

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

A magazine devoted

to the theory and practice of Marxism - Leninism

EDITORIAL BOARD

EUGENE DENNIS, *Editor*; V. J. JEROME, *Associate Editor*

ALEXANDER BITTELMAN, MAX WEISS, HENRY WINSTON

VOLUME XXV, NO. 8

Contents

AUGUST, 1946

- | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-----|
| The Foreign Ministers' Conference | <i>Joseph Starobin</i> | 675 |
| American Imperialism, Leader of World Reaction | <i>William Z. Foster</i> | 686 |
| The Communists and the Fatherland Front | <i>Georgi Dimitrov</i> | 696 |
| Labor in the 1946 Primaries | <i>Rob F. Hall</i> | 704 |
| Atomic Energy—For War or Peace | <i>Joseph Clark</i> | 713 |
| The Negro People Spark the Fight for Peace | <i>John Pittman</i> | 724 |
| The American Veterans Committee Convention | <i>John Gates</i> | 734 |
| Revisionism and American History | <i>Howard Jennings</i> | 742 |
| BOOK REVIEW: | | |
| A Valuable Introduction to Early History | <i>Joshua Strauss</i> | 763 |
-

Re-entered as second class matter January 4, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by New Century Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y., to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: \$2.50 a year; \$1.25 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$3.00 a year. Single copies 25 cents.

AUTHORS AND TOPICS

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER, National Chairman of the Communist Party, is the author of *Problems of Organized Labor Today*, just published by New Century Publishers. * * * JOSEPH STAROBIN is the Foreign Editor of *The Worker* and a political analyst of note. * * * GEORGI DIMITROV, hero of the Reichstag Fire Trial, is the General Secretary of the Bulgarian Workers Party and an outstanding leader of the Fatherland Front of that country. * * * ROB FOWLER HALL, member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, saw active service in the U.S. armed forces in World War II. He is at present the Washington correspondent of the *Daily Worker*. * * * JOSEPH CLARK, also a returned veteran of the United Nations War, is Veterans Affairs Editor of *The Worker*. * * * JOHN GATES, member of the National Committee of the C.P., and a veteran of the recent war, also served as Commissar of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade which fought alongside the Spanish people against Franco and the Hitler-Mussolini intervention, in the years between 1936-39. He is now National Veterans Director of the Communist Party. * * * JOHN PITTMAN was formerly correspondent of the *Daily People's World*, West Coast newspaper. * * *

THE
MIN
CON

THE C
which
Confere
ward th
result—
importa
tionary
and Gr
most t
difficult
oration
Paris n
judged
forming

This
for the
who ho
rupture
It was
firmnes
the So
which
in the
world,

At th
rialist
compro
anxiety
peoples
mand
has been

THE FOREIGN MINISTERS' CONFERENCE

By JOSEPH STAROBIN

THE COUNCIL OF Foreign Ministers, which has just terminated its Paris Conference, made a partial step toward the peace of Europe, and the result—though partial—represents an important setback to the most reactionary circles of our own country and Great Britain. In the light of almost twelve months of increasing difficulties, and the ominous deterioration of great-power harmony, the Paris meeting as a whole must be judged as a positive advance, conforming to the interests of all peoples.

This meeting represented a defeat for the militantly imperialist forces who hoped to bring about a complete rupture of American-Soviet relations. It was made possible above all by the firmness, tenacity and flexibility of the Soviet Union's foreign policy, which again reveals its leading role in the service of the peoples of the world, in peace as in war.

At the Paris Conference, the imperialist powers were compelled to compromise because of the deep anxiety for peace among their own peoples, and the unmistakable demand for great-power unity which has been registered in a series of elec-

tions throughout Europe in recent months.

The work of the Foreign Ministers in their third session at Paris cannot be judged solely by the decisions reached on the particular points under dispute. The Council meeting was itself a phase of a definite offensive which the imperialist powers undertook against the Soviet Union and the entire conception of cooperation among the great powers. This offensive was first brought into view at the San Francisco Conference more than a year ago, when the far-reaching aim of dissolving the United Nations and achieving American domination in all phases of world politics was first revealed. This offensive can be traced through the deadlock of the London Conference last autumn. It reached a high-point with Churchill's provocative threat of war in March, and the deadlock of the Foreign Ministers' session in Paris last May.

THE IMPERIALIST OBJECTIVE

The imperialist objective was to force the Soviet Union, and the democratic forces rising to power (or consolidating their power) in Europe, to retreat.

A year ago, there were some circles in the imperialist world which were prepared to grant the U.S.S.R. a pre-eminent position in eastern Europe; this was considered "unfortunate" but inevitable. In the past half year, the conception of the Moscow and Teheran accords was fundamentally challenged, and a militant battle was

undertaken against what was called "Soviet expansionism."

The aim was not only to prevent the further advance of the democratic-revolutionary tide in Western and southern Europe, but to throw the tide back entirely and penetrate eastern Europe and the Danubian valley. They even threatened to resurrect on the very borders of the Soviet Union a new "cordon sanitaire."

So desperate was this drive that responsible circles in London and Washington encouraged or tolerated open talk of war against the Soviet Union. It made quite a spectacle to have Churchill in his Fulton speech cause such tremendous uncertainty in the minds of millions that only the sharp rebuke from Stalin, and his firm confidence in the possibility of peace could counteract the British Tory.

Every device of pressure and diplomatic blackmail was employed by the U.S. Department of State in a loose alliance with the British Foreign Office—everything from the illegal and unilateral stoppage of reparations in Germany, to the threat of calling a peace parley despite the lack of agreement among the Big Five, to the many military-political demonstrations such as the atomic bomb experiments in the Pacific.

At the same time, a tremendous propaganda was developed, with the cynical assistance of the press, to the effect that cooperation with the Soviet Union was no longer possible. The Soviet statesmen were portrayed

as utterly impatient men, intent on having their own way, "isolationist" one day, and "expansionist" the next. Senator Arthur Vandenberg, in his report to Congress on May 21, stated that the stalemate in Paris revealed "western democracy and eastern communism" were "unable to see eye to eye." And he implied strongly that this cleavage was irreconcilable.

Thus, our imperialists, who themselves did everything possible to break up the wartime coalition procedure, attempted to justify their further policy of "world leadership" by asserting that this was the only course open to American foreign policy in view of the alleged inability to reach concrete settlements with the Soviet Union.

But the Paris Conference has done a great deal to shatter this propaganda. It has shown that despite every shortcoming and obstacle, there is still a basis for effective great-power cooperation. It has therefore rebuked all those who speculated on an unbridgeable gulf between the U.S.S.R. and the imperialist powers.

While it would be sheer illusion to draw long-term conclusions from this fact and encourage any of the concepts of our past revisionist period, it would also be wrong to underestimate the success at Paris, and fail to utilize it for the further struggle on behalf of consolidating an anti-fascist peace.

On the contrary, the defeat which the most reactionary circles in our

country
lowered
ment
to share
issues
and to
tration
out of
tives h
reach.

SOVIE

A sp
period,
ference
viet U
many l
the der
world.

The
remarks
Marxis
as a w

In a
than t
mense
volved,
shown
peace
combin

face of
a tenac
ing for
they ha
and be
while a
struggle

tor of
democr
or anot
of some
nationa

country have suffered must be followed up to give the peoples' movement for peace greater confidence, to sharpen the fight on all the other issues (which are far from settled), and to hold the Truman Administration accountable for the carrying out of decisions which its representatives have now been compelled to reach.

SOVIET DIPLOMACY

A special feature of this entire period, climaxed in the Paris Conference, is the character of the Soviet Union's diplomacy, from which many basic lessons can be drawn for the democratic forces throughout the world.

The Soviet leaders have given a remarkable demonstration of the Marxist-Leninist use of diplomacy as a weapon of political struggle.

In a situation far more complex than the early 'twenties, with immense stakes of war and peace involved, the Soviet leaders have shown how concrete advances to peace can be made. They have combined exceptional firmness in the face of a universal onslaught with a tenacity and doggedness in fighting for a great power unanimity; they have shown how to maneuver and be flexible and even compromise while advancing the main aim of the struggle—the consolidation of a sector of the peace front. Even if the democratic forces in one country or another have reason to be critical of some solutions—such as the internationalization of Trieste which re-

mains fundamentally unfair to Yugoslavia—it is nevertheless true that the Soviet policy as a whole has been a bulwark to the peoples of eastern and central Europe, and in fact the entire world.

The Paris outcome has a special value to the American anti-fascist forces in the sense that it is bound to increase various tactical differences and attitudes within the imperialist camp. At this writing, the Congressional reactions to the Byrnes-Vandenberg mission have hardly been registered; there have been tentative expressions of dismay from journalists like Sumner Welles and Dorothy Thompson, and, on the other hand, cautious expressions of partial satisfaction from Anne O'Hare McCormick in the *N. Y. Times* and from Walter Lippmann. But undoubtedly, the most reactionary circles of the Republican Party—men like Styles Bridges of New Hampshire and Robert Taft of Ohio—will be critical of Byrnes, and will ask an accounting from Vandenberg.

It would be wrong to expect too much from these differences at the moment, or to draw any long-range conclusions from them. On the other hand, in a situation where the bourgeoisie as a whole has been so swiftly united in the past year around the imperialist policy of President Truman and Secretary Byrnes, every expression of rift and disagreement assumes importance.

They must be utilized by the progressive sections of the Democratic Party in Congress and by the devel-

oping camp of the win-the-peace forces. This is the opportunity which the Paris Conference results give us, and also the responsibility which they impose.

The problems and the work of the Big Four meeting can be summarized around the following main headings:

1. The fight for great-power agreement and leadership based on equality of the Soviet position;
2. The fight for the national independence of the former Axis satellites within the framework of treaties which acknowledge their war responsibility;
3. The colonial settlement for Italy and its relation to the entire colonial issue and the Mediterranean balance of power;
4. The preliminary approach to the German settlement.

THE PRINCIPLE OF BIG THREE COLLABORATION

One of the biggest problems, underlying all international difficulties of the past year, has been the American and British drive to abandon the intimate great-power collaboration of the wartime period. The great achievements of Moscow, Teheran and Yalta have been labeled as "appeasement of the Soviet Union." The myth has been created that the late President Roosevelt failed to defend the interests of the United States at those conferences, so that now the path must be reversed. Even the Potsdam accord of July, 1945—which President Tru-

man negotiated and signed—has been lightly labeled as a "deplorable concession" to the Soviet Union.

Thus, in the sessions of the foreign ministers, there has been a steady drive to minimize the value of agreed-decisions by the Big Four, and to create the impression that peace would come sooner if only the Big Four were as disunited as possible. One aspect of this drive upon great-power agreement was the tendency of Britain and the United States to take one side of every issue. As Molotov charged in his May 27 address, Byrnes and Bevin, on the problem of Italian reparations, "usually acted on previous agreement."

The most arrogant attempt to scotch the fundamental principle of prior great-power agreement came in the repeated proposal of Secretary Byrnes that a peace conference should be called among all of the 21 nations who participated in the war, *irrespective of whether the foreign ministers agreed or not.*

The American Secretary's behavior in this proposal is really an illuminating example of how low American political morality has sunk in this period.

On December 5, 1945—half a year ago—Byrnes himself told a press conference that the idea of the United Nations as a whole writing the peace was impractical. He said it was the job of the great powers to write the peace treaties and the job of the United Nations to keep the peace once the treaties were written. Moreover, he maintained that

under
U.N.
actual

Yet
of the
Coun
mind
"peac
a gen
who
phase
write
whet
Failin
matic
gener
14 of

The
nothi
lomat
It wa
nique
persis
end o
that i
in th
ment,

no de
and t
the sp

Wh
gettin
tions
get a
again
Big F
natio
thirds
ley; I
confo
agree
who

under the terms of the Charter, the U.N. had no right to formulate the actual texts of the treaties.

Yet, by May 20—after the deadlock of the April 25-May 16 session of the Council, Byrnes had changed his mind. He came forward with his "peace offensive," and proposed that a general parley of the 21 nations who had fought in the European phase of the war, should actually write the treaties, irrespective of whether the great powers agreed. Failing this, Byrnes announced dogmatically, the U.S. would propose a general peace parley under Article 14 of the Charter.

This entire project was, of course, nothing more than a means of diplomatic pressure on the Soviet Union. It was, as Molotov called it, the technique of "intimidation." But Byrnes persisted in this effort to the very end of the conference, since he knew that if a 21-nation parley were called in the absence of Big Four agreement, the imperialist powers could no doubt corral a numerical majority and thus put the Soviet Union "on the spot."

While Molotov did not succeed in getting a pre-arranged set of instructions for the peace parley, he did get a commitment from his partners against any arbitrary revision of the Big Four agreements by the smaller nations. Molotov secured the two-thirds rule at the forthcoming parley; he also insisted upon and got conformity to the original Potsdam agreement that only those powers who were actually at war with an

Axis satellite could vote on the treaties for that country. Finally, Molotov secured the organization of the parley in committees, in such a way that the chances of a drive to revise the Paris decisions have been minimized.

All of this represents a triumph for the principle that the great powers must agree, and constantly seek agreement—a basic proposition in the entire period ahead of us, if any kind of harmony between the Soviet Union and the United States is to be maintained. This is an important achievement of the Paris parley. But it should not erase from our memory the many efforts which the American negotiators made to scotch the entire principle. These efforts will be made again.

The great mass of detailed agreements on various political, territorial and economic aspects of the peace treaties cannot easily be summarized here. But they can be judged on the basis of whether they will help strengthen the independence of each of the countries involved, or rectify the strategic and political wrongs of the Versailles period.

Surely, the cession of strategic passes in the Italian Alps to France, or the return of the Dodecanese Islands to Greece, falls in the category of territorial changes that strengthen these countries and right old wrongs.

The same can be said for many aspects of the treaties for the Balkan countries and for Italy. For example, a problem arose over whether there

should be an Allied Control Commission of any kind for Italy after the peace treaty. The U.S.S.R. opposed this idea on the grounds that if Italy were to be really independent, there was no basis for any type of foreign control. Equally, on the question of the Danubian waterways, the U.S.S.R. was successful in its insistence that the Danube should be regulated by the countries through which it flows—which would include Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia as well as the former satellites, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary. The Soviet Union brought to the surface very clearly what damage could be done to the actual sovereignty of small nations by the American imperialist pretensions about "free trade" and "free access" to other countries in the name of reviving international commerce. A good deal of the bargaining over the economic terms of the treaties involved questions of interest only to a handful of big British and American oil and mining companies—some of them with former "rights" in these lands—and all of them seeking new "rights." Molotov strove to protect the smaller countries from the imposition of special privileges for these monopolists—and was in the main successful.

ITALIAN REPARATIONS

One of the best examples of how this issue of independence for each country shaped up can be seen in the case of Italian reparations. On the face of it, the Soviet proposal for

\$100,000,000 worth of reparations from Italy was very reasonable, in view of the heavy losses suffered by the Soviet Ukraine as a result of the Italian fascist invasion. As Molotov never tired of pointing out, Italy had virtually paid for the cost of the British and American occupation—in raw materials, special rates of the lira, etc., and it was not therefore unreasonable for her to pay Yugoslavia, Greece and the Soviet Union—apart from the division of war spoils, such as the Italian Navy. At one point, it will be remembered, Byrnes attempted to deduct the value of this war booty from the reparations figure, although no such procedure had been followed in the case of Germany.

Of course, Byrnes objected to the Soviet proposal on Italian reparations. He claimed that the United States was in the process of lending Italy large amounts of money and was preparing to assist in the revival of her economy; he said that no American reparations would be requested; he argued that reparations to the U.S.S.R. from Italy would therefore be an indirect form of loan.

This was a curious argument. Byrnes behaved as though Italy were some principality or colony of the United States, and as though her foreign trade and the payment of her debts must somehow be regulated by the United States. But the climax was capped in the last phase of the Foreign Ministers' meeting when it turned out that the United States was actually asking at least \$100,000,

000 from Italy to satisfy private property claims against her due to alleged losses in the war. France and Britain were asking similar sums.

In other words, while the U.S.S.R. proposed reparations from Italy and pointed out that this would help to revive important sections of Italian national industry, giving it an alternative to the Anglo-American market—the United States made much of the fact that it was asking nothing from Italy. Yet when the bargaining got under way, the American figure for private property damage—in effect the damage of the war to American corporations in Italy—was as large as the Soviet request for reparations!

In the final agreement on this point, the Soviet Union was able to swing the \$100,000,000 figure for Italian reparations. It did so by the interesting compromise of offering to supply Italian industry with raw materials, instead of having Italy import those materials from elsewhere. The net result of such an agreement is to give Italian workingmen the prospect of fruitful work on large-scale orders, and to give Italian industry a perspective of revival. At the same time, Soviet economy should be materially strengthened.

THE TRIESTE QUESTION

The settlement for Trieste and the Julian March is the least satisfactory of the compromises reached in Paris; but it can be included under the general heading of a rectification of old wrongs and the

strengthening of the national sovereignty of the countries involved.

The most that can be said for the Trieste agreement is that it removes the issue as an immediate sore-point of relations between the U.S.S.R. and the western powers; the ultimate question is postponed for ten years.

The technique of internationalization has only this value: that while the Anglo-American position in this strategic corner of Europe is retained, the Soviet Union now enters to share in control of it. Until now, the Anglo-American armed forces alone were in control.

The cession of most of the Julian March to Yugoslavia is a rebuff to Italian imperialistic circles, who, through Orlando and others, would have liked to restore Italian domination over the Slovene and Croatian peoples. The fate of Trieste itself is less satisfactory from any viewpoint, since the city logically and historically had more to gain by becoming a bi-national republic within Yugoslavia than becoming a bi-national republic under the U.N. Security Council.

Nevertheless, it can be said that the Anglo-American imperialist position has to a certain degree been neutralized. Italian imperialist aims have been rebuffed, and Yugoslavia's strengthening as a multi-national republic has been achieved.

COLONIAL AND MEDITERRANEAN ISSUES

With respect to the colonial problem and the general strategic situa-

tion in the Mediterranean, the Paris Conference made the least progress. It decided in fact to postpone consideration of the whole issue for an entire year.

This means that the British military control of Cyrenaica and Tripolitania continues and the British plans to build a Greater East Africa out of Italian Somaliland and a slice of Ethiopia also continues. The present British monopoly of the Mediterranean and Red Sea waterways has therefore been maintained—without regard to the interests, either of Italy, of the Soviet Union, or in fact of any other power.

The Soviet Union had originally proposed—last September—to become the trustee for the Tripolitanian part of the former Italian colonies. Molotov had at that time also suggested the possibility of a Soviet base at the Red Sea in Eritrea. In itself, this proposal was reasonable; if the great powers were to treat each other as equals, and take each other's security-needs into consideration, there was no particular reason why the Italian Empire should go to Britain. If a trusteeship were to be established, as a prelude to full independence, the Soviet Union, as the only non-imperialist big power, could, better than Britain or any other country, fulfill its responsibilities satisfactorily, as its entire record with respect to the freedom struggle of the colonial peoples attests.

This proposal was actually a test of the intentions of the other pow-

ers. A raucous howl arose from London, with Foreign Secretary Bevin complaining that the Soviet Union was trying to stretch a wand across the throat of the empire, as though the entire Mediterranean—built from the patrimony of other peoples—was a special preserve of Britain.

At that time, the United States was not particularly happy about this strengthening of Britain in the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, and in the western Indian ocean. The United States proposed that Italy herself remain the trustee of her former colonies under U.N. control. There were some proposals, notably from Walter Lippmann, that the United States become a colonial power by striking some bargain with the British; only in this way, argued Lippmann, could the United States make its maximum contribution in preventing Soviet influence from growing in the Near East at Britain's expense.

At the April-May session, Molotov abandoned his demand for equality of position in the Italian colonies and subscribed to the original American idea of an Italian trusteeship with a fixed date for the independence. And here the over-riding character of the Anglo-American bloc showed itself. For, instead of fighting for his own proposal against Britain's, Secretary Byrnes quietly abdicated and agreed not to press the British on the matter.

The British argued demagogically that they had promised the Senussi tribes complete independence—and therefore no trusteeship was possible,

espec
one
Britis
selves
The
nothi
trenc
And
terly
"stub
ly pa
of G
Italia
poner
princ
the
gaine
rema
mula
offer

THE

Th
notab
busin
porta
ness.
entire
ment
the v
aspec
ure to
this
other
man
tria,
been
its pr
talkin
matte
Th
consi

especially under Italy. And if anyone were to get a trusteeship, the British argued, it should be themselves.

The United States did little or nothing to fight this transparent entrenchment of British imperialism. And the same newspapers which bitterly slandered the U.S.S.R. for its "stubbornness" on other issues quietly passed over the stubborn refusal of Great Britain to back out of the Italian Empire. The result is a postponement of the entire trusteeship principle for at least a year. And the British Empire has actually gained in size and power. It only remains to be seen what tricky formula for independence the British offer to the Senussi.

THE PROBLEM OF GERMANY

The Paris Conference has been notable for one piece of unfinished business, which is perhaps more important than all the finished business. That is the opening of the entire German question. A settlement for Germany obviously touches the very heart of the entire European aspect of U.S.-Soviet relations: failure to get a reasonable settlement on this question would imperil all others. And bound up with the German question is the treaty for Austria, which the United States has been pressing out of all proportion to its priority and obviously using as a talking point in relation to other matters.

The German question will take considerable time in preliminary bar-

gaining and debate; strictly speaking, it is not part of the Paris Conference but of the next meetings of the Foreign Ministers, which will probably come after the general peace parley ratifies the work already accomplished. But at least a few things have become clear, as a result of the basic statement of policy on Germany made by Molotov as the conference ended.

The Soviet Union has now taken a stand on the future of a democratic Germany, which flows logically from the Potsdam agreement and from its own behavior in the eastern zone of occupation.

Territorially, the U.S.S.R. envisages no further substantial reductions of German soil. It is silent on the French proposal to absorb the Saar basin, and it opposes the actual physical annexation of the Ruhr-Rhineland region, as the French insist they would like to see.

