

# *The Communist*

20c.

NOVEMBER

1940

TWENTY-THREE YEARS  
OF  
VICTORIOUS  
SOCIALISM

•

CHINA AND THE FAR EASTERN CRISIS

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC.,  
REQUIRED BY THE ACTS OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AND  
MARCH 3, 1933, OF THE COMMUNIST, published monthly at New York,  
N. Y., for October, 1940.

State of New York }  
County of New York } ss.

Before me, a Notary Public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared W. E. Douglas, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the Business Manager of THE COMMUNIST and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in Section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher, Communist Party of the U.S.A., 50 East 13th Street, New York, N. Y.  
Editor, Earl Browder, 50 East 13th Street, New York, N. Y.

Managing Editor, None.

Business Manager, W. E. Douglas, 50 East 13th Street, New York, N. Y.

2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, company, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address, as well as those of each individual member, must be given.)

Communist Party of U.S.A., 50 East 13th Street, New York, N. Y.

Earl Browder, General Secretary, 50 East 13th Street, New York, N. Y.

A non-profit organization—political.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.) None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholders or security holders appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

5. That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the twelve months preceding the date shown above is (This information is required from daily publications only.)

W. E. DOUGLAS, Business Manager

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 3rd day of October, 1940.

MAX KITZES, Notary Public

(My commission expires March 30, 1942)

(SEAL)

# THE COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM  
PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A.

EDITOR: EARL BROWDER



## CONTENTS

Review of the Month . . . . .	A. B. . . . .	963
For a People's Policy in U. S.-Soviet Relations! . . . . .	William Z. Foster . . . . .	978
China's Liberation Struggle and the Far Eastern Crisis . . . . .	James Welden . . . . .	990
China Has Proved It Can Unite: Unity Will Bring Victory . . . . .	Manifesto of the Com- munist Party of China	1001
Soviet Socialist Republics in the Baltic . . . . .	Jan Vedral . . . . .	1007
The Path of Lenin and Stalin . . . . .	Joseph Fields . . . . .	1020
Dynamic Changes in the Population of the Soviet Union . . . . .	C. G. Lande . . . . .	1031
The Basic Principle of Socialism . . . . .	G. Kosiachenko . . . . .	1038
Book Reviews:		
<i>Why Farmers Are Poor</i> by Anna Rochester . . . . .	Jackson Eldridge . . . . .	1045
<i>Race: Science and Politics</i> by Ruth Benedict . . . . .	John Arnold . . . . .	1049

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Send checks, money orders and correspondence to THE COMMUNIST, P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 E. 13th St.), New York. Subscription rates: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada \$2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

## **New Books and Pamphlets**

<b>Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State,</b> by Frederick Engels . . . . .	<b>\$1.00</b>
<b>Trials of British Freedom,</b> by T. A. Jackson . . . . .	<b>1.75</b>
<b>The Chosen Few,</b> by William Gallacher . . . . .	<b>1.75</b>
<b>The Second Imperialist War,</b> by Earl Browder . . . . .	<b>2.00</b>
<b>Dialectics of Nature,</b> by Frederick Engels . . . . .	<b>2.50</b>
<b>Why Farmers Are Poor: The Agricultural Crisis in the United States,</b> by Anna Rochester . . . . .	<b>2.25</b>
<b>The Fat Years and the Lean,</b> by Bruce Minton and John Stuart . . . . .	<b>2.50</b>
<b>The South in Progress,</b> by Katharine Du Pre Lumpkin . . . . .	<b>2.00</b>
●	
<b>The Materialist Conception of History,</b> by George Plekhanov . . . . .	<b>.15</b>
<b>Role of the Individual in History,</b> by George Plekhanov . . . . .	<b>.20</b>
<b>The Young Generation,</b> by V. I. Lenin . . . . .	<b>.15</b>
<b>The Tasks of the Youth,</b> by Joseph Stalin . . . . .	<b>.15</b>
<b>Intellectuals and the War,</b> by V. J. Jerome . . . . .	<b>.10</b>
<b>What Is Socialism?</b> by Ernst Fischer . . . . .	<b>.10</b>
<b>The British Labor Movement,</b> by Frederick Engels . . . . .	<b>.15</b>
<b>On Historical Materialism,</b> by Frederick Engels . . . . .	<b>.10</b>
<b>Dialectical and Historical Materialism,</b> by Joseph Stalin . . . . .	<b>.15</b>
<b>The Negro in the American Revolution,</b> by Herbert Aptheker . . . . .	<b>.15</b>
<b>Marx, Engels and Lenin on Ireland,</b> by Ralph Fox . . . . .	<b>.15</b>
<b>The Civil War in France,</b> by Karl Marx . . . . .	<b>.25</b>
<b>War and the Workers,</b> by V. I. Lenin . . . . .	<b>.10</b>

●

Order from

**WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS**

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

---

## REVIEW OF THE MONTH

*The Twenty-Third Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. A Proven Way Out of Imperialism and War. The Lenin-Stalin Path Versus Social-Democratism. Then and Now. Will the Masses Grasp the Opportunity? The C.I.O. and A. F. of L. Assembled in Conventions. The Tasks Facing Them. For Labor's Unity and Independence Against the Imperialists and Reformists. Preparing to Resist More Unitedly the War-Making Offensive and Splitting Maneuvers of Social-Democratic Leaders. Approaching New Phase in Struggle for Protection of People's Standards and Rights. Brookings Institution Presents Program of Big Business Offensive Upon Masses. War Economy, Profiteering and Unemployment. Bethlehem Steel Versus the People. The Tri-Partite Pact and American Imperialism. New Tasks and Forms of Struggle for Peace.*

**T**HE Soviet Republic will be twenty-three years old this month. On this occasion the toiling masses of all countries and continents, not only the happy peoples of the socialist state, will be celebrating the greatest and most far-reaching event in human history. They will celebrate the victory of socialism on one-sixth of the earth, the triumph of the Lenin-Stalin road to freedom from capitalist slavery and imperialist war, the growing might of the Soviet Union and its leadership to peace and happiness for the toiling masses and oppressed nations everywhere.

In anguish and in suffering the masses of the remaining five-sixths of the earth, those already in the midst of the imperialist slaughter

and those that are now being driven into it, are asking the question: what is the way out? How can an end be made, once and for all, of this insane system which keeps the masses in bondage and poverty, brings upon them repeatedly devastating economic crises, and which, in the course of the last twenty-five years, has produced two wars of world dimensions? How can a just and durable peace be achieved? Not the kind of oppressive and war-producing "peace" established by the victorious imperialists in Versailles at the end of the first world imperialist war, but a just and lasting peace which should make the recurrence of war impossible and which should open the way to security, prosperity and happiness for

the masses, to genuine brotherly collaboration between nations and peoples? How can that be achieved?

Twenty-three years ago the peoples of old Russia, headed by the working class and led by the party of Lenin and Stalin, gave the answer to these questions. In the great October Socialist Revolution, whose twenty-third anniversary we are now celebrating, *they struck at the root of the evil*. They abolished the rule of the imperialists, capitalists and land-holding aristocracy and established their own rule, the rule of the people, the rule of the working class allied with the rest of the common people. This was the meaning of the Soviet system. With the power of government in their hands, they took the wealth of the nation out of the grip of a clique of exploiters and war-makers and returned it to its true owners—the nation—thus laying the basis for the building of a socialist society. For the first time in human history they made democracy mean freedom and liberty for the people and not for their exploiters, thus enabling themselves to combat and defeat all the internal counter-revolutionary conspiracies of the capitalists and imperialists, resisting successfully and finally defeating all foreign imperialist interventions. In doing so, they took their country *out* of the system of world imperialism, freed it of the contradictions, crises and wars inherent in and resulting from the capitalist system and capitalist rule, and established the basis of a new world system—the system of socialism, freedom and peace.

It was the only way out of the first world imperialist war, the way of Lenin and Stalin, the way of all peoples and nations. It is also the only way for the masses out of the second imperialist war which is rapidly becoming a world war. Can there still be any doubt about it?

One can still remember the siren songs of the imperialist bourgeoisie and its Social-Democratic flunkeys during the first world imperialist war and the years of revolutionary upheaval immediately following it, roughly between 1914 and 1923. Every country was supposed to have been fighting for its national independence and against the aggressions of a foreign oppressor. Each of the imperialist camps was seeking victory for no other purpose but the establishment of permanent peace, a “new” world order, democracy, freedom and a better life for the people. Hadn’t we in the United States been making war “to end war” and “to make the world safe for democracy”?

Those following the teachings of Lenin and Stalin had been warning the masses against the deceitful promises of the imperialist bourgeoisie and the Social-Democratic leaders. They sought to educate and organize the masses, headed by the working class, to take the Bolshevik way, the way of striking at the root of the evil, at the very source of war and oppression and insecurity, this being the rule of the imperialist bourgeoisie. They called upon the peoples to abolish that rule and institute their own, to take *advantage* for this purpose of the profound crisis of the capitalist system

resulting from the war to liberate themselves from imperialism and all its works, making sure that there will be no more wars and oppression and crises and poverty. Yes, to take advantage of the difficulties of the imperialist war-makers and the crisis of their system to achieve the liberation of the peoples and the establishment of a just and truly permanent peace.

Here stepped in the leaders of Social-Democracy to do for the imperialist war-makers what they themselves could not do. The leaders of Social-Democracy, having become part of the imperialist war machine in their respective countries, were preaching a different way out, an "easier" and "better" one. They said: Let's first win the war and make all necessary sacrifices for it. This will make labor more important and stronger in the nation. It may even put the government in labor's hands; and the more we sacrifice for victory in the war the better are the chances for labor becoming the government in a peaceful, easy and non-revolutionary way. Then—then having won the war, we shall begin to introduce socialism, democratic socialism, without struggle and without sacrifice. In fact, they said, even during the very war, to the extent that the bourgeoisie gives labor representation in the government, we shall already begin introducing certain elements of socialism. For example: conscription of wealth, nationalization of certain industries, etc., etc. And, they added, the bourgeoisie itself will have to come along with these socialization measures because

these are indispensable for winning the war, and the bourgeoisie certainly wants to win the war. Now, they concluded, if we go along that far, there will be no return to the old order. A new order will come, one of democracy and socialism, in an easy, cheap and peaceful way, the way of Social-Democratism.

At this point the reader may find himself wondering whether the foregoing summarizes the preachments of Social-Democratism during the present war or during the first world imperialist war. Both are so similar. So we hasten to repeat that we are still talking about the *first* world imperialist war and that the foregoing represents the essence of the position of Social-Democratism at that time, notably of the leadership of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany and of the Labor Party of England.

What happened? In Russia, the majority of the working class had rejected these preachments of Social-Democratism. It accepted the teachings of Lenin and Stalin and the leadership of the Bolshevik Party. Following that leadership and rallying around itself the overwhelming majority of the toiling people of city and farm, the working class of Russia put an end to Social-Democratism in the labor movement. It made a fight for power and won it, defeating internal counter-revolution and foreign intervention. It restored the economy of the country on a socialist basis. Living in the midst of hostile capitalist states, which have been plotting continually against the security of the Soviet Republic, the

working class of the new socialist state succeeded nevertheless in carrying through triumphantly two of the greatest and most difficult tasks of socialist construction—socialist industrialization and the collectivization of agriculture. It has built up a socialist system and a true people's democracy, free of exploiters, crises, unemployment, insecurity. It has created a mighty bulwark of peace, progress and socialism for the entire world. It achieved all these glorious results, and is moving steadfastly to further achievements, because it follows the way of Lenin and Stalin.

In the other countries, the majority of the working class, far from putting an end to Social-Democratism in the labor movement, actually believed and accepted the deceitful preachments of the leaders of Social-Democracy. And what was the result? Just consider the course of affairs in the capitalist countries since 1917. Just contemplate the agonies and sufferings of the masses of the peoples in such advanced capitalist countries as England, Germany, France and the United States for the last twenty-three years, the pride of capitalist "civilization," and then add to it the hellish existence of the masses in the so-called backward countries, in the colonies and dependencies. And to complete the picture, take in the present war and all that it has already meant for the masses. And as we do so, we shall get the results and achievements of the Social-Democratic way out of the first world imperialist war. We shall gain some idea of the terrific price

the masses have paid and are paying for the trust placed by the majority of the workers in the capitalist countries in the promises of the leaders of Social-Democracy, for their failure to take the Bolshevik way out of the first world imperialist war, for the failure to take advantage of the crisis of capitalism to achieve their liberation.

The opportunity present in the world situation of 1917-23 for the abolition of imperialist rule in most capitalist countries, not alone in Russia, was missed by the working class of those countries. It was missed because the majority of the workers believed the fraudulent preachments of Social-Democratism. Now, as a result of the present war, a crisis of the capitalist system is maturing, of even greater depth and acuteness. Once more the working class is confronted with the question: what is the way out? And once more the imperialist bourgeoisie and the Social-Democratic leaders are seeking to deflect the masses, by false promises as well as by force, from approaching the real way out, the only one for themselves, the way of putting an end to imperialist rule, which demands that an end be put to Social-Democratism in the labor movement.

Here it must be pointed out at once that the realization of the historic task of the working class to put an end to the rule of the imperialist bourgeoisie is—in the present world situation—much easier, in many fundamental respects, than was the case in the first world imperialist war. Imperialist rule no longer embraces the whole world;

one-sixth of it is socialist, growing and expanding. The masses in the capitalist world are increasingly becoming more aware of the decisive help that the victorious progress of socialism in the Soviet Union and its growing influence in world affairs are rendering to their own liberation. They have seen that socialism is indeed *their* solution and their way out, although they have not yet drawn all the practical conclusions. But can they fail to draw these conclusions? Can they afford to fail?

The imperialist bourgeoisie and its Social-Democratic servants are trying to make sure that the masses are fooled once again, that they shall again miss the great opportunity for liberation. To achieve this end, the ruling classes in all capitalist countries are dangling before the eyes of the masses the mirage of "a new order" and of "a better world" to be brought by the victory of the imperialist bourgeoisie in the war. Each imperialism has its own "new order" with which to befuddle the masses, keep them tied to the war machine, and prevent them from moving to the real new order—the abolition of imperialist rule. And Social-Democratism is again doing its utmost to promote these imperialist maneuvers in the labor movement.

But the experiences of the masses with capitalist misrule during the last twenty-five years have left a deep imprint upon their thinking and attitudes. Two world wars in a generation and many "small" ones; three major economic crises during the same time and a few "smaller"

ones; mounting political reaction and open terroristic bourgeois dictatorships; growing insecurity and permanent armies of unemployed; and all of it in *one generation*. And now, if things are left again in the hands of the imperialist bourgeoisie, we shall have to tread the same road again: from war to an imperialist "peace," à la Versailles, and from there to even more devastating and destructive war. The masses have learned and are learning that this is so. Is it conceivable that the masses will accept this kind of perspective, that they will let things go on as of old when made to realize fully that this is the perspective if the bourgeoisie remains in power? Is it likely that the masses will not find their way to a radical change in the situation with the example and influence of the Soviet Union before them? No, it is not likely. The power of the socialist example is too great, the maturity of the masses is too advanced, the alternative of continued imperialist rule is too terrific, and the advancing influence of the Communist Parties is too real, for the likelihood to arise that the masses will let things go on as of old.

And on this, the twenty-third anniversary of the great October Socialist Revolution, we bring to the masses of our people the message of socialism as the way out, the teachings of Lenin and Stalin as the guide to freedom, the program of the anti-imperialist people's front as the only road of struggle against the imperialist war and for a people's peace. For the American working class and for our people

generally this road requires the building of solid friendship with the Soviet Union, active support for its peace policy, and unity of the people around the working class in the daily struggle against the imperialist-reactionary offensive of the exploiters and war-makers.

\* \* \*

**T**HIS month will see the holding of the annual national conventions of the C.I.O. and of the A. F. of L., the former in Atlantic City, the latter in New Orleans. It goes without saying that labor is vitally interested in the deliberations and outcome of these two gatherings. And not only labor.

It is to be expected that the convention of the C.I.O., as formerly, will display initiative in projecting those problems and issues that are of particular importance to labor and all common people at the present time. This is to be inferred also from a statement in the convention call which says: "The Congress of Industrial Organizations, because of its status and position, has a deep obligation to present to the nation the views of organized labor upon the important questions which today beset the American people." It is less clear, at this writing, what the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. plans to bring to its convention, but it is certain that the general (and many specific) problems facing the workers in the A. F. of L. are no different from those facing the workers in the C.I.O.

Both conventions will have to face squarely the fact that the imperialists of the United States have

placed this country in the position of a war participant. The United States is collaborating militarily with England in the war against Germany, Italy and Japan, and the scope of this collaboration seems bound to increase rather than decrease, especially if Roosevelt is re-elected. And in the Far East the possibility of a war conflict and even military operations against Japan is clearly visible. This being the case, it is safe to assume that the imperialist Big Business offensive upon the economic standards and civil rights of the masses will also increase. The two, as we know (imperialist aggrandizement abroad and internal reaction at home), go hand in hand.

Facing this fundamental fact in our situation, the two labor conventions will also have to face another fact. It is the increasing efforts of the imperialist bourgeoisie to *paralyze* labor's resistance to the attacks of the war-makers. It will be done by intimidation and force, but not only by that. It will also be done, as is already being done but on a larger scale and with a greater variety of methods, by means of reformist and Social-Democratic influences within the labor movement itself. The Hillmans, Greens and Tobins will be expected by the imperialists and war-makers to do an even better job of demoralizing labor from within than they have done so far; and they will try to do it.

With these two facts clearly before them, the delegates to the two labor conventions will have to map out labor's course for the coming

months. This means that they will have to be guided in their practical decisions by a number of fundamental considerations—fundamental, that is, to the class interests of labor and its allies, which means to the interests of the American people, the American nation; and fundamental to the interests of labor's *further progress* to influence and leadership in the nation. This means to be aware of and alert to all those reformist influences that are counselling labor to sell its birthright for a mess of pottage.

There is no doubt that the delegates to the two conventions will be hard pressed by the spokesmen of the imperialist bourgeoisie and its reformist agents to give full support to the war-making policies and adventures of the American ruling class and its government. There will be pressure, threats, intimidation, but also deceitful promises of "rewards" and "benefits" to labor. The imperialist cry for "national" unity and the call for "sacrifice" by the masses on the altar of "national" defense will rise manifold in volume and intensity. The Hillmans, Greens and Tobins will play these tunes on all the instruments at their disposal. Disagreement with their policy of surrender to the imperialist bourgeoisie will be branded disloyalty and treason to the nation. The servants of the imperialists and war-makers will even exploit the banner of labor unity for the purpose of suppressing the progressive sections of the labor movement, for the purpose of placing the labor movement under the hegemony of the Hillman-Green-Tobin outfit,

which means under the hegemony of the imperialists and Big Business.

We anticipate all these developments because they are already unfolding themselves; and it is easily foreseen that they will grow in intensity and scope following the elections.

And here the following point has to be made: labor cannot afford to accept or be guided by the treacherous policies of the Hillman-Green-Tobin combination. Labor cannot afford to approve or support the imperialist and war-making policies of the bourgeoisie and its government. Labor has to retain and extend its initiative in the anti-imperialist struggles of the American people, under all conditions, for the sake of protecting and improving its own positions in the immediate situation and for the sake of strengthening and extending its influence with the common people and in the nation.

National defense is a major issue in the life of the American people at the present time, but not in the sense in which the imperialists and their reformist agents present it. In the midst of the imperialist war, in which the American imperialists have already made the United States a participant, the *danger* to national defense comes from the continued misrule of the imperialist bourgeoisie. It is the rule of this bourgeoisie that has led us to the present pass of national danger and that will multiply these dangers if its reactionary and war-making policies are not resisted by a united American people headed by labor.

Labor is the only class in our society that can lead the American

people in defense of the nation. The bourgeoisie, which is now in power, is bankrupt and treacherous. Therefore, for labor to accept the policies of the Hillmans, Greens and Tobins means to *surrender* to the worst enemy of the nation, to the bankrupt and treacherous imperialist bourgeoisie. Whereas really to defend the nation means for labor to continue to rally the common people and lead its struggles against the imperialists and war-makers; it means continuing and broadening the building of the independent power of the people against the imperialist bourgeoisie, for the eventual abolition of its rule, for the establishment of a true people's government. It means that labor has to continue to *lead* the fight of the masses against the war-makers and for a genuine people's peace, collaborating with the people's anti-imperialist peace movements everywhere, especially in Latin America and China, and supporting boldly the peace policy of the Soviet Union.

We repeat: as against the Hillman-Green-Tobin policy of surrender to the imperialists, labor has to fight for and defend the independent anti-imperialist and anti-war position of the working class and its allies—opposition to imperialism and imperialist war and for a people's peace. This is the fundamental interest of labor by which the delegates to the two labor conventions have to be guided; they can be guided by no other.

For the immediate consequence of accepting, even in part, the surrender policies of the Hillmans,

Greens and Tobins on the question of imperialism and war, the inescapable consequences of such a course would be a strengthening of the positions of these reformist agents in the labor movement. Just let the Hillmans, Greens and Tobins foist upon the labor movement *their* policies of "national" defense; just let them succeed in tying the trade union movement firmly to the war wagon of the imperialist bourgeoisie and its government, and the road will be opened for them to try to establish their hegemony in the labor movement, with the assistance of the imperialists and the machinery of their government.

And what would such hegemony mean? That is not difficult to anticipate. It would mean sacrifice and ever more sacrifice by labor and all common people to the war-making machine of the imperialists; profits and ever larger profits for Big Business and its servitors. It would mean the virtual destruction of labor's rights to organize and to collective bargaining. The right to strike would be "suspended." War would be waged against all loyal and progressive labor forces which insist upon defending the interests of labor and the common people, refusing to surrender to the monopolists and war profiteers.

This, in short, would be the nature of the "leadership" which a Hillman-Green-Tobin combination would seek to impose upon the trade union movement if allowed to establish itself in a dominant position, under whatever flag and in whatever form. Consequently, all

honest, loyal and progressive labor forces are faced with the task of waging a united and systematic struggle against the surrender policies of the Hillman-Green-Tobin outfit, against their splitting maneuvers to secure hegemony in the labor movement, *for the class unity of labor and its alliance with all common people in defense and improvement of their economic standards and civil rights against the attacks of the reactionaries and war-makers.*

By all signs and indications, labor's rank and file favors such a program. Even those masses of labor who mistakenly feel that they must support "national" defense, misled into the belief that it is really national, nevertheless are becoming impatient with the hypocritical calls "to sacrifice." In instance after instance they refuse to sacrifice themselves to the war profiteers and their agents in the labor movement. They demand that their interests be protected and that the trade union movement continue to be built and developed as a free and independent movement, free of imperialist entanglements and domination. This is the spirit and mood of the widest masses of labor.

It is clear, therefore, that the loyal and progressive labor forces at the two trade union conventions, of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. respectively, have the support of the overwhelming majority of the workers. They will also enjoy the support of the widest masses of all common people and their progressive organizations. Upon this support, which is bound to increase rather than de-

crease, the loyal and progressive delegates to the conventions should base their conduct and policies. Not backward but forward, to greater strength and influence for labor and its allies—this should be their slogan and banner.

\* \* \*

**T**HE struggle for the protection and improvement of labor's economic standards and civil rights seems to be entering a new phase. On the one hand, there is to be observed a more widespread and more systematic drive by Big Business, especially in the war industries, to keep labor standards *down* and to whittle away the rights of collective bargaining. And, on the other hand, we see a growing resistance on the part of workers to these efforts of the employers, an increasing impatience with surrender policies and readiness to override them. Concurrently, we witness a whole series of feverish maneuvers by the Roosevelt Administration and its "labor" agents (Hillman & Co.) to satisfy in deeds the demands of Big Business and at the same time to play the role of "defenders" of labor.

Big Business and the war profiteers have their program worked out already. And the Brookings Institution, as usual, came forward with an "objective" and "scientific" report to bolster up that program. Appropriately enough, the report was submitted to the War Department.

Ostensibly this report is concerned with formulating measures to prevent "a serious inflation," but

in reality it seeks to back up the imperialist drive against labor's standards and rights. It is also aimed against the toiling farmers. It calls for control of wages "if rising wage rates are not to bring higher costs, with inflationary results." Mind you, the report finds no need of concentrating on *profiteering* as the main factor in rising costs and in a possible inflationary runaway of prices. No, that is not to be expected of a Big Business research outfit; but it concentrates on wages. Nor does it properly raise the question of finding employment for the ten million workers still unemployed as they way of increasing the production of articles of consumption and thus guarding against a possible price inflation and counteracting in a measure the evil effects of a developing one-sided war economy. It does not do so because the war profiteers are not interested in it. Instead the report demands that "all restrictions on production and hours, such as those administered by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and under the Walsh-Healey Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, should be suspended for the duration of the war." It realizes, of course, that something has to be said about controlling prices, too, but it hastens to warn that "if the system of private enterprise is to be maintained, some flexibility in the price structure must be permitted in order to assist in the allocation of resources and men for the production of required war supplies." This means in plain language: don't interfere too much

with the price policies of the monopolists and war profiteers.

