his whole strength on "mopping-up" operations against the guerrilla territories in his rear. The Japanese hope thus to shake our will to fight, and to consolidate their hold on the occupied areas.

In the political sphere, the enemy is doing his utmost in helping and using the traitor Wang Ching-wei to spread anti-Chiang Kai-shek, anti-Communist and pro-capitulation falsehoods, intensively working to create a new "Kuomintang" party, with a puppet government and a puppet army. At the same time they are directing the remnants of Wang Ching-wei's followers and the unfaithful elements in the anti-Japanese coup to plot provocation and carry on anti-Chiang Kai-shek, anti-Communist activities, in an attempt to create a situation which would force China to capitulate.

In the economic sphere, the enemy is engaged in robbing and squeezing, in dumping his manufactured goods,

* Wang Ching-wei, formerly Vice-President of the Kuomintang; deserted to the Japanese imperialists in December, 1938; now designated to head the pro-Japanese puppet Central government in China.—The Editors.
and in exploiting the occupied part of China in order to realize its malevolent plan of utilizing the material resources of our country to slaughter the Chinese people.

In the anti-Japanese camp there are persons who still maintain incorrect conceptions of the situation. Some think that the invading enemy has moderated his policy for the dissolution of China; others that a solution to the Sino-Japanese problem could be arrived at through certain international conferences. These people in consequence abandon the correct view that the revival of China must come through her own efforts, and neglect the practical work of preparing for the counter-offensive. Worst of all, there are even people who ignore the danger to the very existence of China as a nation and wish to divert the main energy of the country to internal strife, instigating anti-Communist intrigues and attempting to destroy the unity between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party, frequently attacking all progressive forces and using repressive measures against the youth.

These are fratricidal acts, and cannot be allowed to occur at a time when the country is engaged in resisting foreign invasion. If unchecked, their evil effect will not only undermine our countrymen's confidence in China's victory in the war of resistance, but also render nil the sympathy of world public opinion toward the Chinese people. The difficulties of military conscription, difficulties resulting from the fall of the legal currency and other deficiencies, cause the feeling among still other people that there exists the will to fight but no clear road to victory. All these factors are making our national crisis more profound and grave.

The developments of the present world situation are effecting great changes in relation to our war of resistance. As a result of the signing of the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact, the anti-Comintern Axis fell apart, thus isolating Japan diplomatically and causing disturbances in her domestic affairs. This has a favorable effect on the position of our war of resistance. The outbreak of the imperialist war in Europe enables Japan to take advantage of the European war situation to intensify her policy for the subjugation of China, and encourages those elements of British imperialism who by sacrificing China are attempting to reach a compromise between England and Japan.

All this is adding many new difficulties to our resistance-war situation. Therefore, our present situation of the war of resistance both at home and abroad is in a new period of sudden changes. The grave task now confronting the entire Chinese people is to distinguish correctly and evaluate every specific characteristic in the situation at home and abroad and the possible trends of development, to hold fast to the national policy of resistance and against the danger of compromise, to strengthen the unity of the whole people against every kind of intrigue making for a split, and to strive for progress in the whole country against reaction and retrogression. At the same time, we must exert effort to take full advantage of all incidents and factors favorable to us in this rapidly changing international situation in order to re-enforce the help.
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from abroad; to overcome the dangers and solve the difficulties in the course of the war; and to increase our strength and prepare for the counter-offensive.

In order to overcome the present difficulties and dangers, in order to prepare seriously for our counter-offensive, we consider that work should be energetically undertaken along the following lines:

A. ON THE POLITICAL FRONT

1. To mobilize all the forces of the country against capitulation and surrender, extend the movement against Wang Ching-wei and clean out the hidden remnants of the Wang Ching-wei clique and all compromising elements in the camp of the war of resistance.

2. To strengthen the war-time government, unify the leadership in military affairs, admit new competent forces from all parties and groups, and raise the efficiency of the war-time administrative apparatus.

3. To practise democracy; severely punish illegal acts of suppression against the masses and the youth; guarantee to the people the rights of free speech, press, assembly and association, as well as the right of the people to armed resistance against the enemy.

4. To remove and seriously punish greedy and corrupt officials, and put into practice local self-government.

5. To set up the local apparatus for the settlement of disputes between labor and capital, between landlords and farm-tenants, to enable the impoverished workers and peasants to improve their livelihood, to raise the fervor of the masses in the war of resistance and facilitate the mobilization for military service.

B. ON THE MILITARY FRONT

1. To develop guerrilla war in the rear of the enemy; this must be carried through to turn the rear of the enemy into a war front, thus to accumulate small successes into big victories. To attain this, we must:
   (a) Draw up and put into force a political program in accordance with the principles laid down in the Program of Resistance-War and National Construction as the basis of guerrilla warfare.
   (b) Unify the military and political power of the regional guerrilla bases under the direction of those sections of the regular army which have distinguished themselves by merit and achievement.
   (c) Regularly supply the forces in the guerrilla bases with the needed arms and necessary economic help from the Central government.
   (d) Dispatch to the enemy's rear the military units which are determined and capable of successfully maintaining guerrilla warfare, which possess strong political training and discipline, thus to expand guerrilla war in the enemy's rear.
   (e) Guarantee that the personnel and the units dispatched to the enemy's rear place unity and the loyal execution of the policy of the anti-Japanese national front above all else, and eliminate any inner frictions which harm our cause and aid the enemy.
   (f) See that the personnel and units dispatched to the rear of the enemy
carry out the policy of democracy and local self-government, establish political power really elected by the people and approved by the superior organ; improve the livelihood of the people, unite the broad masses of the people for the destruction of the puppet regimes, and disintegrate the puppet armies so that the material and man-power can be used, not by the enemy, but at our command.