The U.S.S.R. favors a special four-power administration of the Ruhr (within a united Germany) whose main job would be to make sure the Ruhr is being de-nazified and its production used only for peaceful purposes.

The U.S.S.R. opposes any plan for federalization of the Reich—unless accepted by a plebiscite of the German people itself. The federalization scheme, after all, is a way of legalizing the separation of Germany into zones and spheres of influence—which the U.S.S.R. opposes as much as the United States pretends to.

The basic feature of the Soviet approach is that Germany as a whole shall be completely de-nazified and de-militarized, with her economy geared to as high a productive potential as possible, but with this production used to help rehabilitate the war-ravaged lands of Europe. This de-nazification will be accomplished best if reliable anti-Nazi Germans are encouraged to carry it out. For in the last analysis the democratization of Germany can be accomplished only by Germans themselves. Thus, the U.S.S.R. emphasizes the earliest formation of a central German government, a government which would have to be based—to be reliable—on the unity of the German working class and the cooperation of all other anti-fascist elements with the representatives of the German working class. Such a Germany could expand her present production, resume an export-import trade, and, above all, pay reparations on a large scale. Only after such a Germany is functioning, Molotov suggested, should the peace treaty be written.

In disclosing this broad view of the Germany which the U.S.S.R. would like to see (and is already helping to create in its own zone), Molotov also made a sharp criticism of the imperialist powers for their behavior in their own zones. He assailed the American and British refusal to grant further reparations from dismantled industry or production in their own zones, a unilateral violation of the Potsdam agreement. He again raised search-

ing questions about the de-nazification process in the western zones, and asked again whether the German army has in fact been demobilized in the British zone.

To bring about real advances on these points, Molotov maintained that the American proposal of a 25-year disarmament treaty was clearly "inadequate," since the treaty does not even touch on the basic problems at issue. But Molotov did not rule out the possibility of a treaty among the great powers—provided the basic questions of what kind of Germany there should be has been agreed on.

The scope and depth of the Soviet proposals has clearly caught the imperialist powers by surprise. On the face of it, the U.S.S.R. is presenting ideas which are not too far from the generally accepted American ideas. The U.S.S.R. favors—as the American diplomats have professed—a unified Germany, a productive Germany, a Germany whose people are given a perspective of democratic revival.

The U.S.S.R. is critical of the British monopoly in the Ruhr—as American diplomats have been. And the Soviet Union opposes the actual separation of the Rhine Valley region—as the United States has.

But instead of welcoming the Soviet proposal as a basis for direct American-Soviet understanding on the question, Secretary Byrnes has preferred to make a great noise over the reparations figure of \$10,000,000,000 and has once again tried to in-

timid
tion
Amer
quest
Brita
tual
of G
unite
Unio
ing o
the A
occup
It v
on h
power
ing s
selves
with
Sor
Angl
Angl
invol
ern C
But
shoul
Amer
the d
anti-S
unch
impe
nation
Sovie

timidate the U.S.S.R. by the cessation of reparations. More than that, American policy is resuming the quest for some understanding with Britain and France—that is, *an actual economic and political partition of Germany in order to present a united front against the Soviet Union*. That is the practical meaning of the Byrnes' offer to merge the American and British zones of occupation.

It would be premature to speculate on how successful the imperialist powers, plus France, will be in reaching some agreement among themselves, prior to further bargaining with the U.S.S.R.

Some of the knottiest problems of Anglo-French antagonisms and Anglo-American antagonisms are involved when it comes to the western German area.

But, certainly, the Soviet proposal should open up the possibility of an American-Soviet agreement, unless the desire to partition the Reich for anti-Soviet objectives is the fixed and unchangeable policy of American imperialism. From the viewpoint of national interest, a direct American-Soviet understanding is much more

logical than the complicated by-way of an attempted agreement with Britain, which would simply be a western bloc under the American imperialist lead. The danger of such a course is the splitting of Germany into two camps, which would encourage the forces of German imperialism in the western zones.

This, then, comprises the work of the latest meeting of the Foreign Ministers. The shortcomings are fully clear. The dangers, especially on the German issue, are equally clear, and will require utmost vigilance from America's progressive forces. The characteristic tendency of the imperialist powers to whittle down their own agreements is certain to manifest itself.

Nevertheless, a definite advance has been made which can greatly assist the struggle for a prolonged peace. The edge has been taken off one phase of the postwar imperialist offensive, and if the democratic forces of our people, with labor in the lead, know how to follow up this gain, the basis is laid for a further and more energetic battle to curb the most reactionary elements of American imperialism.

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM, LEADER OF WORLD REACTION

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

WORLD WAR I, from 1914 to 1918, was a struggle between two groups of imperialist powers for control of the world. After four years of the most terrible slaughter humanity had ever before experienced, a sigh of relief went up all over the world. Never again, hundreds of millions were convinced, would mankind be guilty of a similar suicidal folly. Surely an end would be put to imperialism and war. The League of Nations, formed shortly afterward, was hailed as the organization that would maintain world peace. But hardly were the guns of World War I silenced than capitalist forces and trends began to operate which, only 21 years later, were to produce an even more terrible and devastating human butchery.

Now that World War II has barely concluded—indeed the peace treaties are not yet written and the United States has not even officially declared that the war is at an end—the world is once more alarmed by rumors of war. War-mongering is in full cry again. Particularly in the United States, millions of peo-

ple have already decided that a World War III is a certainty, and many are conditioning themselves into accepting the death of at least one-third of our total population in the atomic war that they see as inevitable in the near future.

The world situation is indeed threatening. Reactionary forces are at work, making for economic chaos, fascism, rampant imperialism and war, similar to those that operated in the interim between the two great wars and which finally culminated in the catastrophe of World War II. We should not be astonished at the similarity of these developments, however. Lenin has taught us that we are living in the period of the decay of imperialist capitalism, in the era of wars and revolutions. Naturally, therefore, capitalism throughout its decline displays certain well-marked signs of increasing reaction and crisis.

But we must not make mechanical analogies between the period following World War I and the present one opening up after World War II, for that would lead to a fatalistic acceptance of a World War III. There are profound differences between the two periods. It does not follow that this postwar period, like the last one, must also end in fascism and war. We must view the whole picture dialectically, measuring the shifting relations between the forces of reaction and progress. If we do this, we shall see that the situation following World War II can have a totally different outcome from that

which developed after World War I. Before analyzing the present post-war situation, let us briefly review the period that followed World War I.

THE REACTIONARY OFFENSIVE AFTER WORLD WAR I

World War I was itself the manifestation of the ushering in of the general crisis of world capitalism. One of its most significant consequences was a broad revolutionary upheaval in Europe by the outraged working class. This produced the Russian revolution, as well as big revolutionary movements in Germany, Hungary and other countries. Had it not been for the betrayal of the revolution in Germany by the opportunist Social-Democrats, all Europe would undoubtedly have gone Socialist, the capitalist system would have received a stab in its heart, and there never would have been a World War II.

Desperately alarmed by this profound revolutionary upheaval after World War I, the capitalists of the world, in line with their reactionary trend, mobilized their strength for a general offensive against the forces of Socialism and democracy everywhere. The employers, with the help of Social-Democracy, centered their attack upon the Soviet Union, but they also assaulted every other phase of the peoples' political advance. The general result of this employers' offensive was not only to confine Socialism to the U.S.S.R., but to weak-

en the forces of democracy on a world scale. Even in the United States, which was far removed from the political storm center, the employers' attack was so heavy that the trade union movement lost half its numerical strength in a series of desperately fought, unsuccessful post-war strikes.

The capitalist counter-revolutionary offensive after World War I did not halt however upon checking the spread of Socialism and democracy; it rolled on, with varying intensities and tempos, to new objectives. With the rise of fascism in Italy, followed eventually by its development in Germany and a number of other countries of Eastern and Central Europe, the employers' offensive everywhere took on a new quality. It began to aim at the complete destruction of democracy and the establishment of a tyrannical capitalist control such as the world had never before known. This fascist trend was enormously stimulated by the great world economic crisis of the early 1930's, beginning with the unprecedented October, 1929, crash in the United States.

Fascism was not confined simply to those countries that adopted outright fascist regimes. Capitalism all over the world was saturated with it, its mainspring being in the ranks of finance capital—among the big bankers, industrialists and landlords. These decisive capitalist forces—in Great Britain and France, and also to a large extent in the United States

—began definitely to cultivate ("appease") the fascist regimes in Germany, Italy and elsewhere, as the tragic stories of China, Ethiopia, Spain and Czechoslovakia made quite clear. Undoubtedly the big capitalists of the world were quite generally looking to fascism as their saviour, as the means by which they could destroy the hated and feared Soviet Union and put an end, once and for all, to trade unionism, democratic government, civil liberties, and the Socialist aspirations of the working class. For the most part they had come virtually to accept the perspective of a fascist world.

But, in the midst of this general, big capitalist drive towards fascism, another factor was at work that was destined to wreck the "fascist-world" ambitions of the capitalists of all the big countries. This was the imperialist rivalries among the capitalist great powers themselves.

In the early post-World War I days, the world situation was dominated by the imperialist victors in the war—Great Britain, France, the United States and, to a lesser extent, Japan. These powers, particularly the first two, ran the League of Nations as an instrument to further their respective imperialist ambitions. They especially infused it with an anti-Soviet spirit. With the growth of fascism in Germany, Italy, Japan and their satellites, however, and particularly in view of the appeasement policy followed by the reactionaries in Great Britain, France

and the United States, the militant leadership of the post-World War I capitalist offensive passed more and more into the hands of the fascist countries, which eventually formed themselves into the so-called Anti-Comintern Axis and quit the League of Nations.

The big capitalists in Great Britain, France and the United States also undoubtedly contemplated the establishment of a fascist world, one in which they would continue to play the dominant role. But evidently it did not suit the powerful German capitalists and their man Hitler to fulfill the role of smashing the U.S.S.R. (if they could) and then turn the fruits of victory over to the capitalists of London, Paris and New York. They had different plans. They and their Japanese allies wanted to run the world to suit themselves and to relegate the capitalists of the Western democracies to a secondary position.

It was this quarrel between the capitalist great powers as to which should dominate the contemplated fascist world that prevented the hoped-for, all-out capitalist attack, led by the Axis powers, against the U.S.S.R. And it was the realization by the peoples of the world that a victory by the fascist Axis powers would subject them to an unheard-of slavery, that made them fight so desperately for national freedom and a democratic life.

The reactionary capitalist offensive after World War I had, with its

complex of economic chaos, fascism and imperialism, finally reached its climax in 1939, in World War II—although it was a very different type of war from that for which the capitalists had planned.

THE PRESENT POSTWAR CAPITALIST OFFENSIVE

World War II, like World War I, constituted a deep intensification and climax of the general crisis of world capitalism. Not surprisingly, therefore, the capitalist system is now producing a reactionary offensive directed against everything progressive and democratic in the world. Moreover, this offensive, a master sign of capitalist decay, is manifesting itself much as it did in the interval between the two great wars, by an intensification of imperialism, by a gathering economic chaos, by a development of fascism, and by the growth of a militant war spirit. The differences, however, are that these reactionary manifestations are more pronounced after this war than they were immediately following World War I, and that they are taking place in a very changed world setting. Among the major phases of the present reactionary capitalist offensive are the following:

(a) *The drive of imperialism:* During the recent war the soothsayers of capitalism, among them Earl Browder, were busy telling us that imperialist capitalism had come to an end and that at the close of the war the world would enter into a

new period of spontaneous friendly collaboration among the nations, great and small, capitalist and Socialist. The naive supposition of such people was that the finance capitalists, particularly the Americans, had finally learned the folly of war and, in the main, had concluded that the only way they could preserve their social system, not to mention garnering profits from it, was to maintain world peace and democratic relations among all the peoples of the world.

Postwar experience, however, has already shown the futility of this utopian conception of capitalism. Imperialism, far from being dead, is manifesting itself with a new virulence. This time it is the United States that is playing the decisive imperialist role. It has embarked upon a vigorous expansionist program designed to bring the whole world under its sway. With its tremendous navy, air force and army; with its control of the atomic bomb; with its vast industrial system and great financial reserves, and also in view of the war-shattered state of affairs of other great powers, the United States Government, driven on by the big monopolists who control it, is pursuing an unprecedented imperialist course.

The heart of American imperialist policy is the gigantic finance-capital set-up, whose major political instruments are the G.O.P.-controlled Republican Party and the poll-tax and Northern ultra-reactionary bloc in

the Democratic Party. Since the ending of the war, the Truman Administration has more and more identified itself with the Hoover-Vandenberg camp, and shaped its policies, foreign and domestic, along militant imperialist lines.

The major objectives of American imperialism are to reduce the British Empire to a subordinate position; to cow or smash the U.S.S.R.; to subjugate China to the status of a satellite country; to reduce Latin America to a semi-colonial system of the United States; to take charge of the internal economies of Germany, Japan and various other countries; to dominate the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans with its big navy and air force—in short, to establish American imperialist hegemony over the other peoples and areas of the world. This drive of American imperialism, which is developing at a much faster tempo than British, French, German and Japanese imperialisms did after World War I, is the center and rallying force of the present world offensive of reactionary capital.

(b) *Sowing the seeds of economic crisis*: One of the major aspects of the reactionary offensive after World War I, which culminated in fascism and World War II, was the devastating economic crisis of the 1930's. This crisis wrought havoc with the living standards of the toiling masses all over the capitalist world, and weakened capitalism everywhere. Now, especially in the United States, economic policies are being applied

which threaten to produce an economic breakdown that will arrive more quickly and have far more disastrous consequences than did the one that followed the First World War. The reactionaries who dominate the United States, with a "boom and bust" outlook, are heading this country into inflation. They have rejected all legislation calculated to keep American industry in effective operation after the war boom has passed. Their foreign loan policy is also cut from a similar reactionary pattern. The loans or projected loans to Great Britain, France, China, Poland, the U.S.S.R., etc., are all based on political rather than economic considerations, and, with the domestic economic factors, they are tending to provoke an eventual collapse in this country, a cyclical crisis of unparalleled magnitude. American big capital's present domestic and foreign economic policies are leading straight to an economic crash within a few years, one that will not only ruin American mass living standards but will also shake the economic foundations of the capitalist world. But the capitalists, seeing the reactionary use Hitler made of German mass unemployment, believe they can also turn the coming crisis to reactionary ends.

(c) *Cultivating a regrowth of fascism*: In the current offensive of reactionary capitalism, spearheaded by American imperialism, strong tendencies for a renaissance of fascism are in evidence. In the United States

there
binati
ern p
is rea
and t
fascis
and
field
can i
hard-
State
tectin
tiona
busin
other
main
in La
the p
peopl
it is
the d
Vatic
fascis
to th
ally f
This
sents
(d)
Alth
World
viet
lowin
of th
in W
unde
in G
great
the v
til th
the v
This

there is the ultra-reactionary combination of Republicans and Southern poll-tax Democrats; the K.K.K. is rearing its ugly head once more, and there is a wide outcropping of fascist-like, anti-Negro, anti-Semitic, and anti-labor tendencies. In the field of foreign policy also, American imperialism is providing aid to hard-pressed reactionary forces. Our State Department is definitely protecting Franco Spain and ultra-reactionary Turkey; it is shielding fascist businessmen in Germany, Japan and other former fascist states; it is the mainstay of fascist-minded reaction in Latin America and China and of the pro-fascist opposition in the new peoples' democracies in the Balkans; it is collaborating everywhere with the dangerous clerical fascism of the Vatican. In fact, reactionaries and fascists all over the world are looking to the United States and its British ally for aid, and they are getting it. This cultivation of fascism represents a major world danger.

(d) *Preparing for Another War:* Although the Allied powers after World War I attacked the new Soviet Republic militarily, shortly following its birth, the real war drive of the imperialists which culminated in World War II did not get well under way until Hitler seized power in Germany in 1933. Thus, after the great shock of World War I, it took the war-mongers almost 15 years until they had the world definitely on the way to another world slaughter. This time, however, World War II is

hardly over when the world reactionaries, led by American monopoly capital, are already beating the drums for a new war. Indeed, even while the anti-Hitler war was still going on, strategic plans were being laid by these reactionaries for another conflict.

The new world war threat, which is menacing all peoples, is aimed directly at the U.S.S.R. The anti-Soviet orientation of the imperialists after World War I, which wrecked the old League of Nations, which built up Hitler-Germany, and which led to World War II, is in evidence again, but now more virulently than ever. The great monopolists who control the United States see in the U.S.S.R. the major obstacle in the way of their grandiose imperialist plans of world rule and they are determined to overcome or destroy it. Only in the sense of war preparations against the U.S.S.R. can one understand the present huge imperialist peace-time military program of the United States, the violent anti-Soviet campaign now raging in the American press and on the radio, and the State Department's officially stated policy of getting tough with Russia. The danger of war is rendered all the more acute because of the need of haste that the reactionaries feel to make use of the atomic bomb before the Soviet Union can devise for itself this lethal weapon.

The basic reason for this militant war drive against the U.S.S.R. by

the American imperialists is that these reactionaries understand quite well that the Soviet Union forms the backbone of world democracy. They realize that a blow against the Soviet Government is at the same time a blow against the world labor movement, against the new democracies now springing up in Europe, against the far-reaching national liberation movements in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, and against the rising demand for Socialism throughout the capitalist world. They know too that a military defeat of the U.S.S.R. would open the way to a fascist world, with American imperialism in the saddle. In the war-mongering against the U.S.S.R., the postwar reactionary capitalist offensive takes on its most acute and dangerous aspects.

OBSTACLES IN THE PATH OF THE IMPERIALIST REACTIONARIES

World reaction, led by the American monopolists, has already, even in this early stage of the postwar period, created a highly dangerous international situation by its reckless economic policies, its cultivation of fascism, its rampant imperialism, and its pro-war orientation. In these respects the tempo of the offensive of world reaction is now swifter than after World War I. At the same time, however, this offensive faces resistance and obstacles far more formidable than those which confronted the reactionary forces following World

War I. The counter forces may well defeat all the scheming and plotting of reaction.

First, there is the weakened economic condition of the capitalist system itself. This is much more marked than in the period after World War I. The industries of nearly all of the important capitalist countries are war-ravaged. The people are impoverished and their purchasing power has been catastrophically reduced. The international gold standard is gone and trade is now being carried on almost exclusively on barter or quota systems. Many countries, including our own, also are suffering from galloping inflation. The United States, it is true, fattened on the war and experienced a spectacular industrial growth. But it is idle to expect, as capitalist economists are trying to convince us, that this country can or will re-invigorate the capitalist system of the world. Its monopolistic, imperialistic policies are choking, not developing, the capitalist world economy. This crippled condition of world capitalism definitely puts a damper on the plans of those American imperialists who would try to solve all their problems and make themselves masters of the world by overthrowing the Soviet Government.

Second, there is a definite dearth of potential allies for the war aims of the American imperialists. Germany, Japan, Italy, France, and many other capitalist states are war-ruined and could not, even if they

AME
wants
rial
impe
Great
of the
a virtu
people
world
the U
the
repu
impe
prove
eral
reacti
taking
capita
ish E
Britis
very
positi
and
its ov
sibilit
comp
fright
ers,
the a
Th
incom
durin
great
which
mach
any
sent
Gene
warn
U.S.A
All t
realit

wanted to, at present render material assistance to this country in an imperialist war against the U.S.S.R. Great Britain, it is true, is an ally of the United States and is following a virulently anti-Soviet line. But the people of Britain ardently desire world peace and cooperation with the U.S.S.R. Despite the failure, at the Labor Party Convention, to repudiate the Labor Government's imperialist policy, Britain may easily prove a most shaky ally in the general anti-Soviet enterprise of world reaction. The Labor Government, taking its lead from British big capital, is out to strengthen the British Empire wherever it can. And British imperialism accepts with very poor grace its "Number Two" position in the Anglo-American bloc and will lose no occasion to play its own individual game. The possibility of the United States being compelled to fight almost alone frightens the anti-Soviet war-mongers, even though they do control the atomic bomb.

Third, the Soviet Union is now incomparably stronger than it was during the period between the two great world wars. The Red Army, which met and defeated the Wehrmacht, could hold its own against any capitalist force that might be sent against it. With this in mind, General Eisenhower has seen fit to warn sharply of the futility of the U.S.A. trying to defeat the U.S.S.R. All this constitutes a very painful reality for the Anglo-American im-

perialists, and it may well be the decisive fact in maintaining world peace. Fear of defeat may accomplish what common sense cannot.

Fourth, the reactionaries who would again plunge the world into fascism and war also have to face a whole series of popular mass movements, which constitute a much greater menace to the imperialists' plans than existed in the period after World War I. These movements are alert to the dangers of economic chaos, fascism and war. Among them may be listed the new World Federation of Trade Unions, with its 66,000,000 members. There are also new and powerful national and international movements of veterans, youth and women. Then there is the rapid growth of the Communist parties in many parts of the world, and also their tendency to combine or cooperate with a number of rejuvenated Socialist parties. This time there no longer exists the powerful and almost uniformly reactionary Social-Democracy that smoothed the way for the imperialists after World War I. Besides the popular movements enumerated above, there are the new peoples' democratic governments in Europe and Asia, as well as the great national liberation movements now developing in India, China and other colonial and semi-colonial countries. All these movements are formidable barriers to the American imperialist designs for world domination.

Fifth, there is the widespread war-

weariness and anti-capitalist spirit prevailing among the peoples of the world. Mankind is appalled at the thought of another war, especially one that would be fought with atomic and other super-dreadful weapons. The masses are also determined to resist a regrowth of fascism and to prevent the economic system from being plunged into an even worse chaos that it is now in. Therefore, even the Anglo-American imperialists, for all their vicious anti-Sovietism, will think twice before defying the powerful anti-fascist, anti-war sentiments of the peoples. Even the big financial moguls in Wall Street have seen that one-sixth of the world went Socialist after World War I, and that the indications are that, in the long run, even a larger section of humanity will turn to Socialism after World War II. Hence, they are haunted by the fear that a World War III that did not accomplish their fascist, imperialist objectives, might just about wipe out capitalism altogether.