In short: keep wages down, bring hours up, eliminate all trade union rules of labor protection, and do not monkey with the "flexibility" of monopoly price-fixing and war profiteering, "if the system of private enterprise is to be maintained." And who dare challenge the sacred system? Not Roosevelt and Hillman, who wouldn't be caught even dreaming about it, and certainly not Willkie. So, this is the program of the imperialist bourgeoisie, and its government will now be driving "full speed ahead" to put it into effect. If Roosevelt is reelected, this will be done under a lot of camouflage and with considerable maneuvering; and, whoever is elected, Hillman & Co. will seek to make this program palatable and acceptable to the workers by deceit, demagoguery and intimidation. And this is the program and perspective which the two trade union conventions have to organize the trade unions to resist and combat.

Of course, there is the danger of a serious inflation, and this was pointed out by progressive labor (and in these columns) soon after the outbreak of war, when the economy of the United States was beginning to be geared to the production of war supplies for the Allies and for our "own" war preparations. Today the elements of this danger are more visible. But where do they come from? They come from increasing war profiteering; from monopoly price-fixing; from the existence of ten million unemployed and one-third of our farm-

ers impoverished, and the consequent inability of nearly 40 per cent of our population to support an expanding home market; and finally—from the one-sided development of our economy towards a *war economy*, concentrating on the production of war supplies and sacrificing the production needs of articles of consumption.

To combat the dangers of a serious inflation, therefore, means to combat war profiteering, to combat monopoly price-fixing, to fight for and secure jobs for the unemployed and adequate relief for those without jobs, to fight for raising the purchasing power of the masses generally, and this means adequate relief to the farmers, to fight against every attempt to sacrifice the well-being of the people to the needs of the war machine and the incomes of the war profiteers. And this means to combat the offensive of the imperialist bourgeoisie and the treacherous maneuvers of the Hillman-Green-Tobin combination.

Arguing timidly in favor of continuing the W.P.A., at the recent Conference of Mayors, Howard O. Hunter, Acting Commissioner of the W.P.A., is reported by the press to have said that:

“... unemployment now stands at 8,200,000 to 10,000,000 individuals, adding that there was no justification for liquidation of the W.P.A. in the face of those figures. If \$5,000,000,000 were spent on defense in 1941, he estimated, private employment would gain by two and a half to three million persons.” (*The New York Times*.)

It is safer to assume that not more

than two million persons will find private employment of five billion dollars are spent in 1941 on “defense.” Thus by the end of 1941 there will still be around eight million unemployed. But the Brookings Institution did not see *that* as a factor making for the rise of inflation. But labor will not overlook it. It will continue to make *the demand for jobs* one of its major and fundamental issues in the general struggle against the war-making offensive of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

By all signs and indications, the workers are also determined to press the struggle against the Big Business violators of labor legislation, and specifically the violators of the National Labor Relations Act and the Walsh-Healey Act, the Acts which the Brookings Institution says “should be suspended for the duration of the war” following Hillman’s proposal that labor’s right to strike should be “suspended” for the duration.

In this connection, the struggle of the workers against the war-profiteering Bethlehem Steel Co. is of first-rate importance to the whole of American labor and to all common people. It is a fight which touches the very heart of the people’s cause against the war-makers and imperialists. In it are involved all of the people’s grievances, complaints and demands against the rapacious exploiters and war-makers, the merchants of death, the du Ponts, Morgans, Rockefellers, Mellons, Fords. The struggle to win this fight against the Bethlehem Steel Co. is, in every sense, a struggle for the interests of the entire trade

union movement. And as such it must be supported and conducted.

Labor must not be deceived by the maneuvers of the Roosevelt Administration and of Hillman & Co. with this issue. Pressed by labor under the leadership of the C.I.O. to refuse government contracts to Big Business violators of labor legislation, the Roosevelt Administration and its agents in the unions are pretending to favor labor's demands. But they are only maneuvering, for in reality nothing substantial has as yet been done by the government to enforce labor's demands. These demands can be won, but only by the force of labor's own independent power and with the support of the masses of the people. It can be won only in unremitting exposure of and struggle against the agents of the imperialists in the labor movement—the Hillmans, Tobins, Greens, Thomases, etc.

The delegates to the two trade union conventions will have to deal with all these crucial issues, and with many more, especially with the organization of the unorganized, among which the C.I.O. drive for the organization of the Ford workers is of outstanding importance. And the successful solution of these problems will depend to a considerable extent upon the correct approach to the main line of conduct *on working class unity and independent political action.*

Labor unity today is more imperative than ever before. It is the main strategic aim and central slogan of progressive labor, contrasted to the splitting maneuvers of the agents of imperialism in the trade

unions (Hillman, Green, Tobin) whose "unity" flag is fake and deception. The immediate question is: what can be done in a practical way now to promote further the struggle for labor unity? The answer is *unity of action* on a program of defending the interests of the workers and all common people from the assaults of the imperialists and war-makers; unity of action day by day and on all living issues of the masses, unity of action against the imperialist exploiters (the du Ponts, Morgans, Rockefellers, Fords) and against the betrayers of labor—the Hillmans, Greens and Tobins; unity of action of the masses themselves and their loyal and progressive leaders. Not with the policies of the betrayers of labor but against them. This and only this is the road to labor unity.

Unity of action in the industries and unity of action *on the political field.* Political action by labor in alliance with all common people will not become less necessary after the elections. It will be just as necessary and even more so, only the forms will necessarily be different. These forms will be found and developed as the struggle goes on, but only if the struggle itself is promoted, if labor pushes forward on the road of united independent political action in alliance with all common people. With what perspective in mind? With what orientation? With the perspective and orientation of *uniting* the people's anti-imperialist and peace forces into an independent political organization, into a people's anti-imperialist peace party headed by labor.

All loyal, honest, creative and progressive forces in the labor movement will support—are supporting—such a program. It is a program in the interests of the American nation and will be supported by the toiling farmers, the youth, the Negroes, the women, the aged; the progressive forces among these groups of our population are already supporting it. Its realization will require tenacious struggle and sacrifice, but sacrifice for the people's good and not for the profits of their exploiters, and infinitely less sacrifice than the imperialist war machine and its "labor" agents are demanding from and imposing upon the masses.

The delegates to the two trade union conventions, those motivated and inspired by loyalty to labor and the common people, can have no hesitancy in fighting for such a program. They can confidently count on success, because this way lies the future of American labor and of the American nation.

\* \* \*

**I**T HAS become evident that American imperialism is collaborating with British imperialism not only in the European war but also in the Far Eastern war. This has been made fully clear by the German-Italian-Japanese pact and its immediate consequences. The two wars are practically merged and the United States, by the will of the ruling imperialist circles, has been placed militarily in the same camp with England fighting the powers of the tri-partite pact. The war has en-

tered a new phase and so has the role of the United States in it.

Basically this development expresses the extreme sharpening of the imperialist contradictions between American imperialism, on the one hand, and German and Japanese imperialism, on the other. More immediately it is the result of the growing collaboration of the United States with England in its war against Germany and Italy. The outlook as regards American imperialist policy is for deeper and ever deeper involvement in war, with actual military operations clearly in the offing, especially in the Far East.

There is no doubt that in the coming weeks and months the American people will be confronted by the government with a whole series of imperialist moves leading to deeper military and political involvement. Some of these are freely discussed by the press. Such as: a treaty of alliance with England, modification of the Johnson Act to allow credits to England, the acquisition of bases in the Pacific, extension of military collaboration with Canada and Australia, moving part of the American fleet to Singapore, etc., etc. In all these projected moves, it is very likely that the government will confront the people not with proposals but with accomplished facts, in the manner in which the destroyer-bases deal with England was carried off.

The war is spreading and is becoming more aggravated. Inside the country, the orientation of the imperialists is for sharper attacks upon the standards and rights of

the masses, for more intensified and unbridled reaction. Labor and its allies, and their peace movements, are faced with the need of broadening and strengthening their struggles against this mounting offensive of the imperialists and war-makers. They are faced with the task, now more than before, of defending *daily* the masses of the people from every *specific* expression of this imperialist offensive, because the attacks will be occurring daily in numerous forms and ways.

A good example of this sort of defense of the interests of the masses in the new situation is the seven-point plan of the American Youth Congress for the protection of the rights of the youth conscripted into the military forces. The fight against militarism and militarization continues, and in this fight the slogan for the repeal of the conscription act will play an important part. But also newer forms are developing. And among them is precisely the struggle for the protection of the rights of the conscripts, their health and well-being, as outlined in the plan of the American Youth Congress.

Equally important in this plan are the measures proposed for all youth organizations to maintain live contact with their member-conscripts—measures which should be emulated by trade unions and all other progressive organizations. One cannot overemphasize the importance of such measures, their importance for the well-being of the conscripts and for the general struggle against militarism and militarization. Similarly, many other new

forms and methods of struggle will have to be discovered to carry forward the fight against imperialism and imperialist war in the new situation, to protect and defend daily the interests of the masses.

Hand in hand with this must go a greater political alertness to the imperialist war moves of the bourgeoisie, systematical enlightenment of the masses to the meaning of these moves and organized mass expression of opposition. The struggle against the imperialist war and for a people's peace must be developed now—in the face of America's participation in the war—*day by day and in all fields of organized mass activity.*

Nor can the peace movement afford to neglect the broader issues of the anti-imperialist struggle—the fight for a genuine people's peace, collaboration with and support of the anti-imperialist people's movements in Latin America, support to the liberation struggles of the Chinese people and support for the peace policies of the Soviet Union. In view of the spreading war and of the sharpening situation in the Far East, it becomes particularly necessary to stress in the peace movements the following propositions: all possible support to the national liberation struggle of the Chinese people, solidarity with the Japanese masses against *their* imperialism and against "*our own,*" support for the peace policies of the Soviet Union.

In this connection it is important to realize that world imperialism has not given up the hope of forcing the Soviet Union off its path of

peace and neutrality; of dragging the Soviet Union into the imperialist contradictions, rivalries and war. And the Soviet Union, fully aware of these hopes and maneuvers of the imperialists in all camps, is steadfastly pursuing its independent socialist peace policy, strengthening its defensive capabilities for every eventuality. Of course, the maintenance of the policy of peace and neutrality, a policy of the interests of the masses of the people everywhere, does not depend upon the Soviet Union alone. That is why the *Pravda* concludes its editorial on the tri-partite pact with the following sentence:

“True to its policy of peace and neutrality, the Soviet Union on its part can confirm that, in so far as this will depend on it, this policy

remains and will remain inviolable.” (*Daily Worker*, Sept. 30.)

Clearly, the wider and more active the support given by the masses to this policy everywhere, the greater will be its effectiveness, the greater will be the effectiveness of the anti-imperialist peace struggles of the masses in all countries, the closer we shall come to a real people's peace. Now more than ever, with the merger of the European and Far Eastern wars and with the military participation of the United States in them, the American peace movements need to base their struggles on a policy that leads to genuine world peace. This means a truly *international* peace policy, a *people's* peace policy, a policy championed and pursued by the Soviet Union.

A. B.

---

# FOR A PEOPLE'S POLICY IN U. S.-SOVIET RELATIONS! \*

BY WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

**S**INCE the signing of the military, political and economic alliance by Germany, Japan and Italy in Berlin on September 27, a strong agitation has sprung up in the United States for the establishment of better relations between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. Conservatives, as well as progressives, are advancing the idea. Politicians, editorial writers, foreign correspondents, radio commentators and public figures generally are discussing it. They speak of a closer political tie-up between the two countries, and some are even projecting the plan of a military alliance. Undoubtedly the New York *Daily News* voices a wide public sentiment when it says, "We believe that the best thing this country could do would be to get on better terms with Russia." (September 19.) That the Roosevelt Administration is thinking along these lines is made manifest by its many tentative diplomatic approaches to the Soviet representatives.

After the long and bitter hostility expressed towards the U.S.S.R. by

the United States Government and by American reactionary circles generally, their new spirit of "friendliness" to that country seems a bit synthetic and its ulterior motive rather obvious. The plain fact is that, stripped of all pretense, American and British imperialisms are in a difficult position in the war; a predicament which is dramatized by the announcement of the fascist triple alliance. They badly need the U.S.S.R. as a military ally, and it is to satisfy this necessity that their present "pro-Soviet" agitation is directed. It would be perfect for them if they could acquire the Soviet Union as a belligerent on their side. With that great country lashing into Japan in the East and into Germany in the West, the British and American Tories could (and would) sit back on their haunches, have a good laugh, and wait to pick up the pieces after the war had finished. Indeed, in all probability, before the fracas was over, they would actually be helping Hitler, Mussolini and the Mikado to fight the Soviet Union. Their long record of inveterate hatred of the U.S.S.R. justifies this skepticism regarding

---

\* Speech delivered in Chicago, October 13, 1940.

their present "friendly" attitude towards the Soviet Union.

However, inasmuch as it is the long-established policy of the Soviet Union to live in the best possible relationship with all other countries—through trade agreements, peace pacts, non-aggression treaties and the like—it is quite possible that the present situation will result in a substantial betterment in Soviet-American relations, that is, as far as such improvement is possible in view of the widely diverging policies of the two governments. In fact, the United States Government has already somewhat modified its "moral"—economic embargo against the U.S.S.R. But it is hardly to be expected that the Soviet people will walk into the war trap which the American and British imperialists are now so busily spreading before their feet.

Collaboration between the American and Soviet nations is a matter of the very greatest importance, not only to the people of this country but of the whole world. There are two general approaches to the question. The first, which we have already briefly indicated, is that of the imperialists. It is based upon their policy of war and their desire to exploit the U.S.S.R. as a military ally. This path, as we have seen, must eventually lead to a dead-end.

The second approach to the question of closer American-Soviet relations, the approach of the people, is based on a policy of peace. This is the true path for the development of the maximum Soviet-American friendship and cooperation. The peoples of the two countries are pro-

foundly opposed to becoming involved in the brutal imperialist slaughter and both want to make the recurrence of such a monstrous war crime impossible. The U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., collaborating together for peace, would be the center around which could rally all the peaceful and constructive forces of the world, constituting an irresistible power.

With this general question assuming such fundamental importance, the American people should come to understand the major conditions necessary for effective working together of the United States and the Soviet Union. These conditions are threefold: (a) a fundamental peace policy; (b) an attitude of neutrality towards the imperialist war; and (c) common democratic objectives. Let us consider each of these points in the light of present-day Soviet and American policies.

#### *(a) A Fundamental Peace Policy*

The first essential for a solid collaboration between the United States and the U.S.S.R. is an undeviating policy of world peace. This policy the Soviet Union already possesses. By the very nature of its economic, political and social make-up, it is unshakably committed to a program of peace. With its industries and land owned collectively by the people, with human exploitation abolished, and all social classes liquidated, Soviet society has no over-production of commodities, no industrial crises, no parasitic and war-making ruling class, no imperialistic drive to conquer foreign markets and colonies. It has within

it, therefore, none of the forces that make for modern, imperialist war. The whole structure of the Soviet Union irresistibly impels it to cultivate the peace and welfare of its own citizens and to live and trade in friendly intercourse with other nations. Charges of "Red Imperialism" directed against the Soviet Union by Social-Democrats and others are a contradiction in terms, a lie on their face. Moreover, the socialist peace principles of the U.S.S.R. constitute the general pattern by which humanity will eventually abolish this monster war from the face of the earth.

Accordingly, since its inception the Soviet Union has been the world leader in the struggle for international peace. Repeatedly it has proposed complete or partial disarmament to the capitalist powers, which they have cynically rejected. It also developed the policy of making non-aggression pacts with all willing governments. Then, too, with the rise of Hitler and the growing threat of war, the U.S.S.R. championed the plan, within and without the League of Nations, of forming an international peace front of all the democratic peoples to restrain the fascist aggressors. This historic project, which would have halted the war, was defeated by the opposition of Chamberlain, Blum and Roosevelt and their Social-Democratic aids.

The peace policy of the Soviet Union, however, is no utopian attempt at isolationism. No more than the U.S.A., can the U.S.S.R. cut itself off from the rest of the world. The Soviet Government's foreign

policy is based upon a militant proletarian internationalism. The U.S.-S.R. literally "wages" peace. Not only does it try to restrain the rampant imperialist states, but as a settled practice, it always comes militantly to the support of any peaceful people attacked by aggressors. Spain was one example of this, China is another, and during the Nazi attack upon Czechoslovakia the Soviet Government, as repeatedly acknowledged by President Benes, offered alone to defend that country against the fascist invaders. Nor has the Soviet Union hesitated, with its Red Army, to liberate the oppressed peoples on its borders, and to help them establish socialism. Through this positive policy of peace, the Soviet Union, as the only socialist country, exercises its natural role as the world leader of all oppressed peoples.

Obviously the peace policy of the Soviet Union—its living and trading in harmony with the other great states and its active defense of the peace and national independence of invaded peoples—dovetails with the interests and desires of the overwhelming mass of the American people, who feel themselves being forced into the useless war butchery and who are increasingly realizing the futility of isolationism. But the policy of the United States Government has nothing in common with the people's desires for peace. Capitalist, imperialist, dominated by a profit-hungry ruling-owning class, our Government is following a war policy, skillfully disguised with trappings of "national defense." It is deeply involved in the ruthless

struggle now going on among the imperialist powers over questions of markets, raw materials, colonies and the control of the whole earth. It is out to seize what it can in Latin America, the Far East and elsewhere. It wants to become the dominant world power. This militant imperialism is taking us headlong into the war. After the present national election, regardless of whether Roosevelt or Willkie is elected, we can expect a coalition government of the Republican and Democratic parties and a greatly increased drive to plunge this country into the war.

From the foregoing it is clear that between the basic peace policy of the socialist Soviet Union and the war policy of the imperialist United States, there is a wide gulf. This places severe limitations upon the good relations possible between the present United States Government and the Soviet Government. Before a solid and comprehensive collaboration can be developed between them the abyss separating their policies must be bridged over by our Government adopting a true policy of peace. This can be accomplished only if the basic democratic forces of our country—the trade unions, farmers' organizations, youth and women's movements, etc., bring enough pressure to bear against the Government either to curb or to break altogether the power of the war-making imperialists. Until this is done, cooperation between the American and Soviet governments, despite all efforts of the U.S.S.R., must rest upon a relatively restricted, temporary, and shaky basis.

### (b) A Policy of Neutrality

The second basic essential for a thoroughgoing American-Soviet collaboration is an attitude of neutrality towards the present European war. The Soviet people have correctly condemned this war as an unjust war, a murderous struggle among ruthless imperialist capitalist powers for colonies and world domination, and their Government has adopted the intelligent policy of keeping out of it. Enemies of the Soviet Union undertake to deny that its policy is one of neutrality, trying to picture it as, to use the words of Churchill, "a riddle wrapped in mystery inside an enigma." Others call it an ally of Nazi Germany. Especially they contend that the Soviet-German pact of fourteen months ago was an act of alliance with Germany which started the war. They also assert that the U.S.-S.R. is now a silent partner in the recently announced agreement for joint military action between Germany, Japan and Italy.

But these enemy allegations cannot bear investigation. At the Seventeenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, held in January, 1934, Stalin in answering similar charges that were being made at the time, stated the relationship of the U.S.S.R. towards the imperialist countries as follows:

"We never had any orientation towards Germany nor have we any orientation towards Poland and France. Our orientation in the past and in the future is towards the U.S.S.R. and towards the U.S.S.R. alone. And if the interests of the

U.S.S.R. demand rapprochement with this or that country which is not interested in disturbing the peace, we should take this step without hesitation." (*Socialism Victorious*, p. 20, International Publishers, New York.)

The Soviet Government has steadily followed this policy of keeping out of the war lineups of the imperialist states, while at the same time cooperating with any country desirous of peace, a policy which, as we have already seen, does not prevent the U.S.S.R. from giving active assistance to small or weak peoples attacked by aggressor neighbors.

In the light of this neutrality policy, the significance of the Soviet-German pact was that the Soviet Union, its long efforts to establish the international peace front having obviously failed (because of Chamberlain's, Blum's and Roosevelt's sabotage) and the war having become inevitable, merely stepped out of the line of fire and, through its celebrated non-aggression pact with Germany, adopted an attitude of neutrality towards the war that was beginning. To charge the Soviet Government, therefore, with responsibility for the war amounts, in plain English, to a capitalist confession that it was only the peace pressure of the Soviet Union that had been preventing the outbreak of the war and that when this pressure had to be removed the capitalist powers flew at each other's throats like unleashed tigers.

So far as the present tri-partite fascist military alliance is concerned, the neutrality of the U.S.-

S.R. is attested to, not only by the clear statement of *Pravda* (September 30) that the Soviet policy of peace and neutrality "remains and will remain invariable," but also by the fact that the ambassadors of both sides in the war (including those of the United States) are wearing smooth the path to Moscow, trying to win over the Soviet Government to their respective causes. Indeed, the Pope himself has felt called upon to warn publicly the several capitalist governments against the "great danger" of thus "wooing" the hated Bolsheviks.

Following its established policy of peace, neutrality and friendly collaboration with all peoples, it is not outside the realm of possibility that the Soviet Government should soon sign a non-aggression pact with Japan, even as it has done with Germany and Turkey, and as it would so do with Great Britain and the United States. But we may rest assured that any such pact will not identify the Soviet Union with the predatory designs of Japan, but that it will advance and continue to protect the interests of the Chinese people, and will further the interests of socialism throughout the world.

The Soviet Union's policy of neutrality is, of course, no absolute guarantee that that country can stay out of war. There is always the danger of a deliberate attack from one or the other group, or both of the warring powers. But Soviet neutrality has demonstrated itself to be the intelligent and correct socialist policy to pursue amidst the present desperate struggles of war-mad world imperialism.

It has been so brilliantly successful that the whole capitalist world, however grudgingly, has had to acknowledge it. Thus, although encircled by heavily armed and irreconcilable enemy capitalist governments, the Soviet Union, alone of all the great world powers (not excluding the United States which is part way in the war), has been able to keep out of the slaughter.

While the imperialist states massacre each other's peoples and destroy one another's industries, the U.S.S.R. goes ahead peacefully building up its prosperity and strength, liberating neighboring oppressed countries, and daily growing in world prestige among the downtrodden and exploited millions. The Soviet Union is an oasis of hope and civilization amidst the wild desert of capitalist war and barbarism.

Beyond question the overwhelming majority of the American people, although often laboring under serious illusions as to the justice and character of the cause for which Great Britain is fighting, are nevertheless definitely in favor of such policies of peace and neutrality as would provide the basis for a solid, lasting and beneficial collaboration between the United States and the Soviet Union. They want to stay out of the war, they want to halt the imperialist aggressors, they want to assist the Chinese and other oppressed peoples and they want a just and lasting world peace. These sentiments they have made manifest time and again in Gallup polls and various other expressions of public opinion.

But the American Government, responding to the dictates of Wall Street, is carrying out no such policy of peaceful neutrality. On the contrary, it is part and parcel of the present war for the imperialist re-division of the world, and it bears its full share of responsibility for the war. It is seeking to seize whatever colonies and spheres of influence it can grab from the remnants of the crumbling British, French, Belgian and Dutch empires. The United States is clearly lined up with one side of the war, that of Great Britain. Under transparent pretenses of "national defense" it is building up a gigantic armed force for the purpose of aggressively entering the war. The plan of "all aid to Great Britain" is a belligerent policy. It has already led to a number of definite war acts on the part of the Roosevelt Administration, such as the shipment of the secret army airplanes and the "obsolete" destroyers to England. It is directly stimulating the spread of the war.

*Izvestia* (September 30) was correct in stating that "closer British-American military cooperation . . . served as one of the most decisive stimuli for the Berlin pact." Behind this policy of systematically aiding Great Britain there exists, in all probability, a more or less well-developed secret understanding, or possibly even a definite war alliance, with Great Britain. When the national election is out of the way, we shall probably see this secret understanding or war alliance made more manifest by even bolder acts of pro-British support.

Obviously, with the Soviet Gov-

ernment following a policy of genuine neutrality and the American Government pursuing a course that leads straight towards belligerency, the grounds for effective collaboration between the two governments are greatly restricted. In line with the interests of the American people, and particularly to promote the Soviet-American collaboration we are discussing, it is necessary that the orientation of our Government be changed from one of moving into war into one of neutrality towards the war. To accomplish this re-orientation is the task of the great mass of democratic, peace-loving people in the United States, who must find the ways and means to make their will prevail against that of the warmongering imperialists who are working day and night to plunge our country into the criminally stupid imperialist war.

### (c) *Common Democratic Objectives*

The third basic essential necessary for effective American-Soviet cooperation, in addition to the peace and neutrality policies we have already discussed, is the possession of harmonious democratic objectives in other respects by the two countries. For such cooperation it is not imperative, of course, that the United States adopt the Soviet socialist system, the highest form of democracy, but it should, at least, be moving in the general direction of strengthening its democratic structure and practices.

The Soviet Union is the most profoundly democratic country this earth has ever known. Its democracy, based upon socialization of in-

dustry and the land, and the abolition of all class division, is on an entirely higher level than any type of democracy that capitalism has ever produced or can produce. Bourgeois, Social-Democratic and Trotskyite slanderers of the Soviet Union deny these facts, of course, but occasionally an honest, non-Communist voice speaks out regarding them. Thus Lieutenant-Commander Charles S. Seeley, United States Navy (retired), in his book, *Russia and the Approach to Armageddon* (p. 85), gets a glimpse of one angle of the type of democracy that is growing among the Soviet people:

"It is a different kind of freedom; a freedom we do not have, never have had, and never in our most pleasant dreams expect to have. The Russians are free from all worry and fear of a helpless, dependent old age. They are free from all worry and fear of losing their jobs, crop failure, factory shut-downs, strikes, etc. They are free from all worry about doctors' bills, store bills, interest on the mortgage, or any other money matters. They are free from all worry about whether or not their children will be properly educated. They are even free from all worry and fear of everlasting torment in hell, because the Bolsheviks have abolished the future plan of abode for folks that God dislikes."