2. To cultivate a new army of national defense—for the purpose of firmly prosecuting the war to the end, especially to prepare for a favorable situation really to undertake the counter-offensive to drive the invading enemy out of China. Therefore we must:

(a) Select from the fronts a certain number of divisions which possess a good record of war service, regardless of party or other affiliations, as the foundation of this new army;

(b) Regulate the uniform organizational system of the new army;

(c) Select officers for the new army in accordance with their original ranks in the particular selected units. These officers should be given modern military training and unshakable political education to enable them to preserve the best traditions of their particular units.

(d) Equip and supply the divisions of the new army on one and the same level, higher than the ordinary units.

(e) Train the new divisions with a worked-out plan for a fixed period of time under the direction of capable, veteran, high-ranking military officers; this training to be regional but well coordinated.

(f) Establish industries of national defense, and intensify purchases from abroad so that the modernization of equipment for so many new divisions may be completed within two years.

C. ON THE ECONOMIC FRONT

We must destroy the enemy's construction and the exploitation of our resources, and must realize our own production and thrift. Therefore, we must:

1. Destroy the economic construction and the exploitation of raw materials in the occupied areas, initiate the mass boycott of enemy goods, prohibit the sale of native products which may be of use to the enemy, and place under state control all purchases of enemy goods needed by us for military reasons.

2. Subsidize and encourage private investment, extend the cooperative movement in industry and agriculture, broadly develop all kinds of industries of practical use, and exert the utmost effort to increase production in industry and agriculture.

3. Enforce the movement for thrift in military and political organs and among private individuals.

D. ON FINANCES

We must resolutely change the past manner of work and attain a thorough carrying out of the war-finance policy. Therefore we must:

1. Co-ordinate the issuance of legal currency and the circulation of capital to avoid discrepancy in the rate of our legal currency.

2. Strictly and thoroughly control foreign exchange, and have the Foreign Exchange Commission set up by the People's Political Council periodically examine the utilization of foreign exchange by the Ministry of
Finance to eliminate malpractice for private profit.

3. Strictly examine and prohibit private manipulation of finances, disruption of legal currency, especially profiteering, speculation, and manipulation by those who hold official positions. Offenders must be severely punished.

4. Permit the issuance of a fixed amount of local currency and paper notes in the war zone, and particularly in the occupied territories.

5. Encourage subscription to gold bonds of the state by overseas Chinese and by banks in China, and give guarantees in specified gold deposits as well as by facilities for investing in China.

6. Establish the taxation policy of the state to levy business, income and inheritance taxes on a graduated basis within the possibilities of each locality, and gradually renovate the system of land taxation, abolishing all onerous miscellaneous levies.

7. Strictly carry out the confiscation of properties of traitors. The rents due landlords who "take refuge" in enemy-occupied territory should be collected by the government as direct state income, and such rents shall be lowered to benefit the peasants on those properties.

8. Redraft the state budget from Central down to local government. All items relating to the war should be increased according to needs, and those not connected with the war should be decreased as much as possible, eliminating all outlays that can be dispensed with.

9. Uniformly reduce salaries of state administrators, particularly high officials, to lower levels than those of military officers of the same rank. Special fees, dual salaries and commissions for public loans and purchases should be abolished.

E. ON THE DIPLOMATIC FRONT

In order to isolate Japan to the fullest extent and strengthen aid to China from abroad, we must:

1. Seriously unite with the peoples and governments sympathetic to and helping China in the war of resistance, and strive to have them increase their material and moral aid.

2. Resolutely oppose plots to sacrifice China through compromises between Japan and any foreign government, and steadfastly pursue an independent course in foreign relations.

3. Assist the People's Political Council and all mass organizations, parties and groups to send delegations to other countries on tours of broad people's diplomacy, to attract aid from the democratic and peace forces of the world.

F. ON THE COOPERATION OF THE PARTIES AND GROUPS

The sincere unity of all parties and groups supporting the war of resistance, especially the fraternal cooperation between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party, is the basic guarantee for the carrying out of all the above-cited measures for overcoming the dangers of our situation and for the defeat of the Japanese invaders and Wang Ching-wei. Therefore we must:

1. Order the protection of the legal rights of the parties and groups that are for the war of resistance, and genuinely do away with all the so-called
measures curtailing the activities of the minority parties;

2. Strictly order the prohibition of discrimination and suppressive acts against the Communist Party and all other anti-Japanese parties and groups. Infringements upon the rights of workers, peasants, soldiers, students, merchants and the youth to jobs and civil liberties because of political affiliation and thought must be strictly prohibited.

3. Admit the participation of competent people of all parties and groups that support the war of resistance in every type of war activity. Partisan prejudices must not be permitted to intrude upon the utilization of all talents in our war of liberation.

In this critical moment of foreign invasion and national crisis, when the world-wide storm is causing rapid transformations, the demands and hopes of the entire Chinese people are for resolute prosecution of the war of resistance to the end, consolidation of inner national unity, nation-wide progress to increase actually the power of resistance, and preparation for the counter-offensive against the enemy. We, the Communist members of the People's Political Council, representatives of the people, respectfully issue this statement before the convening of the fourth session of the Council in the hope that advice, encouragement, supervision and criticism will be generously given us and our colleagues in the Council by the whole people.

*September 8, 1939.*
THE COLLAPSE OF THE VERSAILLES SYSTEM OF PEACE TREATIES

MATERIAL FOR STUDYING THE BACKGROUND OF THE SECOND IMPERIALIST WAR

At the Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, held in March, 1939, Comrade Stalin gave an exhaustive and profoundly correct estimation of the whole international situation. ensuing events have, as always, splendidly confirmed his brilliant analysis and prognosis.

Comrade Stalin described the new economic crisis in the capitalist countries, the sharpening of the struggle for markets, for sources of raw materials, and for a new division of the earth. In this connection, he pointed out the sharpening of the international political situation, the collapse of the post-war system of peace treaties, and the beginning of a new imperialist war. On the basis of this analysis, he outlined the very important tasks facing the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the U.S.S.R. in the struggle for communism.