A WORLD PROGRESSIVE COUNTER-OFFENSIVE

From the foregoing it is clear, first, that world reaction, organized and led by American imperialism, is now conducting a militant offensive which is in many respects sharper than that which followed World War I and which is leading the world in the direction of economic smash-up, fascism, and a new world

war; and, second, that this world drive of reaction has to deal with popular mass resistance forces on a far more extensive scale than existed after World War I. These great democratic anti-fascist, anti-war masses are potentially very much stronger than the imperialist forces that are making for fascism and war. But whether or not the world will escape a new bloodbath at the hands of reckless imperialists will depend upon how well the democratic forces can mobilize and unite themselves to resist the new crop of world enslavers. No greater error could the peoples commit than to conform to Browder's criminally wrong notion that the fate of the world can be left to the "intelligent" monopolists to decide.

Naturally, the most urgent task of the democratic forces of the world is to stop the reactionary capitalist offensive, by insisting that Big Three unity be re-established; that the Moscow, Yalta, Teheran and Potsdam agreements be loyally carried out; that the fascist war criminals be vigorously punished; that the defeated fascist powers be thoroughly demilitarized; that the colonial peoples be completely liberated; that sane domestic and foreign economic policies be adopted; and that every defense be thrown around democracy and for the prevention of another war.

But such preventative measures are not enough. The progressive forces must go over onto the offen-

sive themselves. The axe must be applied to the root of the evil. The power of finance capital, the breeder of economic chaos, fascism and war, must be systematically weakened and eventually broken. In this respect the new people's democracies of Eastern and Central Europe are blazing the trail by the seizure and division of large landed estates, by the confiscation of the industries of collaborators with the Nazis, by the nationalization of the basic industries generally, and by the strengthening of the workers' representatives in the governments. But finance capital can be eliminated as a power for evil only when capitalism is abolished and Socialism established. It is to this goal that the workers all over Europe, despite many betrayals by Social-Democratic leaders, are steadily marching.

In no country have the workers and other democratic forces so great a responsibility in the present world crisis as here in the United States. The great trusts and monopolies of this country, with their political concentrations, are the center of world reaction. It is they who are

furnishing the main motive force for the present international capitalist offensive against democracy and peace. They are a menace to our country and the world. They must be curbed by the workers drastically strengthening their trade unions and vastly improving their political activities. They must be finally eliminated and a Socialist regime established.

Finance capital, in the United States and abroad, has been responsible for two devastating world wars, an unprecedented economic crisis, the growth of fascism, and the development of a world famine now involving at least a billion people—all in one generation. These great tragedies, not to mention the daily exploitation of the workers, would seem to be about enough damage to submit to from the obsolete capitalist system. Surely the democratic forces of the world will not allow the parasitic big landlords, industrialists and bankers to thrust upon humanity another round of economic crises, mass unemployment, wholesale pauperization, fascist tyranny, and imperialist war.

THE COMMUNISTS AND THE FATHER- LAND FRONT*

By GEORGI DIMITROV

COMRADES, MEN AND WOMEN! As a party of the working class, a party of Marxists, we differ essentially from many other political parties. There are political parties which exist for a certain time; they are set up to realise certain aims, and as soon as they have fulfilled them they disappear. Our Party is not like that. It can be said that it is an historic party. It arose in struggle; it developed and grew in a constant struggle.

From its beginning and up to today, our Party has been in existence without any sort of a break for 50 years. It must continue to exist and will exist until the historic moment when Communism, the Communist Society, will be realised perfectly. Then every political party will, of course, become superfluous.

Until that moment, the Party must be capable of discharging the task which faces it at each stage of social development. When Communism has prevailed completely, the Party will merge with the nation and the nation with the Communist Society;

* Address to the Workers' Party Congress, Sofia, February 27, 1946. (As monitored by the B.B.C. from Belgrade on March 3.)

then it will have discharged its historic task.

But because our Party has such a character and such an historic task, it must be different from other, temporary political parties by its internal Constitution, by its discipline and by the standard of its ideology. Apart from that, since September 9, our Party, as you know, has grown into a tremendous mass party, to suit our Bulgarian conditions. Many new elements have joined its ranks—workers and peasants, tradesmen, intellectuals, scientists, artists.

Our Party has received many devoted and honourable elements from the people. But, alongside with this, you know very well that, as the leading party, we gained such a power of attraction as we had been unable to have before September 9.

Until September 9, those who were members of the Party were prepared to sacrifice their material interests, their personal convenience, nay their very lives. After September 9 the Party was joined by a certain number of casual elements and by elements alien to the Communist Party, among them those seeking protection against certain inconveniences in connection with their activities in the past, others being concerned for their personal interests, for the securing of positions which they might exploit for their benefit and the benefit of their relations.

These people even proclaimed themselves the most zealous "first class" Communists.

We must say openly that in our Party, which has over 400,000 mem-

bers, there are also elements who do not deserve to be in it, there are elements who have to be purged as being alien and harmful to us and liable to compromise the Party.

If we want the Party to be a party with an historic mission, if we want our Party to maintain itself and to attain success in its faithful service to the people, if we want Communism to prevail completely, there can be no place in our ranks for careerists; there can be no room for people who are availing themselves of authority for their personal interests. There must be no corruption, nothing which might compromise our Party.

Comrades, men and women, severity is indispensable here, ruthless severity.

By it, we cannot lose as a party; we can only gain. Let there not be 450,000 members of the Party; let there be 400,000 of them, but those 400,000 honourable champions of the nation's cause.

These 400,000 honourable fighters for the cause of the Fatherland Front and the cause of Socialism are capable of leading millions of Bulgarian men and women into the future.

The Party must also have an iron—a conscious and voluntary but still iron—discipline which is based and must be based on our unanimity, on our common tasks and objects, on our Marxist teachings.

Such unanimity and discipline are essential if our Party is to accomplish its historic task. Hence, it emerges that personal wishes, interests and

conceptions cannot be placed above the tasks and objects of the Party. That which is personal for us, regardless of the rank we hold, must be subordinated to the interests of the Party and of the people.

From this, it further emerges that in our Party organizations and in the Party as a whole there can be no place for any groups or sections, for any hostile anti-Party nests.

Where such nests appear, they must be purged mercilessly. If necessary, the Party surgical knife must be used. No patience or toleration must exist towards such elements in the Party as attempt to disorganize its ranks, introduce demoralization or preach alien, hostile ideas and influences. This, comrades, is all the more essential in view of the fact that there are a good number of members in the Party who are new, who are not well acquainted with our history, who have not completely assimilated the general Fatherland Front Line of the Party, who may submit to the influence of demagoguery and misguidance from outside, and become the victims of provocateurs and the agents of our enemies.

Our enemies cannot break our Party by a frontal attack from without because it rests on a rocklike basis. However, they are trying by various slogans and demagogic phrases to mislead individual members of our Party, to introduce disorganization into its ranks, to weaken its discipline and ideological political unity from within.

Such elements in the Party must

be watched. Merciless action must be taken against such elements which disorganize and demoralize the Party. In a militant party such as ours there can be no place for anarchists, anarcho-syndicalists anarcho-Communists and similar harmful elements.

The unity, discipline and fighting capacity of the Party depend above all on two important factors: first, the Party cadres; secondly, the correct conception of the Party line and its perspectives—whither we are going, what we are fighting for and what we wish to reach as a Party and as a people.

As regards Party cadres, we often hear talk of "old" and "young" cadres. Old and young! This is a completely mistaken view. The Party has several categories of cadres, we may say four basic categories, but in each one of them there are both old and young. One category consists of cadres—old and young—who were in the ranks of the Party before September 9, some even before 1923, others later, but all inside the Party without a break until September 9, where they fought actively against fascism, took part in the historic work of September 9, and, after that date, continued constantly honourably, and loyally to serve the Party.

That is the first category. The second category—also both old and young—consists of those who, before September 9, some since 1923, others later, were not active fighters of our Party, remained outside, but helped the Party in its work in towns and villages in accordance with their

powers and opportunities. These are honourable and devoted people, but they are not heroes; they were incapable of joining the partisan detachments and were not prepared to go to the Central Prison or the concentration camp. They held aloof but sincerely supported the Party, tried to help it morally and materially, concealed our illegal comrades, helped various fighters, etc. That is the second category.

There is also a special category of Party cadres, both old and young, who, during the fascist regime and until September 9, separated themselves from the Party, were passive, held aloof and considered their own personal interests (some were lawyers, many teachers, many officials, etc.), but who did not adopt a hostile attitude towards the Party, did not go over to the enemy and did not help fascism.

That is the third category of our Party cadres.

Finally we have our new Party cadres—both old and young in years. These appeared and grew up after September 9 when the portals of political activity opened wide, when the skies cleared and when incessant cheers resounded everywhere. That is when they began their political activity in the Party and when they sprang up as new Party cadres in the state machine, in the social organisations, in the Fatherland Front, etc. That is the fourth category of Party cadres.

These are the four basic categories of our Party. The Party is concerned

with the rational exploitation of all these ranks in Party activities or in the state apparatus, the social organizations and everywhere in the nation for the organization of the new Fatherland Front in Bulgaria.

For this reason, all the individual elements of these four categories must have the close attention of Party leaders everywhere. Our task, in the period through which we are going, is the early merging of all these four categories into one whole, into our Party organization, upon which the unity, discipline and fighting qualities of our Party largely depend.

It is, however, natural that the Party cannot adopt the same attitude towards all four categories. There are differences. The central, regional and district leading bodies of the Party must consist above all of men of the first category. The first category is the very backbone of the Party. These are the ranks which offer the best and most complete guarantee for the correct guidance of the Party and the correct education of the Party masses. After that comes the second category of people, who have helped the Party in the struggle against fascism.

One cannot but adopt a certain reserve toward the third category. This category consists of people who have not aided the Party, but who have not gone over to the side of the enemy either. For a long period, in some cases for as much as twenty years, they have been separated from political life, from the Party and from

its struggle. Accordingly, this category has remained behind, politically and ideologically.

They cannot now aspire to leading positions in the Party. They must make up for what they have omitted before being able to pretend to a decisive participation in Party councils.

This category can and will be useful in the state apparatus, in the social organizations, but only under the guidance of the Party. Through their knowledge, the men of this category who are lawyers, physicians, engineers and other specialists, will be useful as far as they comply with the directives of the Party, of the Party leaders, insofar as they submit to strict Party discipline. In this category, there are comrades who feel embittered. Some of them were leaders of regional or district organizations before 1923, some were even members of the Central Committee, national deputies, municipal councilors, until September 23, 1923, and now, when they have come again to the surface in the free political atmosphere, they think that they should certainly occupy leading positions in the Party, the state, the municipality and so on.

This produces a certain amount of friction for the Party organizations, and an end must be made to it. These comrades of ours must be made aware that they can only occupy leading positions in the life of the Party and responsible positions in our state and social life if they roll up their sleeves, put their shoul-

ders to the wheel and if they submit to Party leadership and Party discipline. On the other hand, the Party must help them in every respect to enable them to make up as soon as possible for what they have omitted in the past.

Here it must be said that in certain quarters an incorrect attitude very often prevails towards this category. Some Party leaders say:—"We have been fighting, we have been making sacrifices, and they have looked after their offices, their vineyards, and their convenience; they have never committed themselves but have guarded their skins. Now they want to be leaders, regional directors, district chiefs or regional leaders in the Party organization. How can that be tolerated?"

There is even a certain bitterness against them. Such an attitude is not in the interests of the Party. An end must be made to it. On the contrary, it is essential to exploit the capacities and knowledge of these men fully and in the appropriate way for the cause of the Party and the Fatherland Front.

With regard to the fourth category, they must take pains to master the experience of the Party in the period preceding September 9 and acquaint themselves with the basic doctrines of its theory.

They must bestow particular attention upon raising their ideological and political level in order to become staunch Party men.

All of us, starting from me, down to the last member of the Party,

must learn to guide. Previously we were not the leading party, but an opposition party. We were criticising and fighting, but we did not rule, except temporarily in some municipalities until 1923.

Since September 9 we have been gaining experience as the leading Party. This experience is essential for us. Our Party cadres, wherever they may be, must learn. All of us must learn to administer and to build together with our allies in the Fatherland Front, and to learn to work jointly with them. Wherever there is any kind of competition between us and our allies we must be in a position to supply the best experts so that our cadres are always in the first place and justify the confidence given them. That is why work, knowledge and skill are essential.

There must be no indolence or self-satisfaction. We must not rest on our laurels; we must learn to work untiringly. If somebody is an engineer, he must perfect himself; if he is an administrator, he must increase his qualifications; if he is a teacher, he must do the same; and if he is a Party worker, he must do even more.

Wherever we may be, we must learn indefatigably, because if we administer and build up our democratic Bulgaria without this knowledge, we shall be unable to assure our Fatherland and our people of progress and a brighter future.

I am convinced that these questions of cadres and their education were considered with attention at the conference, but I should like to

emphasise the question of our Marxist-Leninist teachers about which, unfortunately, relatively little has been said in our Party. This educational work must always be directly bound up with practice, with creative work, with activity in the Party and outside.

The separation of theory from practice is harmful. There must be harmony between the practical work we do and our theoretical teachings. We must not think that we have already reached the pinnacle of knowledge. In his own sphere, nobody knows as much as he could know. We must learn in the process of work, as we learnt since September 9, in the process of the struggle against our enemy, in the concentration camps, and partisan detachments. Now, we must learn in the process of reconstruction and creation.

The second factor on which the Party's unity, fighting capacity and discipline depend is a correct appreciation of our general line and policy.

We often hear voices (they are usually provocative voices but they influence unfavourably some of our politically immature comrades) say that our Party, as the main force in the Fatherland Front, has become an ordinary democratic party, that it has renounced Socialism, and that there is a supposed contradiction between the struggle and work for the implementation of the Fatherland Front program and the struggle for Socialism.

We must get rid of this concep-

tion. As long as there is any shilly-shallying among some of our comrades on these fundamental questions they cannot work for the Party with all their energies and enthusiasm or for the common popular work of the Fatherland Front.

What, concretely, is our policy at this stage of social development, that is, in the Fatherland Front era? It can be briefly outlined as follows:

From the point of view of our Party, as the Party of the working class and the working people, it is now and in the future the complete implementation of the Fatherland Front program, the creation of those essential conditions which will make it possible for our people to go over to Socialism. It is, after all, known that the future of nations lies in the creation of Socialism.

However, the struggle for Socialism is different now from what it was in 1917 and 1918 in Tsarist Russia, when the October Revolution was carried through. At that time, it was essential to overthrow Russian Tsarism, and the dictatorship of the proletariat was essential for the transition of Socialism. Since that time three decades have gone, and the Soviet Union, as a Socialist State, has grown into a great world power.

In the Great Patriotic War, this country of Socialism showed the greatest viability, and made the greatest contribution to the victory over fascism for the salvation of European civilization. It was precisely during the war that we were given a glorious confirmation of the

power and superiority of a Socialist social order.

This has had, and still has, a tremendous influence on all aspects of international developments.

As a result of the war and under the influence of the great work of the Soviet Union, a deep change has been wrought in many countries. This is the case in Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Finland and Bulgaria, where this democratic revolution, this development towards progress and against the old reactionary regimes in the world, the regimes of big speculation and capital, cartels and imperialism, is taking place.

We see this development in the colonies and semi-colonies, in Indonesia and in a series of other regions. Moreover, the existence of so great a Socialist State as the Soviet Union, and the historic democratic revolution which has been taking place in many countries since the war, raises the question of the creation of Socialism for many countries, not as a question of the struggle of the working class for Socialism against the remaining productive social strata in the country, but, on the contrary, as a question of cooperation between the working class and the peasants, craftsmen, intelligentsia and the progressive strata of the people. When one day the question of a transition of the people from the present social organization to a new Socialist order arises in this country as well, then the Communists, leaning on the people, will build a new Socialist society,

not in struggle against the peasants, craftsmen and intelligentsia, but together with them.

In short, it will be the historic work of the entire people. This course of social development, comrades, may, to some, appear slower than the policy of "take up your arms; hit right and left and set up your dictatorship!" However, the former course is not only possible and realistic, but it is also undoubtedly much less painful for the people.

Hence, we Communists openly state that, in the prevailing circumstances, we chose this very course because it is a realistic and painless road to Socialism.

That in the end both great and small nations will go over to Socialism there can be no doubt, because that is historically inevitable.

The crux of the matter, and we Marxists should know this well, is this: every nation will effect its transition to Socialism not by a mapped-out route, not exactly as in the Soviet Union, but by its own road, dependent on its historical, national, social and cultural circumstances.

Making use of the great teachings of Marx, Engels and Stalin, we Bulgarian Communists and Marxists will be in a position to find our own Bulgarian course towards Socialism. Those who speak about a contradiction between the Fatherland Front policy of a struggle for the unification of all progressive forces in the Fatherland Front, for the creation of its program, on the one hand, and the struggle for Socialism on the other,

are either not Marxists, or they are provocateurs. Every stage of social development gives the people a great central task. In our Fatherland Front era, this central task is the implementation of the Fatherland Front program, the continuation until its victorious conclusion of the great work of September 9, the safeguarding of the Bulgarian People's democracy, in the political, social, economic and cultural life of the Bulgarian people. Therefore, all those who do not work and do not fight in the Fatherland Front ranks for the accomplishment of this great national task, however much they may declaim about Socialism, merely feed the fire of reaction and the enemies of Socialism.

Lest I take up too much of your time, comrades, just one more word: we must have, as members of the Communist Party, the noble ambition to show ourselves in every respect good and faithful pupils of Lenin and Stalin.

In many places, Party leaders prefer to give orders instead of establishing friendship with the Party members and the population, instead of explaining patiently, instead of teaching and educating and themselves learning from the masses at the same time. If you hold a conference, have a look at what sort of people are present. Promote those who are capable and gifted. Experience shows that the capable Party members are as a rule modest and keep apart, whereas talkative people frequently push themselves to the fore.

Keep an eye open for such comrades who are modest and capable, like Diogenes, with the lantern, when he looked for a man! Look for activists and show the way to the capable. There are honourable and devoted young men who, if they see that somebody more learned than they delivers a speech, think to themselves: "I shall never be able to catch up with him," although they themselves are capable organisers, with a good deal of common sense and firm character. I tell you that in our nation, in our Party, there are many capable people who are so wasted.

Measures must be taken to promote such people and to help them in their development. We must remember that the success of every cause depends upon cadres, as has often been pointed out by Stalin.

Finally, we must have the ambition as Bulgarian Communists, that, as the leading party, our Party must be exemplary in every respect. With our allies, the Agrarians, Zvnos, Social-Democrats and Radicals, we must know how to work together as comrades for the common cause.

We must be the first in the great national movement of the Fatherland Front. Do not forget that men do not always accomplish what they wish, but what conditions impose upon them. Let us by our exemplary Fatherland Front work and by our struggle create such conditions in Bulgaria that all our allies, as well as those who are still vacillating, become ardent adherents of the historic cause of the Fatherland Front.

LABOR IN THE 1946 PRIMARIES

By ROB F. HALL

THE PRIMARY ELECTIONS which began last April and continue into September are taking place in a period marked by the alarming growth of reaction. Monopoly capital pressing for world domination and preparing for imperialist war, has undertaken a series of offensives against labor and the people. While it seeks tax rebates and higher monopoly prices, it has stubbornly rejected the reasonable wage demands of labor and deliberately provoked strikes. As a result of the strikes, Big Business hoped to arouse middle class support for its program of weakening and destroying the trade unions, and to strengthen the voice of reaction in Congress.

The fighting spirit with which labor met the offensive against the workers' standard of living and their unions has prevented Big Business from achieving one of its aims. But whether it will achieve the other, and emerge from the elections next November with larger majorities in Congress and the state governments is still to be decided. This depends upon the ability of labor to throw into the election struggles the same unity, militancy, and organizing skill it exemplified in the historic wage struggles of early 1946. Particularly, it depends upon the ability of labor

to learn and apply more quickly the principles of independent political action, based on the broadest possible coalition between labor and other progressive forces.

For at this stage, with more than half of the primaries already over and with each day bringing November closer, the outlook is not bright. The primary elections have in the main resulted in the nomination of incumbents, suggesting at best a continuation of the lop-sided majority of reactionary Republicans and Southern Democrats which enacted the Case and Hobbs bills, mangled O.P.A., and pigeonholed F.E.P.C. and anti-poll tax legislation. The light balloting in many states and Congressional districts enabled the Republican Party to secure larger primary votes than the Democrats and stressed the danger of a reactionary Republican landslide on November 5.

To emphasize this negative aspect of the picture, however, is not to counsel defeatism. There is a fighting chance to defeat between twenty-five and fifty reactionary Congressmen in November, if the lessons pointed up by the primary elections already held are learned and applied in the remaining primaries and in the November elections.

MAJOR OBJECTIVES OF '46

This requires in the first place a re-assessment of labor's main objectives in the 1946 elections, or rather a re-affirmation of those objectives, because they remain the ones presented by the Communist Party and other

progressive political groups last spring.

Above all, these objectives are designed to defeat the reactionary Republican forces, headed by Hoover, Taft and Vandenberg, who are carrying out the bidding of the du Ponts, Pews and the N.A.M. This is the center of the most pro-fascist elements in the nation, the most rapaciously imperialist, and mainly responsible for the monopoly drive against price control and workers' living standards. Any sectarian tendencies which hinder labor or progressives from achieving this prime objective have been and will be exceedingly harmful unless corrected.

The second objective is to defeat those candidates who personify the imperialist program of the Truman Administration, and to elect candidates who will resist this program.

Third, insofar as this is still possible, it is necessary to defeat Southern Democrats who lead the attack on the Negro people and who constitute a reliable wing of the reactionary bi-partisan coalition.

Fourth, progressive Republicans who will vote more or less consistently for the needs of labor and the people must not be left to the mercy of the Taft-Vandenberg-Dewey machines, but must receive the energetic support of the labor-progressive groups.