In accordance with its own fundamentally democratic character internally, the inevitable international orientation of the Soviet Union is to collaborate with all democratic peoples and movements. Its support of Spain and China and its

struggle to construct the international peace front of the democracies are only a few among many examples of its world democratic policies. Therefore, the enemy charges that the Soviet Union is a "totalitarian" state, whose natural affiliation is with the fascist powers, is a monstrous political distortion.

The capitalists of the world, singularly unconvinced by Social-Democratic denials of Soviet democracy, are quite aware of the socialist character of the U.S.S.R. and of its democratic international orientation. This is precisely why they hate it so bitterly and oppose it so relentlessly. It is not so much that they fear a conquering Red Army (although this is by no means left out of their calculations) as it is that, with a dying social system on their hands, they dread the effects upon their own exploited and harassed peoples of the great world example set by the flourishing socialist system in the U.S.S.R. They consider the very existence of the Soviet Union a grave menace to their whole international system of exploitation and robbery.

Ever since the foundation of the Soviet Government, the capitalist states have never ceased to work and plot against it, individually and collectively. A dozen of them, including the United States, tried unavailingly to overthrow the Soviet Government by armed intervention in 1918-1920, and they later sought for many years to strangle it by economic and diplomatic blockade. For years also, tory England and France schemed to destroy the Soviet Union, and it was in the ill-fated

hope that Hitler would march his troops eastward that, so fatally for themselves, they armed and "appeased" him. Germany, Japan, and Italy, with their anti-Comintern pacts and their open threats to invade Soviet territory, have also unmistakably displayed their deep hatred of the Soviet system. Could these powers, on both sides of the war, succeed in inveigling or forcing the U.S.S.R. into the present war, they would probably finally gang up against it and try to annihilate it, or at least to make the peace at its heavy expense. Throughout its history the Soviet Government has had to maneuver skillfully to prevent a united imperialist coalition against it, and its success in doing this constitutes a diplomatic victory of the very greatest magnitude.

The United States, most powerful of the imperialist powers, has shared fully in the world anti-Soviet orientation characteristic of all the great capitalist states. From the days of its ill-starred armed attack upon the newly-born Soviet Russia down to the present time, the American Government has scorned to hide its hatred for the first socialist government. Its long-continued policy of non-recognition, its systematic attempts to misinterpret the Roosevelt-Litvinov agreement, its "appeasement" of Japan in the hope that this power would attack the U.S.S.R. and, lately, its obvious attempt to transform the Soviet-Finnish conflict into a general capitalist anti-Soviet war, are characteristic features of American imperialistic hostility towards the U.S.S.R.

The deeper the crisis of capitalism becomes the more the capitalists in the various countries turn towards fascism and the more they hate and fear the Soviet Union and try to unite to destroy it. This reactionary tendency is pronouncedly evidenced in the United States. The great capitalists are, with success, heading the country both into the war and towards a reactionary dictatorship. In spite of their present blandishments towards the Soviet Union in their efforts to win it as a war ally, never was their hatred of that country and its socialism sharper than now.

Obviously the Soviet Government cannot trust and solidly cooperate with capitalist governments which are waiting to knife it at the first opportunity. True enough, it makes trade agreements, peace treaties and non-aggression pacts with these governments, and it lives up to them loyally. Yet at its peril would it forget the type of social tiger with which it is dealing. Particularly now the Soviet Government cannot ignore the transparent desires of British and American imperialism to win it as a war ally to do the fighting for them against Germany and Japan.

The question of democracy, therefore, is fundamental in determining the relationship between the Soviet Union and other powers. The more democratic a country is, the more easily and closely it will come into good working relations with the U.S.S.R. When, for example, the Soviet Government was conducting its determined fight to organize the international peace front to restrain

the fascist aggressors, the fate of this vital project was definitely tied up with the status of democracy in Great Britain, France and the United States. The Tories in these countries, of course, were against the peace front. So, in order for it to succeed and to prevent the world from being drenched in blood, the democratic forces in these countries—the workers' parties, trade unions, farmers' organizations, etc.—necessarily had to bring irresistible mass pressure to bear against their unwilling governments or actually to take them over. But this was not accomplished. Because, as usual, the Social-Democratic mass leadership in the bourgeois-democratic countries, tailing along after the capitalist class and accepting its theory that the Soviet Union was the main enemy, sabotaged the whole peace front and allowed the war-makers to have their way. Similarly the fate of the Franco-Soviet mutual defense pact was tied up with that of French democracy. The reactionaries hated this pact, and the only way it could have been given vitality was for the democratic masses to rally solidly behind it. But again the Social-Democratic Party and trade union leaders were more interested in defeating the Soviet Union than they were in stopping the war. They destroyed the Popular Front, and with it went not only French democracy, but also the Franco-Soviet pact.

The main lesson in all this for the American people is that the question of a powerful collaboration between the peace-loving American and Soviet peoples is inextricably bound up with the question of strengthen-

ing democracy in this country. To establish that close cooperation is the task of the workers, farmers, professionals and other democratic strata, as part of their general fight for peace, democracy and prosperity. It cannot and will not be done by the capitalist-minded politicians who are now running our government. Only when the people themselves take up the question of Soviet-American collaboration as their own great political issue will the necessary progress be made towards achieving it.

#### *The Possibilities of American-Soviet Cooperation*

It is clear that the United States cannot avoid becoming involved in the present war nor from suffering its consequences merely by sticking its head in the sand, as the isolationists feebly advise. It should also be no less clear that the proper road for our nation does not lie in joining up with Great Britain and sacrificing our blood and substance in the criminal imperialist war. The intelligent course for the American people to take is not only to stay out of the war but also, in collaboration with the Soviet people, to embark upon a positive policy of world peace. In the foregoing pages we have seen that such Soviet-American cooperation is possible and we have also examined the main bases necessary for its firm establishment.

The United States and the Soviet Union, cooperating actively for peace, would form a world center towards which would gravitate in one form or another such great

peace forces as the Chinese, Indian and Latin American peoples, the oppressed national minorities and vanquished nations, and the labor and farmer movements of the world. Even a casual indication of the potential strength of these vast aggregations of humanity shows that they would be well able to more than defend themselves from the assaults of the fascist and other imperialist war-making states.

To begin with, a truly democratic United States, with its gigantic economic resources, would be a tremendous force for peace. Also, the Latin American peoples, democratized, armed and united, could defend their country from all attacks. As for the Chinese people, their valorous repulse of arrogant Japanese imperialism has shown their great strength. And as for the Soviet Union, it is perhaps the greatest military power of all. Bourgeois and Social-Democratic writers, in their campaigns to slander everything about the Soviet Union, have deliberately minimized its military strength. But current facts give these liars their answer. There was nothing Hitler wanted more than the rich Ukraine and he threatened repeatedly to invade it. But when it came to a showdown he chose to fight Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, France and Great Britain together (with the United States in prospect) rather than try conclusions with the Red Army. Likewise Japan in the East, burning to seize the strategic Soviet Maritime Provinces and also to put a stop to Soviet aid to China, tried its teeth on the granite of the

Red Army and had such a bad experience thereby that it gave the matter up as a bad job.

With even a modicum of organization, such as could be furnished by Soviet-American collaboration, the above-listed peoples and movements and many others, fighting for elementary principles of peace, liberty and progress, could unite and constitute an irresistible force. Not only by direct resistance could they hold the warlike imperialist powers in check, but they also could readily build up a democratic and peace backfire behind the imperialists in their own countries that would eventually bring their reactionary regimes to the ground.

But the working together of the democratic, anti-imperialist and socialist forces of the world, which could develop around the collaboration of a democratic America and the U.S.S.R., would confront historically much greater tasks than the preservation or restoration of their own peace and national independence, vitally important though these things may be. Such a combination of all the peaceful and progressive forces of humanity especially would face the tremendous job of the economic and political reconstruction of the world, and they could accomplish it.

Imperialist capitalism is bankrupt. It is torn asunder with destructive and insoluble economic and political conflicts. It can no longer keep its industries in operation, it cannot feed the starving populations, it cannot prevent the rival states from murderously slashing into one another. All it holds

henceforth in prospect for humanity is endless starvation, fascism and war. The World War of 1914-18 dealt the capitalist system a deadly blow from which it has never recovered, and the present war is giving the system an even more devastating smash. Capitalism is historically sentenced to death.

The League of Nations was unable to reconsolidate capitalism after the last war, and Hitler's New World Order, dividing the world into four great divisions, to be controlled by the four great powers—Germany, Japan, the United States and U.S.S.R.—cannot cure capitalism after this still more ruinous war. The fascists' world scheme, if they actually succeeded in setting it up, could not solve the basic contradictions that are destroying capitalism. On the contrary, it could but lead to deeper and more prolonged economic crises, greatly sharpened class struggles and endless wars by the dominant fascist powers against the oppressed peoples, desperate struggles among the great fascist empires themselves, and fierce attacks by all the world reactionary forces against the Soviet Union and the rest of the expanding socialist world. As for the "democratic" countries—the United States and Great Britain—their bourgeois have no program whatever for solving the world crisis. They have no after-war plan for democracy, and it is no accident that Prime Minister Churchill openly confesses that he cannot state Britain's war aims. The "democratic" governments of these two countries move in the general direction of fascism.

The only possible solution for humanity's present miseries and to avert its unthinkable future under a rotting capitalist system is for the progressive forces of the world to take the situation in hand themselves. Popular Front movements and governments in the respective countries; a linking together of the democratic and anti-imperialist peoples internationally, with Soviet-American cooperation as its core; a determined democratic struggle to break the economic and political power of finance capital, both in its domestic and international aspects—this is the general path along which society is heading. It must result eventually in the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of world socialism. There is no al-

ternative but death and destruction for the world's masses.

The question of American-Soviet collaboration, not in the war sense of the imperialists, but in the peace meaning of the people, must be made a major political issue in the United States. It is high time that the labor movement woke up to this necessity. Soviet slandering, Red-baiting, and persecution of the Communist Party must be dropped, as giving direct aid to the reactionary and fascist enemy. The trade unions should become leaders in the fight to develop a sound cooperation between a democratic America and the Soviet Union. Upon such cooperation depends their future welfare, as well as that of the whole American people.

---

# CHINA'S LIBERATION STRUGGLE AND THE FAR EASTERN CRISIS

BY JAMES WELDEN

**W**ITHIN the past few weeks a crisis has rapidly loomed on the Far Eastern horizon. It is the net outcome of an American imperialist policy, doggedly adhered to for more than three years, that refused to take the measures necessary to halt the march of Japanese aggression. The results are now palpably seen to be an amazingly close parallel to the results of the Chamberlain policy in Europe. Today the American people, like the British people before them, are confronted with the imminent danger of being drawn into the second imperialist war. Their entry may be via the Far Eastern door—a door deliberately left open by America's ruling classes. For the refusal to aid China's struggle was deliberate, as deliberate as the strangling of Spanish democracy by the imperialist "non-intervention." It flouted the clearly expressed will of the American people. China, unlike Spain, is undefeated, and will not be defeated. But there is something in China's fight, like that of Spain's, which awakens the instinctive antagonism of the imperialist world.

It is well, for the sake of clarity,

to dig down to the roots of this antagonism in the case of China. An examination of China's setting in the current crisis of imperialism, and of some of the basic trends in the Chinese nation's present evolution, will shed light on the path taken by American Far Eastern policy and on the problems which now confront the American people as a result of that policy.

## *China and the Colonial World*

On September 14, 1939, shortly after the outbreak of the second imperialist war, Mao Tse-tung, the leader of the Communist Party of China, concluded a brief address to a Staff Conference at Yen-an with the following words:

"... The second imperialist world war is an unparalleled calamity to mankind. The entire world will be swept with death, disease, hunger, unemployment, curtailment of civil rights and destruction of families. Faced with such annihilation, we cannot doubt that the peoples of the imperialist nations will awake and join hands with their oppressed brothers of the colonies and semi-colonies. Together they will oppose the imperialist war and sweep the world with revolutions far

greater than those of the first world war.

"At the time of the first imperialist world war, with the exception of Russia, there was no Communist Party. Today, conditions are entirely different. Communist Parties have been established in the nations of the world and their political organizations have been strengthened and tested in the years of conflict. During the first imperialist world war there was no socialist state. Today, the Soviet Union lives—the greatest power in the world! The Soviet Union firmly opposes imperialist war and unflinchingly supports the peoples' wars for national emancipation. Today, the world is clearly divided into two camps. The propertied classes, whether they participate directly or indirectly in the imperialist war, are the reactionaries. But clashes between these two factions will never prevent them from joining forces against the Soviet Union, the emancipation movement of the peoples of the imperialist nations, the national liberation movements of the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies, and the world revolution. It is childish to hope that they will continue to fight until they are easily overthrown by the revolutionary forces.

"Today we have the world front of reaction and, opposing it, the Soviet Union, the movements for emancipation in the imperialist nations, and the national liberation movements in the colonies and semi-colonies. Together they are charged with the responsibility of building the revolutionary front, of overthrowing the front of reaction, of turning the imperialist war into a revolutionary war, of destroying the basic cause of war—the capitalist class—and of releasing all the op-

pressed peoples from capitalism and imperialist war. This is a tremendous struggle. It requires of every revolutionary that he hold out staunchly and firmly. It is a process of educating, organizing and leading the people in the struggle against the capitalist class. Capitalist economy is dying. Great change and revolution are at hand. We are living in a new period of revolutionary struggle—a time of birth of a new world. . . .

"Having carried on the war of resistance against the Japanese militarist aggressors for two years, the Chinese nation, today, is an important and powerful constituent of the revolutionary front of the world. None can doubt that the war for the national liberation for four hundred and fifty millions will have tremendous influence on the struggle for reshaping the world. . . ."

With a few bold strokes, the Communist leader thus draws the outlines of the conflict that is leading toward world revolutionary transformation. On the side of reaction—the imperialist powers, whether directly or indirectly involved in the war. On the side of humanity's future—the Soviet Union, the people's movements for emancipation in the imperialist nations, and the national liberation movements in the colonies and semi-colonies. This latter triplice is a favorite reference of Mao Tse-tung's. It is a way of bringing into the forefront the importance of the colonial people's struggles.

China occupies today the leading position, the advance post, in the movement for the liberation of the colonial and semi-colonial world.

The Chinese nation is the herald of colonial revolutions that are yet to shake the imperialist system to its foundations. It is the firm ally of all forces that are opposed to the colonial status quo, not from a desire to change the imperialist master, but from a will to free the colonial peoples.

During the first imperialist war, the colonial and semi-colonial nations were shamelessly dragged into the slaughter. After being plundered and mistreated in the era of "peaceful" capitalist rivalry, they were forced into the criminal war that climaxed that era. The outstanding example was India—the world's largest and most profitable colony. The war of 1914-18 levied an enormous additional tribute on the Indian people—in money gifts and subscriptions to British loans, in huge contributions of raw materials and manufactured products, in men sent to the battlefields. Aided by Gandhi's recruiting drive, British imperialism drafted one and one-third million Indian troops, combatants and auxiliaries, for the various fronts—more than all the Dominions put together. China, too, was forced into the war by Allied pressure, mainly to accomplish the ruthless uprooting of the German commercial community but also to draw upon China's labor power, utilized in the Chinese labor corps dispatched to France.

A quarter century ago the colonial world as a whole was thus universally drafted into "service" in the imperialist conflict. The colonial reserves of world imperialism, with little or no opposition, were

mobilized for war, as they had hitherto been exploited in peace, by the rival powers. The awakening came late to the colonial peoples, after the glowing promises of their masters had vanished in the harsh light of the imperialist "peace" of Versailles. China saw Shantung province awarded to Japan—a little matter which the Allied powers had decided by secret agreements in 1917. For India, instead of the promised dominion status "after the war," came the Rowlatt Acts and the massacre at Jallianwalla Bagh, where the dead and wounded were counted in thousands. The first great Indian mass civil disobedience campaign of 1919-21 returned the answer to British repression. In China the initial revolt against the Versailles Treaty, led by the students, swelled into the powerful national revolutionary struggle of 1925-27. For the first time in ninety years the imperialist powers in China were forced to beat a retreat. Both in India and China the mass revolts were crushed and control was reestablished, but not without leaving an indelible impress on the revolutionary movements and leadership in both countries.

Today the second imperialist war is being fought. But the colonial and semi-colonial reserves of world imperialism are being mobilized with the utmost difficulty. A British-controlled Government of India has dragged that country into the war, cynically disregarding its pledge to consult the representatives of the Indian people before taking the step. For the Indian people are not supporting the war. There are

no mass recruitment drives and no outpouring of men and money. There is merely a thin trickle from the reactionary princes of the Indian states. The British rulers must wrest every ounce of support they gain through direct exercise of their controlling political and economic powers. And they are confronted by an organized demand for immediate national independence, which is testing all their powers of maneuver and subterfuge to turn aside.

In China the movement for national liberation has reached a more advanced stage. The Chinese people are already engaged in a national revolutionary struggle that is rapidly carrying them beyond the orbit of imperialist control. The immediate fight is directed against the ruthless invasion conducted by Japan's aggressive ruling circles. Yet no one supposes that victory in this struggle will lead to a restoration of the old system, under which China was a semi-colony exploited in varying degrees by the different imperialist powers. The strength which China must develop to win the grueling test with Japanese imperialism will be a guarantee that no other imperialist power or group of powers will again determine Chinese destinies. For more than three years the Chinese people have successfully withstood the concentrated attack of Japan's military machine. Clearly forces have been unleashed in China that have added to its strength in this seemingly unequal struggle. These forces must also prove to be the makers of China's future, in which one of the great oppressed colonial peoples

will for the first time achieve full emancipation.

### *Pledges of Victory*

The war of defense against Japanese aggression has required an unexampled expression of national unity. This concept must be taken in its dynamic sense. Chinese unity since 1937, more complete than at any time in this century, has been a phenomenon of growth and struggle, and continues to exhibit the same characteristics. It is polarized around the principle that "anti-Japanese resistance is above everything; everything must be subordinated to anti-Japanese resistance; all forces must be mobilized for the final victory!" It is hammered out in practice (as in Spain) through dissensions and frictions, through the ejection of traitors like Wang Ching-wei, and a continuous struggle to purge the organism of unhealthy elements. Success is measured by the extent to which the principle has been maintained. Under the central leadership of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, the Chinese nation has continued to forge its unity in practice, to renew its determination to resist as new difficulties arise, and to mobilize its forces for the ultimate national triumph.

All elements of the Chinese people, under the banner of the anti-Japanese National United Front, are enrolled in the struggle to win the country's independence. This broadest possible front, of a colonial people fighting for national liberation, embraces all patriots

irrespective of party, group, or class. Worker, peasant and man of property are all included. There is one test—that the individual is sincerely devoting his efforts and resources to the anti-Japanese campaign.

At the heart of the process of national unification lies the united front established in 1937 between the Nationalist Party (Kuomintang) and the Communist Party. The Communist troops were incorporated in the national forces as the Eighth Route Army, led by their own officers but acting under direction of the central command and maintained by the central treasury. Similarly, in the political sphere, the former Soviet districts were merged in the Shensi-Kansu-Ninghsia Border Region, with its own government (on an elective basis) under Communist direction. Behind the Japanese lines in Shansi and Hopei provinces, and to a lesser extent in Suiyuan, Chahar and Shantung, the Eighth Route Army has built up extensive guerrilla bases, firmly supported by the fully armed local populations. At the center, Chou En-lai has occupied a government post, while several Communist representatives have been included in the People's Political Council, an embryonic national legislature with advisory powers.

An entrenched political minority, with some following among Kuomintang army officers, has never reconciled itself to the united front as thus constituted. Part of this reactionary minority, embracing Wang Ching-wei and his followers, was

compelled to flee from free China at the end of 1938. The logic of their position has since led them to become the outright puppets of Japanese imperialism. Other reactionary elements have remained in free China, dangerous for their capitulationist, pro-fascist tendencies and for their anti-united front orientation. During 1939 their anti-Communist campaign led to a number of sharp incidents on the political and military front, including several armed clashes in the northern provinces. Mao Tse-tung has defined the attitude of the Communist Party of China on this issue in the following terms:\*

“As for the attitude of the Communist Party towards the ‘friction’ which you mentioned in your question, I wish to speak frankly. We are fundamentally opposed to any friction whatsoever because, by indulging in it, the two parties only cancel out each other’s anti-Japanese force. Nevertheless, if we are subjected to discrimination which we can no longer endure, or if any attempt is made to suppress our activities we shall take a serious attitude. We will, of course, never attack others unless we are attacked, but if others attack us we will certainly reply in kind. An old proverb says: ‘Courtesy, to be real, must be mutual.’ It is wrong to receive courtesy and not reciprocate it, and it is equally wrong to give it if it is not reciprocated. To treat our friends with civility is our fixed principle. But, at the same time, we stand firmly on self-defense. No Communist can afford to neglect

\* In an interview with reporters of the Central News Agency, *Sao Tang Pao* and *Hsin Min Pao*, Yenan, September 11, 1939.

this, and no Communist will be allowed to go beyond this limit. You gentlemen know all the facts of the situation and there is no need to trouble you with further explanations."

During the spring of 1940 the possibilities of friction were diminished by an agreement which somewhat reduced the territory of the Border Region, considerably increased the number of Eighth Route Army divisions receiving financial support from the Central Government, and delimited more exactly the areas of military operations and administrative control for the Eighth Route Army in guerrilla districts. While this agreement is a significant landmark, it offers no occasion for a relaxation of vigilance. The difference which arose in 1939 cannot occur so easily again, but they were sufficiently important to call attention to the existence of a serious focus of infection in China's body politic, which requires a drastic surgical operation. In the further progress of the anti-Japanese struggle, the pro-Nazi, capitulationist, and anti-united front elements at Chungking must be thoroughly crushed. Toleration of these elements is a luxury which can no longer be permitted. The cleansing of the united front is a central aspect of the fight for national unification on which China's victory depends.

In the midst of the anti-imperialist war, and as an essential necessity for the successful prosecution of that war, a reconstruction of Chinese society is taking place. Sun Yat-sen's principles have provided

a common platform, on which the fight for a new China is based. Mao Tse-tung has thus stated the essence of the program:

"Finally, our sole general guiding principle in the war of armed resistance and national reconstruction is the Three People's Principles. The Three People's Principles form the political basis of the anti-Japanese National Front and must be put into practice during the struggle against Japanese aggression and for a new China. The principle of People's Nationalism is nothing other than the overthrow of Japanese imperialism. The principle of People's Democracy means nothing other than the granting of freedom to the entire people. The principle of People's Livelihood means that the whole people must be given work, food and clothing. These things are good and necessary and we must resolutely put them into action. From now on, the entire people must fight for their realization.

"Only by resisting to the end, advancing to the banks of the Yalu River [the Korean border], recovering all our lost territories, and taking a definite stand against capitulation and betrayal can one really be a faithful adherent of Sun Yat-sen's principle of Nationalism. Only by giving freedom of speech, publication, assembly and association to the *Lao Pai Hsing* (common people), refraining from oppressing the people, and 'arousing the masses' in accordance with Dr. Sun's will can we carry out his principle of Democracy. Only by striving to reduce the hardships of the majority of the people, through, for example, the realization of Sun Yat-sen's slogan 'the land to those who till it,' and through the launch-

ing of a production campaign to give work, food and clothing to everyone, can we justify a belief in the principle of Livelihood. Comrades! Let us all strive to be faithful adherents of the Three People's Principles. . . . Let no man who is corrupt pretend to be a student of them. We should not only talk of the Three Principles but we must completely put them into practice.

"I hope that the entire people will enforce the kind of nationalism that is determined on the overthrow of Japanese imperialism and the liberation of the Chinese nation; that the whole people will realize the kind of democracy that helps and arouses the *Lao Pai Hsing* and endows them with democratic rights; that the whole people will strive to carry out the principle of Livelihood that gives the *Lao Pai Hsing* work, food and clothing. The whole country demands the enforcement of the Three People's Principles. Let us fight for it!"

Expressed in simplest terms, these are the guiding outlines of the bourgeois-democratic revolution that is now proceeding at various rates of speed throughout China. Some of its aspects have already been noted. In general, progress is slowest in the all-national sphere, more advanced in certain localities. The People's Political Council is an omen of the future, but still far from a responsible and democratically-elected national legislature. Freedom of speech, publication, assembly and association are newly-won rights in China, far more generally exercised than ever before, but not yet fully established. The industrial cooperative movement is,

in the economic sphere, the broadest all-national effort dealing with the provision of "work, food and clothing" for the people. Land reclamation and resettlement projects by the Central Government are another example of efforts on behalf of the peasant and refugee.