Comrade Stalin said:

"Here is a list of the most important events during the period under review, which mark the beginning of the new imperialist war. In 1935 Italy attacked and seized Ethiopia. In the summer of 1936 Germany and Italy organized military intervention in Spain, Germany entrenching herself in the north of Spain and in Spanish Morocco, and Italy in the south of Spain and in the Balearic Islands. Having seized Manchuria, Japan in 1937 invaded North and Central China, occupied Peking, Tientsin and Shanghai and began to oust her foreign competitors from the occupied zone. In the beginning of 1938 Germany seized Austria, and in the autumn of 1938 the Sudeten region of Czechoslovakia. At the end of 1938 Japan seized Canton, and at the beginning of 1939 the Island of Hainan.

"Thus the war, which has stolen so imperceptibly upon the nations, has drawn more than five hundred million people into its orbit and has extended its sphere of action over a vast territory, stretching from Tientsin, Shanghai and Canton, through Ethiopia, to Gibraltar.

"After the first imperialist war the victor states, primarily Britain, France and the United States, set up a new regime in the relations between countries, the post-war regime of peace. The main props of this regime were the Nine-Power Pact in the Far East, and the Versailles Treaty and a number of other treaties in Europe. The League of Nations was set up to regulate relations between countries within the framework of this regime, on the basis of a united front of states, of collective defense of the security of states. However, three aggressive states, and the new imperialist war launched by them, have upset the entire system of this post-war peace regime. Japan tore up the Nine-Power Pact, and Germany and Italy the Versailles Treaty. In order to have their hands free, these three states withdrew from the League of Nations.
"The new imperialist war became a fact."*

The imperialist war that has broken out in Europe completely confirms the analysis and prediction made by Comrade Stalin. In order to help understand the struggle to which Comrade Stalin's report refers, we summarize the contents of the most important treaties of the so-called Versailles peace system, which has completely collapsed.

**THE VERSAILLES PEACE TREATY**

The Versailles Peace Treaty between the Allied Powers and Germany, in which the first imperialist war culminated, was signed on June 28, 1919, in Versailles.

The Versailles Treaty reduced considerably the territory of Germany in favor of the victorious powers. Germany was compelled to return Alsace-Lorraine to France, provinces wrested from her as the result of the Franco-Prussian War in 1871. The Rhine became the main frontier between France and Germany. The Saar region, which adjoins Lorraine, with its rich coal resources, was occupied by France, and the coal mines of the Saar became the property of France in reparation for the damage done to the French mining industry by German occupation during the war. The Eupen and Malmedy districts went to Belgium.

Germany suffered just as big territorial losses in the East, being deprived of the whole of Poznan, parts of West Prussia, Silesia and Pomerania. All these extensive territories went to make up the newly formed Polish state. The Polish possessions in West Prussia and Pomerania, which stretched to the Baltic coast, formed a "corridor" separating East Prussia from the rest of Germany. Germany was deprived of the important Baltic port of Danzig, which was transformed into a "free city" under the guardianship of the League of Nations. Further, Germany lost the Baltic port of Memel, which was handed over to the Entente Powers and subsequently became part of Lithuania. The fate of several districts in East Prussia and Upper Silesia under the Versailles Treaty was to be settled by a plebiscite to determine adherence to Germany or Poland. As a result of the plebiscite which took place in 1921, the industrially important part of Upper Silesia passed to Poland. By being deprived of Alsace-Lorraine, the Saar Basin and Upper Silesia, Germany lost 70 per cent of her iron ore and 33 per cent of her coal.

Germany was also deprived of her non-European possessions. German East Africa (Tanganyika territory) passed to Great Britain by a mandate of the League of Nations. By League of Nations mandates, Togoland and the Cameroons in West Africa were divided among Great Britain, France and Belgium; and Southwest Africa passed to the British dominion, the Union of South Africa. Germany's colonial possessions in the Pacific were divided in such a way that the British dominions, Australia and New Zealand, received mandates over territory to the south of the equator (part of New Guinea, the Bismarck Archipelago and other islands); while Japan received a mandate over islands to the north of the Equator (the Ma-

---

The Versailles Treaty forced Germany to admit responsibility for the war, and hence to assume the obligation to make complete reparation for all losses suffered from the war by the Allies, the powers aligned with them, and their citizens. The only items omitted were expenditures for direct conduct of the war. The reparation payments and deliveries in kind were a heavy burden on the economy of post-war Germany. This burden was transferred by the German big bourgeoisie to the backs of the common people.

To ensure the fulfillment of these conditions, the Versailles Treaty established corresponding guarantees of a military character. German territory on the left bank of the Rhine, together with Cologne, Coblenz and Mainz, were occupied by Allied troops for a period of fifteen years. Germany was deprived of the right to raise fortifications and maintain troops within fifty kilometers of the right bank of the Rhine (the so-called demilitarized zone). Germany had to deliver all reserves of military supplies to the Allies and to demobilize its army, the latter being reduced for the future to six divisions (100,000 men). Conscription was prohibited, and the army had to be made up exclusively of volunteers. Germany was prohibited from possessing military air forces of any kind, and the army was not to have heavy artillery (excepting fortress artillery), tanks, and certain other types of armaments. Germany had to deliver almost the whole of its navy to the Allies, and for the future to regulate strictly both the number of ships in all classes and their size. In particular, Germany was not to possess any big battleships, aircraft carriers and submarines.

The Versailles Treaty was a heavy burden on the backs of the common people of Germany. The German fascists employed anti-Versailles demagoguery in the establishment of their dictatorship. In reality, German fascism was striving, not to liberate Germany from the fetters of Versailles, but to fasten still more burdensome fetters on other peoples, and to force still more plunder treaties on them.