Fifth, wherever circumstances make it advisable, independent peoples' candidates should be put forward and given the support of the

broadest possible coalition of labor and progressive circles. Where Communist candidates are entered, the campaign should be conducted with greatest stress as a struggle for the needs of labor and the people, so that regardless of victory or defeat at the polls, the result will be a broader understanding of the necessity for independent political action on a program of peace, democracy and security. For one essential aim should pervade the entire electoral strategy of the labor-progressive forces, that is, to lay the basis for the emergence of a third party, a people's anti-monopoly party, after November. This is one reason, why it is necessary to build Political Action Committee, Negro Congress-Political Action Committee, the Independent Citizens' Committee and all other progressive political organizations and groups down below, on a ward, precinct and township level.

THE TRUMAN ADMINISTRATION

These objectives are based on an analysis of the role of the major political groupings in the nation today. As stated above, the Republican Party continues the main party of reaction. But if it achieves sweeping victories on November 5, the responsibility will be largely that of the Truman Administration.

For President Truman has proven a feverish zealot in promoting some of the most reactionary aims of the G.O.P. chieftains, in his "get tough with Russia" policy, his atomic bomb

diplomacy, and his utilization of the government as a strike-breaking agency.

The Truman Administration is definitely not a part of the labor-democratic coalition; at the same time, notwithstanding its reactionary policies, it is not a fascist administration. The President occasionally pays lip service to the slogans of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and his Administration is still subject to mass pressure on certain issues, particularly when labor is united with other sections of the people. An example of this wavering was his veto of the mangled O.P.A. Bill and the Case Bill, although he followed the one with proposals for slightly less drastic price increases and the other with a more drastic anti-labor bill.

But the role of the Democratic Party in 1946 is not determined exclusively by Truman. While its major orientation is toward reaction, thus justifying the third party movement after November, the Democratic Party is at this moment a battle ground for sharply divergent tendencies within. Southern Bourbons and spokesmen for the reactionary top circles of the Catholic hierarchy represent one wing which would like nothing better than fusion with the G.O.P. Another grouping, dominated by James Farley and the corrupt municipal machines, consider the situation ripe for a complete rupture with P.A.C. and labor and are not overly worried if this means defeat for the Democratic Party at the polls in November.

But there are other, more positive tendencies. One group led by Chairman Robert Hannegan of the Democratic National Committee, is loyal to the Truman Administration but considers it essential to continue collaboration with labor as the only means of electoral victory both in November and in 1948. Finally, there are those who, like Representative Adolph J. Sabath of Illinois, Senator Pepper of Florida, and Representative DeLacy of Washington, support labor's demands with sincerity and seek to follow the program of peace and progress enunciated for the party by Roosevelt.

This means that labor and the progressives cannot ignore the Democratic Party, or adopt a superficial attitude of damning all Democratic candidates because they fail, in one way or another, to meet all the requirements of the fight against reaction.

But equally it means that labor and the progressives cannot follow the electoral pattern of 1944, as advocated by some elements within labor and the P.A.C. and place reliance on the Democratic Party for the solution of 1946 election problems.

THE CALIFORNIA PRIMARY

The California primary elections held in early June, illustrates both of these conclusions. The progressive Democrat Robert W. Kenny was defeated in both the Republican and Democratic gubernatorial primaries by Governor Earl Warren. Ellis Paterson, backed by C.I.O., P.A.C., and

other progressive groups, lost the Senatorial nomination in the Democratic primary to the less progressive Will Rogers, and the Republican vote for the incumbent Senator Knowland, one of the hatchet men against O.P.A., was greater than the combined vote for Patterson and Rogers.

The primary elections occurring a few days after President Truman had broken the railroad strike and jammed his labor-draft bill through the House, the Democratic candidates were caught in the powerful backwash of popular protest against the Democratic national administration. Many voters, disillusioned and confused, stayed home on election day or voted for the Republican candidates. But this was only a dramatic climax to a trend that began shortly after V-J Day. The glaring departure of the Truman Administration from Roosevelt's policies gave birth to cynicism among the people, which has resulted in some instances in apathy and in others in a definite Republican trend.

In California, the progressive candidates did not sharply disassociate themselves from the policies of the Truman Administration, which is one of the major reasons for their defeat.

They did not conduct their campaign with sufficient independence of the regular Democratic Party machine which, dominated by anti-labor elements, preferred defeat to victory under the leadership of the pro-labor progressives.

On the other hand, their cam-

paign was considerably weakened by the failure of the labor forces to work actively to build a broad coalition of progressive forces behind their candidacies. The old 1944 coalition was no longer workable, but the labor progressive forces did not generally—although there were commendable exceptions, as in Los Angeles—build the new type of independent political coalition necessary for 1946.

This failure of the labor-progressive camp was in part the result of a widespread tendency, present even in the Communist Party, to see no essential difference between the progressive Democrats and the reactionary candidates. The energetic work down below for which California labor became known in previous elections, was lacking, and reaction was the beneficiary.

Of this, there should be no doubt. Although Warren was painted as a liberal and secured endorsement by the A. F. of L., he represents the most reactionary forces in the state. It is an indication of the false liberal front which the G.O.P. will attempt to use in other states and perhaps nationally in the 1948 elections.

REPUBLICAN STRATEGY

This strategy of the Republican Party is in fact one of the best indications that there is not, as some columnists maintain, a conservative trend among the voters. B. Carroll Reece of Tennessee, Taft's hand-picked candidate for chairman of the Republican National Committee, has

in fact made a number of campaign speeches in which he has contended that the Republicans are really the "liberal" party. His logic is of course tortuous and unconvincing, but it suggests why some Republican leaders, including some of their most wealthy contributors, are backing the forces around former Governor Harold E. Stassen of Minnesota as potential G.O.P. fronts because of Stassen's spurious and misleading "liberalism."

Another indication of the real trend among voters can be seen in several primaries where the successful candidates based their campaigns primarily on exposing the power of the big monopolies.

This was especially true of Representative Hugh DeLacey of Washington who defeated Harold Costigan, the renegade from the labor movement, in the democratic primary on July 9. The N.A.M. is reported to have poured \$100,000 into the district to defeat DeLacey, and it has been revealed that Republicans were instructed to vote in the Democratic primary in order to bring about his defeat.

A broad coalition was organized in support of DeLacey which carried him to victory. But equally important was the type of campaign conducted by the candidate. He based himself squarely on the program of Franklin D. Roosevelt, disassociated himself from the policies of the Truman Administration, and ran on the platform of peace, jobs, democracy and security. He exposed the role of the

monopolies in wrecking price control and, unlike some progressive candidates, eagerly took up the discussion of foreign policy in which his views were markedly different from those of Truman and Byrnes.

At this writing, the Texas primary has not been held, but observers are confident that Homer P. Rainey, former president of the state university, backed by all progressive forces in the state, will, even if not elected, make an excellent showing. Rainey's campaign has been based on a fight against the monopolies which are very powerful in the state, and he has enlisted tremendous support, not only from labor but from farmers and middle class elements. The victorious campaign of James E. Folsom, C.I.O.-backed candidate for governor of Alabama, was similar in many respects. Like Rainey, he warred against the Big Mules, as the vested interests are dubbed in the state, and handily defeated the representative of the corporations and the Black Belt planters.

PRIMARIES IN THE SOUTH

The primaries in the South have been notable this summer, not only because they refute the contention of a conservative trend, but because they reflect a new progressive upsurge and the re-entry of the Negro people as an important political factor for the first time since the disfranchising constitutions of 1890-1900.

These developments are influencing certain sectors within the Dem-

ocratic Party nationally and are important in the potential realignments currently taking place, with great significance for a third party movement after November. The C.I.O. and A. F. of L. organizing drives in the South, even though undertaken after many of the primary campaigns were under way, have undoubtedly had an influence on these developments.

With labor still relatively weak, with the farmers unorganized and with the Negro people only now successfully overcoming the obstacles to political action, a major role is played by independent local capitalist interests. These are the interests represented by Governor Ellis Arnall of Georgia, Folsom of Alabama, and Rainey of Texas. They are opposed to the pro-fascist line of the planters and big capital, which they correctly recognize as hampering the industrialization of the region. Alone they are unable to resist the power of the monopoly-planter coalition, but in alliance with labor and progressive forces, they can be decisive.

At the present writing, it is not yet known whether this alliance will secure victory in Georgia for Carmichael against the native fascist Talmadge. In Mississippi, however, a similar alignment gave the vicious Bilbo a closer race than he has had for years and even threatened to unseat Representative Rankin.

This alliance, however, is not new. It was present to a lesser degree during the Roosevelt Administration and was responsible for the election

to the Senate of Pepper from Florida and Hill from Alabama. The new factor in the South is the unprecedented upsurge, for our times, in Negro registration and voting.

THE NEGRO VOTE

Partly as a result of the United States Supreme Court decision outlawing white primaries, but even more so the result of the maturing of a fighting political consciousness on their part, the Negro people have braved terror, intimidation and violence to participate in the all-important Democratic Party primaries in one Southern state after another.

It is reported that 134,000 registered in Georgia, 160,000 in Texas, 55,000 in Tennessee, and considerable numbers in other states. In the face of the most open provocation, several thousand Negroes voted in Mississippi. In North Carolina, Negro tobacco workers and their union, the Food, Tobacco, and Agricultural Workers Union C.I.O., are given major credit for the manner in which Representative John Folger, after trailing in the first primary, made a come-back in the run-off to defeat his Liberty League, N.A.M. opponent.

These primary elections are demonstrating that never again can the Southern Bourbons reckon without the Negro vote as a factor in the elections. If labor and the progressive forces continue and intensify their fight for the rights of the Negro people, including the nomination of Negro candidates, the progressive

camp in the South can count on a new and ever stronger electoral ally.

This last statement has validity not only for the South. The Negro vote in the North was decisive in the election of Roosevelt and Roosevelt supporters in a number of Northern states. But with the violation of New Deal principles by President Truman, the G.O.P. has made a demagogic play for the Negro vote. Republican money has recently been poured into Negro districts and into the Negro press. Obviously Truman cannot hold the Negro vote for the Democratic Party.

But labor can retain and strengthen the alliance of the Negro people and the progressive camp if it consistently and resolutely champions the rights of the Negro people, simultaneously exposing the reactionary anti-Negro aims of the G.O.P.

Another group of key importance in the elections are the veterans. The reactionary Republicans have made a frenzied bid for their support and in many instances have used former G.I.'s as candidates. But they have miscalculated, in assuming the G.I.'s to be a conservative sector of the population. In fact, the Communist Party canvassers in Michigan, collecting signatures to put the Party on the ballot, found that next to Negro voters, veterans were most willing to sign.

The record of the Republican Party on hamstringing the veterans housing program, wrecking price control, and preparing for a new imperialist war, needs to be exposed

vigorously by the labor-progressive forces in order to enlist the broadest possible support of the veterans behind progressive candidates.

But precisely because the Truman Administration has failed to fight for the needs of Negroes, veterans and other groups, the labor-progressive camp must conduct its independent campaign for these demands and at the same time involve these groups organizationally in campaign committees on a district, precinct and ward level, which goes far beyond the regular party organizational machinery.

THE NEW YORK PRIMARY

Of the primaries still to be held, those in New York State, scheduled for August 20, are most crucial, in view of their effect on the national political picture.

Here the major aim is to defeat the forces of reaction gathered around Dewey. The key question is whether the candidates nominated by the Democratic Party will be capable of conducting a successful campaign. To achieve such candidates, the labor-progressive forces, including the A.L.P., entered the most important primaries

This contrasts sharply with the action of the Liberal Party leadership which committed its organization to blanket support of the Democratic slate without even elementary guarantees on program. By this action, the Liberal Party tended to undermine the progressives' fight for the type of program required as

the basis for an effective anti-Dewey coalition.

As pointed out by New York State Chairman Robert Thompson of the Communist Party, in the *Daily Worker* of July 16, "everywhere through the State, labor and progressives should seek to make their influence felt in the composition of the anti-Dewey slate and the construction of the anti-Dewey platform."

The moods of apathy and confusion among the voters resulting from Truman's defection from Roosevelt's policies, moods which play into the hands of the Dewey forces can be ended only by the formation of an anti-Dewey coalition with a program "based on the fight for world peace, the rejection of the Truman-Byrnes-Vandenberg atomic diplomacy, a vigorous fight for price control, speedy construction of low-rent housing, especially for veterans, the protection of labor's hard-won rights and the abolition of Jim Crowism and all forms of racial and religious discrimination."

NEED FOR COALITION

The broadest coalition and the most energetic work in the primary therefore is the precondition for victory in November. In those states where the primaries have already been held, there remains for labor the task of constructing such a coalition as rapidly as possible. The Communists particularly must contribute their best energies to the coalition, supporting it with their day-to-day work and simultaneously striving to era-

dicate from the ranks of labor and progressives, on the one hand, the leftist tendency to minimize the importance of victory by less-than-perfect progressives, and, on the other, the Right tendency to rely on the regular Democratic Party organization.

Obviously the alliance between the Communist forces and the other sections of the labor-progressive camp is of crucial importance. To destroy or weaken that alliance because of differences in tactics—or even on the more fundamental aim of independent political action which must be consistently promoted—would jeopardize the entire fight against war, fascism and reaction.

This is not to counsel concealment of these differences, which would mean the negation of the independent role of the Communist Party. Such differences exist, particularly on the role of the Democratic Party and the need for a third party after November.

THIRD PARTY SENTIMENT

Since that day last May when Truman broke the railroad strike, sentiment for a third party has developed at a new pace. This, however, points to the need for broader education on the issue, with the proposal for a third party raised for discussion publicly in trade unions and other mass organizations. It does not mean that conditions warrant an effort now to crystallize organizational forms for a third party, which would simp-

ly play into the hands of the Social-Democrats and the Trotskyites, who hope by premature action to prevent the rise of a genuine third party.

Key figures in the labor-progressive camp, such as Wallace, Ickes and associates of the late Sidney Hillman, need still to be convinced of the wisdom of a third party. They favor independent action such as practiced by P.A.C., but base their future strategy on a revamped, "revitalized" Democratic Party.

They fail to see that a third party movement is not created or wished out of existence by a small group of strategists but rises inevitably out of objective conditions. The people, in fact, are already building the basis for a third party movement.

Communists and other third party advocates, however, may differ with these leaders without coming into head-on collision with them. This is particularly true in view of the fact that the efforts of these leaders, directed toward the defeat of reaction in the 1946 elections, help to create the most favorable conditions for the emergence of the anti-monopoly people's party after November.

That is why labor and the progressives, including those who are confident of the necessity for a third

party, can greet warmly the efforts of Senator Pepper to organize progressives within the Democratic Party to fight for the Roosevelt program. While it is impossible that such a liberal bloc can exert veto power over the powerful forces of Truman, the city machines and the Southern Democrats who dominate the party nationally, it can strengthen the fight for progressive legislation and by its activity demonstrate the need for a third party. Similarly, labor and the progressives can and should support the efforts of Senators Aiken and Morse to strengthen the small liberal bloc within the Republican Party.

In short, everything that enhances the independent political action of labor and the progressive forces today, in preparation for 1946, not only helps guarantee defeat for reaction in November, but leads to the formation of a more powerful weapon against reaction in 1948.

For these reasons, the task of the Communists and all progressives in this period is to help cement the broadest possible coalition for successful electoral action in the remaining primaries and for a sharp setback to the Hoover-Taft-Vandenberg forces on November 5.

ATOMIC ENERGY— FOR WAR OR PEACE

By JOSEPH CLARK

In September 1938 a choice had to be made "between the quick and the dead." Hitler, Daladier, Mussolini and Chamberlain were the actors who performed on the Munich stage that Fall.

The United States government was not directly represented at the 1938 Munich performance. But it had already given moral and political support to the theme of the drama by cooperating with the British and French governments in undermining the Republic of Spain. From the *New York Times* to the small town press, the Munich conference was hailed for preserving peace in our day.

There is no final count of the dead in World War II. But this is certain, the choice "between the quick and the dead" which Bernard Baruch presented to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission is an old one for capitalism.

If there is a danger of another world war, its roots must be sought in the imperialist soil that nourished two world wars in two generations. Wars are not caused by the development and control of specific weapons. But the struggle for peace today is bound up with a fight against the use

of the most terrible weapon for the mass destruction of noncombatants known to man—the atomic bomb.

It was not new weapons of war that formed the basis of fascist politics and its quest for world domination. But the fascist aim of subjugating nations was furthered by the use of weapons suitable, not only for the battlefields, but also for the destruction of civilian populations. Fascism developed the concept of total warfare.

However, the most effective weapon of total warfare, the atomic bomb, was first developed and used by one of the nations in the anti-fascist coalition against those who had first launched war against women and children. To those who naively ask how there can be a danger that atomic warfare will be used by the United States, the stark answer is that *it has already used* this weapon. Unborn babies in Nagasaki and Hiroshima who were aborted when the bomb fell are mute testimony that atomic war is a real danger; it has already been waged.

Scientists have told us there are tremendous constructive uses to which atomic energy can be applied. Immediately, in the cure of dread diseases, potentially, as a source of power, atomic energy can become a powerful force for progress. Under the same conditions which produced two world wars and the danger of a third, atomic energy has been applied almost exclusively as an instrument of wholesale death and destruction.

The atomic bomb is not a weapon that will end all weapons. It may not even be the most dread weapon of the future. The Navy has boasted of a germ weapon which it claims is as destructive as the atom bomb. One general testified that the advantage of the bacteria weapon was that while it destroyed human lives it left materiel intact.

The Bikini test has encouraged the Big Navy advocates who already have a Navy bigger than those of the rest of the world combined. Nor have the ordinary infantry soldiers been withdrawn from Trieste, from Iceland and China and the 50 other countries and major islands occupied by U.S. armed forces, because we have an atomic bomb.

It is wrong to exaggerate the role of the atomic bomb, just as it would be a terrible mistake to underestimate the awful destruction mankind will suffer if atomic warfare is ever launched again. Exaggeration includes the idea that possession of the bomb gives automatic guarantees of invincibility. Underestimation includes the complacent acceptance of the dispersal of our cities and the construction of our civilization underground.

Scientists who invented and developed the atomic bomb say that there is no secret about the basic process involved. Those who cry out that we must retain a "monopoly" of the bomb fly in the face of fact. In an uncontrolled atomic armament race, other nations will have the bomb.

While we were at war with Germany, William C. Bullitt wrote that the U.S. would have to fight the Soviet Union in 15 years. Now he urges that the U.S. drop atomic bombs on the Soviet Union without delay.

Realizing that the U.S. cannot maintain a monopoly of the bomb, the Big Business circles and the U.S. Government strive to force the adoption of a world atomic energy policy that can permanently guarantee for the U.S. the temporary advantage accruing from its head-start in developing the bomb. Even more important, they use the present "monopoly" as an instrument of diplomacy and of economic and military aggrandizement.

Those who brandish atomic weapons are doing nothing less than Hitler, Mussolini and Hirohito did when they threatened the world with their domination. They invite the same historical retribution which was visited on the fascist Axis.

The most ominous sign in world affairs today is that the anti-Soviet, anti-Communist banner of the fascist Axis is the standard held up by those who practice atomic diplomacy.

THE TWO PLANS

The fight for peace today is in great part a fight to outlaw the use of atomic weapons. A careful study should be made of the current discussions in the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. This commission was established on the

proposal of the Moscow Conference of the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain, held on December 27, 1945. The U.N. Assembly on January 24, 1946, then passed the resolution setting up the commission.

Two proposals have been placed before the commission dealing with the threat of atomic war, one by Bernard Baruch for the U.S. Government on June 14, 1946, and the other by Andrei Gromyko for the Soviet Government on June 19.

What the people of this country and of the world want from any plan is that the threat of atomic destruction be lifted from their heads. Ask the man in the street and he is apt to say that the Baruch plan is one for eliminating atomic war by creating world-wide control of atomic energy. Ask him about the Gromyko plan and he may tell you it proposes that the U.S. gives the Soviet Union the "secret" of making the bomb while the U.S. destroys the bomb. Let us therefore examine the content and implications of both proposals.

Baruch proposed the creation of an International Atomic Development Authority. By a series of stages this Authority will assume control of all atomic energy activities potentially dangerous to world security. It will control, license and inspect all other atomic activities. It will foster the beneficial uses of atomic energy and will lead in research and development of atomic energy. Before any of these goals are realized, it will start

out by controlling the uranium and plutonium resources needed for developing atomic energy.

Under the Baruch plan the U.S. will maintain its stockpiles of atom bombs and continue to produce more bombs while the Authority is being set up. At any stage in its development the U.S. can veto the entire plan. It not only keeps its bombs and makes more, but it keeps its "know-how" from the I.A.D.A. until it feels ready to release information. Then, once the plan suits the U.S., the I.A.D.A. assumes all its functions and the manufacture of the bombs is presumably ended.

A crucial part of Baruch's plan requires revision of the U.N. charter. This charter is founded on the idea of Big Five unanimity, which is embodied in the veto-power principle formulated by President Roosevelt. Under the Baruch plan the veto is eliminated on matters pertaining to atomic energy, although why it may exist as regards bacterial warfare and not atomic warfare has never been explained. When the I.A.D.A. is established, it will be controlled by whoever musters a majority of votes in the Authority. Thus, a voting bloc will control atomic activities all over the world and be the sole judge of what it considers violations of the atomic agreement.

Gromyko's plan consists of two proposals. The first deals with the conclusion of an international agreement for outlawing the production and use of atomic weapons. Three

months after the signing of such a treaty, all stocks of atom bombs are to be destroyed. The second proposal concerns the work of the Atomic Energy Commission and implements the adoption of the agreement by the setting up of two committees. One committee would devise ways and means of exchanging scientific information on the peaceful, constructive use of atomic energy. The other would prepare the treaty and provide measures for the control of atomic energy. It would elaborate "a system of sanctions for application against the unlawful use of atomic energy."