The most concrete progress, along both political and economic lines, has been achieved in the guerrilla areas of North China. In these districts the officials of the local governments, including an increasing number of county magistrates (traditionally the most important Chinese local official, always appointed from the center), are now elected by the people. All classes participate in this local democracy. Peasant literacy is rapidly increasing. Many of the newly-elected magistrates come from the progressive local "gentry," i.e., the former dominant semi-feudal class. The vested economic interests of the gentry have been partially curtailed, and the position of the poorer peasants correspondingly bettered, by a moderate program involving debt moratoria, reduction of interest rates and land rents, a graduated tax system, and the beginning of the simpler forms of agricultural co-operation. In the course of the bitter struggle occurring in guerrilla territory, marked by Japanese barbarities, there can be no maintenance of a privileged caste. When a village is razed to the ground, the effects are burned into landlord and merchant, as well as the peasant. The old Chinese semi-feudal society disappears before the demands of the national revolutionary war.

*America's Role*

The liberation of China would be a rallying cry for the colonial and semi-colonial world. It would exert a profound effect on India, where a new crisis in the Indian people's struggle for freedom is maturing. Its echoes would reverberate throughout the colonial Far East—a "prison house" that includes Korea, Formosa, Indo-China, the Philippines, the Malay States, Burma, and the East Indies. (This is the region in which American imperialism demands maintenance of the status quo against the rival Japanese imperialism's slogan of a "new order.") China's victory, in a struggle so similar to our own Revolutionary War, would answer to the desires and aspirations of the American people, to the best in their revolutionary traditions and heritage. It would be of immense practical value in the immediate struggle which confronts the American people. It would make the war between Japan and the United States, which has now become an imminent possibility, unnecessary and impossible. China's victory corresponds to the best interests of the American people, but not to the interests of American imperialism. For three years the ruling forces in American life have effectively sabotaged all moves that would guarantee China's victory.

With preparations under way to spread the imperialist war to the Pacific, it becomes necessary to lay emphasis on the steps in American policy that have created this threat. *For if war comes in the Far East,*

*the United States will be as culpable as Britain was in Europe.* The parallel becomes more obvious and more damning as the crisis in the Far East matures.

In the critical 1936-38 period in Europe, the British Government's "appeasement" policy, demonstrated most clearly in Spain and Czechoslovakia, directly strengthened and "built up" the Nazi and fascist regimes. The policy did not stop short of actual connivance with Mussolini and Hitler. Chamberlain openly wooed Mussolini at Rome on the eve of the last axis offensive against the Spanish Loyalists; Runciman shamelessly intrigued to break down the Czech will to defend the Sudetenland. In Britain itself every obstacle was placed in the way of the British people's efforts to aid Spain. (American popular support for People's Front Spain, of course, was similarly thwarted by Washington officialdom, through the embargo on munitions; this same government that was keeping Japan amply supplied with American war materials!) The Chamberlain regime placed every obstacle in the way of a genuine collective security program, with Soviet participation, that would have blocked the advance of aggression. Even at the eleventh-hour Anglo-French policy, as expressed in the attitude of the military missions at Moscow, continued to maneuver for a Soviet-German conflict. British policy could still be equated with a Soviet-German war. The bankruptcy of British diplomacy was equated with the Anglo-German war.

In the Far East American imperialism has pursued essentially the same policy *vis-a-vis* Japan, though with a greater degree of cleverness so far as deceiving the American public was concerned. Beginning with the Stimson period of 1931-32, the diplomatic record is replete with statements expressing opposition to Japan's aims and activities in China. In view of their overwhelming support for China, the American people were allowed these statements of opposition, and were even thrown sops in the form of meager loans to China. In 1939 this policy reached a new height in the abrogation of the Japanese-American trade treaty. For six months more the American public was fed with expectations of some real action to halt Japanese aggression. In January, 1940, the bubble burst. No action whatever was undertaken; instead, Ambassador Grew made a "frank" speech at Tokyo and entered into negotiations with the Japanese Foreign Office, the full purport of which was never divulged but which apparently aimed at reaching some *modus vivendi* in regard to China.

Meanwhile Japan's war machine, year after year, was being lavishly supplied by the American market and enabled to continue on its destructive course in China. Here was no program to stop Japanese aggression, any more than Chamberlain's policy was designed to halt the axis advances in Europe. It was, in proper terminology, a program of "appeasement" (with China as the sacrifice), sufficiently camouflaged to keep American public opinion

from being outraged. It was very cleverly handled, much more so than Chamberlain could accomplish in his more difficult situation. But it was not so clever as to avoid the consequences that Chamberlain's policy led to in Europe. It could not prevent the same consequences, because it was essentially the same policy. And today the American people face the possibility of war with Japan—a war that could have been prevented as surely as Britain's war with Germany.

At the eleventh hour, moreover, American imperialism—like British imperialism in Europe—continues to pursue a policy that voids the measures which could still be effective in preventing war. On the face of it, the policy now being followed is "stiff," but in reality it is the same old appeasement game. A token embargo—on scrap iron alone—will not stop Japan. Nor will a third loan to China, nor orders for Americans to withdraw from the Far East. These moves are all in the category of provocative gestures that invite provocative responses, but do not move beyond the token plane onto the basis of solid opposition that would exert effective restraint. They are invitations to Japan not to step beyond the bounds—not to pass beyond China into Southeast Asia. They still look with hope toward an amicable settlement on the basis of a division of the spoils, if only Japan will not be too greedy. Nor can the reopening of the Burma Road be viewed in any other light. There are no indications that American imperialism intends to send adequate amounts

of heavy munitions to China, which is the effective action that reopening of the Burma Road permits. Unless these munitions are sent, the reopening of the road falls exactly into the category of the warning gestures already described. It becomes merely a somewhat more spectacular example of the same policy.

Coupled with these gestures of disapproval goes something more serious—conversations at Washington that are further cementing the virtual Anglo-American alliance that has been formed behind the backs of the American people. Here is the real answer which American imperialism is preparing if its Japanese rival, despite all warnings, refuses to stay within bounds. A new "deal" is being discussed, by which British naval bases in the Pacific, notably at Singapore, will be made available to the American fleet. No complete embargo, no real aid to China, but—the American fleet taking over in the Far East. This is to avoid taking the measures that will prevent war, while taking those which encourage its spread. Japan joined the axis on September 27, in obvious answer to the Anglo-American alliance that had already been established. The path towards war is thus greased. If Japan, like Germany in September, 1939, refuses to heed the Anglo-American "warnings," there can be but one outcome. And the American people will be precipitated into the second imperialist war by the back door—via the Far East. The American ruling class will then be able, within the Far Eastern sphere,

to deal with China's national liberation movement as well as to fend off its imperialist rivals and choose its pickings. These, at least, will be its hopes—which could not be realized by a policy of helping China to defeat Japan, the only genuine peace policy in the Far East.

There is still another essential element in the criminal policy which American imperialism has been pursuing in the Far East. So far this policy has been considered under two heads: (1) No complete embargo and no real aid to China—measures that would actually halt Japan and prevent war; (2) a secret military alliance with British imperialism, tending in actual practice to carry the United States into the second imperialist war. But there is a third aspect to American foreign policy—no cooperation with the Soviet Union. This is not accidental; rather, it is essential. For the Soviet Union is a standing rebuke to American imperialist policy in the Far East. The U.S.S.R. has completely ceased trading with Japan, even more completely than it stopped trading with Germany during the heyday of Chamberlain's "appeasement" era. Statistics for 1939 show a total Soviet-Japanese trade amounting to a few tens of thousands of dollars. This—against the four hundred-odd millions involved in the annual Japanese-American trade exchange! Soviet trade with Japan is as much a token trade, as the American embargo is a token embargo. The U.S.S.R. has also been sending China real help in the form of heavy munitions—airplanes, heavy guns, tanks. It is,

as the world knows, China's largest supplier of the munitions which the imperialist powers (shades of Spain!) find it impossible to send. No! American imperialism cannot easily shake hands with the Soviet Union in the Far East; it must first reverse its policy of fending off China and wooing (today with "warnings") Japan—the policy which it has pursued since 1937, and which it is still pursuing.

What are the prospects for this policy? Of this there can be little doubt. It will meet with inevitable shipwreck, and that fairly soon. At no time has Washington wanted China to win its complete freedom, or Japan to be completely defeated. In such case, the forces of colonial emancipation along with the Soviet Union would both be strengthened. American imperialism's fond hope, again paralleled with British policy toward Germany, was that Japan would fight the U.S.S.R. On the two occasions when large Soviet-Japanese clashes occurred, the American newspaper headlined the most meager accounts and splashed Tokyo's lying dispatches across their pages. When Japan's solid military defeats became obvious, the chorus suddenly subsided. The lesson of Soviet policy—firm resistance to Japanese aggression, active help to China—was lost on Washington. Today, and for some time past, however, it has become obvious that Japan does not intend to attack the Soviet Union. Like Germany, it is following the line of least resistance. In this regard

American diplomacy, like the British, also faces bankruptcy, spelled out in war with its imperialist rival. The U.S.S.R. will have no part in such a war. Rather will it declare its neutrality, continue to help China, and settle outstanding issues (fisheries, boundaries, etc.), with Japan.

The American people do not want this result. They do not wish to be precipitated into war with Japan by our Chamberlains. They demand *real* and not *false* opposition to Japanese aggression, *real* and not *false* measures to choke Japan's ability to make war. They know that the United States can still halt Japan and lift the threat of a Far Eastern war. They make three demands:

1. A complete embargo on Japanese-American trade. Give up the tentativeness, the "gradualism," the piecemeal approaches to a real embargo. Put a complete stop to both exports and imports.

2. Full aid to China. Make use of the reopening of the Burma Road. Send in airplanes, tanks and heavy guns to China. Provide much larger credits for the purchase of these munitions.

3. Soviet-American cooperation. Settle all existing differences. Reach agreement on types and amounts of munitions to be sent to China.

The fight to enforce these demands is part and parcel of the fight against the second imperialist war. But time grows short. The voice of the American people must be heard quickly, if it is to prevail.

---

## CHINA HAS PROVED IT CAN UNITE: UNITY WILL BRING VICTORY

### MANIFESTO OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA ON THE THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE WAR OF RESISTANCE AGAINST THE JAPANESE INVASION

**B**RETHREN, beloved soldiers, anti-Japanese co-comrades of the various parties and fractions:

On the occasion of our commemoration of the third anniversary of China's war of resistance against the Japanese invasion, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China earnestly and warmly extends its sincere national revolutionary salute to every fellow countryman, to every soldier at the front and to every anti-Japanese co-comrade of the various parties and political fractions. To those martyrs who bravely gave their lives to the cause of the nation, we extend our boundless condolence. To those wounded soldiers and suffering fellow-countrymen, we extend our deep sympathy.

With the heroic war of resistance now ending its third full year, we have once more proved to the world that Japanese imperialist collapse is certain. Our firm will to carry on the war continuously toward its successful conclusion is now strongly engraved in the hearts of the Chinese people. The current changes in the international political situation have resulted basically to the advantage of China. Nevertheless, the

stage of unprecedented difficulty arising from our war of resistance is confronting us once more with Japanese imperialism's declaration of its so-called Monroe Doctrine, followed with the intensification of its aggressive war against China. What is more, within our united front there now appears a group of persons with wavering tendency. Japanese imperialism's intensification of its attack upon China is but the echo of the airplanes and cannon of Hitler and Mussolini. By such means, they are attempting to fulfil their imperialistic war aim, that is, to redivide once more the whole world among themselves and consequently for the further enslavement of the people of the world. On the other hand, the English, American and French imperialists are still continuing their anti-Soviet and anti-Communist policy coupled with their suicidal policy to yield to the pressure of Germany, Italy and Japan. The consequences of such maneuverings are obvious; France is annihilated, England is hard pressed, while American interests along the Pacific and Atlantic are facing a serious threat.

The imperialist war has by this

time developed into a new phase. Contradictions among the imperialists themselves still remain unsolved. Unprecedented economic and political crises in these countries as the inevitable consequence of the present imperialist war have now resulted in a brutal assault upon mankind. Such crises will undoubtedly lead to an upsurge of the world revolution. Among the suppressed people and within the oppressed nations, a revolutionary crisis is brewing. We are living in a new era, the era of criminal predatory wars versus revolution. Imperialist wars are to slaughter the people. The only country that stands aloof and does not permit itself to be involved in the whirlpool of the imperialist war is the great and mighty socialist state, the Soviet Union, genuine champion of the oppressed people and enslaved nations of the world.

As a consequence of the present new developments in the international situation, Japanese imperialism, confronted with numerous difficulties due to the crises within and without, is now taking a final decisive adventure. By her attempt to blockade China's international trade routes, Japan is launching a frontal attack against China and by means of savage aerial bombardments and other high pressure actions is trying hard to break China's internal unity and to force her to capitulate. The wavering elements remaining within our camp, in the face of the increasing pressure and difficulties, are still more wavering, leading themselves into capitulation. These elements, whose minds are confused and whose wills are weak, can bare-

ly endure hardships and difficulties. They are confused as to the probable outcome of the war of resistance. In most instances when difficulties appear they invariably waver. These persons are the worst and most dangerous elements remaining at present within our camp.

\*   \*   \*

Brethren, soldiers, anti-Japanese co-comrades of the various parties and political fractions! With China at present facing unprecedented danger of a possible capitulation and the utmost difficulty of conducting her war of resistance, it is a mistake to hide such existing dangers and difficulties from the knowledge of the people. The Chinese Communist Party considers it its task to arouse the whole nation clearly to realize the existence of these dangers and difficulties. At the same time, the Chinese Communist Party points out to the people of the nation the necessity of strengthening further our national unity as the only means to subdue dangerous activities for capitulation and to overcome the difficulties confronting us at present. Wang Ching-wei's capitulation is becoming a total bankruptcy. He and his party have now become the meanest toy in the hands of the Japanese imperialists. Capitulation of the French bourgeoisie resulted in the wholesale enslavement of the French people by Hitler. What future is there in capitulation? With the French people undergoing sufferings in their present condition, the Communist Party of China is wholeheartedly in sympathy. Nevertheless, the Chinese Commu-

nist Party firmly believes that under the guidance of the sturdy and mighty leadership of the Communist Party of France, the great French nation cannot be destroyed. The struggle of the French people together with that of the Chinese people will continue to march hand in hand in challenging their respective foreign oppressors until final victory is won.

\* \* \*

Brethren, soldiers, anti-Japanese co-comrades of the various parties and fractions! We must counteract with full resistance every sort of Japanese offensive, we must overcome every kind of difficulty, we must subdue every shade of capitulatory conspiracy, we must overcome every kind of traitorous elements, we must decisively deal with them by liquidating them completely from our camp. The whole nation must stand strong for unity. All sorts of factions must be discouraged. The relationship between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party must be adjusted and improved. The imminent danger of a reappearance of internal strife or civil war must be uprooted. The National United Front for resistance to Japanese aggression must be further strengthened under the guidance of Chiang Kai-shek, and every Chinese must stand for the continued resistance to Japanese aggression. Pledges which were once solemnly vowed by the different parties and fractions must be carried out.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China declares and wishes it to be known to every

fellow countryman and every comrade member of the Party that we Communists always carry out faithfully in practice what we have once pledged. In the manifesto we issued on September 22, 1935, we publicly declared that we will fight for the full realization of the Three People's Principles, that we will cease to conduct any agrarian revolution, that we will desist from advocating an uprising policy, that the Chinese Red Army will be converted into the National Revolutionary Army and that the Chinese Soviet Government will be converted into a local democratic government. We have faithfully carried out all these promises to the letter since then; we have never tried to violate what we have pledged. Today in the border government of Shensi-Kansu-Ningsha and in the regions of the anti-Japanese bases, which are created within the rear of the enemy, the policy we are putting into practice is fully in conformity with the doctrine of the Three People's Principles. In all these places, we never have attempted to carry out anything that is not within the scope of the Three People's Principles.

At this moment, we, the Communists, once more wish to make it clear to the people that as long as the anti-Japanese war is being waged and as long as the policy of the National Government is based upon the doctrine of the Three People's Principles, we pledge ourselves to fulfil the said principles. All kinds of slanderous attacks branding the Communist Party of China as a pledge-breaker are totally baseless and false. With regard to the ques-

tion of pledges, we demand that the Koumintang, too, give due respect to what it has once adhered to. It should earnestly put into practice the solemn promises it once made to the people at large and to our Party in particular on the question of political and other issues.

Only then could national unity be assured of its everlasting existence, while our common resistance in dealing with the enemy could have more effective results.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China reiterates once more that as long as the united front for resistance is still on and cooperation between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party still prevails, our stand is absolutely opposed to the advocacy of internal strife and dissension. From beginning to end, we support Chiang Kai-shek and the National Government in their execution of the national policy for continuous resistance against the enemy. We have never broken our promise by pursuing the policy of sowing dissension and destruction. All rumors circulated to the effect that the Communist Party is returning to its old activity of the civil war time by reviving its former policy of uprising and destruction are entirely absurd and groundless. Such accusations against us are merely concoctions by the national traitors. Yet, on the other hand, we equally demand that the Koumintang forsake its destructive policy against the Communist Party. This must be done in order to ensure the unity of the two parties as well as to guarantee their continued cooperation.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China wishes to assure once more that all armed forces under our command are confining their activities in the fighting area within the rear of the enemy and within the twenty-three counties that are under the administration of the border government of Shensi-Kensu-Ningsha. They are forbidden to pursue their activities into other areas that might provoke a conflict with other friendly armies, while in the fighting area as well as in the rear of the enemy, we constantly encourage the forces that are under our command to cooperate with other anti-Japanese friendly forces to fight hand in hand with them against the enemy.

Likewise, we are asking the other anti-Japanese friendly armies under different commands to prevent their forces from carrying on any kind of activity that is liable to provoke a direct conflict between themselves and the Eighth Route and the new Fourth armies. This should be so in order that unity within the anti-Japanese front be preserved.

Simultaneously we beg to ask the National Government for its un-failing support to the Eighth Route Army, the new Fourth Army and the other anti-Japanese guerrilla forces. The support of the National Government to these forces is urgently necessary because the Eighth Route Army, the new Fourth Army and the other anti-Japanese guerrilla columns are the main armed forces that are carrying anti-Japanese activity into the rear of the enemy as well as occupying the fore-

most front in resisting the enemy.

During the last three years of their continuous struggles, the Eighth Route and the new Fourth Armies conducted a total heroic struggle of more than ten thousand combats. Through such numerous struggles, they firmly upheld the banner of the war of resistance in a vast area within the rear of the enemy. Both armies have at present drawn from activity 45 to 50 per cent of the total Japanese forces at present operating in the Chinese battlefield. Yet the environment of these armies is precariously dangerous, their living conditions are extremely hard, while their ammunition supplies are astonishingly poor.

Our Party policy with regard to our relations with other anti-Japanese friendly armies is to render them all necessary assistance, to bolster up their unity, and to increase their fighting strength instead of splitting or disrupting them. However, we are demanding from the Kuomintang and every other anti-Japanese friendly army to render reciprocal treatment of the Eighth Route Army and the new Fourth Army. By means of such mutual courteous treatment, mutual suspicions could be erased, while at the same time united action in their resistance against the enemy can be effectively enforced. Only then will the task confronting us for the complete destruction of the enemy by the armies under a supreme commander be possible.

We and our Party realize that in order to counteract the sinister danger of capitulation and to overcome the difficulties that our war of resis-

tance is confronting, the nation should see to it that the various so-called policies such as the "anti-Communist," "restricting the Communists," "annihilating the Communists," or "forbidding the Communists," etc., etc., be stopped at once. The policies in actual practice have retarded and weakened our forces of resistance in dealing with the enemy onslaught. Moreover, such practices have aroused an intensely uneasy feeling among the people of the nation. Furthermore, it will do us a lot of good to bear in mind that it is absolutely impossible to execute our war of resistance against Japanese aggression on a "double-face" war policy, that is, to carry on an internal strife while at the same time fighting an external war. The consequence of such a policy will be the nation's suicide. The complete collapse of the Daladier government in France is due to the government's mistake of pursuing anti-Communist activity. This should be a warning to the nation not to repeat such policies.

As Communists, we think the best way to subdue the danger of capitulation and to overcome the unprecedented difficulties confronting the war of resistance is to start first with the complete overhauling of the procedures that are now being adopted in conducting the war of resistance. The people should be granted freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and of organization for the war of resistance. The Communists and other patriotic elements that are kept in prison should be released at once. The legal right of the various parties and political fractions should

be officially acknowledged. A democratic People's Convention should be summoned. The harmful activity of the so-called "squad for technical activity" should be abolished. The present unwarranted financial and economic policies should be properly adjusted. The cultural and educational policies of the military service policy should be pursued along the line of conducting the war of resistance on the basis of self-sufficiency and not upon unreliable foreign aid.

\* \* \*

Brethren, soldiers, anti-Japanese co-comrades of the various parties and fractions. The Communist Party of China firmly believes that we can conquer the danger of capitulation and overcome the difficulties that are confronting us. For China possesses every required condition to override such dangers and difficulties. It is up to the Chinese Government and the Chinese people to use these conditions.

China is a nation embracing a vast territory with the greatest wealth of mineral resources as yet untapped. She has a great population. For China is not Ethiopia, nor Spain, Holland, Belgium, or France. Furthermore, Japan is far behind as compared with Germany. China has still preserved several million fighting forces in action. What is more, China has the unity of the two leading parties, the Kuomintang and the Communist Party, and the unity of the great majority of her people as well. In addition, imperialist contradictions which prevail can be utilized by China to the fullest ad-

vantage. And there is the great Soviet Union and the world revolutionary movements that are supporting China in her struggles against foreign aggression.

Ever since the start of the Opium War, China, within the last hundred years, has encountered uncountable dangerous adversities which have enriched her with immense experience. China has the heroic morale of Dr. Sun Yat-sen as an outstanding model for the Chinese people to emulate. In times such as the present, when we are confronted with national crisis, we should bind ourselves more closely with the teachings of Dr. Sun Yat-sen.

We should fulfil his revolutionary Three People's Principles (namely, to ally with the Soviet Union, to ally with the Communists, and to assist the workers and peasants) and his "Last Will."

Overcome all sorts of pessimism and hopelessness. Be firm in the struggle. Only through that way shall we be able to overcome the danger of capitulation. In the long run, China will win the war of resistance against Japanese invasion and she will proceed with full confidence in her national reconstruction to success. The glory of future China is everlasting.

Down with Japanese imperialism! Carry on the war of resistance to the end! Preserve national unity! Long live the national emancipation of China!

CENTRAL COMMITTEE,  
COMMUNIST PARTY  
OF CHINA

July 7, 1940.

---

# SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS IN THE BALTIC

BY JAN VEDRAL

ON JULY 21, the world witnessed an event of supreme historical importance. Three European nations broke the chains of imperialism and capitalism and proclaimed the Soviet Socialist system in their countries. The people's parliaments of Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania resolved, in conformity with the will of the broad masses of the working people, to proclaim these countries Soviet Socialist Republics, to base their new political system on the Stalin Constitution and to secure the entry of the new Soviet Socialist Republics into the great family of free nations, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. At the Seventh Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., Latvia, Lithuania and Esthonia, the three new Soviet Republics of the Baltic, were admitted into the Soviet Union.

This event, marking a great victory for the international working class, is the result of two factors: first, the power and might of the Soviet Union and its policy, which serves the cause of peace and freedom for all nations; and, second, the long and arduous struggle waged by the proletariat of all the Baltic countries against capitalist oppres-

sion and for freedom and socialism.

The history of the Baltic nations in the last two decades has been the history of the struggle of the Baltic proletariat and working people generally, both against their own capitalists and landlords and against plotting foreign imperialists who strove to draw the Baltic into their net.

### *Historic Background*

The October Revolution cleared the road to freedom and independence for these nations. Under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin the Russian proletariat smashed the tsarist prison of nations, and gave to all the nations constituting the former Russian empire the unrestricted right to self-determination. The proletariat of the Baltic countries, united with the Russian proletariat by bonds of common struggle and common sacrifice, took its place at the head of the masses of the people in order to put this right of self-determination into effect, and to take advantage of its social emancipation for laying a firm foundation for national independence.

In Esthonia, a Soviet Government

was established in October, 1917.\* The bourgeoisie dared offer no serious resistance, although it possessed considerable armed forces. The Esthonian Soviet Government lasted three and a half months. During this time it transferred the land of the landlords and the church to the peasants, thereby becoming endeared to their hearts.

In Latvia, also, a Soviet Government was established in October, 1917. It was subsequently overthrown by the German army of invasion, but was set up again after the defeat of Germany, and on December 17, 1918, Latvia was proclaimed an independent Soviet Republic.

In Lithuania, in the early part of the revolution, the will of the people was suppressed by German militarism, which had overrun the whole country. Only in December, 1918, after the defeat of Germany, was a Lithuanian Workers' and Peasants' Government set up under the leadership of Comrade Mitskevicz-Kapsukas. On December 16, Lithuania was proclaimed a Soviet Republic.

The bourgeoisie in the Baltic countries were incapable of resisting, or suppressing the revolutionary movement of the workers and the people by their own efforts. They, like the ruling classes in all countries under similar circumstances, sought assistance against their own people from outside. They appealed to the imperialist powers, and sacrificed the independence of

their own nations in order to save their class privileges.

The first "allies" of the bourgeoisie in the Baltic countries were the German armies of Kaiser Wilhelm II. In Esthonia, on February 24, 1918, a bourgeois government was set up with the help of German bayonets. It was destined, however, to be very short-lived. The German army occupied the whole of Esthonia, and the government was represented solely by the German General Staff, which contemptuously swept aside the "independence of the bourgeois republic."