The conditions of the Versailles Treaty most severe for Germany, namely, reparations, actually were lifted long before the advent of German fascism to power. Beginning with 1931, Germany ceased making reparation payments. Almost at the same time, Allied occupation of German territories came to an end—ahead of scheduled time. At the beginning of 1935, after the plebiscite in the Saar region, the latter was returned to Germany with the understanding that the German government would compensate France for the value of the coal mines. On March 16, 1935, German fascism unilaterally tore up the decisions of Versailles which limited its armaments. Conscription was reintroduced in Germany, and German fascism began to prepare for war at a furious rate on land, sea and in the air, expending all the energies and resources of the German people on armaments.

On March 7, 1936, German troops entered the demilitarized Rhineland. This was followed by the piecemeal liquidation by German fascism of territorial and political provisions of the
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Versailles Treaty. It laid its hands not only on territories that had belonged previously to Germany, but also on the territories of other states that had never been part of Germany. On March 11, 1938, German fascism seized Austria, and a year later, on March 17, 1939, Czechoslovakia. Almost at the same time it took the Memel region from Lithuania. Thus were the frontiers created by the Versailles Treaty destroyed. The German fascists, who have made a great point of the burdens that the conditions of the Treaty imposed on Germany, have themselves seized territories of other countries and enslaved neighboring peoples. Abetted by the "appeasement" policy of Chamberlain and Daladier, directed primarily against the Soviet Union, German aggression unloosed the second imperialist world war.

THE ST. GERMAIN PEACE TREATY

As a result of the World War of 1914-18, Austria-Hungary disappeared from the political map of Europe. In its place, new states arose. The territory of what was formerly Austria-Hungary was divided among Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Austria and states hostile to Germany and the Austro-Hungarian coalition. Rumania more than doubled its possessions at the expense of Transylvania and the Banat; Serbia became transformed into the extensive state of Jugoslavia, after adding Bosnia and Herzegovina, and also Croatia, Slovenia, Dalmatia, Syria and other southern regions of the former Austro-Hungarian Empire; Italy received, not only Trient and Trieste, but also the southern part of Austrian Tyrol.

The new state frontiers were defined by the peace treaties between the Allied and associated powers, on the one hand, and, on the other, the two states considered by the Allies to be their "defeated enemies." In particular, the agreement concluded with Austria at St. Germain, on September 10, 1919, defined the frontiers and the international position of Austria. As a result of this treaty, Austria was turned into a small state, with a population of six million people, of which the disproportionately big industrial center of Vienna was the capital, a state very much dependent on foreign countries as regards supplies of fuel, industrial raw materials and agricultural products.

The weak Austrian state became the object of the aggressive designs of its neighbors. The St. Germain Treaty, like the Versailles Treaty, forbade the Anschluss of Austria to Germany. Germany's first attempt to achieve this, on the basis of a customs union concluded in 1931, fell through, as it met the resistance of other powers, primarily France. Austria, like Hungary, was bound to fascist Italy by the so-called Rome protocols concluded in 1934 and re-endorsed in 1936, which meant in fact an alliance between these countries. Italy opposed the attempt of German fascism to seize Austria by the Hitlerite putsch of July 25, 1934, a putsch that was accompanied by the assassination of the Austrian Chancellor Dollfuss. However, subsequently Italian fascism, having taken the path of aggression in Africa and in the Mediterranean, and having established close political and military contact with German fascism, gave the latter free-
dom of action in Central Europe. On March 11, 1938, Austria was seized by German troops and was proclaimed to be the eastern province of Germany. Thus the St. Germain Peace Treaty was annulled.

THE TRIANON PEACE TREATY

The Trianon Peace Treaty of June 4, 1920, drastically reduced the territory of Hungary. As a result of the Treaty’s territorial provisions, which were the consequence of the World War, and also of the suppression, in 1919, of the Hungarian proletarian revolution by the reactionary Hungarian bourgeoisie and landlords assisted by the Rumanian and Czechoslovakian interventionists, a large part of the native Hungarian population remained outside the bounds of Hungary, in the region annexed by Rumania, namely, in Transylvania and in the Banat region divided between Rumania and Jugoslavia.

The big imperialist powers have made skilfull use of the territorial claims of Hungary and her neighbors arising from the Trianon Peace Treaty, for the transformation of Hungary into an instrument of their policy. In particular, she has been used for these ends by Italy which is bound to the Treaty by the Rome Protocols of 1934 and 1936. Later, German fascism, in the course of its aggression in Central Europe, transformed Hungary into its ally and vassal. In particular, after the Munich agreements of the autumn of 1938, Hungary seized a large part of the territory of Slovakia inhabited, not only by Hungarians, but also to a great degree by Slovaks. When German fascism finally seized Czechoslovakia in March, 1939, Hungary seized Carpathian Russia by force of arms. The only territorial and political provisions of the Trianon Peace Treaty to remain are those which establish the frontiers of Hungary with Rumania and Jugoslavia. However, Hungarian fascism, with the aid of its German and Italian allies, is striving to secure the forcible revision of even these frontiers.

THE LAUSANNE PEACE TREATY

The Lausanne Peace Treaty was signed on July 24, 1923, between Turkey and the Allied Powers. The original conditions of the treaty were forced on Turkey after the World War, in Sèvres (August 10, 1920). In fact, the Peace Treaty of Sèvres reduced Turkey to a semi-colonial position. The Turkish people, however, succeeded in an heroic struggle for their national independence. Turkey, supported by Great Britain in its war against Greece, won complete victory in 1921-22. As a result, the Lausanne Conference, which took place in 1922-23, and in which Turkey, Greece, Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, the U.S.A., Jugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, and also the U.S.S.R. (having been invited on the insistence of the Turkish government) took part, drew up a new peace treaty. Turkey secured the abolition of the limitations, established by the Treaty of Sèvres, on its armed forces, and of the obligation to pay reparations.