The Gromyko plan does not propose the establishment of an international authority to produce atomic bombs. It suggests "joint scientific efforts directed towards a broadening of the possibilities of the use of atomic energy only in the interests of the raising of the material welfare of the people and in the development of science and culture."

International cooperation in promoting atomic energy for peaceful needs is a basic part of the Gromyko plan. It does not seek any dual organization paralleling the United Nations. But it does envisage an agreement whereby all atomic weapons are destroyed. Under this treaty the storing or manufacture of atom bombs is proclaimed "a serious crime against humanity." The treaty and the provisions for punishment of violations are derived from the structure and functions of the United Nations Organization. Any criticism that the

plan will not work assumes that the U.N. is impotent in any eventuality threatening war. Of course, Big Three unity and cooperation are essential if the U.N. is to be an instrument of peace under any circumstances.

Analyzing the two plans, the criterion must be how they would further or obstruct the desired aim: elimination of the danger of atomic warfare.

THE VETO ISSUE

Most prominent in the discussion of the two plans has been the question of the veto. In the Baruch plan, as in the Lilienthal-Acheson proposal upon which it was based, the U.S. secures a unilateral veto. This was admitted by Walter Lippmann in the *Herald Tribune* on June 20:

"For while his [Baruch's] words imply that the United States is opposed to the principle of the veto, the American proposal . . . is founded upon the American veto. Mr. Baruch's task is to negotiate a treaty with other governments. . . . The treaty must . . . satisfy us or we shall veto it. . . . The power to prevent something from happening by withholding consent is the veto. In the case of atomic energy the American veto is unique and absolute.

"Now Mr. Baruch as our representative, not only has no slightest intention of surrendering the American veto; on the contrary, he intends to use it for all it is worth to induce the other governments to agree to a

treaty which we judge to be good enough not to veto. We intend to use our veto as a diplomatic instrument to obtain what we believe to be a constructive and beneficent treaty."

To those who are puzzled by Lippman's frank admission that the Baruch plan is based on a unilateral American veto it must be said that Lippmann has not abandoned support of imperialist policy in world affairs. His differences with Baruch are merely on matters of emphasis. Lippmann is too well aware of the limitations of the atomic bomb to put all his eggs in one basket. He wants to establish U.S. world domination, but the road is not merely an atomic highway, according to Lippmann.

In the *Herald Tribune* of June 29, Lippmann warns: "We must be careful not to overestimate the military value of the atomic bomb. It would, for example, be unusable even as a threat, at Trieste and in Venezia Giulia. . . ." In fact, Lippmann is quite proud of the fact that he was one of the first to propose sending the American fleet to the Mediterranean in order to establish our base and sphere in that sea. He is afraid the continued threat of the atomic bomb can boomerang. Other instruments of force are necessary to achieve the grand scheme of U.S. world domination. Nevertheless, Lippmann's admission is valuable in exposing the arguments which sanctimoniously call for the elimination of the veto power while asserting the

uncontrolled right of unilateral veto by the United States.

Just as Litvinov astounded the "disarmament" conference in 1928 by proposing disarmament, Gromyko startled the Atomic Energy Commission by proposing the destruction of atomic weapons. Under the Baruch plan, the international authority is established and begins to function by a series of stages which makes a mockery of the hope of ever eliminating the atomic bomb. Under the Gromyko plan the destruction of the atomic weapons follows soon after the international agreement is carried through.

It had already been stated in the Acheson-Lilienthal plan that the U.S. proposed to intervene in the control of other countries' sources of atomic energy, while barring access to its own "know how."

Baruch repeated this point in his speech:

"The Authority shall have as one of its earliest purposes to obtain and maintain complete and accurate information on world supplies of uranium and thorium and to bring them under its dominion. . . ."

"Only after all current information on world sources of uranium and thorium is known to us all can equitable plans be made for their production, refining and distribution."

Both the extreme reactionary propaganda which opposes any discussion of atomic control for peace and the illusions created by the

Baruch plan have led people to believe that the U.S. gives something away under the Baruch plan. Misguided people also believe Gromyko proposed getting the information on how to make atomic bombs from the U.S. and giving nothing in return.

Baruch's statement on the role of the Authority in securing access to, and control over, uranium and thorium resources as "its earliest purpose" means that the U.S. will give away exactly nothing. It will secure access to the raw materials needed for releasing atomic energy. It will continue stockpiling atom bombs and making more. Then it will go to the next "stage" in setting up an I.A.D.A. But meanwhile, *no* access to Oak Ridge and *complete* access to Soviet and European sources of atomic energy.

Nor does Gromyko propose that the U.S. give his government the "know how" of atom bombs. His plan is one, first, for eliminating the bomb, second, for strict control and punishment of those who violate the agreement, and, third, for international development of atomic energy, not to make bombs, but to benefit mankind.

In addition to "stages" in his plan, Baruch proposes "there must be no veto power" as it affects the final functioning of the Authority. This means that the Anglo-American bloc will have sufficient votes to control the I.A.D.A. Recent months have given the world some sad experience with such a voting bloc.

This bloc prevented the U.N. from acting against the last remaining Axis member, Franco-Spain. But it whitewashed the war against the Indonesian people. It created a war scare against the Soviet Union on Iran, but it sanctioned the ways of empire in the Levant.

The most outrageous manipulation of votes in the U.N. was demonstrated when Byrnes told the Iranian ambassador, not only how to vote, but what to say and when to say it. Finally the Iranian government had to withdraw Ala as its representative in the U.N. in order to prevent Byrnes from casting the Iranian vote in the U.N. Removing the veto power means not only insuring such vote manipulation. It insures that life-and-death matters can be decided and wars launched by such blocs.

The basic idea of U.N. action in averting war stems from the principle of Big Five unanimity. The U.N. was not intended as an institution for facilitating the formation of blocs.

Recognizing that public sentiment might view the Baruch plan as a means for weakening the United Nations, Baruch at a subsequent meeting of the commission said that he favored close cooperation between the atomic energy authority and the U.N. organization. This followed Australian representative Dr. Herbert V. Evatt's proposal which would have openly converted the U.N. into a meaningless institution, superseded by the I.A.D.A.

Evatt has taken upon himself responsibility for carrying the ball in the fight against the veto. He said B to Baruch's A. Evatt supports the idea of an autonomous international authority which will have the power to punish violators of the agreement regardless of Security Council action. It would in reality eliminate the Security Council as the major instrument of the U.N. for maintaining peace. In opposing the veto power Evatt presumes to champion the rights of the small nations. The net effect of his proposal would be to make the small nations pawns in the Anglo-American voting bloc on atomic energy, just as so many of them have been used in the U.N. till now. Evatt and other "small nation" representatives already reflect the financial and military pressures of the Anglo-American bloc when they insist on the elimination of the Big Five veto.

Baruch's insistence on eliminating the veto on atomic matters shows that what is involved is an effort to establish the Anglo-American voting bloc supreme, not only in any projected I.A.D.A., but also in the U.N.

The campaign against the veto has paralleled the "get tough with Russia" drive which reached a high point in Churchill's Fulton, Mo., call to war against the Soviet Union. It coincided with the joint Vandenberg-Byrnes drive to force the Soviet Union to accept Wall Street domination all over the world. Clearly, the veto remains the means by which the

Soviet Union can prevent the "western" bloc from completely capturing the U.N. and using it to insure domination over the world.

U. S. ATOM-BOMB DIPLOMACY

Since the end of the war we have been treated to the use of a variety of specific means for furthering the foreign policy dictated by the big financial interests of the U.S. Our armed forces were used in China, Italy, Trieste, etc. We used the threat of starvation against the peoples of Yugoslavia, the Soviet Union, and other countries holding U.N.R.R.A. as a weapon over their heads. The loan to France was timed to influence the recent election. And underlying all the pressures of a rampant imperialism has been the atom-bomb threat.

The bluntest translation of the Baruch plan into the real terms for which it is intended was made by George Fielding Eliot on June 21 in the *Herald Tribune*:

"If the United States and Great Britain accept the Russian proposal that all atomic weapons be destroyed . . . it is reasonable to ask that the Russians permit the return of normal life in Poland, Romania, Hungary and Bulgaria, and come to terms on over-all solutions of the German and Austrian problems."

What would a return to "normal" in the above-mentioned countries imply? Before Hitler came to power in Germany, the Bulgarian, Romanian, and Hungarian govern-

ments had monstrous regimes of terror and torture. Eliot would use the atomic threat to allow a General Anders to establish once again a fascist, pogrom-ridden regime in Poland.

And then, as a bargain in exchange for eliminating atom bombs, the American plan for Germany and Austria will be obtained. Already, in the sections of Germany and Austria under U.S.-British control the Potsdam agreement to furnish reparations, to eradicate German military formations and to destroy fascism has been consistently violated. In return for advancing another stage in the Baruch plan, we will insure reactionary control of all Germany and Austria. Raymond Daniell reported in the *New York Times* that in the American zone the Nazis are more powerful than ever before. From the Soviet zone, American correspondents report, not only improved industry and more food, but no Nazi control. They report further that the Junker landlords and the financiers who brought Hitler to power have been wiped out. In return for carrying the same conditions that Daniell noted in the American zone into the Soviet zone, we will "advance" another stage of the I.A.D.A.

The diplomatic jockeying on the question of atomic energy cannot be separated from the major trends in the policy of the world powers today. British and American policy since V-J day has sought to resurrect the "anti-Comintern" Axis created by

Adolph Hitler. That was the meaning of Churchill's Fulton speech, sponsored by Truman. That was the basis for the close collaboration of Vandenberg and Byrnes in Paris and in the Bronx. This basic objective of American foreign policy is therefore involved in the sponsorship of the Baruch plan. That is why the Baruch plan seeks a unilateral U.S. veto in establishing the International Authority. That is why it seeks to end the Big Five veto and the effectiveness of U.N. That is why it uses the threat of atomic energy in furthering U.S. domination from the Mediterranean to the China Sea, from Iceland to the Philippines. Discussion of atomic energy takes place on a high moral plane. But the actual alignments of forces in world power politics are expressed in the controversy over atomic weapons.

If an agreement is to be reached that will effectively outlaw atomic weapons, it must be based on a realignment of world powers which reestablishes the Big Three Victory Coalition.

Most spurious of all arguments in the atomic control debate is the one which claims that the U.S. offers to surrender its sovereignty while the U.S.S.R. refuses to do so in even the slightest degree. Let alone not surrendering sovereignty, the U.S. does not surrender its bombs and its right to make more bombs as the I.A.D.A. is established. The sovereignty of other nations will be affected by the U.S. role in an international author-

ity which controls uranium and plutonium all over the world. But the sovereign right of the U.S. to continue making bombs is upheld.

In addition to not depriving the U.S. in any way of national sovereignty, the Baruch plan will not deprive the du Ponts and other monopolists from participating in the development of atomic energy. Nor is the "sovereign" right of the du Ponts and Standard Oil to tie up with a firm such as I. G. Farben contested. After all, Baruch is a millionaire businessman in his own right. His advisors are big businessmen. They do not contemplate surrendering the sovereign right of Big Business to profiteer in this field as in all other fields of military and productive endeavor.

The issue of "sovereignty" is unreal in discussing atomic energy. Neither the U.S. nor any other country is called upon to give up its sovereignty. Agreement among sovereign powers can help avert war. And a final recognition that the Big Powers must be equal and united will do more to the threat of atomic war than sentiments about surrendering national sovereignty.

Much confusion attaches to the question of whether the Baruch plan provides for the elimination or the control of atomic weapons. Lippmann says he has been advised that it eliminates such weapons. Max Lerner, in *PM* of June 25, berates the Soviet Union because it is unwilling "to adopt the sound core of the

Baruch plan, which seeks to outlaw atomic weapons by creating an international monopoly of atomic weapons."

Evidently the words of the Baruch speech are no guarantee. Baruch stated that when the I.A.D.A. is finally functioning, presumably in a very late stage, "existing bombs shall be disposed of" and "manufacture of atomic bombs shall stop."

There is no confusion on this question in the Gromyko plan, for it specifically provides for the destruction of existing supplies of bombs and for ending their manufacture. Furthermore, as we have pointed out, it does not depend on securing for the Soviet Union the secret of bomb manufacture. It provides that scientific and technological information shall be interchanged and that the nations control atomic energy for industrial, scientific, constructive purposes.

While Baruch was vague on the question of whether the international authority would destroy or control the bombs, he was not vague in demanding elimination of the veto. He was not vague in demanding an international authority which to all intents and purposes will have its life and function apart from the U.N. He specifically insured American control of the international authority through elimination of the veto.

Gromyko's plan has been criticized for its alleged failure to provide punishment for those who violate the atomic agreement. It has also

been criticized for failure to provide methods of control and inspection.

The fact is that in the speech he made when presenting the U.S.S.R.'s plan, Gromyko emphasized the need for "strict supervision of the observance of undertakings entered into . . . the setting up of a system of supervision and control to see that the conventions are observed and measures concerning sanctions against unlawful use of atomic energy."

Gromyko made repeated references to the need for sanctions against treaty violators. The Soviet Union has a long record of struggle on the international scene for collective security and punishment of aggressors. That is the light in which it views the central task of the U.N. The proposed treaty on atomic energy and the elaboration of sanctions are intended to strengthen the U.N. as an instrument of peace. In many ways, the stress Gromyko placed on such sanctions was under new conditions, reminiscent of the unsuccessful campaign conducted by the Soviet Union for sanctions against aggression in Ethiopia, China and Spain. However, Gromyko has strongly opposed discussion of sanctions apart from the charter of the U.N. and the functions of the Security Council.

If the obstacle to agreement between the Soviet Union and the U.S. were really alleged Soviet opposition to punishing violators of a treaty outlawing atomic weapons, there would

be nothing to prevent the immediate realization of an agreement. International sanctions and the effective use of the U.N. against treaty violators are a fundamental part of the Gromyko proposals.

BIG THREE UNITY

No plan on atomic energy can be effective without the cooperation of the United States, the Soviet Union and Great Britain. Much of the discussion on controlling atomic energy is unreal because it presumes that this matter can be abstracted from the world we live in. A plan is only as good as the agreement among the nations to carry out the plan. Therefore, while participating in the public discussion of specific plans for outlawing atomic warfare, it is necessary to place Big Three unity in the center of the discussion. Elaborate agreements are necessary. But they will be made or broken by the kind of relations that exist among the Big Three.

But the issue today is not an agreement on paper. No agreement will work unless it is founded on the unity and alliance which won the war. As long as U.S. foreign policy follows the lines of Munich in seeking to isolate the Soviet Union and create hostile blocs against it, discussion of atomic energy gets us nowhere except closer to atomic war.

By its very nature, imperialism seeks to use atomic energy as an instrument of diplomacy and war.

That does not imply that the peoples can have no effect on the course of events. Hatred of the peoples for the reactionary forces which brought about the misery of two world wars is a powerful factor impelling them to fight against the war-mongers. A tremendous power for peace exists in the working class and the democratic forces generally of all lands. For the first time in world labor history a unified single international trade union organization has been established. In Central and Eastern Europe new peoples' democratic governments reflecting the power of the working class and its allies have been established. The Communist Parties have grown vastly in every country of Europe. In Western Europe Communists are in the governments of France and Italy. The premiers of the peoples' democratic governments of Yugoslavia and

Czechoslovakia are Communists. In China millions of people live and fight under the democratic alliance in which the Communists play a leading role. And the Soviet Union has emerged from this war, not weakened as its enemies in the Allied countries hoped, but morally and militarily stronger than ever before.

Byrnes and Baruch are not the American people. A deep desire for peace exists among all sections of the nation. Upon the working class, organized more strongly than ever before in America's history, devolves the task of rallying the people in a broad, militant movement for Big Three unity to safeguard peace.

The organized pressure of the working class and peoples' movements can alter the dangerous trend toward war. The imperialist plans for atomic war can be defeated.

THE NEGRO PEOPLE SPARK THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

By JOHN PITTMAN

I.

WORLD WIN-THE-PEACE FORCES, battling enormous odds and suffering repeated setbacks in recent months, now possess strong new reinforcements and a new powerful weapon to help check Wall Street's drive toward world domination and war.

The reinforcements with their new weapon became part of the win-the-peace army as a contribution of the Negro people of the United States, acting through their aroused and energetic young organization, the National Negro Congress, but expressing as well the aspirations of all sections of the Negro people, manifest in recent conventions of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and of business, fraternal and religious organizations.

On the surface, the new weapon is merely a petition from the National Negro Congress to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations on behalf of the Negro people of America "for the elimination of political, economic and social discrimination against Ne-

groes in the United States of America." But this new weapon may be likened to an intricate mechanism, deceptively simple to the naked eye, yet comprised of numerous interconnecting relations which can set off, in their total reaction, a force of world-shaking magnitude.

For one thing, the petition to the U.N. is merely one part of the program of the National Negro Congress, yet so dramatic and intrinsic a part of the whole that it can be said to symbolize the Negro people's entire struggle for full equality in the United States. At the same time, the struggle to utilize this weapon and to win U.N. intervention in behalf of the Negro people can be an instrument for mobilizing and organizing all Americans in support of the Negro people's program for full equality. As we shall see, the implications of such a struggle extend beyond all previous conceptions of the significance of the Negro people's fight for national liberation.

For another thing, the National Negro Congress, in appealing to the U.N., left the door open for continued appeal to the United States government and for continued struggle within the framework of the existing political and social structure of the United States. Other parts of the program approved by the N.N.C. convention in Detroit, May 30-June 2, call for intensive work to strengthen the Congress's trade union base, to eliminate discrimination in employment, housing, and in the treatment of veterans, and to wage a political struggle, alongside of other

Negro organizations, for such remedial measures as a permanent F.E.P.C., abolition of the polltax system and the lily-white primaries, and an offensive against terrorist organizations such as the Ku Klux Klan. The convention, in fact, amounted to a rebirth of the Congress, and reflected a determination on the part of the Negro people to wage an uncompromising, furious battle for full equality, utilizing every means at their command.

It is within such a context that the Congress petition to the U.N. must be seen. The petition begins by setting forth the jurisdiction of the U.N. body over matters involving the "protection of minorities" and the "prevention of discrimination on grounds of race." This jurisdiction is established in the Charter and in the Report of the Committee on the Organization of the Economic and Social Council.

Next, the petition asserts the right of the National Negro Congress to appeal for redress of wrongs to the U.N. body. It cites Article 71 of the U.N. charter, as follows:

The Economic and Social Council may make suitable arrangements for consultation with non-governmental organizations which are concerned with matters within its competence. Such arrangements may be made with international organizations and, where appropriate, with national organizations after consultation with the member of the United Nations concerned.

Then the petition urges the U.N.

body to study the situation in the United States, to recommend action "to the end that 'higher standards' in the field of human rights may be achieved," and that "'discrimination and other abuses' on the grounds of race and color, may be 'checked and eliminated.'" Finally, it asks the U.N. body to "take such other and further steps as may seem just and proper to the end that the oppression of the American Negro be brought to an end."

This petition was supported by a statement of facts, obtained "in their entirety, directly from official publications of the United States Government." These facts established the charge of the petitioners that political, economic and social discrimination against Negroes exists in the United States.

As the unanimous view of the approximately 700 delegates and visitors to the National Negro Congress convention, the petition was received by Mr. Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the United Nations. The acknowledgement of its receipt promised that it would be "put on the list of communications transmitted to the Commission on Human Rights and will be dealt with in accordance with the procedures that may be laid down by the Economic and Social Council in regard to such communications." Meanwhile, leaders of the Congress were subsequently informed by Mr. Petrus J. Schmidt, Secretary of the Commission on Human Rights, that a copy of the petition would be sent to Mrs. Franklin

D. Roosevelt, Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights, and that the Commission would gladly receive all material bearing on the petition at any time.

Such features of the new weapon which Negro America has contributed to the win-the-peace forces suffice to distinguish it as a brilliant and original move, with incalculable tactical potentialities.

Indeed, in stepping forth boldly to confront the modern Goliath of U.S. imperialism, the Negro people have essayed the role of a doughty David. The boldness of the National Negro Congress, in articulating the challenge of the Negro people, marks a new advance in Negro America's organization, unity and political thinking.

II.

As a weapon for world peace, the struggle to win U.N. intervention in behalf of Negro Americans has special importance and power. It is capable of reaching the vulnerable places—economic, political and ideological—in the anatomy of U.S. imperialism. It will inspire other oppressed peoples, particularly those of the colonial and semi-colonial countries, to resist intimidation by imperialist aggressors, and to continue striving for independence and an equal place in the family of nations.

The establishment of a precedent for U.N. intervention in behalf of oppressed peoples would itself stimulate the growth of the struggle for

national liberation in the colonies. It can be expected that the National Negro Congress's struggle will stimulate appeals for similar U.N. action from the Bantus of the Union of South Africa, the Puerto Ricans, Palestinian Jews and Arabs, and peoples of other Asiatic, African and Latin-American lands.

The Negro people's struggle for U.N. intervention will also help to dispel illusions about the character of U.S. imperialism which are still prevalent among other peoples, even among those presently victimized by Wall Street. It will correct the false pictures spread by Hollywood, the U.S. monopoly press, the travelling delegations of the Rotary Clubs, Lions, Elks and Chamber of Commerce—pictures which have disarmed many peoples elsewhere and left them defenseless before the cold-blooded, iron-fisted drive of Wall Street for world domination. It will puncture the myths U.S. imperialism has assiduously sown abroad that the United States is a land of abundance, where the four freedoms are fully enjoyed by everyone, where there is no class distinction and democracy has attained its fullest flowering. The eradication of these falsehoods, and a realistic picture of the United States as the Negro people know it, will arm and steel win-the-peace forces everywhere.

By such means the broad conception of "aggression" which the Soviet Union delegation sought unsuccessfully to write into the U.N. Charter at the San Francisco conference

might be given practical implementation. This conception would extend the meaning of aggression to include oppression of minorities and peoples within a multi-national state—a condition which general observation shows to be one of the causes of modern war, and which is recognized in the very existence of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights.