Latvia met with the same fate: after the October Revolution, the Russian counter-revolutionary General Staff withdrew from the country, and amidst the applause of the Latvian bourgeoisie handed it over to the German imperialists. The German army occupied the whole country and Kaiser Wilhelm II solemnly declared Riga to be "a German city for all time."

When German imperialism was defeated, the bourgeoisie of the Baltic countries hastened to seek a new protector against their own peoples. The place of the deposed "protector" was taken by a new "protector," the place of the Germans was taken by the Allies.

The Allies, which after the World War started military intervention against the Soviet Union, were quick to realize the extreme importance of the geographical position of the Baltic countries. Their whole policy towards those countries was determined exclusively by their anti-Soviet plans. As long as England and

\* Old calendar.

France relied on the forces of the Russian counter-revolution, on Kolchak, Denikin and Yudenich, their attitude towards the Baltic people and states was extremely restrained. The Soviet Union recognized the Baltic states that were set up after the defeat of the proletarian governments before England and France were ready to do so, and it also recognized Lithuania's right to Vilna. When the Red Army occupied Vilna, during the Soviet-Polish War in 1920, it handed the city over to the Lithuanian authorities. But when the Allies were disappointed in their hopes of a victory for the Russian counter-revolution, when the White armies, in which the capitalists of London and Paris had invested so much gold, were routed by the Red Army and driven out by the Soviet people, the attitude of the Anglo-French imperialists towards the Baltic states changed very sharply. In his speech at the Conference of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) in December, 1919, Lenin said:

“The pressure that Entente imperialism is bringing to bear upon these small, hurriedly erected and powerless states, which are entirely dependent upon the Entente even in such urgent matters as food supplies, and in every other respect, is common knowledge. They cannot escape this dependence. Every means of pressure, financial, economic and military, was brought into play in Esthonia and Finland, and undoubtedly, also in Lithuania, Latvia and Poland, to compel the whole group of these states to march

against us.” (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIV, Russian edition.)

And this policy, which converted the Baltic states into the tools of Entente imperialism, was pursued for a number of years. The imperialists of the Entente countries, aided by the bourgeoisie of the Baltic countries, strove to create a “bloc of Baltic states” to serve their anti-Soviet plans. This bloc, with Poland included, was to stretch from the Arctic to the Black Sea.

A conference was held in Helsingfors in 1920, under the aegis of France, attended by representatives of Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Finland and Poland. Already at this conference attempts were made to form a military alliance against the Soviet Union. The antagonisms between France and England and between the Baltic countries and Poland, however, frustrated these plans. Another conference of the foreign ministers of Esthonia, Latvia, Finland and Poland was held in Warsaw, in 1922, at which France made another attempt to establish a “Baltic bloc” and to link it up with the Little Entente. This time the attempt was frustrated mainly by the opposition of Lithuania, which could not reconcile itself to the loss of Vilna and to an alliance with the Polish squires.

In 1926, British imperialism came into the foreground in the Baltic, in place of France. That year a conference of Baltic countries—Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland—was held in Geneva under the

aegis of Great Britain. Although no alliance was formed, regular conferences of the representatives of these countries and of their General Staffs were to ensure that their plans in the Baltic would be served.

Thus, the independence of the Baltic nations, won by the working class of these countries on the crest of the first wave of the proletarian revolution, was reduced to a mere illusion. The Baltic countries became tools in the hands of the imperialist powers; in international relations they represented an outpost of imperialism against the Soviet Union, built with the aid of foreign gold and by the treachery of their own bourgeoisie.

Naturally, this degrading position of the Baltic countries in international relations roused the opposition of the broad masses of the working people, of progressive intellectuals, and of all true patriots. The situation prevailing within these countries, however, prevented the voice of the people from being heard. The veil of bourgeois democracy, which, after the World War, became the main form of the class rule of the bourgeoisie, was soon torn off in the turmoil of class conflicts and the turbulent progress of the class struggle. The revolutionary working class movement was soon driven underground, and for twenty years the Communists, the most loyal sons of the people and champions of their rights, were subjected to the most brutal persecution.

In all the Baltic countries the

financial oligarchy, under the wing of their foreign protectors, sooner or later, established open dictatorships of reaction. In Esthonia, on March 12, 1934, a coup d'état was brought about. All the remnants of democratic rights were abolished, all parties were dissolved and the reactionary dictatorship was backed by the "Fatherland League," whose members were recruited from among the Esthonian wealthy farmers, and which resorted to every means to terrorize the poorer strata of the rural population.

In Latvia, a reactionary coup d'état took place on the night of May 15, 1934. The "Peasant League" government then in power declared martial law all over the country, dissolved the Diet, dissolved all parties and elected local government bodies, and suppressed the trade unions. A "corporative state system" was established in which all power was concentrated in the hands of the financial oligarchy, backed by the kulak "Peasant League." The whole nation was terrorized with the aid of the military organization known as the *Azsargi*.

In Lithuania, a reactionary coup was carried out as early as 1926. Here, too, all the remnants of democratic rights were swept away, all political parties were dissolved, and all power was concentrated in the hands of President Smetona, leader of a rich-peasant organization.

This state of political oppression was accompanied by a process of economic deterioration. The separation of the Baltic countries from

the vast regions with which they had been connected by centuries of economic development, and the anti-Soviet policy pursued also in economic affairs, seriously affected the economic life of these countries, their industry in particular. Estonian industry, which played a very important part in the economy of the former Russian empire, was now like a cemetery. The huge shipyards and the highly-developed engineering plants were brought almost to a standstill, and the equipment of many factories was sold as scrap iron. The output and number of workers employed in the factories that continued to function were considerably reduced. For example, the Krenholm textile mills, which in 1914 employed 14,000 workers, now employed only 2,000. The same thing occurred in Latvia. In 1913, the number of workers employed in industry throughout the country was 108,000; but in the boom year of 1929, the number was only 62,000. The decline in industry is indicated by the decline in the urban population. In 1914, the urban population amounted to 40.3 per cent of the total population, whereas in 1937 it was only 36.2 per cent. Whatever was left of industry was owned mainly by foreign capital, which had converted the Baltic states into economic dependencies.

Nor were conditions in agriculture more cheerful. Thus, in Estonia, after the land reform was carried through, the kulaks owned 65 per cent of the total cultivated land, whereas, according to the statistics for 1929, over 72,000 poor

peasants lost even their small holdings and were reduced to the position of agricultural laborers. In Latvia, the kulaks concentrated in their hands over two-thirds of the total horses and dairy cattle, whereas 34,000 farms possessed no horses, and 17,000 possessed neither horses nor cows. In Lithuania, 53 per cent of the total cultivated land was owned by landlords and kulaks, while 70,000 poor peasants were compelled to sell their labor power for a bare pittance.

These political and economic conditions imposed a heavy burden upon the working people of the Baltic countries. Wages were even lower than they had been in tsarist Russia; the workers had no protection or rights. Unemployment was constantly rising. The working farmers, having to compete with the big kulak farmers, sank deeper and deeper into debt. The mortgage banks took their property bit by bit and reduced them to beggary. The birth-rate dropped catastrophically. Poverty led to mass emigration.

The Baltic countries were lands of poverty; but they were also lands of popular struggle. Often the workers defended their bare existence in strikes and determined struggles, and bravely resisted the governmental machine of oppression. The peasants resisted the bailiffs, and very often sanguinary collisions occurred. The progressive intellectuals fought against the reactionary cliques who impeded cultural development. But the governments retaliated to these movements with

still harsher measures of repression. The prisons in Tallin, Riga, and Kaunas could tell a very sad story of the martyrdom of the best sons of Esthonian, Lettish, and Lithuanian working people. Many were compelled to emigrate, not only men and women who had been active in the trade unions and in the working class political movement, but also many progressive intellectuals. This is how for years these countries were governed; this is how the people lived and suffered; this is how the regime oppressed the people, who had no voice in determining the destiny of their nations. The reactionary rulers in the Baltic countries boasted that "Communism and all rebellion have been torn out by the roots." Until, suddenly, new events struck a death blow to their whole political system.

### *The Impact of the New Imperialist War*

The second imperialist war has upset the entire imperialist system; it has also knocked from under it the prop of the "order in the Baltic" that has existed up to now. The imperialist world has been weakened; the Soviet Union has become a decisive factor in international politics. The political, economic and military might of the Soviet Union ensures peace for the Soviet people; it also opens the road to peace for other nations.

The consequences of this shifting of power were revealed at the very beginning of the war. The ruling reactionary cliques in the Baltic

countries suddenly found themselves in a vacuum. Abandoned by their imperialist protectors, they were compelled to change their foreign policy, or at any rate, to pretend to do so. Thus, in October, 1939, mutual assistance pacts were concluded between the Soviet Union and Esthonia, Lithuania and Latvia. In her pact with Lithuania the Soviet Union restored to Lithuania the city of Vilna, which the Red Army had previously liberated from the yoke of the Polish squires.

Nevertheless, the Baltic reactionary bourgeoisie continued to play their old game: gambling with the peace of the Baltic countries, they feverishly searched for new imperialist "protectors." In contravention of the explicit provisions of their pacts with the Soviet Union, they established a political and military alliance and resorted to every possible act of chicanery to make impossible the presence of the troops of the Red Army in the Baltic countries, which were there to protect, not only the Land of Soviets, but also the peace and security of the Baltic nations themselves. In short, the financial oligarchy of the Baltic countries did their utmost to jeopardize the peace and security of the Baltic, and to return to the old "system" of imperialist plotting and war.

Meanwhile, the change in the relation of forces had become so great as to make these underhand tricks appear like an impossible anachronism. The Soviet Union energetically took the protection of peace into her own hands. She demanded that

the warmongers be removed from power and called to account, and that governments be established in the Baltic countries that would guarantee the honest fulfilment of the mutual assistance pacts.

This demand was the final blow to the power of reaction in the Baltics. It collapsed, and with its collapse a mighty factor, hitherto suppressed, appeared on the scene of history in the Baltic nations: the working people.

### *The Day of the People*

The working people rose to express their will concerning the destiny of their nations. With lightning speed the revolutionary popular movement spread over all the Baltic countries, to every town and village, to overthrow the old regime of oppression and poverty and to lay the foundations of a new world. The former rulers of the Baltic countries were probably themselves amazed at the speed with which their vaunted power melted away, and at the immense wave of the working peoples' movement which they had so long and so brutally suppressed. Their astonishment was no doubt shared by the entire imperialist world, which learned from these events how great is the power of the people, and how shaky the foundations of the many regimes that are based on fetters and prisons.

The first vivid expression of this popular movement was the enthusiasm with which the people of the Baltic countries welcomed the Red Army, which marched in as the powerful protector of peace. The

world has witnessed many great events recently. It is witnessing the horrors of war; and often it witnesses new migrations of peoples, when millions abandon their homes and property to escape the horrors of war and to save themselves from foreign armies.

But when the Red Army marched into the Baltic countries the whole world was amazed by the unprecedented scenes: vast masses of working people meeting the Red Army-men with rejoicing. The Red Army was welcomed by workers marching to meet it bearing aloft their old red banners which, twenty years earlier, had fluttered over a free country, and which, symbolic of their hopes and aspirations, had been all this time carefully concealed from the eyes of the police. The Red Army was welcomed also by the working people in the rural districts and by the working intellectuals in the cities. In all the cities in the Baltic, huge spontaneous mass meetings, by their very elemental force, thwarted every act of provocation attempted by the old, deposed authorities. Thousands upon thousands marched through the streets, welcoming with open arms the hundreds of political prisoners who, at last, had gained their freedom. In many places workers, peasants and intellectuals gathered at conferences and meetings to discuss the new situation and the establishment of a new regime. And so the free will of these nations, their fetters fallen from them, found expression.

This elemental emancipation

movement grew from day to day, from hour to hour, and was soon crystallized in political and state organs. In all the Baltic countries new governments were set up, consisting of representatives of the progressive sections of the people who were connected with the popular movement and with the struggle for the liberation of the people. Free trade unions sprang up, soon growing into mass organizations and becoming important political factors in the respective countries. Organizations of working peasants, as well as other public associations, came into being. The reactionary parties, which under the old regime had enjoyed a monopoly in public activities, were swept away by this popular movement. The same fate was shared by the old former parties, including the Social-Democratic Party, which had been utterly discredited by actually serving the old regime or capitulating before it.

The only political party that enjoyed the confidence of the broad masses of the Baltic people, the only party which, as the masses of the working people themselves unanimously declare, had "never compromised with the class enemy, had never capitulated; and had always remained loyal to the people," was the Communist Party. The struggle which the Baltic Communists had waged and the privations they had endured in the service of the people now bore fruit. The Communist Parties in the respective countries became the leading party of the working class and, moreover, soon

became the leaders of the broad masses of the toiling people, while ensuring the hegemony of the proletariat in the people's governments.

### *The Working People's League*

All the popular organizations merged in a single political organization. In each of the Baltic countries a "Working People's League" was established, joined by the Communist Party, the trade unions, the peasant organizations, the youth leagues, and other progressive popular organizations. This League, really representing the will of the people, was a People's Front in the true sense. It was a People's Front that united all sections of the working population—workers, peasants, intellectuals and urban lower-middle classes—in the struggle against the reactionary financial oligarchy. It was a People's Front firmly led by the proletariat, the most progressive and most advanced class.

The program of the Working People's League contained the fundamental democratic and economic demands of all sections of the working people. In regard to foreign policies it contained guarantees for the peace and independence of the Baltic nations; the imperialist fetters that bound the Baltic peoples were thrown off, the "Baltic League" which the bourgeoisie in these countries had created as a weapon against the Soviet Union was dissolved; the Baltic people now based their security on a close alliance with the Soviet Union. In

home politics the program demanded guarantees for the liberties and democratic rights of the people. In this respect much had been achieved in the first upsurge of the revolution, but now the liberties gained were made secure. The reactionary parties and armed organizations were dissolved, the army was democratized and political commissars were instituted. The economic demands in the program expressed the fundamental needs of all sections of the working population.

For workers and office employees they signified a considerable improvement in wages and conditions, as well as the introduction of social and old-age insurance. The working peasants were guaranteed, not only release from debt, but also land. In place of national oppression the program proclaimed equal rights for all nations in all the Baltic countries.

#### *The People's Voice in Free Elections*

During the ensuing elections the working people, everywhere, workers as well as peasants, expressed their firm determination to proceed further along the path of liberty, to tear up all the roots of oppression and exploitation, and to sweep away the whole capitalist system. From all sides demands arose for the establishment of a Soviet Socialist system. Resolutions passed at numerous meetings of workers and peasants read: "We have had enough of bourgeois parliamentarism, which is nothing but lies and

falsehood. We want the Soviet system, for only the Soviets protect the interests of the working people." The workers and peasants everywhere demanded that the Baltic countries join the great family of free Soviet peoples, which not only would guarantee them peace and security, but would offer them a new and happy future. At election meetings, the candidates were instructed to give effect to the unanimous will of the people.

The result of the elections was a striking demonstration of this will. During the elections the reactionaries were very active. Although they did not dare openly to oppose the united forces of the people, they nevertheless spread all sorts of lies about the Soviet Union of the kind for which Riga and Tallin have always been notorious all over the world. They sought to induce the electors to stay away from the polls, and so disrupt the unity of the working people. But all their efforts were in vain. The voting on July 14 and 15 reached a figure that had never been reached under the old regime, despite all the intimidation and election trickery to which it had resorted.

In Esthonia, 84.1 per cent of the electorate voted ; of these, 92.8 per cent voted for the candidates of the Working People's League. In previous elections, no more than 60 to 70 per cent of the electorate had gone to the polls; most candidates had obtained only 23 to 47 per cent of the votes of the electorate, and only seven had obtained over 50 per cent.

In Latvia, 94.7 per cent of the electorate went to the polls; of these, 97.6 per cent voted for the candidates of the Working People's League. According to official figures, the number of electors who voted in the 1931 elections was 204,827, 19.1 per cent lower than the number that voted in 1940. The number voting for the Working People's League in the 1940 elections was 184,510 higher than the total number of electors voting in the 1931 elections.

The situation in Lithuania was similar. There, 95.51 per cent of the electorate went to the polls; of these 99.19 per cent voted for the cause of the united people. In the elections of 1936, only 30 to 38 per cent of the electorate voted.

The capitalist reactionaries were completely isolated. The unity of the people triumphed. This victory served to give a further, mighty impetus to the movement. In all the cities of the Baltic, huge demonstrations of unprecedented dimensions took place on election day, or the day after. Everywhere the unanimous cry was heard: "We want the Soviet system! We want the Stalin Constitution! Join the Soviet Union!"

#### *The People's Will for Socialism Realized*

On July 21, the new democratically-elected parliaments of the Baltic countries held their first session and unanimously carried out the will of the people:

The Baltic countries were proclaimed Soviet Socialist Republics.

In the declaration of the Esthonian parliament, we read:

"The Soviet regime is a democratic regime. Through the medium of the Soviets the whole working population takes part in the administration of the state and in the work of creating a free and happy existence. The Soviets give effect to the alliance between the workers and peasants, which in the Soviet state becomes an invincible force. Only the Soviet regime creates the conditions for the display of human talent, for training leaders and organizers for the various branches of political, economic and social life from among the ranks of the working people.

"In the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, national oppression and national inequality have been swept away forever. All the nations in the U.S.S.R. constitute a single, united family. In the U.S.S.R. the national culture of all peoples is flourishing unhindered. In the U.S.S.R. there are no longer any backward nationalities. The example of the Soviet Union shows that only the Soviet regime guarantees peace, work, bread and liberty for the working people in town and country, and can liberate the Esthonian nation from exploitation, poverty and oppression. Only the Soviet regime can ensure our political, economic and cultural development. Only the Soviet system can assure the Esthonian nation truly free national development."

The newly-elected parliaments of the Baltic countries also fulfilled the second fundamental demand of the masses of the working people:

They decided to apply for the affiliation of the Baltic Soviet Socialist Republics to the U.S.S.R. In the declaration unanimously adopted by the Lithuanian parliament we read:

"Experience has shown that only united Socialist Republics can successfully resist the efforts of the imperialist Great Powers to subjugate and fetter the small nations. Unless an alliance of the Soviet Republics is formed, unless they are amalgamated in a single military and economic power, it will be impossible to contend against the forces of world capitalism either on the military or on the economic front. . . . The Lithuanian People's Parliament is convinced that only by joining the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics can the complete sovereignty of the Lithuanian state and the genuine development of industry, agriculture, national culture and the material and spiritual forces of the nation be guaranteed."

The parliaments of the Baltic countries adopted two other historic decisions, which served as the foundation stones of the Socialist Republics. They decided to nationalize all the land and all the banks, as well as large-scale industry. The land belongs to the whole nation and is granted to the working peasants for their use. The decision of the Latvian Parliament on the land question reads:

"Henceforth, there will be no room on our land for those who live on the sweat of the working peas-

ants, no room for exploiters, for landlords and their henchmen."

Industry belongs to the people, and will be planfully conducted by the people in order, as the decision of the Latvian Parliament states,

". . . that a new page may be written in the history of the Latvian nation and of its economy, that the conditions for a rapid and immense economic development may be created for the well being and happiness of the Latvian nation."

These laws, which laid the economic foundation for the new socialist system, were soon put into operation. The area of land each peasant could retain for his use was limited to thirty hectares.\* All land in excess of that area was incorporated in the state land fund to be distributed to those peasants who hitherto had had no land or who had toiled and milled on tiny plots. Thus, the peasants received land. But this is not the only benefit that the working peasants in the Baltic countries have derived. The governments also issued orders annulling mortgage debts amounting to hundreds of millions, debts which had served as a means of steadily dispossessing the peasants. The working peasants also received exemption in taxation, particularly in regard to arrears in past taxes. A crushing reply to the lies spread by the rich farmer elements to the effect that the Soviet Government

\* Hectare = 2.471 acres.—Ed.

would introduce compulsory collectivization is the declaration made, for example, by the Estonian parliament:

"All attempts to introduce collectivization against the will of the working peasants must be regarded as conduct prejudicial to the interests of the state and the people."

The law on the nationalization of the banks and industrial enterprises was carried out with equal vigor. Government commissars, assisted by the workers and peasants, took over the management of these enterprises in the interests of the entire people. Capitalist ownership of the means of production, the fundamental cause of all poverty, was abolished.

Thus, socialism has triumphed in the Baltic! The three Baltic nations have taken their place under the glorious banner of the Stalin Constitution. The prophetic words with which Comrade Stalin, at the Extraordinary Congress of Soviets of the U.S.S.R. on November 25, 1936, characterized the international significance of the Soviet Socialist Constitution, have come true:

"It is a document that proves that what has been achieved in the U.S.S.R. can be fully achieved in other countries also."

Much need not be added to emphasize the importance of this historical decision in the life of the Baltic nations. "The hands of the clock of the history of our people have leaped forward a whole cen-

tury," declared the Lithuanian Prime Minister, Paleckis. And all the working people in the Baltic countries fully appreciate the truth of these words. Although in the past the bourgeoisie often succeeded in isolating the proletariat from the middle classes, their attempts to do so now will be frustrated by the bankruptcy of capitalism on the one hand, and socialist development, on the other. The Soviet regime in the Baltic is welcomed by all sections of the toiling population. It is welcomed by the proletariat, which has firmly taken its place at the head of each nation to clear the road for a genuine socialist future. It is welcomed by the peasantry, whom the Soviets have liberated from landlord oppression. It is welcomed by the working intellectuals, who have seen from the example of the U.S.S.R. what socialism means for the cultural development of a nation, socialism, the Soviet system, in cooperation with the great family of nations of the U.S.S.R.—this is not only the ambition and goal of the proletarians of the Baltic countries, but of the nationwide movement of the Baltic toiling people, for whom these watchwords mean peace, real national independence and a life of happiness.

*The International Significance of  
the Victory of Socialism in  
the Baltic*

The events in the Baltic are of world-wide import. The imperialists have lost one of their *place d'armes*

for war against the Soviet Union. Moreover, another breach has been made in the imperialist world system. The events in the Baltic clearly reveal to the whole world the enormous revolutionary power that is inherent in the masses of the working people. And, lastly, they reveal once again the strength of the Red Army, not only its purely military, but its *political* strength, which is fostered by the love entertained by the working people of all countries for the freedom-bringing soldiers with the Soviet Red Star in their caps.

Once again has the power of the Soviet Union been demonstrated to the international working class and the working people of all countries, a power that serves the cause of peace and freedom for the people. They can see now how rickety, weak and rotten are all "strong-

arm governments" when the working class and the masses of the toilers raise their heads. And what has taken place in the Baltic countries should convince them that the ideas of socialism and of the Soviet system live not only in the hearts of the proletariat, but in the hearts of *all* sections of the toiling people, and that the proud banner and name of Stalin are the hope of all mankind.

These lessons will imbue the international proletariat with even greater class-consciousness, with even more confidence in the strength of its own class, whose mission it is to lead the nations out of oppression and despair to freedom and happiness, to a really new world. The working class will once again learn from the events in the Baltic that it is capable of following in these historic footsteps.

---

# THE PATH OF LENIN AND STALIN

BY JOSEPH FIELDS

**I**T IS twenty-three years since the victorious socialist October Revolution wrested one-sixth of the world from the power of capitalism. It was the path charted by the giants of the proletarian revolution, Lenin and Stalin, which led the workers of the huge Russian empire to their historic victory. It was the revolutionary Party of the Bolsheviks, forged by Lenin and Stalin, steeled and tested in innumerable class battles, that led the oppressed toilers of that land to break the chain of the imperialist world system and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat on the vast territory of the U.S.S.R. In the fire of irreconcilable struggle against imperialist war the imperishable Soviet Socialist Union was born.

## *The Struggle Against the Imperialist War*

Less than a generation has passed and once again the oppressed masses of the capitalist countries find themselves embroiled in a new bloody slaughter which is swallowing up nation after nation and threatens to engulf the world. The new imperialist conflict, like the

first imperialist war, is a struggle—now assuming even greater proportions—for the forcible redivision of the world. It has become, in the fullest sense, a struggle for *world domination*, involving whole continents and hemispheres as the objects of plunder and booty.

American imperialism is preparing to stake out a huge claim in the division of spoils of the second imperialist war. It is relying on its gigantic wealth, powerful military resources, and strategic world position to enter the war at the most appropriate moment in order to dictate the peace terms to its enfeebled imperialist rivals. Already committed to the side of Great Britain, American finance capital has by no means relinquished the possibility of an eventual understanding with the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo axis in the final division of plunder, should the latter be victorious. While brandishing the two-edged sword of intervention and “appeasement” to the East and West, American imperialism is aggressively extending and consolidating its position to the South, ruthlessly forcing out its imperialist rivals from the Latin American countries. In all spheres

of its foreign policy, American finance capital is influenced by its relentless hostility toward the Soviet Union, the mighty anti-imperialist power, the only genuinely peaceful and neutral great nation.