The question of Mosul which was the subject of a conflict between Great Britain, which was striving to attach it to its mandated territory of Iraq (Mesopotamia), and Turkey was left open. Subsequently it was settled by the League of Nations in favor of
Great Britain. In Central Asia Turkey received back Smyrna and Aydin, of which the Treaty of Sèvres had deprived her and which had been given to Greece. In Europe, Turkey recovered her pre-war frontiers. At the same time Turkey, according to the Lausanne Treaty, secured the abolition of the regime of capitulations (exceptional rights for foreigners) and the establishment henceforth, within the bounds of its territory, of a legal status for citizens of foreign states on a mutuality basis. The question of the Ottoman public debt, i.e., of the foreign debts of Turkey under the Sultans, was left open. The question of the regime of the Straits (the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus) was regulated by a special convention which included the Lausanne Peace Treaty. According to the convention dealing with the Straits, the latter were declared open both for merchant ships and warships of all powers, in peace and in war time (with Turkey neutral). Turkey was deprived of the right to fortify the coast of the Straits and maintain any armed forces whatsoever in the adjacent special zone. Thus, the fleets of the Mediterranean powers were able freely to enter the Black Sea, thus creating a danger to the security of the states whose coasts border on this sea. The Soviet delegation which took part in the discussion of the question of the Straits' regime, categorically objected to such a solution of the question. However, the point of view of the imperialist powers, primarily of Great Britain, which saw in the Straits convention a convenient instrument of its anti-Soviet policy, triumphed at Lausanne.

Subsequently certain conditions of the Lausanne Peace Treaty were subjected to review. In particular, on Turkey's initiative the Straits convention was reviewed and replaced by a new convention, concluded as a result of a conference at Montreux on July 30, 1936. This convention restored to Turkey the right to fortify the Straits and to maintain its armed forces there. Limitations were established in respect to the passage through the Straits of warships of states not bordering on the Black Sea. In 1938, on the insistence of Turkey, the frontiers established by the Lausanne Treaty between its territory and Syria, which is under France's mandate, were reviewed. In particular, the former Alexandretta region, which originally formed part of Syria, was made a separate administrative unit under the joint administration of France and Turkey.

**THE NEUILLY PEACE TREATY**

The Neuilly Peace Treaty was concluded in Neuilly (France) on November 27, 1919, between the Allied powers and Bulgaria. The latter, according to this treaty, suffered considerable territorial loss. It was deprived of an outlet to the Aegean Sea from the port of Dede Agach (now Alexandroupolis), which went to Greece, and lost part of Dobruja, which passed to Rumania. It was also burdened with the weight of reparations and forced to disarm. However, as time went on considerable modifications were made in the regime established for Bulgaria. The total sum of reparations was considerably cut down, and the payment of it postponed so that actual payments were comparatively insignificant, and later
reparations were formally abolished. Since the time of the establishment of the military dictatorship in Bulgaria (in 1923) the latter has, in fact, not fulfilled her obligations regarding disarmament, making use in this case of the tolerance of Italy, which has striven to transform Bulgaria into an instrument of its policy in the Balkans. Particularly since its seizure of Albania, Italian imperialism has been maneuvering to utilize Bulgaria as a pawn in its plan of conquest.

THE NINE-POWER PACT

The Nine-Power Pact was concluded on February 6, 1922, at the Washington Conference between the U.S.A., Great Britain, Japan, France, Italy, Belgium, Holland, Portugal and China.

During the first imperialist world war Japan strengthened its position in China to a very considerable degree. The seizure of the former German colony Kiaochow greatly strengthened the strategic position of Japanese imperialism, while the famous twenty-one conditions forced on China by Japan on May 9, 1915, in fact established a Japanese protectorate in China. Such a situation, of course, did not fall in with the interests of American imperialism, for whom it is exceedingly important to maintain the "open door" policy in the Far East. Other things being equal, the United States, as the country with the most powerful industry, had every ground for counting on taking first place in China's foreign trade and of driving other powers out of the Chinese market. The advance of this policy was held up by the policy of "spheres of influence" pursued by the other imperialist states, particularly Japan and England. The policy of "spheres of influence" amounted to the seizure, by these states, of definite territorial regions of China in which they established for themselves conditions especially favorable to profits, and eliminated any possible foreign competitors. A result of the consolidation of Japan's position in China was an acute sharpening of Japanese-American contradictions. Side by side with this, another factor rendering imperialist contradictions acute in the Pacific was the naval competition between Great Britain, the U.S.A. and Japan.

The Washington Conference, called on the initiative of the U.S.A., was to regulate Far Eastern and Pacific Coast problems and to limit naval armaments. The Nine-Power Pact was one of the main results of the conference, in addition to an agreement regarding the limitation of naval armaments, and a fourth treaty between Great Britain, the U.S.A., Japan and France, concerning the inviolability of their island possessions in the Pacific. At the Washington conference, the Anglo-Japanese alliance was annulled under pressure from the U.S.A. and the British dominions. The parties to the Nine-Power Pact undertook to maintain toward China the principle of the "open door," i.e., they undertook not to strive in any part of the country for special privileges for themselves or their citizens as against corresponding privileges accorded other countries or their citizens. This agreement, adopted under American pressure, temporarily limited the imperialist designs of Japan in China (the twenty-one
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demands) but did not put a stop to the further policy of conquest of the Japanese imperialists.

In 1931 Japan seized Manchuria by force of arms and organized the buffer state of Manchukuo. At the beginning of 1932, Japan made an onslaught on Shanghai. Subsequently the Japanese imperialists have been carrying through further acts of aggression at the expense of China. Since 1937 Japan has been waging a sanguinary war against China, in order to subjugate the entire country by force of arms. Thus, the Nine-Power Pact has actually been torn to bits by Japanese bayonets, although formally it has not been annulled. It should be said, in passing, that at the beginning of 1939 the Japanese government officially declared its intention of “reviewing” the conditions of the pact in adjustment with the situation existing in Eastern Asia and the “special mission” allegedly being pursued there by Japan. Great Britain, the U.S.A. and other powers have repeatedly protested against the violation of the Nine-Power Pact by the Japanese aggressors. But these verbal protests have had no practical results.