Such construing of the authority of the U.N. to warrant its investigation of conditions of national oppression within a member state has the sanction of the Charter and the precedent of the Nuremberg trials. On the one hand, it is noteworthy that during the U.S. Senate discussion on ratification of the Charter, it was specifically stated that such investigatory powers would reside in the U.N., and ratification came after such an understanding. In addition, the language of the Charter is explicit in several sections on the function of the U.N. to promote "universal respect for, and observance of human rights and basic freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion." In the case of the Nuremberg trials, the oppression of the Jews by the Hitlerite chieftains has been listed as a "war crime," and the precedent established for construing national oppression as one of the seeds of international conflict which requires prohibitory action by the United Nations Organization. Needless to say, such a construction of the authority of the U.N. is in the interests of the peoples of the world, and the strug-

gle to obtain such a construction is also a struggle to save the U.N. from the imperialists and preserve its usefulness for mankind.

Of greatest importance, however, is the direct relation of the struggle for U.N. action in behalf of Negro America to U.S. imperialism's role as the leader of the forces instigating a third world war. In this relationship, Negro America is in position to strike a paralyzing blow at Wall Street's strategy for war. This is so for three reasons.

First, such a struggle can mobilize the Negro people to full participation in their historic role as an ally of the working class, thereby bringing desperately needed reinforcement into labor's present struggle to beat back the offensive of the big monopolies. By thus strengthening labor in this life-and-death fight, Negro America would be serving, not only its own highest interests, but would be striking directly at the war plans of Wall Street. For the monopolies' twin drive toward inflation and toward the complete shackling of the trade unions is but the domestic side of its foreign policy, the home-front strategy designed to prepare its rear for aggressions abroad. Very directly, the fight to defeat the numerous restrictions which monopoly and its general staff, the Truman-Byrnes Administration, plan to impose upon the trade unions is also a fight for peace.

The National Negro Congress, moreover, can be expected to be the appropriate spark-plug of this strug-

gle. The Congress's predominantly trade union base, and its programmatic orientation toward the deepest unity with the labor movement, ensure that the character of the struggle will not be diverted into reformist or anti-labor channels. It is noteworthy, in passing, that the convention, which unanimously endorsed the appeal to the U.N., also denounced President Truman's attempt to break the railroad strike and the many restrictive bills with which monopoly-capital seeks to emasculate the trade unions. With the Congress as a prime lever, the possibility exists of welding the broadest unity among the Negro people, drawing the powerful N.A.A.C.P. and other Negro organizations into the fight.

Second, the struggle for U.N. remedial action, as an expression of the national consciousness of the Negro people, can stimulate the growing political-mindedness and political action of the progressive people's coalition, and check the attacks of reaction on the people's liberties. Here again, the interests of the Negro people are identical with those of the great majority of Americans. The fight of the Negro people for the franchise, for abolition of the poll tax and lily-white primary, for public office and justice in the courts, for federal action against the Ku Klux Klan and other native fascist groups, for the punishment of lynch-terrorists—this fight conjoins in aim and principle with the fight of the labor movement, of the National

tee, of the Independent Citizens Committee of Scientists, Artists and Professionals.

As one example, the form which the struggle will take in Washington, the national capital, will constitute a bridge between the Negro people and practically every other section of progressive Americans. There, the struggle to marshal evidence of oppression, the inauguration of a people's tribunal on the oppression of Negroes, is expected to center around the fight against Bilboism, with all that the term connotes regarding national oppression. But Bilboism is also anti-Semitism. It is also hatred for the Italian Americans. It represents the most flagrant denial of democracy. It means agrarian backwardness and the impoverishment of the farming population. It is hatred for labor organization, hatred against the Soviet Union, and a policy of colonial oppression. It embodies, therefore, the most vicious elements of Wall Street's attack on the whole American people. Hence, the fight against Bilboism is a fight in behalf of the living standards and liberties of all Americans. Obviously, herein is a powerful lever for raising the struggle for unity against U.S. imperialism to a high level.

Such a struggle threatens directly one of the main agents of monopoly capital in its attacks on the people and its plans for world domination. This agent is the conspiratorial grouping of Hoover Republicans and poll-tax Democrats which has been able to thwart every progressive

measure in the federal legislature, which has been the inspiration of the inflationary measures and anti-labor bills that have recently inundated the Congress, and which has captured both the Democratic and Republican party apparatuses and subjected the too pliant and willing Truman Administration to its will.

Third, Negro America's appeal for U.N. aid in its fight against oppression strips U.S. imperialism's atom-bomb diplomacy of every hypocritical pretense to democracy with which it strives to cloak its cold-blooded war preparations. For the Negro people, Secretary of State James Byrnes' professions of concern for the freedom of Bulgarians, Rumanians, Hungarians, Iranians, Manchurians and Austrians are unadulterated demagogy. Negroes are not taken in by talk about the Four Freedoms; they know the conditions of tyranny and hooded terror in South Carolina, Byrnes' home state. They understand clearly the motives which prompt the House Committee on Un-American Activities to refuse to investigate the Ku Klux Klan.

In this all-important sphere of ideology, the Negro people can make a significant contribution to America, where the people's sensibilities have, in the main, been dulled to the lack of democracy in their homeland, by the lies and pretensions disseminated by a monopolistic press, radio, and cinema. This insufficient sensitivity to the meaning of the struggle for Negro rights to labor

as well as to the Negro people has been an important obstacle to the growth of political consciousness in the labor movement. Thus, even today, labor leadership preponderantly approaches the struggle for Negro rights from a humanitarian, rather than from a clear, political viewpoint. It is inconceivable that the American people, fully aware of and sensitive to the manifold oppression of the Negro people, would tolerate a poll-tax bureaucrat in the office of Secretary of State, or would allow him to brandish the atom bomb in the faces of the rest of the world to compel their adoption of the South Carolina brand of "democracy."

Hence, the Negro people's struggle to win intervention in their behalf from a higher body than the United States Government is in itself an indictment of the democracy now obtaining in the United States. As the National Negro Congress told President Truman, "Negro citizens find the present conditions intolerable, and are therefore presenting their appeal to the highest court of mankind—the United Nations." The full prosecution of this struggle is capable of injecting a self-critical attitude into the consciousness of the rest of America. It can alert the people to the dangers from within, and accordingly arm them for a more effective struggle against the aims of Wall Street. It can enliven their sensibilities and steel the trade unions for the high political responsibilities which history has thrust upon them. It can strengthen the hand

of the peace forces abroad, and, by stripping the mask from the face of U.S. imperialism, bare the whole hideousness of the horrors it is preparing for mankind.

Such are the possibilities of the new weapon which Negro America has contributed to the arsenal of the win-the-peace forces. It is clear that these possibilities, in toto, include the perspective of helping to check Wall Street's drive to war and of developing a mighty people's progressive coalition. But it would be illusory to think that such possibilities will be realized without the broadest and deepest unity, both among the Negro people and between the Negro and white democratic forces in the land, or without an intensive and prolonged struggle to overcome the difficulties and obstacles which the imperialists will certainly place in the way of victory.

III.

In the course of its struggle to obtain assistance from the United Nations, Negro America will run into headlong collision with U.S. monopoly capitalism. Monopoly capital may be expected to deal with the plea to the U.N. directly. Through its direct U.S. representation and the representatives of its satellites and partners, U.S. imperialism may first attempt to create procedural obstacles to hearing the Congress' petition, and, failing that, to contest and refute the charges upon which the petition rests.

Fortunately, the National Negro

Congress has anticipated both moves and has begun precautionary action to forestall them. The Congress has appealed to the National Lawyers Guild and the National Bar Association to prepare legal advisory opinion sustaining the right of the U.N. Economic and Social Council to receive pleas for freedom from oppression from non-governmental bodies. Both bodies have also been asked to prepare opinion sustaining the elevated policy status of the Secretary General of the U.N., whereby he is permitted to give clearly defined instructions to the U.N. Economic and Social Commission.

To meet any attempt to refute the basis of its charges, the Congress is also organizing apparatus for mass people's testimonial tribunals throughout the United States, which would provide up-to-the-minute testimony on the conditions of Negroes within the country. In addition, the Congress is launching a nationwide petition drive to support its petition to the U.N.

But while such measures may satisfy the requirements for meeting U. S. imperialism's direct opposition on the U.N. level, they will not suffice to cope with the offensive of terror and demagoguery which Wall Street traditionally unleashes against the Negro people whenever they assert their claim to full equality. To meet this offensive, it is obvious that the Negro people cannot be left to wage the battle alone.

It is obligatory on the trade union movement and the progressive peo-

ple's organizations to counter any offensive against the Negro people with the fullest support and backing. The leaders of many of these organizations should bear in mind the unpleasant fact that their own irresoluteness in the struggle for Negro rights is partially responsible for the Negro people's need to appeal for aid outside of the U.S. Government. They should also bear in mind that Negro America's fight for full equality advances the interests of the American people as a whole.

Accordingly, the characteristic tactic of monopoly capital to divide and rule must be countered with profound organic unity of Negro and white workers. The testimony for the U.N. Commission will have added validity if it consists largely of statements from white Americans. But beyond the procedural problems of bringing the weight of world opinion to bear upon U.S. imperialism, white Americans, especially the labor movement, bear the main responsibility for defeating any attempt to incite anti-Negro violence and discrimination. They have the chief responsibility for bringing to justice the perpetrators of the outrages against Negroes in Freeport, L.I., and Columbia, Tenn., and for conducting a fight to the finish against the Klan and the sundry fascist groupings.

Such a fight is especially important now, when monopoly capital, in its drive to revise through inflation the national income and to crush the trade union movement,

has special reason for driving a wedge between Negroes and white Americans. And Negro workers, because of their weak economic position, are particularly susceptible to inflation, to Wall Street's plan to expropriate their savings, to drive them out of skilled jobs, and to create a huge Negro labor reserve. With such a reserve, Wall Street hopes to intimidate white workers, and if possible, to stage a flank attack against the trade unions.

Hence, it will require continuous vigilance and uncompromising militancy on the part of white Americans to foresee and forestall the many maneuvers Wall Street may press to achieve its aim. Especially are white trade unionists obligated, in their own interests, to fight discrimination in lay-offs and rehiring, to work in the political sphere for passage of federal and state Fair Employment Practice authorities, to demand the abolition of discrimination in housing, public conveyances, lily-white shops, education and recreation. Under no circumstances can the trade unions afford to give monopoly's agents a pretext for spreading anti-union sentiment among the Negro people. This is especially important in the South, where both the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. are at present engaged in organizing drives. Any compromise with Southern traditions of Jim Crow will carry the penalty of stalling the organization drives and aiding the Southern employers' effort to foster Negro-white antagonism.

Similar responsibilities apply to the trade unions and progressive organizations in their political activities. It is high time that white Americans realize that if the poll tax injures the Negro, it also injures white America. If a mob of state patrolmen are permitted to terrorize a Negro neighborhood in Tennessee, no Americans anywhere in the United States are secure from terror. It is inevitable that as the most chauvinistic, reactionary section of U.S. monopoly capital intensifies its chauvinist persecution of Negroes, progressive white Americans will come into conflict with every form of chauvinism. In this conflict, in fighting for Negro-white unity, Americans will be fighting for peace and freedom for themselves and their children.

Another reflection of monopoly capital's drive to crush Negro America's struggle will be found within the Negro movement itself. There, the influence of monopoly capital will be seen, on the one hand, in the growth of separatist nationalist sentiment, and, on the other hand, in the increasing growth of reformist and compromising leadership. The problem here is one of mobilizing the Negro people in the struggle to win United Nations support for their demands. It is fundamentally a problem of Negro unity.

Reformism and opportunistic tendencies among the Negro people manifest themselves in an attachment for avoiding mass action and resorting solely to legalistic means of seeking redress for injuries or

improvement of their status, in blind allegiance to the two main political party organizations, and in the preoccupation with discussion-group types of organization. Separatist nationalist tendencies, while posing as militant champions of Negro America's demands, lead into the same blind alley as do the reformists. They eschew the alliance with labor and thus play the game of monopoly capital, which hopes to maintain the structure of Jim Crow as a bulwark of its class interests.

To overcome these divisive obstacles within the Negro movement, a real struggle for unity is required. Though the National Negro Congress, in articulating the national aspirations of the Negro people by the appeal to the U.N., stepped into the leadership of the struggle, it cannot be expected to mobilize and organize sufficient strength by its own efforts alone. The N.A.A.C.P., possessing greater resources and deep roots in the South, and now oriented toward greater militancy in alliance with the labor movement, is indispensable to the movement in behalf of the petition to the U.N. The Negro press and church have strategic roles to play in such a national mobilization. And valuable services and support can be contributed by Negro fraternal, business and social organizations. Indeed, the struggle to unite the Negro people will have to embrace every section and penetrate all strata of Negro America. Only by such means can the Negro people themselves

utilize fully their own new weapon for peace and democratic advance.

IV.

Marxists will recognize the Negro people's struggle to end discrimination and oppression through an appeal to the U.N. as an expression of that will to self-determination, the right to which the Communist Party was the first to demand for the Negro nation. The tasks of Communists in furthering this struggle flow naturally, therefore, from our Party's position on this decisive demand.*

However, in fully differentiating ourselves from the Browder revisionist position, it is necessary to smash, at the outset, any illusions regarding an easy victory in Negro America's struggle for full equality. While throwing our full support to the National Negro Congress in its effort to win U.N. action, we must make clear to the Negro people that complete success in their struggle will be won only through a transformation of the existing political and economic structure, replacing monopoly capital's anarchic system and terroristic rule with the planned economy and genuine democracy of Socialism. But in carrying on their struggle for economic, political and social equality alongside the millions of white workingmen and women who are fighting to maintain their living standards and liberties, Negro Americans are advancing the struggle for

Socialism. This is the historic significance of their struggle for national liberation.

We Communists should spare no effort to advance this struggle, especially through the fight for Negro-white unity in the trade unions and progressive organizations. Communists will participate actively in the National Negro Congress campaign for additional testimony supporting its charges to the U.N., and for petitions supporting the original petition for U.N. intervention.

In addition, Communists will be in the forefront of the fight to resist Wall Street's attempt to drive a wedge between the Negro and white working masses. We must act boldly to lead the struggle against discrimination in layoffs and rehiring, against Jim Crow barriers in the trade unions, as well as for the enactment of federal and state F.E.P.C. legislation. We Communists must carry on the fight, also in our own ranks, against chauvinism in its every manifestation.

Further, we must pay special attention to the training of Negro cadres for leadership of our Party, and to the recruitment and education of thousands of militant Negro men and women who will look to us for guidance in the coming sharp struggles for peace, jobs and liberty.

By such measures, our Party can further the Negro people's struggle for full equality and simultaneously fulfill its vanguard responsibility of leadership in the fight for security, democracy and peace.

* Inasmuch as the question of national self-determination for the Negro people in the Black Belt is now under discussion by the Party, this statement is to be understood as the individual position of the author.—*The Editors.*

THE AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE CONVENTION

By JOHN GATES

THE FIRST Constitutional Convention of the American Veterans Committee, born of World War II and consisting exclusively of veterans of that war, was held in June at Des Moines, Iowa. In view of the reactionary leadership and policies of the old line veteran organizations, the progressive character of the A.V.C. convention holds great significance for the future of the veterans in the United States.

The Convention was attended by approximately 900 delegates from 350 chapters, representing 35,000 members of a total estimated membership of 60,000 at the time of the convention. The delegates were predominantly white collar workers, professionals, small businessmen and students, with only 25 Negro delegates and a sprinkling of women. This is an accurate reflection of the membership composition of A.V.C. at present. Contrary to the practice of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, this convention was extremely serious, business-like and democratic with a

100 per cent participation of the delegates in the affairs of the convention.

FOREIGN POLICY

In general, the convention adopted a liberal, progressive program with some exceptions. On foreign policy, the principle of Big Three unity was adopted, with World Government to evolve out of the effective functioning of the United Nations. This was an improvement over the draft platform, which made World Government the main basis for world peace, in that it makes World Government conditional upon cooperation between the Big Three. Nevertheless, the insistence upon the concept of World Government, while showing the idealistic desires of the convention, betrayed a basic lack of understanding that this reactionary utopian concept is being used today against the veto right which is the very heart of Big Three cooperation.

The program called for a rupture of relations with Franco-Spain, for recognition of the Spanish government-in-exile, for a democratic policy in China, for self-determination for Puerto Rico and for the freedom of the colonial peoples. The convention demanded the internationalization of atomic energy and a halt to the production of atom bombs, but endorsed the Baruch report which would permit the United States to continue to manufacture atom bombs until it alone decides to stop doing so, and would do away with the veto right, thus enabling the United States to dominate the United Na-

tions and world affairs. With respect to the armed forces, peacetime universal military training was opposed, but extension of the draft was endorsed on the grounds of being essential for our occupational commitments. The truth is that our regular army is several times big enough to handle our commitments in Germany, Italy and Japan (aside from the fact that that army is being used to aid fascist reaction and to fight against real democracy everywhere) and that extension of the draft makes possible the keeping of American armed forces in China, the Philippines and in far-flung bases in the Pacific, Atlantic and Latin-America for imperialistic purposes.

The foreign policy program, while generally progressive, is thus seen to contain a considerable amount of confusion. This is explained by the fact that the convention showed no understanding and recognition of the imperialistic, aggressive, world-dominating role of U.S. imperialism as the main threat to world peace. Unless the A.V.C. is able to learn from events and to eliminate the elements of confusion in its foreign policy, it stands in danger of receding from its progressive position to a reactionary one. In general, however, its policy constitutes a minimum program on which progressive veterans can collaborate to preserve the peace and stands in fundamental contrast to the reactionary imperialist program of the American Legion,

V.F.W., Catholic War Veterans, etc., providing it is actually carried out by the A.V.C.

The domestic affairs program endorses the fight for the Full Employment Bill, the FEPC, the Wagner-Ellender-Taft Housing legislation, extension of price control, river valley authorities, the Minimum Wage Act, the Wagner Health Act, support to the organizing drives of the unions, etc. Active participation in the coming elections was advocated, with A.V.C. chapters to concentrate on getting out the veteran vote and setting up independent veterans committees to campaign for progressive candidates, since the A.V.C. cannot officially endorse candidates. This is an excellent program which goes in the opposite direction from that of the major veteran organizations, which tend to follow the lead of the National Association of Manufacturers and the reactionary bi-partisan coalition in Congress.

BASIC WEAKNESSES

But it was on veterans affairs, where it should have stood out, that the A.V.C. made its weakest contribution, a fact which may have very serious consequences for the organization. What was adopted was good (with one exception), but it received the last and least consideration of the convention. So true is this that many observers remarked that one would scarcely have known he was attending a veterans convention were there not so many "ruptured ducks" in evi-

dence. A most serious error was made in decisively rejecting a bonus by a 2-to-1 vote. The underestimation and neglect of veterans affairs and the stand on the bonus show the contradictions and dilemma from which the A.V.C. suffers.

The dilemma of the A.V.C. stems from its main slogan, "Citizen First, Veteran Second," coined by Charles Bolte, head of A.V.C., and popularized in his book of the same name. The slogan is catchy but essentially misleading. It is responsible for much of the progress of A.V.C. but also for most of its problems and failures. Its good side lies in that it emphasizes that the veteran is part of the nation, that he cannot solve his problems unless those of the nation are solved too, and in that it opposes the reactionary efforts to set the veteran apart from, and in opposition to, the working class. This is undeniably progressive and has attracted considerable support for A.V.C., particularly from non-veterans.

The harmful side of the slogan lies in its relegating the fight for the special needs of veterans into a secondary category. It implies that such a fight is somehow in contradiction to the interests of the nation as a whole. Indeed, its logic leads to the denial of the reason for the existence of veterans' organizations at all. If the primary purpose of the A.V.C. is its general political program, then there are many other organizations which the veteran can join that are

far more effective. But the masses of veterans will only join a *veterans* organization if they can find an answer to their problem *as veterans*. What would be the result if trade unions were guided by the philosophy of: Citizen First, Worker Second? That is exactly what the worst enemies of the unions try to prove, that the interests of trade unions are inimical to the nation, and by means of this they seek to hamstring and destroy the effectiveness of the unions. But trade unions are champions of the economic interests of the workers and, as such, do not hinder but enhance the well-being of the nation. Trade unions espouse broad general programs too, but they secure their mass base (and hence their effectiveness) by their fight for the immediate interests of the workers.

If the A.V.C. hopes to attract even the first two hundred thousand members in its drive for "A Million Members, A Million Dollars," it must establish itself as the foremost champion of the special needs of the veteran, as well as of a progressive general program. Millions of veterans have joined the Legion and V.F.W., despite their reactionary leadership and program, because of the many services performed for them as veterans. As a matter of fact, the A.V.C. contradicted its own slogan in its forthright fight for the Wyatt Housing Program which is a "Veterans First" program!

It is not surprising that so few

Negro veterans belong to the A.V.C. While the A.V.C. is opposed to discrimination, it conducts no major or consistent struggle for the extremely pressing needs of the Negro veteran. At Des Moines, the convention forced the arrest of a restaurant proprietor who had refused to serve a Negro delegate, but it then spoiled the victory with a statement absolving the City of Des Moines of any responsibility for the discrimination against Negroes. This was no service to the Negroes who live in Des Moines and who will continue to be discriminated against long after the convention has gone. The superficial approach of the A.V.C. to Negro veterans, in effect denying their special problems, proves the wisdom of those veterans who formed the United Negro and Allied Veterans of America. No other organization of veterans today answers the urgent needs of the Negro veteran.

The underestimation of veterans' needs by the A.V.C. is a result of the middle-class character of the organization. It is not yet representative of the mass of veterans who are faced with serious economic problems. The A.V.C. must look for its mass base to the 72 per cent of the armed forces who held social security cards, which means that they worked for a living, to the three million who belonged to unions prior to entry into the service, to the half-million student-veterans, to the million Negro veterans, to the women veterans and to the merchant seamen, as well

as to the progressive middle-class veterans so far attracted to it. But it will only attract the lower income veterans by vigorously fighting for their needs as veterans, as well as for the general program of the A.V.C.