In the far-reaching conflict for world supremacy now raging among the big imperialist powers, their policy of conquest and subjugation of nations is only one side of the picture. They are combining their criminal war for loot abroad with the most savage offensive against the working class and the toiling masses at home. In every country, it is the masses who are being made to bear the brunt of the war. All distinctions between the military fronts and the densely populated cities, teeming with millions, are rapidly disappearing. Civilian populations are incessantly subjected to murderous bombings which are pulverizing into dust whole towns and villages, and leveling to the ground immense metropolitan areas. The mangled flesh of hundreds of thousands of vigorous young men who a month, a week, a day ago were sons, brothers, husbands, fathers of loving families, are mingled with the dust and carnage of war. Smoke rises from a thousand places in the wounded earth. Cemeteries grow on every side. The nervous energetic proletarian hands which but late were firmly grasping the winch-handle, the tractor wheel, the steam throttle, the electric drill, the miner's pick, the plow handle, are today gripping weapons of murder and destruction—in a war that is not their war. Armies of homeless

refugees sweep in waves across the face of the land, seeking safety and shelter, yearning for peace, bread, freedom. The whole burden of the horrible cost of the shambles, out of which a handful of billionaires are amassing huge profits, is being shouldered onto the backs of the impoverished masses. Wages are being driven down below the level required for bare subsistence. Hours of labor are being increased at the point of a muzzle. The plow rusts in the untilled field while wives, children, and dependents of the conscripts are forced to go hungry. Unbearable taxes are being imposed on articles of absolute necessity. In unspeakable agony, whole peoples are being driven before the war-scourge.

But, above the din and clamor of the war, unlike twenty-three years ago, a clear strong voice is heard in every country—the voice of the heroic Communist Parties proclaiming the historic tasks which Lenin and Stalin proclaimed a generation ago. They summon the workers to lead the peoples out of the imperialist war which is spreading desolation and death across the face of the land. They call upon the working class to unite all sections of the toiling people in a common anti-imperialist front against the war incendiaries. They point out to the working class that only to the degree that it conducts its own proletarian policy, completely independent of the bourgeoisie and its Social-Democratic agents, can it really inspire confidence in the toiling people generally and win them over to decisive struggle

against those who are profiting from their misery. Above all, the Communist Parties indicate to the masses the path of *final liberation* from capitalist exploitation, reaction, and war, the path of Lenin and Stalin, the path to socialism.

If bloodthirsty imperialism has sown the wind, it must prepare to reap the whirlwind, even more inexorably than it did in 1917. For, today it is no longer a relatively small force of dauntless class-fighters who have rallied around the banner of Lenin and Stalin, but a new, powerful, genuinely proletarian and really revolutionary International. Millions of toilers in the capitalist and colonial countries, on the basis of their own experiences in the struggle against oppression, have found and are increasingly finding the path of Lenin and Stalin. The teachings of Marxism-Leninism have become the strong arsenal of all the vanguard parties in the great world Communist movement whose goal is socialism. Millions are mastering the scientific theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, and are galvanizing its force into an irresistible historic movement that has far transcended the portent of the "specter which is haunting Europe." The specter has already become the victorious Soviet giant, gaining hourly in stature, calm and confident amidst the turmoil of war, to whom the eyes of the oppressed and exploited of the whole world are turning as to a champion newly risen.

Lenin's irrefutable analysis of imperialism, in which he laid bare the nature of the imperialist world

system, the roots and the real causes of war, and in which he exposed the criminal aims of the imperialist war-makers, opened the eyes of the workers and armed them with the weapon of revolutionary theory in the struggle against their capitalist exploiters. They were able to see their bourgeoisie as a criminal class of robbers, equally guilty with all other imperialists of plunging the nations into a bloody slaughter for their own enrichment and aggrandizement—"a war between the slave-owners for a redivision of the slaves." By exposing imperialism as the rule of monopoly capital, as decaying capitalism, Lenin delivered a shattering blow, both to the reactionary bourgeoisie and to its ideological agents within the ranks of labor, who were seeking to palm off the war as a "just" war, as a "war for democracy," as "a war to end war." By calling upon the workers to convert the imperialist war into a struggle against their own bourgeoisie, into a struggle for peace and socialism, Lenin aided the proletarians of every country to find the only genuine path to final liberation. By pointing out that imperialism is the eve of proletarian revolution, Lenin not only showed the workers the way out of the inferno of war, but he prepared them for the decisive struggle against capitalism. For the epoch of imperialism is the epoch of dying capitalism fighting desperately to maintain itself in power against the rising class of vigorously developing proletarians, the bringers and builders of socialism.

The new imperialist war is strain-

ing to the breaking-point all imperialist and class contradictions. The fundamental contradictions between the world of socialism and the world of capitalism is driving all others to a head, and in this deep-going process, the mighty Soviet Union, by its powerful role for peace in world affairs, is bringing to bear tremendous weight on the side of the forces of progress, on the side of the forward march of history. The contradictions of capitalism continue to operate and to develop even within the framework of the formal alliances among the big imperialist powers and their groupings. As the war progresses, it is also intensifying the basic antagonisms between the industrially-advanced capitalist powers and the enslaved peoples of their colonial possessions. But, above all, the war is everywhere giving rise to decisive changes in the class and social relations of bourgeois society. It is rapidly bringing the working class and its allies into direct conflict with the *system* of capitalist war, exploitation and brutal repression, with the system of capitalism.

#### *The Struggle Against Social-Democratism*

Even before the outbreak of the first imperialist World War, Lenin and Stalin were preparing the working class for the decisive struggle against capitalism by their relentless struggle for the consistent Marxist theory of the proletarian revolution. For years, they had waged a fierce, stubborn, persistent battle against every attempt to "revise" revolutionary Marxism, to

"correct" the scientifically-formulated laws of the class struggle enunciated by Marx and Engels. During his whole lifetime, Lenin combated the treacherous opportunists of the Second International, unmasking them as "a political detachment of the bourgeoisie . . . transmitters of its influence, its agents in the labor movement," striving to retard and disintegrate its struggles, to divide and disorganize the working class and to isolate it from its allies, and to sow despair and defeatism in its ranks. After Lenin's death, Stalin carried forward the uncompromising struggle against every deviation from revolutionary Marxism-Leninism, whether of the "Left" or of the Right variety, against every capitulation to the class enemy.

Opportunism reappears in new forms at every stage and in every arena of the class struggle. It finds expression in all theoretical and practical questions of policy, tactics and organization affecting the class interests of the toilers, and, unless detected and effectively combated, will continue to harm the working class as long as its source and inspiration, capitalism, exists. The danger to the proletariat of this corrupt agency of imperialism is attested by the fact that it has not only infected the broad progressive and democratic movements of the masses, but has frequently infiltrated into the vanguard parties of the working class, and has persisted even in conditions of the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union. It is a hydra-headed monster, spawned by the bourgeoisie, to the

isolation and destruction of which Lenin and Stalin directed unceasing efforts.

Social-Democratism today has degenerated from opportunism to counter-revolution. It now plays a far more "advanced" role for the bourgeoisie than it did in the decades prior to the last imperialist war. Its servitude to the imperialist war-makers is now much more brazen and cynical. In the decades following its great betrayal of 1914, Social-Democratism has fully "matured."

"The war of 1914-15," wrote Lenin, "is a break in history of such magnitude that the attitude towards opportunism *cannot* remain as of old. . . . Pre-war opportunism . . . was in an adolescent stage, as it were. With the war it grew; it can no longer be made 'innocent' or youthful."

No, the heroic French people, nursing the wounds of a barbarous war of betrayal and invasion, can prove with their skins that the hangman, Leon Blum, is not "*innocent*." The chains of the Spanish masses are grim testimony of the fact that the leaders of the Second International, partners to the "non-intervention," were not "*innocent*." The Citrines, the Tanners, the Sanders, the Hillmans and Greens, the Waldmans and Thomases can by no stretch of the imagination be termed "*innocent*" of the frightful crimes they have perpetrated and are continuing to perpetrate against the peoples in the interests of the bourgeoisie.

The wretched social-chauvinists

who at the outbreak of the last imperialist war came forward with a host of "theoretical" arguments to justify and exonerate their bourgeoisie of all responsibility for the war; who then, as now, conjured up all sorts of illusions to make the war palatable to the workers by characterizing it as a "democratic war," a "war of national defense"—the same running dogs of imperialism are today in the forefront of the pack which is baying for the blood of the Communists and all who take a stand against the war-makers, instigating every vile provocation against the Soviet Union, working to involve entire nations in the maelstrom of the new slaughter. They have become the most rabid of warmongers—the vanguard of reaction!

"Social-Democratism," declared Dimitroff, "which began by revising Marxism and ended by completely repudiating it, which for decades has served as an instrument for demoralizing and disorganizing the working class movement, *has now become a weapon for the suppression of the working class, a weapon of reaction, imperialist war, and counter-revolutionary attack on the Land of Socialism.*"

The degradation of Social-Democracy coincides with and parallels the development of capitalism in its final, moribund stage, imperialism. Opportunism developed to the extent that the imperialist bourgeoisie, through its engendered labor aristocracy, relief increasingly upon reformist misleaders to retard and behead the struggles of

the masses against its regime of exploitation, oppression and war. But this very reliance of the bourgeoisie upon its Social-Democratic agents exposed on the one hand the increasing difficulties and weaknesses of capitalism, while, on the other, it revealed the rapidly developing forces and growing strength of the working class.

"The era of dying capitalism," declared Stalin, "is also the era of dying Social-Democratism in the labor movement." There can be no victory over the first without an equally resolute and persistent struggle against the other. That is why, in the simultaneous rise and emergence of the glorious Communist International of Lenin and Stalin with the decay and bankruptcy of the Second International, we can discern the most powerful and prophetic reflection of the fierce struggle between rising socialism and perishing capitalism—and the surest guarantee that socialism will be victorious!

Social-Democracy is not only an "ideological pillar" of the bourgeoisie. It is also its *last reserve*, to which it is being compelled to resort ever more frequently in a desperate endeavor to stem the rising tide of the people's resistance to its criminal war. One after another, the treacherous leaders of the Social-Democratic parties are being exposed in the eyes of the masses as thoroughly corrupt agents of monopoly capital. Increasingly, as the indignation of the masses brands them, they are being discarded by their masters. But it would be a fatal misjudgment to assume that

these treacherous elements can be liquidated without an energetic and protracted struggle. Any illusions regarding the "weakness" of Social-Democratism, especially in the United States, can only serve to hamper the development of the people's anti-imperialist, anti-war struggles, and to disarm the workers. "The gigantic power of the opportunists and chauvinists comes from their alliance with the bourgeoisie," warned Lenin.

"The capitalist press does not give away millions of dollars' worth of favorable newspaper attention out of liberal Quixotism; they expect to receive value for value," Earl Browder declared, in speaking of the Socialist Party. . . . "We shall not underestimate the damage it can do to the cause of working class advancement and peace."

To combat successfully the disastrous influence of Social-Democratism, to isolate it completely and destroy it, calls for constant proletarian vigilance and the ability to recognize and expose opportunist tendencies in whatever varying forms they appear in the ranks of labor. It calls, moreover, for bold, aggressive and open struggle—before the workers and involving the workers—in order to uproot Social-Democratism from the working class movement. This is one of the chief lessons to be learned from the history of the Bolshevik Party, which achieved victory because it unswervingly following the path of Lenin and Stalin.

### *The Party of a New Type*

In the tireless and stubborn strug-

gle against opportunism Lenin and Stalin forged the *Party of a new type*, the glorious Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Bolshevik Party, the model for the proletarian parties of all capitalist and colonial countries. The word "bolshevik" has come to be a word of the highest and most ardent praise among class-conscious workers, synonymous with everything which is heroic, incorruptible, conscious and revolutionary in the working class. The word "bolshevization" has come to mean the process of raising to ever higher levels the ability of the vanguard parties to prepare, organize and lead the proletariat in decisive battles against the bourgeoisie, to the victory of the socialist transformation of society. The word "bolshevization" has come to denote the mastery of the art of combining the historic class theory and practice of the proletariat and the ability to test both, fearlessly and self-critically, in the fire of the class struggle. Uncomprising adherence to principle combined with the widest mass connections, unanimity of purpose and unity of action, iron proletarian discipline and the utmost flexibility, maneuvering ability and the faculty of rapidly finding one's bearings even in the most complicated and difficult situations, these are the qualities which the exemplary Bolshevik Party has taught the advance guard of the working class to strive for. This is the Party of a new type, the highest form of class organization, which Lenin and Stalin built.

In rallying to the banner of the Bolshevik Party the boldest, most

self-sacrificing and conscious forces of the revolutionary proletariat, Lenin and Stalin also developed the *man of a new type*, "people of a special mold . . . made of special material." No better description of this new type has been given than by Stalin himself, in explaining to an assemblage of Soviet citizens what they must demand of a *Bolshevik* deputy:

" . . . the people must demand of their deputies that they remain equal to their tasks, that in their work they should not descend to the level of political philistines, that they remain at their posts as public men of the type of Lenin, that they stand out as clear and definite public men as Lenin, that they be just as fearless in battle and as merciless towards the enemies of the people as was Lenin, that they be free of all panic, of all semblance of panic when things become complicated and when some danger appears on the horizon, that they be just as free of any semblance of panic as Lenin was free, that they be just as sagacious and deliberate in deciding difficult questions which require an all-around orientation and all-around considerations of all pros and cons, as was Lenin, that they be just as truthful and honest as was Lenin, that they love their people as Lenin loved them."

The bringing forward of this new type of man corresponds to the historic tasks presented the working class at the head of all progressive humanity in the epoch of decaying capitalism and of socialist revolution. And it is in Lenin and Stalin that we find the highest embodi-

ment of this new type of man. Masters of the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism, they were able to foresee events, forewarn the masses in time, and equip the proletarian vanguard with correct tactics and strategy for defeating the class enemy. Basing themselves upon the teachings of Marx and Engels, which they developed in a living manner to meet the needs of the level of the class struggle in the imperialist epoch, they were able to raise politics to the level of a science, and revolution to the level of an art. Unswerving revolutionaries, connected to the masses by millions of ties, they were able to learn from the masses as well as to teach them, to make them understand history and events in order consciously to direct and shape their course in the direction of progress, in the direction of socialism. They combined the broad world outlook of the genuine internationalist with the most scrupulous attention to details; for, "from little things are built the big things," Stalin taught.

Above all, Lenin and Stalin, with the eye of genius, were able to discern the inherent greatness of the working class. More than any others, they were able to fathom the enormous reservoirs of creative power latent in the proletariat, and to release these dynamic forces from the shackles which had enchained them for centuries. They saw the proletariat as the *advanced class* of society, immortal and indestructible, and thus were able to imbue it with confidence in its own strength and in its ability to vanquish the class enemy. Deep and abiding faith in

the masses!—this was the bedrock upon which the invincible Bolshevik Party has been able to arouse, organize and guide the masses to victory, to the fulfilment of the historic tasks proclaimed by Lenin and Stalin.

Today, the rulers of the capitalist countries are reserving their heaviest blows for the Communists, for the people of the new type inspired by Lenin and Stalin. The bold stand of the Communist Parties—the spearhead of the people's resistance to imperialism—has infuriated the bourgeoisie. In every country it has unleashed a savage campaign of terror, provocation and intimidation against the Communists, with the intention of isolating and crushing the only working class parties which, from the very beginning, raised high the banner of struggle against the imperialist war, and which are today conducting a courageous and consistent defense of the interests of *all* sections of the toiling people.

It fears the inspiring example of the Soviet Union, whose historic achievements are arousing the revolutionary spirit of the masses everywhere, and it fears the Communists, those who comprehend the significance of the lessons of October, 1917, who are fully basing themselves on the great historical experience which gave the Bolsheviks victory, and who are preparing in each country to lead the masses in the struggle for socialism, along the path of Lenin and Stalin.

"The bourgeoisie is afraid of the Communists," declared Dimitroff,

"for Communists at the head of the working class and the working class at the head of the people represent a force powerful enough to upset all its calculations."

The bourgeoisie fears the Communist Party because it is the Party of the working class, the Party whose interests coincide with the interests of the masses. It fears the Communist Party because it is the party of struggle which, in the fight for the immediate interests of the masses, is strengthening the working class for the decisive struggle against capitalism; because it follows the Leninist tactic of securing allies for the working class. It fears the Communists because they have learned from Lenin and Stalin the art of changing defeats into victories, of converting every setback into a base for new advances, of overcoming all obstacles in order to find the path to further progress.

As the war progresses, the bourgeoisie is resorting to increasingly ferocious measures to smash the Communist vanguard. The bourgeois press is instigating a veritable inquisition of police terror, creating an atmosphere charged with hooliganism and lawlessness, descending to outright blackmail in order to frighten the workers away from the path being indicated by the Communist Party. But every blow of reaction only brings the Communists closer to the masses, strengthens their ties with the masses, and thus raises up an invincible counterforce in the face of the bourgeoisie. These indomitable class fighters are rapidly learning how to develop

new forms of struggle to meet every new situation. They are strengthening the compactness of their ranks, discarding all rotten, opportunist and cowardly elements, achieving iron discipline, and adapting themselves with the utmost flexibility to new conditions as they arise. They are able to do this because they are of the growing army of men and women of the new type, and are rapidly acquiring the necessary Bolshevik stamina and fortitude "to withstand the stress and storm which accompanies membership" in the Party of the new type.

#### *The First Outpost of the World Socialist Victory*

Surrounded by the flames of a war which is heaping ever new calamities and misfortunes upon the peoples of the capitalist countries, the Soviet Union stands heroic and invincible, clear-visioned and composed, pointing the way of final liberation from the yoke of capitalist hunger and war. Throughout the years, it has cleaved undeviatingly to the course charted by its mighty helmsmen, Lenin and Stalin.

"They are greedy, and they hate each other intensely. They will be at loggerheads yet," predicted Lenin in the dark days of 1922, speaking of the enemies which encircled the young Soviet Union. "We need be in no hurry. Ours is a sure road: we are for peace and agreement, but we are against enslavement and enslaving terms of agreement. We must keep a firm hand on the wheel and steer our own course, and not

yield to either flattery or intimidation.”

That is the wise and far-seeing policy which has led the Soviet Union from victory to victory, to positions of impregnable strength and worldwide prestige. As never before, the international significance of the victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. is leaving its impress upon the peoples and nations of the world.

By withdrawing the first vast segment from the sphere of world imperialism, the victorious proletarian revolution established the first outpost of the *world* socialist victory. It smashed the *weakest* link, but a vital link in the *chain* of the imperialist world system. By fully confirming Lenin's thesis that “the victory of socialism is possible, first in a few or even one single capitalist country,” it opened up great revolutionary perspectives before the proletarians of *all* capitalist countries. It established the proletariat as *historically* the gravedigger of capitalism—in the U.S.A. as in the U.S.S.R.

Victorious socialism is giving tremendous impetus to the revolutionary movements in the capitalist countries and to the struggles for national liberation of the oppressed masses in their colonial possessions. For in the Land of Socialism, the toiling people are able to see with their own eyes the fulfilment and confirmation of the theories of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. Socialism is no longer a dream. It no longer represents *merely* the aspirations and hopes of millions of

oppressed. It is a living reality. It is no longer a promise but a *guarantee* of deliverance from the chains of capitalist exploitation. Its achievements are enduring; for the victory of the proletarian revolution has been consolidated a thousandfold by the victories of socialist construction. Its achievements are not static but dynamic; for in *peacefully* liberating twenty-three million people and vastly extending the borders of the Soviet power, it has opened up new perspectives and tremendously strengthened the positions of the international working class. The glorious Soviet Union is immortal and unconquerable, a source of immeasurable strength and inspiration to the workers of all countries, the greatest achievement of the international proletariat.

Therefore, Stalin declared at the bier of Lenin:

“The greatness of Lenin lies, first of all, in the fact that he, by creating the Republic of Soviets, showed by deeds to the oppressed masses of the whole world that hope for emancipation is not lost, that the rule of the landlords and capitalists will not last long, that the kingdom of labor *can* be created by the efforts of the toilers themselves, that the kingdom of labor must be created on *earth* and not in heaven. By that he inflamed the hearts of the workers and peasants of the whole world with the hope of liberation.”

From the day of its inception, the imperialist powers began frantically to build a cordon around the Land of Socialism in a desperate endeavor to conceal from the improv-

erished and oppressed masses in their own countries the truth about the tempestuous advances of the new socialist society.

Fuming with rage, the bourgeoisie, its press and its whole retinue of hirelings were compelled to take note of the unprecedented growth in the political, economic and military might of the young commonwealth of nations under the guiding genius of Lenin and Stalin. They studied with fear and trembling the rising indices which charted the ever-increasing abundance and prosperity of the liberated Soviet peoples, whose factories, mines and mills hummed with productivity. They saw new cities arise on every side. Fleets of barges loaded with bursting sacks of grain plied new-dug canals. Out of the roar of the foundry, the steam locomotive and the threshing-machine rose a new choral hymn of socialist industry in which the multi-millioned voices of a free people joined. Before the frightened eyes of the bourgeoisie unfolded a flowering of culture, in which a

huge nation, stupified by centuries of imprisonment in feudal darkness, emerged into the light of socialism. The pent-up hunger of scores of millions for the printed word, for poetry, music, philosophy, the sciences, found final release from the restrictions of capitalism.

That is why the oppressed and impoverished masses of every country, smarting under the lash of imperialist war and capitalist reaction, are increasingly turning with hope and yearning towards the Soviet Union. That is why they are learning to regard its victory as their own. That is why they are acquiring confidence in their own strength, in their own ability to follow the path of Lenin and Stalin. That is why they are being imbued with the spirit of proletarian internationalism. That is why they are turning in ever greater numbers to the Communists for leadership in the decisive struggle against their own exploiters. That is why they are learning that *the path of Lenin and Stalin leads to victory.*

---

# DYNAMIC CHANGES IN THE POPULATION OF THE SOVIET UNION

BY C. G. LANDE

**M**ORE than a year and a half has passed since the last census was taken in the Soviet Union, in January, 1939. It had been twelve years earlier, in the year 1926, that a previous census had been compiled. Twelve years may not seem a very long span but these twelve years in the life of the Soviet Union cannot be measured with any rod supplied by previous history. There is no parallel for it in the history of mankind. The transformation of a backward agrarian country into a progressive industrial country and the final abolition of the exploitation of man by man are the accomplishment of these years. Both processes are closely interconnected; one is inconceivable without the other. The abolition of the exploiting classes and the extirpation of the last economic roots of capitalism, of small peasant economy, through the collectivization of agriculture and the abolition of the kulaks as a class, represented the most difficult task which the proletarian revolution in Russia had to solve. It could accomplish this task only with the aid of a powerful, new socialist industry; and indus-

try on its part could not have developed to this extent without those millions of new workers which the mechanization of agriculture had released.

The process of the revolutionary transformation of the country finds clear expression in the social and economic shifts in its population, for the Soviet people are the vehicles of the socialist transformation, the builders of socialism; it is they who begin the construction of the communist social order.

Figures are often tedious reading. Not so with Soviet census figures. They are actually startling and thrilling, just as startling and thrilling as the historical process which has been going on there for the past twenty-two years.

Since 1926, the population of the Soviet Union has increased by 23,500,000, or 15.9 per cent, yielding a total in January, 1939, of 170,500,000, while in the rest of Europe, which is still capitalist, the increase in population during the same period was only 8.7 per cent.\*

\* Almost all figures relating to the census taken in January, 1939, have become quite obsolete today because of the further rapid development of the national economy of the Soviet Union.

This is apart from the populations of the territories liberated in 1939-40 (Western Byelorussia, Western Ukraine, the new territory of the present Karelo-Finnish Soviet Republic, Bessarabia, Northern Bukovina and the new Soviet Republics of Lithuania, Latvia and Esthonia). At the time the census was taken they were not yet part of the Soviet Union.

The reason for this great difference in rate of growth of population is not only the higher birthrate in the Soviet Union but also its decreased death rate, due to the social and sanitary measures of disease prevention taken by the Soviet public health service and to the rise in the general well being of the masses.

The national income increased from 21,700,000,000 rubles in 1926 to 105,000,000,000 rubles in 1938—that is, almost five times. In the period from 1926 to January, 1939, the value of the gross per capita industrial output increased almost sixfold.

In the twelve-year period the Soviet Union was transformed from an agrarian country into an industrial country. During this interval the urban population increased from 23,300,000 to 55,900,000. In 1926 there were 709 cities and 125 urban settlements; in 1939 there were 922 cities and 1,448 urban settlements. This whirlwind growth of the urban population, particularly the increase in the number of cities, can be understood only when

contrasted with the fact that the population of the rural areas, in spite of a natural increase of 18,200,000 people during the said twelve years, actually decreased by six million. From this it may be seen that a great portion of the new city dwellers (about 24,000,000 of them) have migrated from the countryside.

One may be tempted to draw a parallel between this phenomenon and the well-known flight from the country to the city that we observe in capitalist countries. But there is nothing in common between the flight of ruined peasants and superfluous landless villagers from the wretchedness of the countryside to the city in the capitalist countries on the one hand, and the orderly migration of rural labor from the Soviet villages to the industrial areas in the Soviet Union, on the other. The mechanization of agriculture created a huge human reservoir from which industry can draw the labor power it lacks. It is not a case of the labor power released in agriculture remaining unemployed for years or even months before it can be engaged in industry. On the contrary, even before the farming machines and tractors performed their miracles of multiplied agricultural productivity, the various branches of industry were waiting to welcome the released labor power with open arms.