COMRADE STALIN ON THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE U.S.S.R.

At the Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Comrade Stalin made the following statement about the foreign policy of the U.S.S.R.:

“The war has created a new situation with regard to the relations between countries. It has enveloped them in an atmosphere of alarm and uncertainty. By undermining the post-war peace regime and overriding the elementary principles of international law, it has cast doubt on the value of international treaties and obligations. Pacifism and disarmament schemes are dead and buried. Feverish arming has taken their place. Everybody is arming, small states and big states, including primarily those which practice the policy of non-intervention.

“Nobody believes any longer in the unctuous speeches which claim that the Munich concessions to the aggressors and the Munich agreement opened a new era of ‘appeasement.’ They are disbelieved even by the signatories to the Munich agreement, Britain and France, which are increasing their armaments no less than other countries.

“Naturally, the U.S.S.R. could not ignore these ominous events. There is no doubt that any war, however small, started by the aggressors in any remote corner of the world constitutes a danger to the peaceable countries. All the more serious then is the danger arising from the new imperialist war, which has already drawn into its orbit more than five hundred million people in Asia, Africa and Europe. In view of this, while our country is unwaveringly pursuing a policy of preserving peace, it is at the same time doing a great deal to increase the preparedness of our Red Army and our Red Navy.

“At the same time, in order to strengthen its international position, the Soviet Union decided to take certain other steps. At the end of 1934 our country joined the League of Nations, considering that despite its weakness the League might nevertheless serve as a place where aggressors can be exposed, and as a certain instrument of peace, however feeble, that might hinder the outbreak of war. The Soviet Union considers that in alarming times like these even so weak an international organization as the League of Nations should not be ignored. In May, 1935, a treaty of mutual assistance against possible attack by aggressors was signed between France and the Soviet Union. A similar treaty was simultaneously concluded with Czechoslovakia. In March, 1936, the Soviet Union concluded a treaty of mutual assistance with the Mongolian People’s Republic. In August, 1937, the Soviet Union concluded a pact of non-aggression with the Chinese Republic.

“It was in such difficult international conditions that the Soviet Union pursued its
foreign policy of upholding the cause of peace.

"The foreign policy of the Soviet Union is clear and explicit:

"1. We stand for peace and the strengthening of business relations with all countries. That is our position; and we shall adhere to this position as long as these countries maintain like relations with the Soviet Union, and as long as they make no attempt to trespass on the interests of our country.

"2. We stand for peaceful, close and friendly relations with all the neighboring countries which have common frontiers with the U.S.S.R. That is our position; and we shall adhere to this position as long as these countries maintain like relations with the Soviet Union, and as long as they make no attempt to trespass, directly or indirectly, on the integrity and inviolability of the frontiers of the Soviet state.

"3. We stand for the support of nations which are the victims of aggression and are fighting for the independence of their country.

"4. We are not afraid of the threats of aggressors, and are ready to deal two blows for every blow delivered by instigators of war who attempt to violate the Soviet borders.

"Such is the foreign policy of the Soviet Union.

"In its foreign policy the Soviet Union relies upon:

"1. Its growing economic, political and cultural might;

"2. The moral and political unity of our Soviet society;

"3. The mutual friendship of the nations of our country;

"4. Its Red Army and Red Navy;

"5. Its policy of peace;

"6. The moral support of the working people of all countries, who are vitally concerned in the preservation of peace;

"7. The good sense of the countries which for one reason or another have no interest in the violation of peace."*

---

* Ibid., pp. 15-17.
BOOK REVIEWS

CAUGHT BY THE FINE ART OF PROPAGANDA


In October, 1937, there was organized the Institute for Propaganda Analysis, Inc., consisting of academically prominent people especially trained in the formal analysis of propaganda. That the monthly reports issued by the Institute did not bear out the promise it embodied early leads one to question the social-scientific character of its work. This doubt is increased by the publication of its first book, The Fine Art of Propaganda. It is at best a minor contribution to the exposure of fascist demagogy, largely because of its failure to grasp the essential nature of demagogy.

The editors of the book have very painstakingly analyzed the form of Coughlin's speeches and have learned (and they easily prove it) that Coughlin uses all the Seven Propaganda Devices with which the Institute is preoccupied. Coughlin's broadcasts are full of (1) name-calling; (2) glittering generalities; (3) transfer devices consisting of the transfer of prestige from one idea to another; (4) testimonials of respected persons; (5) the plain folks appeal to the people; (6) card-stacking; and (7) the band-wagon appeal that other people are doing the same thing, why not you?

They convict him repeatedly of lying, distortion, falsification, and of using Nazi and other discredited sources in his speeches. But such evidence is insufficient and ineffective in fighting Coughlin's fascist demagogy. Today demagogy is not merely the use of certain devices and of monstrous lies; fascist and imperialist demagogy is the skillful exploitation of the deepest feelings and profoundest needs of the masses in the interest of reaction, of finance capital and its predatory wars. A liar is answered when he is confronted with the truth. But the exposure of specific lies is not a sufficient answer to the demagogue, because he has used his lies and his devices in order to mislead his audience into believing that he can provide something it really needs: jobs, security, social justice, peace, democracy, even socialism. To prove that a demagogue has lied, however, is not to satisfy the need of the people that listen to him. Really to combat the demagogue you must expose the demagogy and offer a better explanation of the joblessness and insecurity on which reaction tries to feed and a real program to achieve jobs, security, peace and socialism. And, finally, you must organize the people in struggle to satisfy these deeply-felt wants. To believe, as the Institute does, that you do not need to explain to the working class and the middle classes the cause of their misery, that you do not have to offer a counter-program, that you do not need to lead them in struggle, that you can defeat Coughlinism merely by proving he is a liar—to believe that, is to be naive in a characteristically "liberal" and unscientific fashion.