Is the veteran's problem gradually disappearing? An analysis of history and of future economic perspectives answers *no* to this question. The veteran's problem after World War I reached its climax and erupted *14 years* after the end of that war in the Bonus March of 1932. The veteran's problem is thus seen to be quite persistent and intimately tied up with economic conditions. If we were going into a period of permanent boom and full employment, then of course the veteran's problem (aside from that of the disabled) would disappear. But such is not the outlook before us, at least as long as capitalism exists. Even in a period of high production and employment, such as at present, the standard of living of the people is being forced down through the rise in the cost of living and the robbery of the workers' earnings and savings. There is considerable unemployment among veterans, estimated at well over one and a half million. Meanwhile, the factors are fast accumulating for a great economic crisis that will dwarf that of 1929, which produced such ferment amongst veterans.

THE BONUS QUESTION

In view of this perspective, the

A.V.C. must reconsider its attitude toward a federal bonus. The main arguments against the bonus were: (1) It is a "handout"; (2) It is inflationary; (3) If the veteran can secure a decent job, decent wage and living conditions he would not need a bonus. The answer to the last argument is that he is not getting those things, and under capitalism things are going to become much worse, so that the fight for a bonus is part of the daily fight for a higher standard of living. The first two arguments sound very strange coming from a progressive pro-labor organization. They are the stock-in-trade arguments habitually used by the Chamber of Commerce, N.A.M., and the bi-partisan reactionary coalition in Congress against unemployment relief, social security, wage increases, and all expenditures for the benefit of the people.

It is easy to understand the contemptuous rejection of the bonus as a handout by the few millionaire's sons present at the convention, but its rejection by the A.V.C. as a whole raises serious doubts in the minds of the overwhelming majority of veterans as to whom the A.V.C. really represents. The bonus is no more a handout than are mustering-out pay, terminal-leave pay, and allowances under the G.I. Bill of Rights, all of which the A.V.C. supports. It represents the recognition that the veteran made great sacrifices for our country, and that in order to start out, after an absence of several years,

on an equal basis with the rest of the population, he needs and deserves considerable assistance from the government. The veteran needs to catch up, and the program to help him do that, which includes the bonus, is not a "handout" but legitimate and essential differential pay for losses suffered and services rendered during the war. One can debate the amount of a bonus and the manner in which it should be paid, but to argue against the principle of a bonus is to argue against the need for special and extra assistance to the veterans.

The charge that a bonus would cause inflation is ridiculous. The payment of a bonus to World War I veterans caused no inflation. On the contrary, it helped to ease the burden of the depression on the people. Increases in wages, and other means of increasing the purchasing power of the people, such as a bonus, will cut into the exorbitant profits of Big Business, but they are not the cause of rising prices or of inflation. It is the monopolistic control of industry by the giant trusts, their refusal to accept reduced profits and their desire for ever greater profits, which are responsible for the present price rise. Moreover, the rising cost of living is robbing the worker of his wage increase and the G.I. of his benefits, so that increased wages and allowances for veterans, including a bonus, are urgently necessary in addition to the maintenance of price controls.

LABOR AND THE VETERANS

The recent *Fortune* poll reveals a very important trend among veterans. The poll compares the attitude of the public toward labor and management last fall and this spring. It reveals 25 per cent for labor, 45 per cent for management, and 29 per cent "don't know," last fall; and 37 per cent for labor, 37 per cent for management, and 26 per cent "don't know," this spring—a decided trend in the nation generally in favor of labor. But the figures for *veterans* this spring show 43 per cent for labor, 41 per cent for management, and 16 per cent "don't know," a higher pro-labor sentiment among veterans than among the people generally.

These facts are hardly surprising. They reflect the largely working-class composition of the veterans, as well as their disillusioning experiences in becoming adjusted to civilian life. The veteran is beginning to learn the truth about the allegedly fabulous salaries of war workers, and placing responsibility for low wages, high prices, shortage of homes, clothing and food upon the big trusts and their exorbitant profits. At the same time the veteran is becoming increasingly conscious of the progressive role of the labor movement in fighting for a decent standard of living. On the other hand, one should not overlook the high percentage of veterans for management, higher than that of the public as a whole.

This shows that a considerable number of veterans still retain the anti-labor indoctrination they received while in the armed forces, and also that reaction has been somewhat successful in convincing some veterans that the labor movement is responsible for the run-around they have been getting.

Reaction is seeking to get a foothold among the veterans. It is doing this primarily through its control of the major veterans' organizations and through the Scripps-Howard and Hearst press. The leadership of these veterans' organizations is reverting back to its traditional anti-Communist, anti-labor role of before the war. Stelle and Stack of the Legion and the V.F.W. make this the central theme of every speech they make. They echo Attorney General Thomas Clark and J. Edgar Hoover. It is a planned, concerted part of the "get tough with Russia," "get tough with the world," "get tough with the people" policy of the American monopolists.

The veteran's problem will more and more become a major issue. It will reach its climax when America is plunged into an inevitable economic crisis. The lesson of nazism in Germany teaches us that reaction can win large masses of disillusioned and demoralized veterans for its program if a united labor movement fails to develop a program and effective struggle for the needs of the veterans. Fortunately, the labor movement here has made significant

beginnings in this direction in the adoption of veterans' programs, the formation of veterans' committees, and the organization of many struggles on behalf of veterans.

These are, however, only the merest beginnings. There are great weaknesses in the labor movement of which the employers are not unconscious, and they are increasing their efforts to win the veteran and poison him against labor. Labor must not fall into the trap of thinking that all is well with the veteran, that the veteran's problem is disappearing, and that it therefore need feel no concern with it. Labor must continue and extend its fight for the needs of the veteran, both inside and outside the unions, must develop further the alliance between the trade unions and the veterans through united action on the common issues confronting both.

RED-BAITING OPPOSED

A significant aspect of the A.V.C. convention was its attitude toward Red-baiting. The only public Red-baiting was expressed by the fake liberal, Stassen, who was very coldly received. Several delegates had come with anti-Communist resolutions, but taking heed of the atmosphere of the convention they did not dare to present them. Nevertheless, a certain amount of sly Red-baiting took place behind the scenes, mainly by the friends of Reuther and Dubinsky present at the convention. In the elec-

tions for office the main contest took place around the vice-chairmanship. The issues involved in this were not clear to the mass of the delegates and revolved mainly around the accusation that Gilbert Harrison, founder of the A.V.C., was a Red-baiter. He denied this, but the narrow margin of his victory, 19,000 to 16,500, proved that he failed to convince a great many delegates. It remains to be seen whether Harrison will live up to his pledge. There are already disturbing post-convention signs that the dominant circles in the national leadership are moving to fire personnel for political reasons.

Bolte was elected chairman without opposition and with but one dissenting vote. A national planning committee of 24 was elected, consisting roughly of one-third rich men's sons with a liberal outlook and with ties to the Wallace Democrats and Stassen Republicans, one-third mixed *New Republic* and New Deal liberals and Social-Democratic friends of Reuther, Dubinsky and Carey, and one-third tied up with the independent political action forces represented by N.C.P.A.C., I.C.C., etc. If the leadership of the A.V.C. can unite around a bold program of struggle both for the needs of veterans and for the general good of the nation, direct its appeal to the mass of the veterans, and defeat the efforts of the few professional anti-Communist disrupters in the leadership to set the A.V.C. on the same sterile path as the reactionary Red-

TH
baiting
V.F.W.
a great
must
entire
Amve
possibi
action
in the
have
from
leader
thousa
above
in ally
mover
tionar
organ
rank-a
those
It m
ever,
millio
the A
lion i
do no

baiting leaders of the Legion and the V.F.W., then the A.V.C. indeed has a great future before it. The A.V.C. must stretch out its hand to the *entire* labor movement, to the Amvets with which there are even possibilities of merger, and to united action with the millions of veterans in the Legion and the V.F.W., who have an entirely different outlook from that of their own reactionary leaders. An A.V.C. of hundreds of thousands of members, playing the above role, will be a major influence in allying the veterans with the labor movement, in countering the reactionary policies of the major veteran organizations, and in stimulating rank-and-file movements within those organizations.

It must never be overlooked, however, that there are at present two million World War II veterans in the American Legion and one million in the V.F.W. These veterans do not share the outlook of the en-

trenched bureaucratic leadership of their organizations, who are primarily interested in carrying out the anti-democratic program of monopoly capital, and must not be left at their mercy. Every effort must be made to collaborate with the rank-and-file of these organizations, who will increasingly come into conflict with the bureaucracy (as many of the State Encampments of the Legion and V.F.W. already show) and to do everything possible to stimulate such movements. Progressive-minded veterans, especially trade union veterans, should follow the lead of the Communist veterans. Just as they fought on all fronts and in all branches of the armed forces, so Communist veterans are increasingly active in *all* veterans' organizations, including, and not least of all, the Legion and V.F.W., and seek to unite all veterans in the struggle for security, democracy and peace, and against reaction.

REVISIONISM AND AMERICAN HISTORY

By HOWARD JENNINGS

IN A LETTER written in 1890, Engels spoke of the trend of historical study in Germany:

In general the word *materialistic* serves many of the younger writers in Germany as a mere phrase with which anything and everything is labeled without further study; they stick on this label and then think the question disposed of. But our conception of history is above all a guide to study, not a lever for construction after the manner of the Hegelians. All history must be studied afresh. . . *

During the past decade, American Marxists have devoted considerable attention to problems of American history. But Engels' description of the errors of German historical interpretation in the last years of the nineteenth century provides a suggestive commentary on the manner in which our Party has approached the task of rediscovering and utilizing our rich heritage of national tradition and experience.

The brief unsystematic reference to American history in Browder's writings from 1934 to 1945 were regarded as an authoritative guide to the

* *Correspondence of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, 1846-1895*, International Publishers, New York, 1936, p. 473.

American past. This material was welcomed as a reversal of previous sectarian trends; but it was not subjected to critical analysis from the viewpoint of historical materialism. It is significant of the generally low level of our historical knowledge that throughout the recent discussion of revisionism there has been only occasional mention of Browder's historical views. Yet these views are among the most important elements which he used as a rationale, a theoretical foundation, for the structure of revisionism. We have demolished the rotten structure. But as long as this phase of revisionism is not exposed, it serves as the basis for dangerous misconceptions concerning the American tradition and the nature of the "democratic process." Demagoguery regarding democracy and Americanism is one of the most potent weapons in the arsenal of ruling class propaganda. Failure to combat the historical assumptions of Browderism surrenders the field of history to bourgeois liberalism, which is objectively serving the interests of monopoly capital.

In calling for a united front against the rising power of Hitlerism in 1935, Dimitrov said:

The fascists are rummaging through the entire *history* of every nation so as to be able to pose as the heirs and continuators of all that was exalted and heroic in its past. . . .

Communists who suppose that all this has nothing to do with the cause of the working class, who do nothing to enlighten the masses on the past of

their own people, in a historically correct fashion, in a genuinely Marxist, a Leninist-Marxist, a Lenin-Stalin spirit, who do nothing to *link up their present struggle with its revolutionary traditions and past*—voluntarily relinquish to fascist falsifiers all that is valuable in the historical past of the nation, that the fascists may bamboozle the masses.*

The whole greatness of our history is the inheritance of the American working class and its allies. The possession and use of this inheritance depends on scientific understanding of the movement of history, on application of the general laws of social evolution to the concrete conditions of American development.

Historical materialism holds that the *mode of production* is the basic and chief force in the development of society, and that the study of the forces and relationships of production provides the key to the historical process. If we examine Browder's articles dealing with American history in the light of this definition, we find that his method is in no way consonant with the principles of historical materialism. His approach to history, and the system of ideas inherent in that approach, are not of very recent origin; the trend is evident as early as 1934, and is fully crystallized in his use of historical analogies at the time of the 1936 Presidential election and the events following it.

ERRORS IN METHOD

There are three outstanding characteristics of Browder's method: (1) uncritical acceptance of the viewpoint and conclusions of bourgeois historians; (2) mechanical identification of past and present situations; (3) exclusive interest in the early national period. Brief consideration of these characteristics may serve as a starting point for a more detailed analysis of the revisionist pattern underlying Browder's historical writings.

1. Browder tells us that his views on the Constitution and the Jeffersonian period are derived from three books: *Jefferson and Hamilton* and *Jefferson in Power*, both by Claude G. Bowers; and *Bulwark of the Republic: Biography of the Constitution*, by Burton J. Hendrick.* His discussion of the Civil War and the role of Lincoln shows similar reliance on a few limited sources. It is natural enough that Browder should utilize the most readily available historical literature as the basis for his study; what is striking is the uncritical manner in which he accepts this material and his failure to interpret it in the light of Marxist-Leninist understanding. He follows Bowers in treating the Jeffersonian period in terms of political trends and personalities, without attempting to define the economic and social roots of these phenomena. Thus attention

* *United Front Against Fascism*, New Century Publishers, New York, 1945, pp. 77-8.

* *The People's Front*, International Publishers, 1938, p. 249.

is concentrated on the political and legal aspects of history, and on the ideas and attitudes of individuals. For example, the adoption of the Constitution and the struggle that followed it are presented as conflicts of ideas, in which Jefferson and Hamilton stood as the proponents of opposing ideologies. This is true, insofar as it describes the form in which the conflict of forces expressed itself; but we cannot understand the period adequately unless we relate ideas and personalities to the interplay of economic and social forces.

Browder gives no serious attention to Shays' Rebellion in New England or to the whiskey Rebellion in Pennsylvania, or to the deep currents of popular protest of which these events were manifestations.

A careful survey of Browder's work on history fails to reveal the presentation of statistics or documented references to economic developments. He makes no mention of the facts concerning labor, agriculture, commerce and industry, which are readily available in standard economic histories. This disregard of economic data is characteristic of academic historiography (because the academic historian, however well trained he may be in the formal marshalling of economic facts, lacks the Marxist understanding that would enable him to give these facts a meaningful relationship to political and social events.)

2. Closely related to Browder's

acceptance of the method and viewpoint of bourgeois historians is his easy and mechanical identification of past and present situations. Thus, the historical parallels to which he draws attention are fundamentally abstract and idealistic, and give us no sense of the complex movement of history. Any liberal scholar will agree that the democratic forces of the present day may gain inspiration from the heritage of Jeffersonian democracy. But this is a vulgarization of the rich truth of history. The relationship between the age of Jefferson and our own period can be understood only if we grasp the broad movement of American and world history over a century and a half, placing the achievements of the Jeffersonian period in their correct historical setting as an integral part of our national experience.

3. Browder's emphasis on the early national period is especially significant. His historical references cover only the years from 1776 to approximately 1820, and from 1856 to 1865. He shows no awareness of the generally neglected record of agrarian struggle that began with Bacon's Rebellion in 1676 and continued throughout the century before the Revolution. This struggle gives the key to the property relationships and the level of productive forces at the time of the Declaration of Independence, and thus clarifies the sweep and meaning of the Revolution and the events following it.

Even more noteworthy is Brow-

der's
ing
of
Rec
offer
appl
the
and
Acc
crati
Am
son,
sudd
teen

It
treat
histo
flects
bour
a co
tant
rece
letar
and
recei
and
tory
proa
histo
valu
labor
force
and
mate
isten
cont
agra
perio
jour

* S
later

der's disregard of the period following the Civil War. The great years of democratic achievement during Reconstruction in the South seem to offer no lessons which he wishes to apply to our own time. He ignores the era of industrial concentration and the rise of the working class. According to Browder, the democratic process as it is revealed in American history begins with Jefferson, skips to Lincoln, and reemerges suddenly with Roosevelt in the nineteen-thirties.

It is evident that this fragmentary treatment obscures the continuity of historical evolution. But it also reflects a one-sided preoccupation with bourgeois-democratic traditions and a concurrent disregard of the militant working class traditions of more recent history. It is from these proletarian traditions that the workers and their allies in the present period receive the most direct inspiration and the deepest consciousness of history as a living process. If we approach American history as "the history of the producers of material values themselves, the history of the laboring masses who are the chief force in the process of production and who carry on the production of material values necessary for the existence of society,"* we observe the continuity of development from the agrarian upheavels of the colonial period through the struggles of journeymen and artisans in the early

nineteenth century to the growth of the industrial proletariat, the breaking of the slave system of plantation production, and the rising tide of militant proletarian struggle in the past seventy years. It is the task of the Marxist historian to see history in its wholeness, revealing the inter-relationship between the basic history of the producers of material values and its reflection in political and ideological struggles. It is only through this approach that what is vaguely described as "the democratic heritage" becomes a present reality and a basis for further democratic development, and the role of the workers emerges clearly as the builders of the nation and the inheritors of its most vital traditions.

DEMOCRACY AND STATE POWER

Having outlined the general errors of Browder's method, we can now proceed to define the basic revisionist theory that dictates his approach to American history.

In *State and Revolution*,* Lenin analyzes the fundamental character of revisionism as revealed in its attitude toward the state:

. . . the bourgeois, and particularly the petty-bourgeois, ideologists, compelled under the pressure of indisputable historical facts to admit that the state only exists where there are class antagonisms and the class struggle, "correct" Marx in such a way as to

* Stalin, *Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, International Publishers, 1940, p. 30.

* International Publishers, 1932, pp. 8-9.

make it appear that the state is an organ for *reconciling* the classes.

Lenin's words summarize the trend of bourgeois-liberal historical thought in the United States. It has been the historian's function to prove that the American state, embodying "the rule of the majority" through parliamentary democracy, stands above classes as the perfect expression of abstract and changeless democracy. It is not possible within the limits of the present article to trace the evolution of this theory and its adaptation to changing social-economic pressures, from the work of Henry Adams to a recent study of the Jacksonian period by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.* The historical justification of the theory lies in the idealization of the era of small landholders and independent craftsmen that preceded machine production.

Superficially, one may say that the historian is able to idealize the formative years of the nation because the period is remote and lends itself to romantic interpretation. But the deeper reason lies in the fact that the property relationships of the pre-industrial period serve to create an illusion concerning the nature of capitalism. The limitations of modern historical scholarship, especially in its more liberal and social-democratic forms, become understandable if we recognize the scholar's propaganda function. He appeals to the

authority of the past to prove that further progress is possible under capitalism. The actual content of the argument is economic, and concerns the potentialities of free competition and the further development of independent farming. But the argument takes the form of what Engels describes as a "construction after the manner of the Hegelians."

The bourgeois historian does not analyze the actual level of production forces in the Jeffersonian and Jacksonian periods; he concentrates attention on ideas and aspirations, not as the reflection of the real world at a given point in the evolution of society, but as an ideal *construction*, the permanent form of a "people's free state."* Hence, if the people have failed to achieve the full possibilities of political democracy, the fault cannot be attributed to the Jeffersonian ideal, but to the confusion and selfishness of the people themselves, their unwillingness to place the welfare of the whole nation above sectional and group interests, their inability to cope with the complexities of an industrial civilization.

Thus, historiography creates a gap between the beginning of the American nation and its later development. The period that opens with Reconstruction and marks the rising strength of the working class and the struggles between capital and

* *The Age of Jackson*, Little, Brown, Boston, 1945.

* See Lenin's analysis of this slogan in the program of German Social-Democrats in the seventies, *State and Revolution*, pp. 18, 69-78. Also Marx, *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, International Publishers, 1938, pp. 17-21.

labor that are the driving force of modern history—the era in which the democratic needs of the masses come into increasingly open conflict with the “democratic” state of the bourgeoisie—is treated as an abandonment of the Jeffersonian tradition, a proof of the people’s inability to master the instruments of political democracy.

The writings of Claude G. Bowers show the liberal pattern with unusual clarity. His biographies of Jefferson present a limited but nonetheless useful account of the issues and personalities of the time. But Bowers’ enthusiasm for human rights turns to gall and worm-wood when he deals with the efforts of the Negro and white masses of the South to achieve equality and economic security in the decade after the Civil War. *The Tragic Era** distorts the facts of history, proclaims the “inferiority” of the Negro, and applauds the brutality of the Ku Klux Klan, declaring that “it was organized for the protection of women, property, civilization itself.”**

At a Jefferson Bicentennial Celebration held under the auspices of the Workers School in New York on April 9, 1943, at which a specially prepared paper by Bowers was presented, Browder spoke of him in these terms:

Mr. Bowers’ monumental political studies, *Jefferson and Hamilton* and *Jefferson in Power*, have earned their

position as “required reading,” as basic textbooks, for all who would seriously understand the origins of American democracy.*

One may well question whether it is correct to offer such unconditional commendation to a man whose published writings include historical arguments to justify “white supremacy” and the oppression of an entire people. Furthermore, a Marxist cannot separate Bowers’ writings on the Jeffersonian period from his work on Reconstruction and assume that there is no interrelationship between the two. Indeed, Bowers’ idealization of the Jeffersonian period is the logical counterpart of his blindness to the realities of democratic struggle in the later development of American history. Bowers’ books on Jefferson contain a great deal of useful and accurate information, but Browder’s acceptance of these anecdotal and unsystematic accounts as “basic textbooks” springs from his acceptance of Bowers’ liberal ideology as an adequate explanation of the American past.

There are a number of significant passages in the speech just cited which show the complete identity between Bowers’ liberalism and Browder’s “Marxism.” Browder speaks of “the people’s democratic revolution,” and describes it in the language of liberal idealism:

[Jefferson] coordinated and guided

* New York, 1929.

** *Ibid.*, p. 309.

* *The Heritage of Jefferson*, Workers School, New York, 1945, pp. 28-29.

the rising mass movement in the conquest of political power, seizing the reins of government and ousting the old governing strata. . . . The foundation of the Jeffersonian concept was agrarian, the democracy of farmers owning the land they cultivate and entirely subordinating the other classes within the nation.*

Here we have the liberal juggling of *concept* and *reality*. The description of the Jeffersonian *concept* is acceptable. But the phrases concerning political power and subordination of other classes lead us to assume that the concept achieved full realization. It is historically untrue that the farmers cultivating their own land achieved power or subordinated the mercantile and slaveholding classes.