The districts into which machine and tractor stations have been introduced are visited by representatives of the various new industrial enterprises to enlist, with the permission of, and in agreement with,

the collective farms, as many workers as the latter can spare. Thus many sons and daughters of collective farmers freely choose a new profession in the city where they enter a course of study at the expense of the state. Some attend the higher educational institutions and, upon graduation, enter upon industrial professions in the city. In similar manner the young men in the Red Army who come from rural areas often settle in cities and other industrial centers when they finish their term of military service, which means for them an improvement in their general education and often the acquisition of some particular trade. These people are not driven into the cities by sheriffs' executions or by the fear of starvation; nor does unemployment greet them in the city as is usually the case with peasants who take refuge in urban areas in capitalist countries.

What an increase in the productivity of agricultural work was achieved by the use of tractors and combines! Just calculate what it means that in 1939, in consequence of the far-reaching mechanization of agricultural labor, 1,900,000 people did work which, without the aid of the machine and tractor stations, it would have required more than 9,000,000 people to perform. Seven million people could therefore be absorbed by industry.

Expressed in other figures, the cultivation of one hectare\* of land during the period of the predominance of individual small-peasant farming, required an average of

20.8 man-days, and the production of one centner\* of grain, 3.2 man-days. In 1937, one hectare of sowing area required on the average 10.5 man-days and one centner of grain one man-day. (It must here be remembered that the process of increasing the productivity of farm labor continues year after year.) These figures also express the process of intensification that is going on in agriculture, when the increase in the labor productivity expressed per hectare is compared with the much greater increase in the labor productivity expressed per centner.

Under capitalism such a tremendous increase in the productivity of agricultural labor is impossible. Just consider that despite the numerical decrease of the rural population by 6,000,000 people in the U.S.S.R., agricultural output in 1938 showed an increase in comparison with 1926 of 25 per cent (in value, in prices of 1926-27). Thus it is the mechanization of agriculture that supplies industry with new labor power.

The economic and political transformation in agriculture becomes quite clear when we investigate the source of farm products which supplied non-peasant consumers in 1926 and in 1939.

In 1926, 630,000,000 poods\*\* of grain were put on the market. Only 37,800,000 poods came from collective and state farms, while the kulaks still accounted for 126,000,000 poods and the mid-

\* A hectare = 2.471 acres.—Ed.

\* A centner = 100 pounds.—Ed.

\*\* A pood = 36.113 lbs.

dle and poor peasants for a total of 466,000,000 poods. In the year 1938-39, on the contrary, 2,230,000,000 poods were marketed. State farms now accounted for 245,000,000 poods, collective farms for 1,980,000,000, and the balance of 5,000,000 poods by individual farmers. Such is the numerical result of the greatest transformation in agriculture ever known to humanity.

The process of shifting a considerable portion of the population of the Soviet Union from the country to the city is characterized by one other particular feature which distinguished it radically from the migrations of the peasants in capitalist countries. The influx from the countryside adds to the population not only of the old and new industrial centers of the central republics of the Soviet Union but also to the outlying republics. Even the Far East and the Far North are prominent recipients of this influx as they take an outstanding part in the development of new industrial centers. This is by no means accidental. Just as the entire country is being industrialized while the rural districts are undergoing mechanization and are virtually completely collectivized, so the distribution of industry over the entire country—nowhere carried out in capitalist states—is an integral part of the great plan of building communist society. This conscious planning of the distribution of industry brings with it the abolition of the contrast between town and country, between central and outlying districts, and regulates the shifting of the popu-

lation according to Marxian principles.

\* \* \*

The victory of socialism in the Soviet Union finds expression in the fundamental transformation of the social structure of the country, as seen from the following figures:

In 1939 there were in the Soviet Union (in per cent of total):

Workers and officers employees in town and country .....	49.73
Collective farmers and handicraft workers organized in producers' cooperatives.....	46.90
Individual farmers and handicraft workers not organized in producers' cooperatives....	2.60
People not engaged in useful work .....	0.04
People not belonging to any definite social group.....	0.73
	100.00

Present-day Soviet society is therefore supported by the compact mass of the workers, employees and collective farmers who represent a total of 97 per cent of the population.

Not so long ago, about 1928, the structure of Soviet society was still quite different from what it is today. At that time 73 per cent of the population was still individual peasant farmers or independent handicraft workers; that is to say, the economic mode of life of 73 per cent of the population still harbored the germs of capitalist growth and of the exploitation of the labor power of others. Quite evidently the socialist system of society was far

from being as developed as it is now.

Furthermore, within the main groups of present-day Soviet society, that is, within the group of those employed in industry and the group of those employed in agriculture—radical changes have occurred in the relative importance of particular trades and in the kinds of trades practiced. While during the last decade the increase in the number of those employed in industry in general has reached unprecedented proportions, this rate of increase was particularly high in certain specific trades, particularly in heavy industry and machine building.

In this respect the following table speaks for itself:

	1926 (In Thousands)	1939	Increase (times)
Metal workers generally ..	981.	4,331.1	4.4
Of which:			
Turners .....	63.5	432.3	6.8
Cutters .....	5.0	65.2	13.
Other machine tool-makers	14.9	240.5	16.2
Electro-autogenous welders	...	109.5	...
Tool and die-makers ....	11.3	137.6	12.2
Stamp and press operators	8.9	55.2	6.2

Certain trades disappeared entirely and others which were not yet comprehended in the 1926 census made their appearance.

Thus in 1926 there were still in the mining industry 4,500 "sleighmen" who hauled away the mined coal on sleighs. They drew these sleighs themselves. Today there are no more sleigh-men. At that time there was also a group of 3,000 workers in the oil industry who poured oil with vessels. Naturally, this "trade" also has ceased to exist.

On the other hand, as the result

of the mechanization of the building industry, there are now 8,800 excavator and 15,400 other mechanical equipment operators which did not exist before. Building has become a regular large-scale industry in the Soviet Union.

In agriculture there has been formed an army comprising millions of technically and agro-technically trained workers which were non-existent in the Soviet Union before the collectivization of agriculture and have no parallel in the rural professions of any capitalist country. For they represent a category all by themselves, are unique in character, as are the socialist large-sized collective farms, and the common ownership of all means of agricultural production, as unique as is the tremendous mechanization of agriculture which has brought them forth.

The following table brings out this significance:

	(In thousands)
Managers of collective farms..	200.5
Tractor brigade leaders.....	97.6
Field-work brigade leaders....	549.6
Cattle-raising brigade leaders	103.1
Miscellaneous agricultural brigade leaders .....	89.3
Group leaders .....	466.5
Managers of village labora- tories, selection* and ver- nalization** specialists.....	16.9
Tractor drivers .....	803.1
Combine operators .....	131.2

Total .....2,457.8

In 1926 the census recorded 4,200 tractor drivers; by 1939 their num-

\* Breeders of high grade cattle and grains.

\*\* Artificial acceleration of sprouting of seed.

ber had multiplied one hundred and ninety-fold, increasing to a total of more than 800,000.

We see then that a new people is inhabiting the Soviet countryside, a people becoming more and more thoroughly acquainted with scientific agriculture and cattle breeding, a people whose youth knows the tractor as well as their fathers knew the wooden plow.

But this mechanization of agriculture and the training of this technical personnel for agriculture would have been impossible if the socialist state had not taken all necessary measures to abolish illiteracy and raise the general educational standard of the people. According to the figures of the last census, 81.2 per cent of the population over the age of nine were able to read and write, as compared with 51.1 per cent in 1926 and 24 per cent in 1897. In the provinces the number of illiterates is even today greater than in the big industrial centers (in Moscow and Leningrad, for instance, approximately 94 per cent of the people are literate); but it must not be forgotten in this connection that at the time when the proletarian revolution was victorious in Russia illiteracy was greatest in the national republics. The rate at which illiteracy was abolished in these border districts was therefore even more rapid than that of the central districts.

<i>Percentage of Literacy</i>		1926	1939
Tajik Soviet Socialist Republics .....	3.7	71.7	
Uzbek S.S.R. ....	10.6	67.8	
Turkmen S.S.R. ....	12.5	67.2	
Kirghiz S.S.R. ....	15.1	70.0	

	1926	1939
Kazakh S.S.R. ....	22.8	76.3
Dakhestan Autonomous S.S.R. ....	13.9	69.8
Kabardino - Balkarian Autonomous S.S.R. ..	23.6	74.8

Just as the abolition of illiteracy pursued the aim of raising the cultural level of the countryside to that of the city and to render 100 per cent of both sections of the population able to read and write, it is further aimed to eliminate the great disparity that existed in tsarist Russia between the average elementary education of women and men.

*Percentage of Literacy  
Among Women:*

	1926	1939
Tadjikistan .....less than	1.0	65
Uzbekistan .....	6.5	61.6
Kirghizia .....	7.4	63
Turkmenistan .....	7.7	60.6

In 1939, almost 38,000,000 people were attending school in the Soviet Union, 31,000,000 of whom were children; 5,000,000 were taking evening courses for adults or special courses of study. Thus 223 out of every thousand inhabitants of the Soviet Union were studying in 1939.

As a result of this there are already 13,200,000 people with a high school education, or 78 per thousand of the population. Of these, 11,800,000 acquired their high school training after the October Revolution, so that only a small portion of them belong to the old intelligentsia. It is a fact characteristic of the school system of the post-revolutionary period that almost half of the Soviet citizens with a high school education are women.

At the beginning of 1939, 1,080,-

000 persons, that is, 6.4 per thousand of the population of the Soviet Union, possessed a higher education (university or equivalent).

Since then the numerous universities and institutes of the Soviet Union have graduated two new

classes, adding several hundred thousand to the ranks of the Soviet professional people. The army of Soviet intellectuals has grown apace between 1926 and 1939, as is evidenced by the professions listed in the following table:

	1926	1939
	<i>(in thousands)</i>	
Engineers, architects, designers (exclusive of factory and shop managers) .....	32	305
Middle technical personnel (technicians, foremen, foresters, station masters, etc.) .....	175	836
Agronomists .....	18	90
Other agro-technical personnel (surveyors, agricultural improvement technicians, agro-technicians, zoo-technicians) .....	13	114
Scientific workers (professors, university teachers, etc.).....	14	93
Teachers .....	348	1,201
Journalists, librarians, club managers, etc. ....	59	495
Members of artistic professions .....	54	174
Physicians .....	70	155
Middle medical personnel (medical assistants, midwives, trained nurses) .....	130	607
Bookkeepers and other trained office workers.....	375	1,769

Thus the population of the U.S.S.R. is growing in number, prosperity and cultural acquirements at a rate which elsewhere is impossible

because the fundamental basis of this growth in the Soviet Union is the social transformation that has been going on there.

---

# THE BASIC PRINCIPLE OF SOCIALISM\*

BY G. KOSIACHENKO

**A**RTICLE 12 of the Stalinist Constitution declares:

“In the U.S.S.R. work is a duty and a matter of honor for every able-bodied citizen, in accordance with the principle: ‘He who does not work, neither shall he eat.’

“The principle applied in the U.S.S.R. is that of socialism: ‘From each according to his ability, to each according to his work.’”

The activities of millions of people in the Land of Socialism are based upon this principle, which is the fundamental feature characterizing the first phase of communism and is the essential beginning of socialist society.

Socialism constitutes a formation of communism at that stage of development when society has just emerged from the womb of capitalism and still carries its “birthmarks.” At this stage of development of communism private ownership of the means of production has been completely liquidated and exploiting classes completely abolished. The fundamental difference between the working class and the peasantry has also been abolished: the two friendly classes find

common ground in the socialist ownership of the means of production—state property and cooperative collective-farm property. There remain only minor (not fundamental) differences between the classes in the U.S.S.R., which will gradually disappear as we advance further towards communism. There remain as yet the differences between the city and the village and between manual and mental labor, which can be completely eradicated only in the higher phase of communist society.

There still remain vestiges of capitalism in the mental attitudes of people. Soviet citizens, by virtue of their economic position in society and by their place in production, are the carriers of socialist production relations. But the mind of a certain part of the population is still clogged with old prejudices. Such people have not as yet freed themselves of habits and inclinations which are characteristic of the old system, the system of exploitation of man by man. These are “birthmarks” of the old society which were not eradicated in the first phase of communism.

The degree of development of the productive forces of socialist society is such that it is not yet in a position

---

\* Translated from *Pravda*, August 19, 1940. 1038

fully to satisfy the needs of all of its members. Therefore, each member of society receives, not according to his needs, but in accordance with the work that he performs for society, in accordance with the quantity and quality of expended labor.

On the other hand, work has not yet been generally accepted as a natural need. Not every member of society has as yet developed a habit of working honestly and conscientiously, as well as willingly. There is, therefore, still the need for strictest state control over the measure of labor and the measure of consumption, control to assure that every able-bodied person partakes in the work and receives from society for his work only in accordance with the quantity and quality of his performance.

“. . . If we are not to fall into Utopianism, we cannot imagine that, having overthrown capitalism, people will at once learn to work for society *without any standards of right*; indeed, the abolition of capitalism *does not immediately* produce the economic prerequisites for *such* a change.” (V. I. Lenin, *State and Revolution*, Chapter 5.)

And in the capacity of the basic standard of socialist right comes forth the principle—he who does not work shall not eat; for an equal quantity of work, an equal quantity of products. Lenin says that this principle remains “in the capacity of regulator (determining factor) in the distribution of products and allotment of labor among the members of society.” (*Ibid.*)

Control over the measure of toil

and the measure of consumption extends to all branches and spheres of economic life and lies at the basis of the activities of all members of socialist society.

Explaining the essence of the basic principle of socialism and its necessity during the first phase of communism, Marx, with remarkable foresight, outlined the laws of distribution of the socially produced goods in a socialist society, laws which serve as the basis of the system of distribution in the U.S.S.R.

Out of the aggregate product, Marx, to begin with, sets aside a part which is used for the replacement of the depreciation of the means of production, and another part required for expansion of production as well as to build up a reserve. In addition to this, society creates a fund of material resources to cover expenses of management, a fund to satisfy general needs (schools, hospitals, etc.), and also a fund for those unable to work. The remainder of the products is then distributed among the workers in accordance with the quality and quantity of their work.

The magnitude of these funds and the concrete correlation between them is determined by the conditions of each given stage of development of socialist construction: by the volume of production reached, the accomplishments in the field of productivity of labor and also by the economic, political and other tasks facing the state. Thus, to fulfil the basic economic tasks of the U.S.S.R. it is necessary to increase the capital investment in the national economy, that is, to increase the fund of ac-

cumulation. The need for raising the defensive capacity of the country, in view of the aggravated international situation, demands additional material resources to strengthen the defense.

The more the productivity of labor grows and the cost of production declines, the greater are the possibilities to increase both the fund of accumulation which goes for further expansion of production and the fund for the personal consumption of the toilers.

In state enterprises, wages are the concrete form for the regulation of labor and the regulation of consumption. On collective farms accounting of labor and distribution is carried on on the basis of standard workdays.

The individual wage of each worker must correspond to the quantity and quality of his work for society, must correspond to the qualification of the worker, his individual productivity. A more qualified worker should receive more than one who is less qualified; a worker who produces a higher output than the average worker of the same category should receive higher pay; thus a Stakhanovite receives more than one who is not a Stakhanovite. Therefore, the most correct method for the determination of wages in a socialist enterprise is that based on individual performance, wages based on piece rates. Precisely, this method of determining wages assures the most consistent and full realization of the socialist principle—equal obligation of each person to work according to his abilities and equal right of each

person to remuneration according to his work.

Comrade Stalin has elaborated and further developed the theoretical declarations of Marx, Engels and Lenin about the socialist principle of remuneration, outlining and establishing concrete forms for its realization in state and cooperative collective-farm property.

The socialist principle—from each according to his abilities to each according to his work—regulates not only the distribution of individual consumption goods; it regulates also the productive activity of every member of socialist society as well as of socialist enterprises as a whole.

The performance of each state enterprise is evaluated by counterposing its expenditures, in materials, wages, etc., against the results of production, that is, by comparing the output, in quantity and quality, with its costs.

The enterprises are managed on the basis of cost-accounting, and this method assures, on the one hand, that each enterprise will exercise economic initiative and will have a material interest in fulfilling its assigned plan of production, and, on the other hand, provides a means for checking the performance of the enterprises as well as financial responsibility for the fulfilment of the quantitative and qualitative provisions of the plan.

Planned cost of production determines in monetary terms the amount of the investment of social labor and its distribution among the various branches and divisions of the national economy. The quality of the work of a given establishment—the

sum total of the activities of its collective body of workers—is expressed in the cost of production.

Thus, the socialist principle, combining the social and personal interests of the multi-millioned toiling masses, constitutes the greatest stimulus for our growth. A conscientious, socialist attitude toward work is thus strengthened by the personal interest, the individual material stimulus of each toiler.

The consistent application of the socialist principle, remuneration according to work, results in each worker's being directly interested in increasing the productivity of labor, in raising the standards of production. Under capitalism higher productivity of labor brings about more intensive exploitation of the workers and rising unemployment. Under conditions of socialism increased productivity of labor leads to the growth of the social wealth and to the systematic rise of the standard of living of the toiling masses.

The high earnings of the Stakhanovites are known to all. These earnings are the result of the high productivity of their work, of their exceeding the planned standards of production.

In socialist society, eminence and material well being, honor and respect are enjoyed by those who distinguish themselves by a highly conscientious attitude toward work.

The overwhelming mass of the toilers realizes that its material well being depends upon the flourishing of the socialist economy, upon the fulfilment and over-fulfilment of the state plans for the national economy.

Therein lies the harmony between the personal and social interests in a socialist society. That is why any act against the state and any damage done to the national economy is a blow directed at the people's interest and well being.

\* \* \*

The U.S.S.R. has made tremendous progress in the communist education of the people. With the abolition of the capitalist classes there took place in the Soviet Union a profound change in the attitude toward work on the part of the broad masses of workers and members of collective farms. This has found its highest expression in the Stakhanovite movement.

The overwhelming mass of workers have an honest approach to socialist labor. There still remains, however, a certain part of toilers which persists in an improper approach to labor on the basis of the "principle": give to the socialist state as little as possible and grab for yourself as much as possible, come what may. Although such backward toilers constitute only a small percentage, they nevertheless do no small harm to the national economy.

Floaters and truants disorganize production and bring about a high fluctuation of labor, thus interfering with the growth of the forces of qualified workers and their intensive training in the plants. Truants disturb the regular process of production and thus lower the productivity of the rest of the workers. These people abuse the greatest achievement of socialism—the guar-

anteed right to work. They disregard the honorable obligations which are the share of each member of a socialist society. Their conduct undermines the basic, leading principle of our social life: to work honestly, to guard and strengthen socialist property, to perform honestly one's social duty. Against these people is directed the decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., which prohibits the arbitrary quitting from enterprises and institutions, and which declares absence from work without justifiable reasons as a penal offense.

Lenin taught us that a socialist state is obliged to "safeguard the interests of the working class from those small handfuls, groups, strata of workers who stubbornly cling to the traditions and habits of capitalism and persist in regarding the Soviet state as of yore: give to it, as little work as possible and of inferior quality, and grab from 'it' as much money as possible." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIII, p. 213, Russian edition.)

The decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. is directed against those who violate the basic principle of socialism, against those who evade their basic obligation as citizens of the socialist state, those who attempt to live at the expense of others. A socialist society does not tolerate exploitation, loafing and parasitism. Among the backward sections of the workers and members of collective farms there are still people who want to eat without working, who do not want to work honestly.

In this category belong grafters,

loafers, truants and floaters. To this category belong also those who receive wages without earning them. The socialist society cannot tolerate in its midst spongers. It is obliged to employ all means at its command to compel all able-bodied people to work. He who does not work shall not eat!

The decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the S.S.R. safeguards the interests of the honest toilers, the interests of society and of the nation as a whole. The toilers have welcomed with great satisfaction the transition to the seven-day week [6 working days], the eight-hour day and the prohibition of arbitrary quitting on the part of workers in factories and institutions.

The strained international situation, pregnant with all kinds of surprises, made it imperative that the workday be increased. The standard of work is determined by the concrete conditions of socialist construction. Even now the Soviet Union has the shortest working day in the world. It should also be the most productive. The new law creates great possibilities for increasing the output, for increasing the productivity of labor and lowering of costs. This in turn will lead to the further growth of the economic and military might of the Land of Socialism and will contribute to the speediest realization of the basic economic task of the U.S.S.R.—to overtake and surpass the foremost capitalist countries in the level of per capita production.

\* \* \*

The entrance of the U.S.S.R. into

the stage of completing the building of a classless socialist society, and the gradual transition from socialism to communism, not only does not call for relaxing the application of the socialist principle—to each according to his work—but on the contrary makes it necessary even more persistently and consistently to root it deeper into life.

After it surpasses the leading capitalist countries economically, the Soviet Union can expect to have an abundant supply of consumption goods, to be enabled to make the transition from the first phase of communism to its second phase. Then it will become possible to realize the principle of communism: "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs."

The transition to the higher phase of communism is an extended and gradual process. In formulating the basic economic task of the U.S.S.R., Comrade Stalin indicated the concrete path which has to be traversed in the direction of the higher phase of communism. The most important prerequisite for the fulfillment of this magnificent task is the consistent enforcement of the socialist principle, strictest control of its observance, relentless struggle against those who violate this fundamental principle of our social life.

The transition to the communist principle requires, not relaxation of the socialist principle, but its inculcation and strengthening in every respect. Only through the consistent enforcement of the socialist principle and its application to the very

end can the conditions be created for the transition to the communist principle. Such is the law of development. Thus, for example, direct labor accounting and direct exchange of goods in place of the monetary accounting and Soviet trade (which are connected with the socialist principle) can come about only as a result of the strengthening of the Soviet ruble in every way, the expansion of Soviet trade in every respect and the strictest observance of financial discipline. Speaking of the agricultural commune of the future, Comrade Stalin showed that it can only come as a result of the strengthening of the artel form of collective farms and an abundance of agricultural products. No form in nature or in society disappears before all of its inherent possibilities are exhausted and the conditions created for the rise of a new, higher form. Such is the dialectics of life, the dialectics which Comrade Stalin has taught us.

To abolish prematurely the socialist principle, without having exhausted all of its inherent possibilities, would lead to the application of the principle of levelling, which conflicts with socialism, and would check our progress.

The transition to the communist principle is the ultimate result, and not the starting point, of the new phase of our development. Therefore, our task is not to relax, but to strengthen the socialist principle in every respect, to educate the entire people in the spirit of its strictest enforcement and its consistent application at every link of our economic and social life.

The decisions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the Soviet Government aimed at raising the socialist labor discipline; at strengthening the socialist public property; at eliminating the deficiencies in the organization of work and system of wages, and in the organization of and distribution in collective farms; at reducing the inflated staffs in our institutions—these are the

links of a comprehensive system of struggle for the assertion of the socialist principle in all the phases of our activity. These are not decisions of an emergency nature. They represent the further development and concrete application of the basic principle of socialism and are directed toward the strictest and most consistent realization of this principle, which is fixed in the Stalinist Constitution.

---

## BOOK REVIEWS

### THE PLIGHT OF AMERICAN FARMERS

*WHY FARMERS ARE POOR: The Agricultural Crisis in the United States.* By Anna Rochester. International Publishers, New York, \$2.25.

UNTIL recently there has been little authoritative material in English which shows how the development of capitalism in agriculture is bankrupting the average producer. Now two books have been published which throw much light on this problem. Volume XII of Lenin's *Selected Works*, entitled *Theory of the Agrarian Question* presents for the first time in English some of his writings on agriculture. Particularly noteworthy is his study of the class divisions of the American farm population which is included in this volume under the title "New Data on the Laws of the Development of Capitalism in Agriculture." Now, in addition, we have Anna Rochester's illuminating study *Why Farmers Are Poor* which presents the American farm scene in the light of the most recent available data.

Following Lenin's analysis, *Why Farmers Are Poor* shows how the

development of capitalism in agriculture parallels its development in industry. It reveals that there is the same tendency in both industry and agriculture to apply increasing capital investment in production which in agriculture takes the form of fertilizer, machinery, hired labor, etc. There is the same tendency for the control of production to center in fewer and fewer hands. There is the same tendency for the average rate of profit to fall. There is also the same impoverishment of the mass of the working people in both industry and agriculture.

The author does a great service in presenting the picture of the American farmer just as he is without the watering down of facts to which we are accustomed in government reports. She shows that American farmers are in large part virtually paupers. The very small and very poor farm families number today more than four million. These four million families, or twenty million people who live their uneventful lives on the poorer farms along the back country lanes outnumber the total population of America's five largest cities, New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit and Los Angeles. Though they amount to over 50 per cent of our farm population,

they produce only 10 per cent of our commercially marketed crops. These destitute farmers have become American peasants.

*Why Farmers Are Poor* concerns itself with analyzing the forces which have driven half our farmers down to their present condition of poverty. The book shows how farmers have always been pinched between monopoly processors who hold down prices paid to farmers and the great corporations which manufacture the farm implements and other commodities that farmers must buy. Low prices for the products they sell, and high prices for the commodities they buy is the "scissors" which keeps farmers poor.