But is there no need for an Institute that will restrict itself to factual analysis and leave to other bodies the task of defining a program and of organizing the masses? There is, of course, always use for factual study of any problem, even if those who make the study do not themselves apply its results. But this book of the Institute's is scientifically deficient in other basic respects. First of all, it does not understand the class nature of fascism. Hitler's and Coughlin's political and economic theories are called "quasi-socialistic" (p. 9); on page 66 the book quotes approvingly from an Institute bulletin the following: "Despite its Socialism [1], the growing following of the N.S.D.A.P. [Nazis] made it a useful tool to crush Marxism, democracy, and the German labor movement." It speaks constantly of European dictators as if Hitler and Mussolini were per-
sonal dictators, not representative of their own most reactionary finance capitalists. We are informed that Hitler promised everything to every one, but not that he kept only those promises made to the Junkers and finance capital. Moreover, there is no attempt made to show what connections Coughlin has with Wall Street. Indeed, the book creates the impression that Coughlin not only promises everything but attacks everybody; for it publishes in a list of those Coughlin attacks the names of the “Du Pont family, Carter Glass, Herbert Hoover, Alfred M. Landon, John D. Rockefeller, J. P. Morgan and Hugh Johnson.” Is this supposed to show Coughlin is against Wall Street? Isn’t that the impression his reactionary monopolist backers want Coughlin to create? Then how are we to understand the comment of the editors that the whole list speaks for itself. It contains revered leaders from many walks of American life? (p. 46)

As a result of this treatment of Coughlinism as unrelated to finance capital, the unguarded reader of the book would be totally unable to penetrate the present “peace” demagoguery of Coughlin, whereby Coughlin, serving his imperialist masters, covers up his design ultimately to involve the United States in an imperialist, anti-Soviet war. It is significant that, since the editors of the book generally neglect the content of Coughlin’s demagoguery for the formal devices he uses to spread it, there is no analysis of Coughlin’s position on foreign policy.

Secondly, the Institute does not understand the class nature of bourgeois democracy. There is constant neglect of class content, and concentration oh the seemingly classless forms by which the bourgeois democracy seeks to hide its capitalist character.

In the Foreword, the Secretary of the Institute writes in italics: “So far as individuals are concerned, the art of democracy is the art of thinking and discussing independently together.” The concept is basic to the book: the democratic ideal or technique is “give-and-take around the local cracker barrel or the stove in the railroad station or the fireplace in the Commercial Hotel or the counter in the corner tobacco shop” or in more formal town or national legislative assemblies. But as long as local power was in the hands of the local banker or mill-owner, did the cracker-barrel debater really decide anything? And as for the state or national assemblies, we know that a parliament may parley, but that the ruling class rules, if possible, with the aid of parliaments. And when the ruling class wishes, it will recess a parliament in order to arrest democratically-elected Communist deputies, as in France. For the masses, democracy is not merely a way of talking or debating; it offers certain opportunities to struggle for a system that will assure them jobs, security, peace. They also increasingly learn that if bourgeois democracy does not offer enough opportunities and guarantees, it does provide a basis for struggle for a genuine democracy that is permanent: socialist democracy.

The Institute is no more scientific in treating socialism and the Communist Party than it is in regard to Coughlin, fascism, or the veiled dictatorship that constitutes bourgeois-democracy. They offer this “scientific” gem:

“Competent observers, including social scientists, who have analyzed the rise of Communism, are agreed on these points: The so-called Kerensky or democratic government of Russia, formed after the first or democratic revolution of 1917, was undermined by the Imperial German government in an effort to obtain from it a separate peace. The Imperial German government arranged for the passage of Lenin from exile.” (p. 63.)

By soberly citing this “interpretation” of the socialist revolution, the Institute betrays the uselessness of its whole approach. Certainly, here is a hoary fiction that has been exploded a thousand times; and yet there are people, even editors of an “Institute,” who feel the need to use the tale in order to confuse the basic issue: the imperialist nature of the Kerensky regime, which the working class and the peasantry refused to tolerate, and which they overthrew in the struggle for bread, land, and peace, and the power to guarantee the permanence of these attainments.

On another occasion, the editors are crossing swords with Coughlin’s favorite device of name-calling, especially with his habit of calling all his opponents Communists and (or) Jews. But the solution in the book is no less false and dangerous than Coughlin’s argument: “Can a person be both a Communist and a Jew? In answer to this question, one finds substantial agreement among those
chiefly involved, the Jews and Communists. They would answer: No.” And then for five pages there is an attempt to prove that no Jew can be a Communist and no Communist a Jew! This is not merely nonsense; it reeks with reactionary demagogy. In the first place, it defines Jews “only in terms of religion, which is decidedly unscientific. In the second place, the Communist Party has in its ranks both religious and non-religious Jews, as it has both religious and non-religious Gentiles. And most important of all, the Institute avoids the basic issue of democratic liberties: that a Jew has a right to be a Communist. By following the line that no Jew can be a Communist, the Institute is accepting Coughlin’s premise that no Jew ought to be, or has a right to be, a Communist. The Institute is here not exposing Coughlin, but actually yielding to him.

In sum, our charge against the Institute and its book is that they are not products of social science. More can be learned about Coughlin and fascism from one page of A. B. Magil’s pamphlet, The Real Father Coughlin, or R. Palme Dutt’s Fascism and Social Revolution than from the whole of the Fine Art of Propaganda. Those, however, who understand the class nature of fascism and reaction and the character of their demagogy will find in the Institute’s book some interesting data and technical analysis conveniently arranged.

A. H.

A BOURBON DEFENSE OF SLAVOCRACY


Dr. Lloyd’s work epitomizes and brings to a climax a generation of the writings of the Bourbon revisionist school of American history. The author permits nothing, neither the most elementary standards of honesty, nor the accumulated learning of a myriad of scholars, to bar his purpose—the production of a naked and unashamed defense of American Negro slavery and the reactionary political system it fostered.

What must Lloyd (and the many members of his sect) demonstrate? First, that the Negro is “innately inferior” to other peoples. This is done merely by assertion, and the scientific work of Boas, Mall and Klineberg, which proves the opposite, is not even mentioned, let alone considered. Secondly, it is important that one “prove” that the African is, was, and always has been, an utter barbarian who has made no contribution to civilization and who has no history. The cited authorities for this are an article of 1847 in the pseudo-official Southern publication DeBow’s Review, and a book published in 1852 in Charleston, called the Pro-Slavery Argument! No mention will be found of the works of Wiener, Delafosse, Herskovits, Ellis, Du Bois and other authorities, which demonstrate the rich cultural and historical contributions of the Negro people.

Dr. Lloyd’s third task is to convince his readers that American slavery was “patriarchal” and that the slaves were “contented.” This he attempts by citing pro-slavery sources (he refers, for this purpose, to DeBow’s Review and the Pro-Slavery Argument eleven times within the limits of two pages, 132-133!) and by avoiding any notice of works that prove the opposite—that prove the beastly character of American slavery and the unhappy, heroically rebellious condition of the Negroes. Thus, no reference to Catterall’s massive five-volume collection of court records relative to slavery is made; in discussing the foreign slave trade no notice of Du Bois’ standard treatise is taken; in discussing the nature and extent of the domestic slave trade, Bancroft’s authoritative monograph is “overlooked”; in falsifying and minimizing the evidence of discontent among the slaves no mention of the work of Siebert, Aptheker, or Wish is made. And, though it may appear incredible, in this work on American slavery the author does not once even hint at the existence of Carter Woodson, easily the outstanding scholar on the subject.

The fourth job, to discredit the abolitionists, is now simple. Their propaganda, says the learned Dr. Lloyd, can only be compared “to the more recent crusade of certain Northern elements to turn attention to the alleged [!] political and judicial discriminations against the Negro in the South” (p. 76). Thus, just as now “certain Northern elements” (later on the author becomes specific
and names "the Communists") are making a fuss about nothing at all, about "alleged discriminations," so a hundred years ago the Abolitionists, "not acquainted with actual conditions in the South," such as Dr. Lloyd describes, permitted their "vivid imaginations" to run away with them, denounced "alleged" cruelties and injustices, and began their "deleterious" campaign for the destruction of human slavery.

The fifth proposition, often repeated, is that it was only because of this attack, and only after it occurred (in 1831) that the South began to defend slavery. The same methods, omission and distortion, are used to buttress this falsehood. The impassioned defense of slavery by the slaveholders of Georgia and South Carolina during the Revolution (at one time threatening the success of that war) is omitted, the vehement denunciations of a mild Quaker emancipationist petition to Congress in 1790 by the same group is falsified, and significant and numerous open justifications of slavery from that time on are neglected. The author adds to the falsification, too, by consistently confusing the colonization movement with emancipationism. The two were opposed, not complementary.

This widespread idea that the slaveholders held on to their slaves merely to spite the nasty Abolitionists is manifestly absurd. Much evidence could be presented to refute it, but for reasons of space we wish to quote but one example. This is a statement by Senator Hammond of South Carolina made in 1845. Hammond referred to the truculence of the Abolitionists and went on to say to them:

"But if your course was wholly different—if you distilled nectar from your lips, and discoursed sweetest music, could you reasonably indulge the hope of accomplishing your object by such means? Nay, supposing that we were all convinced, and thought of Slavery precisely as you do, at what era of 'moral suasion' do you imagine you could prevail on us to give up a thousand millions of dollars in the value of our slaves, and a thousand millions of dollars more in the depreciation of our lands, in consequence of the want of laborers to cultivate them?"

These, of course, the property question and the political relations dependent thereon, are the crux of the matter. It is that which made the agitation of the Abolitionists so distressing to the slaveholders; they were real revolutionists seeking to advance the rights and interests of the masses at the expense of the property interests of the rulers of the state, and those interests defended (and tried to enhance) their power not to spite the Abolitionists, but in spite of them. Incidentally, two years ago Professor Hesseltine published a paper demonstrating that there was at least as much reason to believe that the brazen pro-slavery enunciations and activities of the Bourbons aroused the Abolitionist agitation as there is to believe the opposite; but, of course, Dr. Lloyd is, or presumes to be, blissfully unaware of this.

The next major falsehood of Dr. Lloyd is his repetition of the fable which pictures the Civil War as the united uprising of all the (white) people of the South regardless of class position. To turn this counter-revolutionary oligarchic rebellion into a great popular uprising, the author has to omit consideration of the method by which the Confederacy was created; the admission of lack of public support by the slavery's leaders, like Edmund Ruffin; and the story of disaffection and desertion among the Southern whites, as demonstrated in the works of Moore, Tatum and Lonn. Of course, the action of the Negro people either in this connection, or in the Abolitionist movement itself, is below Dr. Lloyd's notice.

The author closes his work in a blaze of what he seems to think is originality by stating that an essential cause of the Civil War was the conflict over state power between a rising industrial free-labor North and an agrarian slave-labor South. This is as ancient as the war, when Marx, Engels, Cairnes and others said the same thing, and is well established in American historiography through the writings of Beard, Cole and others; but none of these men is mentioned by the pioneering Dr. Lloyd!

Specific errors of fact abound and add to the nightmare the author has concocted. But it is a dream that has many nostalgic disciples and wide currency. It is disappointing to see the hitherto fairly liberal press of the University of North Carolina allowing itself to be used for the production of such vicious trash.
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