The high degree of concentration of those processors that handle farm products is revealed in one of the author's many original tables in which she contrasts the number of processing companies handling each of five products with the number of farms producing those crops. Thus, thirteen milling companies and ten baking companies handle two-thirds of the output of 1,363,000 farms. Three meat packers handle nearly one-half the hogs and cattle from 550,000 farms. Six giant milk companies handle one-third of the milk produced by 893,000 dairy farms. Five tobacco companies handle 57 per cent of the tobacco grown by 420,000 tobacco raisers. Then even this high degree of monopoly concentration is integrated even further by the giant financial institutions whose interlocking boards extend their control to these same milling, packing, dairy and tobacco companies.

These are a few of the reasons

that farm income is far below that of the rest of the population. In 1937 the per capita income for the farm population was \$196, while the average non-farm per capita income was \$655 for that year. Twenty-five per cent of America's farm families have an income of under \$500 for the whole family. Only 3 per cent of America's non-farm families have so low an income. Slum living conditions are not confined to our cities; rural communities have their full share.

At the end of the preliminary chapters on the effects of capitalism in agriculture the author notes the marked trend towards an increase in the number of very small farms which took place between 1930 and 1935 and undoubtedly continued between 1935 and 1940. Her comment on this new development is worth quoting in full:

"Now not only do small farmers cling to the land, but fewer of their sons and daughters are able to escape to industry or some form of city employment. An expanding population of very poor farmers and their families depend upon the land, with a diminishing share in the total farm output that enters into trade. In so far as they are excluded from commercial agriculture they are victims of the capitalist process of development. Their presence on the land does not mean that very small-scale commercial production survives in agriculture as an exception to the laws of capitalist development. On the contrary, these very poor farmers are victims of capitalist development which has deprived them of livelihood on the land and has pushed them down into a semi-proletarian destitution."

*Ground Rent*

Following the author's panoramic lay-out of the scene presented by rural America, there follows an important chapter on "Rent and Land Ownership" which is one of the clearest expositions of Marx's theory of rent that exists in the English language.

It starts by pointing out that:

"... rent of one kind or another is one of the oldest forms under which some members of the human race have exploited others. It has always been a way of appropriating the product of other men's labor."

True, economic rent on capitalist farms represents that increment of total surplus value produced on the farm over the average rate of profit for other types of investments. Since farming operations require a relatively small amount of capital investment in machinery and equipment and a relatively high expenditure of labor (that is, agricultural capital is of low organic composition) the rate of profit on this farm capital was in the days of free competition much higher than in industry.

But private ownership of land sets up a barrier blocking the interplay of agricultural and industrial profit and preventing the formation of an average rate of profit which results in drawing off this surplus profit from agriculture as rent. Economic rent includes, not only absolute rent which is the charge for the use of the land, since the amount of land is limited, but also differential rent or the additional charges for pieces of land with special advan-

tages. Differential rent is charged for superior soil and advantageous location; also more rent is charged when an operator increases the productivity of a farm by applying more capital in one form or other.

To illustrate how large a portion of the value produced on an average well-equipped farm is channeled off by the capitalist process, we cite two examples:

A dairy farm with twenty milch cows might produce 40,480 quarts of milk per year if its cows equal the national average. This milk will sell in the city after transportation, pasteurizing, bottling and distribution for around \$4,452. The dairy farmer has been receiving about \$1,518 of this amount.

A half-section Kansas grain farm might raise twelve bushels of wheat per acre on three hundred acres. After transportation, milling, baking, and distribution, the three thousand six hundred bushels of wheat are sold in the form of bread for \$21,600. But the farmer has received only around \$2,880 for it.

In both instances, the enormous spread absorbed by the giant processing companies is far out of proportion to the services rendered. Sustained profits of these food monopolies contrasted with the continued farm crisis is the natural result of the capitalist process.

Farmers actually determine whether to continue farming or sell out and move to the city by comparing the returns from their farming with probable returns from city employment. In the past when city jobs were available there was continuous emigration from the farms.

But with the development of the general crisis, with the rapid increase of unemployment in the cities the attractions of moving to the city have faded. And as the escape from the farm has been thus closed, it has been possible to depress more and more the farmer's share of the value which he produces.

"The minimum to which the farmer can be pushed by deduction of rent (or its equivalent) is down to its bare subsistence."

The author concludes:

"We have returned to a situation which makes it possible . . . for the feudal landlord to take as rent all surplus value produced (and realized) by the farm family and the small amount of wage labor employed by the middle farmer."

The capitalist process has traveled the whole cycle and has driven farmers back to a condition not unlike feudal servitude. Gone is the title to their land, or at least it is so plastered with mortgages as to be capable of seizure at the whim of the mortgagor. Gone is any prospect of climbing up the ladder to independent farm ownership. Gone is the pioneer spirit of making a good living and transmitting an improved farm to one's children.

The chapter on how small farmers are crowded out of commercial production contains some of the richest material in the whole book, illustrating the plight of these twenty million people. The key to the situation is the increased productivity of our farms and the narrowing of the markets, which is a:

" . . . characteristic of capitalism in its present stage of general crisis. . . . Capitalism—both on farms and in industry—is geared for abundance in production with a smaller working population."

Actually, half the present farm population could be eliminated and our cities would experience no noticeable lessening of the food supply.

American farmers are poor, not because of being inefficient producers, not because of speculation in land, but simply because of the capitalist process. American farmers are poor because the value of their products is absorbed by the monopolized industries which dominate the food industries. The book proves that there is no solution of the farm problem other than the overhauling of our economic system.

Attention is given to the limited merits of those New Deal measures which were of benefit to some of the farmers. Large farmers benefited the most, medium-sized farmers were also helped, and the half of the farm population who do not produce much of a commercial crop scarcely received any benefits at all. But the failure of the A.A.A. to interfere with the profiteering of the monopolies meant that it could not be considered a serious attempt to grapple with the farm problem.

The solution of those reactionaries who are opposed to even the milk-and-water measures of the A.A.A. reveal that Wall Street's program for the American farmers boils down to a program of peasantry. They urge farming as a way of life rather than a business. The most

recent public espousal of this "solution" of the farm problem was made by a large Catholic gathering at St. Cloud, Minnesota. Here several of the bishops publicly urged that American farmers raise smaller crops and content themselves with a quiet "thrifty" home life where little is sold and little needs to be bought. People advocating this program admit that rural poverty is the natural lot of millions of farmers. They are admitting that under capitalism small farmers cannot hope to attain an "American standard of living."

The reactionaries' program of defeat as well as the feeble measures of the A.A.A. amount to no solution at all. The author points out that the millions of farm units must find a way to grapple with the tightly organized forces of finance capital. She emphasizes that farmers need the assistance of the ranks of organized labor who too are suffer-

ing from the same exploiters. The process now working itself out in America is the growing realization that the economic problems of farmers and city workers must be attacked as one joint problem. Realization of how the capitalist process condemns the mass of the American people to unnecessary poverty should spur these two sections of the population making up the overwhelming majority of the people into decisive action leading towards a socialist America.

*Why Farmers Are Poor* will be a big factor in spreading an understanding of the common plight of the farmer and the industrial worker. It can scarcely be imagined that anyone who seriously wishes to acquaint himself with the effect of capitalist development in agriculture will fail to study carefully this scholarly book.

JACKSON ELDRIDGE

#### A CONTRIBUTION TO THE STRUGGLE AGAINST RACISM

*RACE: SCIENCE AND POLITICS.*  
By Ruth Benedict. *Modern Age*  
Books. 274 pages. \$2.50.

**T**HE theory of "naturally" or "innately" superior and inferior races has always been advanced by ruling classes in a vain attempt to

justify their oppression of the majority of the people. Racism, like all other "theories" designed to perpetuate class rule, is today one of the chief ideological weapons of the bourgeoisie. Any scientific refutation of racism, limited as its political outlook may be, therefore objectively tends to weaken the influence of bourgeois ideology.

*Race: Science and Politics* is

among the better liberal-bourgeois refutations of the claims of the racists. The author evidences a wide and thorough knowledge of her subject matter and arrays an imposing body of evidence to prove "the travesty of sober anthropological material which racism offers." Written for popular consumption, the volume retains, however, too much of a technical and academic character to attain its objective fully.

This exposé of the absurd claims of racism merits wide circulation. Mrs. Benedict clearly shows the limited meaning of the term "race" (which she defines as a "classification based on traits which are hereditary"). She demonstrates, once again, that there is greater variety *within* each "race" than between "races." She marshals innumerable facts proving that ability, talent, understanding, level of social or intellectual development, have nothing at all to do with a person's race.

She analyzes the results of various "intelligence" tests and presents the evidence to justify the conclusion that there are no "racially" superior or inferior groups. These incontrovertible facts are of immediate value in combating the fantastic white chauvinist lies about the Negro people, victims of the most widespread expressions of racism in the United States. Quoting figures from Otto Klinberg's *Race Differences*, Mrs. Benedict points out:

"The [intelligence] testers therefore tabulated the whites of Southern states as against the Negroes of

Northern states and the results were startling—arranged by median scores Southern whites fell below Northern Negroes.

#### Whites

Mississippi .....	41.25
Kentucky .....	41.50
Arkansas .....	41.55

#### Negroes

New York .....	45.02
Illinois .....	47.25
Ohio .....	49.50

"Such a breakdown of the results showed a fundamental fallacy in the original [racist] interpretation." (p. 114.)

Further:

"The testers felt that there was reasonable doubt concerning conclusions of inherent racial differences, and they gave further tests. They tested Negro and white boys in Nashville, then in Chicago, and then in New York City. The Negro scores were farthest below the white in Nashville, somewhat below in Chicago, and equaled the white scores in New York City. They tried Los Angeles where Negroes are few in number and are educated in the same classrooms with whites, their average I.Q. was 104.7 (as over against an average I.Q. for the Southern Negro of about 75) and this was slightly above that of the white children with whom they were compared. The results of the test varied with educational opportunity." (p. 115.)

Still further:

"Even Brigham, whose interpretation of the army tests in 1921 was that they showed social superiority of the Nordic over the Alpine and Mediterranean, has reversed his conclusion. In 1930 he wrote: 'Com-

parative studies of various national and racial groups may not be made with existing tests. . . . In particular one of the most pretentious of these comparative racial studies—the writer's own—was without foundation.'” (p. 118.)

Regardless of the relative merits or demerits of intelligence tests, these facts are of practical value because even on the basis of the accumulated data of the tests they explode the claims of racial inferiority or superiority.

\* \* \*

The author does not devote any special section to an analysis of anti-Semitism. In many places, however, she discusses various manifestations of anti-Semitism. Although she devotes only limited attention to this problem she throws light on the character of anti-Semitism.

Mrs. Benedict shows clearly that anti-Semitism is a *tool* of reaction, that it has no justification, and that the Jews are not a race. Thus, she points out:

“He [Houston Stewart Chamberlain, a nineteenth century ‘father’ of racism and anti-Semitism] expounded anti-Semitism in the same manner. The *Foundations* stated all the racist pronouncements against the Jews, which in the past decade we have come to associate with the Third Reich. Chamberlain, however, did not distinguish Semites by physical traits or by genealogy; Jews, as he knew, cannot be accurately separated from the rest of the population in modern Europe by tabulated anthropomorphic measures. But they were enemies

because they had special ways of thinking and acting. ‘One can very soon become a Jew . . . it needs only to have frequent intercourse with Jews, to read Jewish newspapers, etc.’ Chamberlain is therefore the most frank of the pre-War racists. Carrying out their arguments to their necessary conclusions, he disavows race completely and boasts that it is irrelevant to the racist position.” (pp. 208-09.)

Consequently, the author correctly points out:

“The cure for anti-Semitism, therefore, logically lies, as in all minority conflicts, in the extension to all men of full citizenship rights and of full opportunity to make good in any field. There would have been no Dreyfus case if certain traitors had not felt that a framed Jew would be found guilty by the courts.”

The author does not isolate the Jewish question from the problems confronting society as a whole. She see in anti-Semitism a problem, not only for the Jews, but for all democratically-minded people. Nor does she blame the people for anti-Semitism. She indicates properly that, were the courts free—and this argument should be extended far beyond the courts to every capitalist institution—there would have been no Dreyfus case.

Regrettably, the author does not deal sufficiently with present-day anti-Semitism. The rise of anti-Semitism in capitalist countries like England and the United States is hardly touched upon, an omission likely to create the impression that Nazi-Germany alone is anti-Semitic.

Today every capitalist country in the world is witnessing a sharp increase in anti-Semitic activity,' but *Race: Science and Politics* does not take note of the significance of this phenomenon.

This volume is not merely a compilation of facts about race to dispel the fog of arguments fostered by the imperialist camp. While facts are important, the author recognizes that mere refutation of arguments is not enough. Education alone will never eliminate racism so long as society does not provide for the actual needs of the people. The author points out sharply:

"The fatal flaw in most arguments which would leave to the school the elimination of race conflict is that they propose education *instead* of social engineering. Nothing but hypocrisy can come of such a program." (p. 225.)

The author correctly insists that the expansion of social and economic opportunities is fundamental to any struggle against racism.

"Everything that is done in any nation to eliminate unemployment, to raise the standard of living, to ensure civil liberties, is a step in the elimination of race conflict. Whatever is done to fasten fear upon the people of a nation, to humiliate individuals, to abrogate civil liberties, to deny coveted opportunities, breeds increased conflict." (pp. 245-46.)

The author's insistence on the preservation of civil liberties and the extension of full citizenship rights to all as the precondition for undermining racism is of particular importance in this period when

capitalism is doing away with even the limited rights of bourgeois democracy in order to safeguard the rule of finance capital.

But precisely because Mrs. Benedict possesses such great factual knowledge and because *Race: Science and Politics* is among the better examples of bourgeois anthropology it is necessary to call attention to the limitations and inadequacies of *bourgeois* anthropology as revealed in this study. Without minimizing the author's contribution, we must note that her class outlook imposes fetters on her science. With all her great knowledge she, like the majority of the bourgeois anthropologists, even the better ones, fails to realize the full meaning and implications of the facts and historical data which she so painstakingly and faithfully compiles.

#### *Origins of Racism*

In Chapter Seven, "A Natural History of Racism," Mrs. Benedict reveals both her strength and her weaknesses. She correctly asserts:

"Racism was first formulated in conflicts between classes. It was directed by the aristocrats against the populace." (p. 174.)

Elsewhere she says:

"Gobineau's *Essay* is still the classic document of racism, and its argument is so universally read today as nationalistic propaganda that its place in history is misunderstood. Gobineau was neither pro-French nor pro-German—in spite of the volumes his followers have written claiming the one or the

other—he was pro-aristocracy.” (p. 184.)

And elsewhere:

“The Count de Gobineau wrote not as a modern nationalist, but again like Boulainvilliers, as a conservative aristocrat. He was angered and disturbed by conditions which had just led up to the Revolution of 1848. He had himself in that year been one of the founders of a *Revue* to work for the establishment of a republic led by aristocrats. . . . (p. 178.)

“He was caught up in a world in which the unwashed mob [sic.] were in despair and were demanding some means to live. It could not be denied them on the basis of Rousseau’s Social Contract or even Hobbes’s idea of the state; it could be denied them, however, on the basis of congenital inferiority, that is, on the basis of race.” (p. 179.)

Here we find a correct recognition of the fact that racism from its very inception, in the writings of Gobineau and his colleagues, was a tool of the decaying feudal aristocracy, used against the bourgeois-democratic revolution.

It was no accident that racism emerged. It had its roots deep in the class conflicts leading to and following the bourgeois revolution.

#### *The Material Base of Bourgeois Equality*

For any thorough understanding of racism it is imperative to comprehend fully the historical epoch which gave birth to the racists. That epoch is described by Engels with profound penetration, in his *Anti-Dühring*:

“Trade on a large scale, that is to say, international and, even more, world trade, requires free owners of commodities who are unrestricted in their movements and have equal rights as traders to exchange their commodities on the basis of laws that are equal for them all, at least in each separate place. The transition from handicraft to manufacture presupposes the existence of a number of free workers—free on the one hand from the fetters of the guild and on the other from the means whereby they could themselves utilize their labor power: workers who can contract with their employers for the hire of their labor power, and as parties to the contract have rights equal with his. . . . But where economic relations required freedom and equality of rights, the [feudal] political system opposed them at every step with guild restrictions and special privileges. . . . Nowhere was the path open and the chances equal for all the bourgeois competitors—and yet this was the first and ever more pressing need.

“The demand for liberation from the feudal fetters and the establishment of equality of rights by the abolition of feudal inequalities was bound soon to assume wider dimensions from the moment when the economic advance of society first placed it on the order of the day.” (Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, pp. 118-19.)

Since legal equality was the major need of the bourgeoisie, the bourgeois revolution raised the slogan of equal rights, and the ideologists of the young, progressive bourgeoisie developed the theory of the equal rights of man, embodied so clearly, for example, in the

American Declaration of Independence.

It is no wonder, then, that the feudal aristocracy, in defense of its own economic interests and in an attempt to preserve political power, advanced a theory to justify *inequality* of man under feudalism. Thus racism originated as a counter-revolutionary instrument. It was one of the answers of the decadent, medieval strata of society to the struggles of the rising bourgeoisie.

On the one hand, the feudal forces advanced racism to counteract the equalitarianism of the ideologues of the rising bourgeoisie. At the same time, these forces also preached their own peculiar brand of "anti-capitalism" to plant a wedge between the bourgeoisie and the working class. The young bourgeoisie, on the other hand, developed *nationalism* which originated as an instrument for the unification of the people around the banner of the young progressive bourgeoisie. At a later date the bourgeoisie turned nationalism to chauvinism.

But even in its young and progressive stage the bourgeoisie as a class was beset with contradictions, vacillations and weaknesses. While championing formal equality, it wanted extra-privileges for itself. While bourgeois nationalism sought to unify the people, it was a special type of unity that it sought—"unity" under the hegemony of the bourgeoisie. Mrs. Benedict's weaknesses, to a very great extent, stem from her inability to perceive the role of the bourgeoisie correctly.

Engels states the contradiction inherent in the bourgeois demand for

equality very sharply in his *Anti-Dühring*:

"From the moment when the bourgeois demand for the abolition of class *privileges* was put forward, alongside of its appeared the proletarian demand for the abolition of *classes themselves*. . . . The proletarians took the bourgeoisie at their word: equality must not be merely apparent, must not apply merely to the sphere of the state, but must also be real, must be extended to the social and economic sphere." (*Ibid.*, p. 120.)

While Mrs. Benedict recognizes the fact that racism is a class weapon, she fails to recognize fully the *character* of the classes advancing racism. She likewise fails to realize that the bourgeoisie, while itself a victim of racism in its infancy, took up the racist arguments itself, at a later date, in order to divide and weaken the rising working class. Thus, at a later date, the bourgeoisie at one and the same time preached nationalism, to unite the people under the mailed fist of capital, and racism, to divert the attention of the oppressed from their real enemy and to divide the working class.

Limited by the outlook of her class, the author fails to recognize a very significant fact for any anthropologist, particularly an American anthropologist. Even the *most* advanced documents of the bourgeoisie, in its most progressive stage, fell short of demanding genuine equality. Engels pointed this out in no uncertain terms:

"And it is significant of the

specifically bourgeois character of these human rights that the American Constitution, the first to recognize the rights of man, in the same breath confirmed the slavery of the colored races in America: class privileges were proscribed, race privileges sanctified." (*Ibid.*, p. 120.)

Traces of mechanistic materialism also blur Mrs. Benedict's vision. She sees man too much as a mere victim of social and historical forces: clay molded by conditioning. She fails to see how man, in turn, changes society and creates new social and historical conditions. It is petty-bourgeois philistinism, a component part of her class outlook, which often-times make the sober anthropologist sound like a petty-bourgeois moralist.

Thus, for example, after scientifically demonstrating that there are no *pure* races, and that the history of man is a history of racial intermixture, she concludes:

"It [intermarriage] can obviously be made a social evil, and, where it is so, sensible people will avoid contributing to it and grieve if their children make such alliances. *We must live in the world as it is.*" (Emphasis mine—J.A.)

Although critical of the specific inequalities and discrimination to which the Negro of America is subjected, she still reveals a refusal to accept the Negro fully and completely as an equal.

Her condemnation of the "slave-owner attitudes" in the South is well and good. But how can she say:

"Granted that great numbers of Negroes are not ready for full citi-

zenship, the social conditions which perpetuate their poverty and ignorance must be remedied before anyone can judge what kind of citizens they might be in other more favorable circumstances."

What kind of talk is that? *Who* is to decide whether the Negro *nation* is ready, or not ready, for full citizenship? Is that not an acceptance, subtle as it may be, of some predestined superior group which is to determine whether or not the Negro has a right to citizenship? Such questions vitiate the scientific material.

Thus, in the very fight against racism the *bourgeois* in the author compromises with the most vicious manifestations of racism.

Mrs. Benedict enters the world of political reality in her pursuit of the causes of racism and offers a program for the alleviation—at least—of racist practice.

Consequently she seeks examples of countries where racism has been minimized or abolished. She cites the example of Brazil, as a country in which the Negro is relatively well treated. But astonishingly enough, for one interested in a solution to the hideous problem of racism, the author fails to draw upon the rich and world-significant experiences of the Soviet Union which afford the anthropologist the only scientific solution to the problems of racism.

In the Soviet Union racism has for the first time in the history of man been eradicated. The Soviet Union has completely abolished all legal, juridical, economic, social and political expressions of racism. More-

over, it has taken specific steps to offset and do away with the effects of past discrimination and oppression of minorities. But, above all, the very social order, the building of socialism, has meant the removal of the very roots of racism.

Precisely because capitalism has been abolished and because the Soviet Union is advancing toward a *classless* society, the basis of racism, an instrument of class oppression, has been uprooted.

But the author of this study closes her eyes to the significant experiences of the Land of Socialism because of her own class bias. The reasons for this are indirectly explained by Mrs. Benedict herself. . . . On page 231 we read:

"Social change is inevitable, and it is always fought by those whose ties are to the old order."

Although the author recognizes that social change is inevitable, her class position still binds her to the old order, and she can couple, in her one indirect reference to the

Soviet Union, "modern nations with Ogpus and Gestapos."

The anthropologist certainly knows that the difference between the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany—or, for that matter, any capitalist country—is like the difference between day and night. It is not of mere passing interest that the prison of nations, the one-time classical land of pogroms, has been transformed into the one society in the world in which the least expression of racism is a *crime*. The serious shortcomings of *Race: Science and Politics*, as indicated, limit the usefulness of this work. Nevertheless, its scholarly refutation of racism and its rich factual data give the book an important place among the literary weapons in the struggle against racism in the United States. American imperialism's preparations for war are directly responsible for a war hysteria and intense expressions of racism in America. Ruth Benedict's volume can be utilized to combat this hysteria.

JOHN ARNOLD

## **BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS ON THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION**

- History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union . . . \$1.00**  
An authorized history prepared by a special commission established by the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., with the personal participation of Joseph Stalin.
- The Russian Revolution, by V. I. Lenin and Joseph Stalin . . . \$2.00**  
Articles, speeches, letters and documents by the two outstanding leaders of the October Revolution.
- History of the Russian Revolution**  
Edited by Stalin, Zhdanov, Gorky and others . . . \$1.25  
A detailed account of the events leading up to the armed uprising of November, 1917.
- The October Revolution, by Joseph Stalin . . . \$1.00**  
A political analysis of the first proletarian revolution.
- The Revolution of 1917, by V. I. Lenin . . . 2 vols., each \$3.00**  
From the overthrow of the Tsar to the conflict with the Provisional Government.
- The Bolsheviks in the Tsarist Duma, by A. Badayev . . . \$1.00**  
How the Bolsheviks used the reactionary Duma as a tribune for socialism.
- THE OCTOBER DAYS 1917, by I. Mintz . . . \$1.15**  
The story of the establishment of Soviet power.
- STATE AND REVOLUTION, by V. I. Lenin . . . \$1.10**  
Classic interpretation of the role of the state as an instrument of class domination.
- Civil War in the Taiga, by I. Strod . . . \$2.25**  
A stirring narrative of the revolutionary struggle in Siberia.
- Preparing for October . . . \$2.20**  
Documents and reports of the Sixth Congress of the Bolshevik Party, August, 1917.



Order from  
**WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS**  
P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York City

**Just Published!**

## **WE ARE MANY**

BY ELLA REEVE BLOOR

Mother Bloor's long-awaited autobiography abounds in reminiscences of friends, co-workers, comrades-in-arms, whose names are indelibly inscribed in the annals of modern history—Lenin, Walt Whitman, Eugene Debs, Clarence Darrow, Charles Ruthenberg, William Z. Foster, Earl Browder, Upton Sinclair, Daniel DeLeon, "Big Bill" Haywood, Charles Steinmetz, Sacco and Vanzetti, Tom Mann, Krupskaya, Edwin Markham, Clara Zetkin. She knew them all, and many others of whom she writes in her new book, **We Are Many**. To read her book is an unforgettable experience and education.

Mother Bloor's book is more than an autobiography. Woven into her rich and varied life is the story of American labor during the last five decades, its heroic struggles, its setbacks and victories, its coming of age. It is the story of its political working class movements in which she participated as an active, militant fighter in the cause of labor and socialism. It is the story of how she progressed to outstanding leadership in the Communist Party, as one of the best known and best loved figures in the American revolutionary movement. No progressive can afford to miss this book!

320 Pages. Price \$2.25

THE MARXIST BOOK-OF-THE-MONTH FOR NOVEMBER



Order from

**WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS**

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.