The American bourgeoisie has been peculiarly unappreciative of Jefferson's pre-eminent role as the architect of American capitalism.**

This is a vulgarization of Jefferson's profound social philosophy, and contains the seeds of the suggestion that the bourgeoisie would follow its present "true class interests" in adopting Jeffersonian policies.

Jeffersonianism must be united with Marxism and thus brought to the higher level of historical development that corresponds to the tasks of the twentieth century.***

This is a vulgarization of the relationship between the theory and

practice of the bourgeois revolution and the theory and practice of scientific socialism. The proposal to combine the two must inevitably lead to a revision of the basic tenets of Marxism.

These views, presented by Browder in 1943, have their roots in his earlier writings, and especially in his essay on the "Revolutionary Background of the Constitution,"* written in 1937, which depicts the struggle for the Bill of Rights and the presidential election in 1800 in a one-sided manner that emphasizes the "constitutional" aspects of the conflict and the completeness of Jefferson's victory, and ignores the life and struggles of the people—the Negro masses who were enslaved, and the white masses who were to a large extent disfranchised, holding land burdened with mortgages (as in New England) or under the disabilities of feudal tenure (as in New York), or moving westward to wrest a living from the wilderness. The greatness of our tradition—and the living reality of the bourgeois revolution—lies in the heroism and struggle of the masses, and not in an idealized picture of agrarian democracy.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE JEFFERSONIAN PERIOD

The character of the American Revolution as a war of liberation and its place in world history becomes clear to us only if it is examined in the world-context of developing

* *Ibid.*, p. 33.

** *Ibid.*

*** *Ibid.*, p. 36.

* *The People's Front*, pp. 249-269.

capitalism. Marx analyzes the historical genesis of industrial capitalism in the final chapters of the first volume of *Capital*:

The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement and entombment in mines of the aboriginal population, the beginning of the conquest and looting of the East Indies, the turning of Africa into a warren for the commercial hunting of black-skinned, signaled the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production. These idyllic proceedings are the chief momenta of primitive accumulation.*

Marx then proceeds to show how colonial exploitation, the rise of the national debt, the slave trade, and the great commercial wars of the eighteenth century, hastened the birth of the English factory system, with its wholesale enslavement of children and the expropriation of the people from the land. Thus, capitalism comes into the world "dripping from head to foot, from every pore, with blood and dirt."***

What then, of the genesis of capitalism in the United States? Did it arise as the product of purely democratic institutions, unencumbered by the blood and dirt that marked its birth in Europe? American development differs sharply from that of Europe in that it is free of the encrusted weight of feudal institutions. But the idealization of the first period of American capitalism con-

ceals both its striking special characteristics and its relationship to the general laws of capitalist production.

"Political economy," writes Marx, "confuses on principle two very different kinds of private property, of which one rests on the producers' own labor, the other on the employment of the labor of others. It forgets that the latter not only is the direct antithesis of the former, but absolutely grows on its tomb only. . . ."

In the colonies,* "the capitalist regime everywhere comes into collision with the resistance of the producer, who, as owner of his own conditions of labor, employs that labor to enrich himself, instead of the capitalist. The contradiction of these two diametrically opposed economic systems, manifests itself here practically in a struggle between them."***

The American Revolution contained within itself the full force of these two opposing tendencies and introduced a new phase of the struggle between them. The American people smashed the stranglehold of British colonial domination, expropriated the Crown lands and Tory estates, and opened the way to Western expansion. But the Revolution also led to the rapid accumulation of capital; the exploitation of land through speculation, legal chicanery

* Although Marx's reference here is to real colonies, the United States is, in this connection characterized as "speaking economically, still only a colony of Europe." (*Ibid.*, p. 838).

** *Ibid.*, p. 838.

* *Capital*, Vol. I, Charles H. Kerr & Co., Chicago, 1912, p. 823.

** *Ibid.*, p. 834.

and outright theft; the transformation of patriarchal slavery into a commercial system of cotton culture based on slave labor in the South. These were the "idyllic" manifestations of American primitive accumulation, which had already secured a substantial base during the colonial period from the profits of piracy, smuggling, the slave trade, and grants of land secured through bribery of royal governors.

Bourgeois writers of history, like bourgeois economists, are determined to conceal the contradiction between the mode of production based on the producer's ownership of his own means of labor and the capitalist system in which the producer has been severed from the means of production, and, while production has become a social act, the means of production are privately appropriated for exploitation. Therefore, such historians insist that capitalism and independent production are identical, and prove their point by depicting the first phase of the bourgeois revolution as a clear-cut victory for the small producer. Jefferson's election in 1800 is presented as the triumph of a unified national interest, preparing the way for the further peaceful evolution of democratic capitalism. The "people's free state" is the mirror of an economy of free enterprisers, little "capitalists" controlling their own means of production.

In demolishing this myth, are we impelled to go to the other extreme

and underestimate the accomplishments of the mass movement that brought Jefferson to the presidency? It is precisely the obligation of Marxist scholarship to study history in its all-sided movement as a continuous conflict of changing forces. Engels' description of the dialectics of social activity has direct application to the course of American history:

In history, motion in opposites is most markedly exhibited in all critical epochs of the foremost peoples. At such moments a people has only the choice between the two horns of a dilemma: "either—or!" and indeed the question is always put in a way quite different from that in which the philistines, who dabble in politics in every age, would have liked it put.*

Browder's one-sided approach to Jeffersonian democracy conceals the contradictions which are the driving forces of American development. A detailed analysis of these contradictions would go far beyond the limits of the present article, and would require extensive marshalling of economic and sociological data. However, certain facets of the problem may be indicated, not as definitive formulations, but as suggestions for further study.

Jefferson received the support of those classes whose interest demanded struggle against British economic domination, which continued to threaten to reduce the country to

* *Dialectics of Nature*, International Publishers, 1940, p. 207.

semi-colonial status. Thus, the measure of unity around Jefferson was determined by the over-all conflict between English world-power and the growing American economy. But within the nation, the contradictions inherent in the bourgeois-democratic revolution were intensified. The most basic of these was the contradiction between property based on the producer's own labor (chiefly the small farmer) and wealth accumulated through mercantile or industrial-capitalist operations. The conflict is expressed in the three decisive trends of the first decade of the nineteenth century: western expansion, growth of American ocean commerce, and development of cotton production by slave labor.

Let us attempt to sketch, in a necessarily abbreviated and far from satisfactory form, the way in which these three trends were interwoven. The western movement, dramatically implemented by Jefferson in the Louisiana Purchase and the Lewis and Clark expedition, opened the way to wider ownership of land; it was also accompanied by ruthless exploitation of the land-seeking pioneers, the rise of Western speculators, merchants and bankers with close ties to Eastern financial interests, and the spread of slavery to the southwest. The growth of agriculture was related to the increasing importance of American shipping, largely devoted to the export of products of the soil. Among Jefferson's most important achievements were

his contributions to international trade cooperation; protection of ocean commerce, recognition of the rights of neutrals in wartime, shipping reciprocity, were the permanent fruits of Jeffersonian policy.

The growth of American shipping stimulated agricultural production; but it especially served the needs of the growing system of cotton production in the South. In ignoring the genesis of large-scale plantation production,* Browder conceals the relationship between slave labor and the evolution of capitalism in the United States and Europe. Marx points out that "the veiled slavery of the wage-earners in Europe needed, for its pedestal, slavery pure and simple in the new world."** The mercantile and banking interests of the Northern states (as well as the American textile manufacturers who required cheap cotton) also needed slavery as a means of maintaining the "veiled slavery" of American workers and strengthening financial ties with British capitalists, on whom American capitalists were still largely dependent.

It is obvious that the conflicting tendencies of the time cannot be wrapped in a bundle and labeled "agrarian democracy." The election of Jefferson demonstrated the political strength of the people in a man-

* In 1800, cotton production was 35,000,000 pounds; exports were 17,789,803 pounds. In 1807, the total had risen to 80,000,000 with exports at 63,944,459.

** *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 833.

ner that had never been dreamed of by the framers of the Constitution. The Jeffersonian clubs, composed largely of artisans, professionals, and merchants in the cities, and farmers in certain rural areas, showed the possibilities of political organization. But it in no way contributes to our understanding of the democratic process to assign an exaggerated and unhistorical importance to these clubs. They were few in number,* limited in membership, and active only in scattered areas. They were not representative of the great majority of the agricultural population, and could not possibly have brought an agrarian democracy to control of the government.

One-sided emphasis of the *political* aspects of the Jeffersonian period tends to obscure the basic economic factors which determined the lives and aspirations and struggles of the people in a rapidly changing and expanding economy. The people were not quiescent during the early years of the nineteenth century. There were sharp local struggles throughout the states, especially in the South and the border regions. These were struggles for a livelihood, for a decent standard of living, against the encroachments of the slaveholding oligarchy in the South and the ex-

ploitation of speculators and bankers in the West.

The political struggles were localized because the masses found the most direct answer to their needs in the movement to the West. The men and women seeking land in the wilderness were either propertyless or had worked land so encumbered with debts and restrictions that they were forced to abandon it. Western migration expressed the conflict between the free producer seeking to establish himself through land ownership and the power of mercantile capitalism accumulating wealth through the exploitation of the independent producer.

The western movement was made possible by the existence of a vast expanse of free land (or, more accurately, land which could be expropriated from the Indians without great expense or difficulty) and a comparatively small population. The specific historical character of the migration was determined by the level of productive forces and by the production relations. While production of raw cotton by slave labor developed in the South, primitive techniques and tools limited agricultural production as a whole. The freedom of the small producer was circumscribed, not only by economic exploitation and uncertain tenure but by the low level of production and the concurrent limitations of transportation and the market.

At the same time, the beginning of the capitalist mode of commodity

* Forty-three clubs were organized between March, 1793, and Jefferson's election in 1800. (Eugene Perry Link, *Democratic-Republican Societies, 1790-1800*, New York, 1942, pp. 13-15.) See also the map showing the distribution of the societies, which serves as a frontispiece to Link's volume.

pro
tenc
and
gan
labo
pre
Rev
mos
ers,
the
cont
that
man
talis
ney
ney
orga
duct
lasti
The
cern
of ap
thro
boar
this
fact
dict
1806
La
the s
* No
masters
with n
(Comm
the U.
* * *
New Y
Four w
in Bal
in Pitt
aggress
tailors
in whi
On the
the basi
women
not dev
period.

production in certain urban areas tended to proletarianize the artisan and craftsman, and forced him to organize against the archaic forms of labor, indenture and long-term apprenticeship, that had survived the Revolution. The struggle developed most sharply among the shoemakers, because this industry had reached the stage of social organization (subcontracting, division of labor, etc.) that transformed the master-craftsman into a contractor or small capitalist, exploiting the labor of journeymen and apprentices. The journeyman-shoemakers of Philadelphia organized as early as 1792, and conducted the first organized strike, lasting nine or ten weeks, in 1799. The shoemakers were especially concerned with the unpaid competition of apprentices.* Organization spread through the cities of the Eastern seaboard. The crucial significance of this movement is indicated in the fact that shoemakers faced six indictments for conspiracy between 1806 and 1815.**

Labor's attempt to free itself from the straitjacket of legal and economic

restrictions was closely related to the movement toward the West in search of land. The poverty of the propertyless masses drove them westward. As they established themselves under better economic conditions beyond the Alleghenies, they created a wider market for commodities, which in turn stimulated manufacture, raising the technical level of production and introducing intensified labor struggles.

The political reflection of this historical process is to be found in the struggle for the extension of the franchise. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, property and tax qualifications in most of the states deprived a considerable part of the white population of any means of political expression, giving the vote only to those who, through possession of land or tools, had obtained control over the conditions of their own labor. The people hungered for land as the key to economic security and full citizenship. But in the mass they were deprived of the political weapon (the franchise) which would have aided them in achieving their goal of economic independence. Therefore, the people occupied the land—their public domain—on terms that were largely dictated by the vested interests that held the reins of political power, and these interests exploited both the desperate quest for land and the growing system of capitalist production. This in turn created the necessity for a free labor market, and the destruction of the

* New York cordwainers charged that "the masters were in the habit of crowding their shops with more apprentices than they could instruct." (Commons and Associates, *History of Labour in the U. S.*, New York, 1940, Vol. I, p. 117.)

** There was one case in Philadelphia, one in New York, two in Baltimore, two in Pittsburgh. Four were decided against the journeymen. One, in Baltimore, was rendered in their favor; one, in Pittsburgh, was compromised. There was also aggressive organization of printers, carpenters and tailors at this time. All of these were industries in which the master was becoming a capitalist. On the other hand, industries newly organized on the basis of factory production (textiles) employed women and children at starvation wages, and did not develop trade union organization until a later period.

archaic forms of labor such as indenture and apprenticeship.

The half-century of struggle, lasting until the eighteen-fifties, that eventually extended the franchise to the adult white male population, accompanied and reflected the changing level of productive forces. It was not until the evolution of capitalist production reached the point at which labor-power appeared on the market as a commodity, and it was necessary for the worker and the owner of money to "deal with each other as on the basis of equal right," both ostensibly "equal in the eyes of the law,"* that the fight for universal white male suffrage (the juridical recognition of this freedom of contract) could be won.

Thus, the tradition of working-class struggle has its fountainhead in the first period of national growth and is interwoven with the movement of Western settlement and the struggle for the extension of political and economic democracy. Marxist-Leninist study of the Jeffersonian period exposes the deception practiced by the bourgeois historians in identifying the American heritage with the growth of capitalism. The continuity of the life-struggles of the masses, from the first agrarian revolts in the seventeenth century to the labor struggles of 1946, contains the deepest truth of American history and the basis for a truly progressive national tradition.

The great figure of Thomas Jefferson

stands at the threshold of our national development. The presentation of Jefferson as the ideologist of democracy-in-general makes him a lifeless figure, a man whose greatness is as abstract as the democracy he is supposed to have fathered. Jefferson comes alive and his ideas assume new meaning when we consider him in relation to the actual system of property and class relations that emerged from the Revolution. Jefferson and Paine, among the most profound thinkers of their time, attempted to solve the contradiction inherent in the rise of capitalism and insoluble within the framework of the bourgeois revolution. We can understand (and solve) the contradiction only through the Marxist knowledge that capitalist property is the antithesis of individual private property and "grows on its tomb only."

Jefferson and Paine were determined to pursue the doctrine of human rights to its full political and economic fruition. This brought them into direct collision with the privileged classes, who were seeking to utilize the contradictions of the bourgeois revolution for the further concentration of their economic and political power. Jefferson and Paine struggled to utilize these contradictions in the interest of the people.

Jefferson's greatness as a statesman lay in his ability to recognize and organize the movement of historical progress that led to the capitalist mode of production. In this

* *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 186.

sense
"arch
a on
reser
confl
unles
enem
creat
mens
revea
behin
us th
ists w
posin
Th
talis
expl
lacion
opme
cheap
the e
dren,
of ca
histo
Re
ism
advan
prog
ruthl
proc
prop
prop
Th
lusio
tribu
biliti
have
it is
tive

sense, we may say that he was the "architect of capitalism." But this is a one-sided statement, which misrepresents his social philosophy and the conflicts that shaped his personality, unless we also note that he was the enemy of the thing he helped to create. Browder gives us a one-dimensional picture of Jefferson. He reveals the political sleight-of-hand behind the portrait when he assures us that the merchants and industrialists who opposed Jefferson "were opposing their true class interests."

The more typical architect of capitalism was Hamilton, whose plans for exploitation of public lands, manipulation of the national debt, and development of manufacturing based on cheap labor with special emphasis on the employment of women and children, reveal the authentic tendency of capitalism at the beginning of its history.

Recognition of the fact that capitalism marked a tremendous historical advance and set the stage for further progress need not blind us to the ruthless and violent character of the process that transformed "the pigmy property of the many into the huge property of the few."*

Throughout American history, illusions concerning the wider distribution of property and the possibilities of a free agrarian economy have mesmerized the masses. Marx, it is true, did not merely take a negative attitude toward the American

land reformers in 1846. As Lenin puts it, "Marx notes the revolutionary aspects of the attack on land ownership and recognizes this petty-bourgeois movement as a peculiar and primary form of the proletarian and communist movement."** At the same time Marx castigated their dreams of solving all problems by the immediate and equal division of the land. "Such a dream," Marx told them, "is as possible of realization and as communistic as the dream to turn all people into emperors, kings and popes."***

In 1915 Lenin exhaustively studied the agriculture of the United States in order to expose the theory of the non-capitalist evolution of agriculture as "an illusion, a dream, the self-deception of the whole of bourgeois society."*** The continuance of the illusion is responsible for the separation between farmers and workers, and the generally low level of political activity in agrarian districts at the present time. The propaganda of history, idealizing the limited democracy and primitive economy of the Jeffersonian period, perpetuates "the self-deception of the whole of bourgeois society."

ASPECTS OF BROWDER'S REVISIONIST APPROACH

Having defined the revisionist pattern in Browder's theory of Ameri-

* V. I. Lenin, *Marx-Engels-Marxism*, International Publishers, p. 127.

** *Ibid.*, p. 126.

*** *Selected Works*, International Publishers, New York, 1938, Vol. XII, p. 191.

* *Ibid.*, p. 835.

can history, we can take any one of the analogies or lessons he drew from the past and analyze its political purpose in relation to the general pattern. For example, his treatment of American history as a series of purely "Constitutional" crises in dealing with Roosevelt's fight for the liberalization of the Supreme Court, distorted the meaning of a genuinely important issue and bolstered the Social-Democratic concept of the Constitution as an instrument of democracy-in-general.

Even more significant is the role that Browder's interpretation of history has played in obscuring the relationship between capitalism and the exploitation of the Negro people, both in the early plantation economy, and in its later form after the breakdown of Reconstruction. In order to understand the rise of industrial capitalism in the last half of the nineteenth century, we must recognize the dialectical "motion in opposites" inherent in the Civil War. The war destroyed the slave power and released the energies of the working class and the whole people for new struggles. It also:

. . . brought in its train a colossal national debt, and, with it, pressure of taxes, the rise of the vilest financial aristocracy, the squandering of a huge part of the public land on speculative companies for the exploitation of railways, mines, &c., in brief, the most rapid centralisation of capital.*

* *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 847.

An indispensable condition for this process was a return to a modified form of slavery, namely peonage in the South and the segregation and oppression of Negro workers throughout the country. This was the pedestal on which the intensified exploitation of all labor rested; its racist ideology implemented the brutal treatment of immigrants, stimulated prejudice against the foreign-born, divided and weakened the working class. In the epoch of imperialism, the ruling class is forced to rely increasingly on the special exploitation of the Negro as the basis for the system of exploitation. The present policy of American monopoly rests on the historic foundations of a limited industrialization and impoverished population in the South, the systematic oppression of Negro and other minorities, and the ideology of "white supremacy."

Browder's theory of history concealed all this. Slavery was treated one-sidedly as the antithesis of capitalism; the continued oppression of the Negro after the Civil War resulted from the failure of capitalists to understand their "true class interests." Thus, in a period in which a moribund capitalism would inevitably resort to lynch law and burning crosses, Browder argued that the Negro people had *made their choice* for democratic integration within the framework of the American counterpart of the "people's free state."

THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

At the time of the 1936 election, Browder began to develop his theory that the two-party system is an integral part of the American form of government. He based his argument on shallow, and fundamentally opportunistic, considerations:

The difficulties of getting new parties on the ballot and the possibilities of work in the direct primaries, have been insufficiently considered and studied by the vanguard of political radicalism in the United States. . . . Everyone who wants to influence the political actions of millions in the immediate future will have to take these factors increasingly into account.*

At that time, Browder, although not formally rejecting the demand for a new party of farmers and workers, formulated the demand in a manner that revealed servile reliance on the existing party system:

The Farmer-Labor Party, conceived as the equivalent of the People's Front in France, is taking shape and growing within the womb of the disintegrating two old parties. It will be born as a national party at the moment when it already replaces in the main one of the old traditional parties, contesting and possibly winning control of the federal government from the hour of its birth.**

Note the Utopian formulation: the new party will win control from the hour of its birth! The rationale underlying this hope for immediate

and easy victory is the assumption that the new party will represent no significant change in class leadership, and will thus inherit the political strength and organizational ties of the existing parties.

Browder drew an historical parallel between the situation at the beginning of Roosevelt's second term and what he described as the "Constitutional crisis" leading to the Civil War. He pointed to the formation of the Republican party as a model of national coalition. The analogy is misleading: the Republican party, rising at a period of rapid *capitalist* growth, secured the support of farmers, workers, and a decisive section of the *bourgeoisie*; its structure and leadership were determined by its historic function—the completion of the bourgeois revolution and the establishment of favorable conditions for further *capitalist* development. Browder's reference to the party of Lincoln conceals a revisionist conception of the role the bourgeoisie is destined to play in the regrouping of political forces in the present period. An effective new party must be a party of the masses under the leadership of the *working class*, conducting a militant struggle against monopoly and leading the people to the next stage of historical development.

In 1942, Browder finalized his conclusions concerning the two-party system:

The institutionalized party structure, preserved by tradition and habit, as

* *The People's Front*, p. 159.

** *Ibid.*, p. 161.

well as by its being imbedded in statutory law, furnishes only the shell within which the political life of the country evolves. And within each major party structure all political currents and ideas find expression, some more, some less, without much apparent system or coherence.*

Having identified American tradition and habit with the upperclass control of the two major parties, and having thus eliminated the long, rich tradition of third-party movements, it is comparatively simple to take the next step—the assurance that *all* political currents and ideas find expression in each major party structure.

What is the actual historical meaning of the two-party system? The comparative fluidity of class relationships during the early nineteenth century—resulting from the possession of a vast public domain which offered the pioneer the chance to “turn part of it into his private property and individual means of production”***—made the organization of a variety of parties representing specific class interests unnecessary. During the Jacksonian period, the rapid expansion of the frontier reached a point at which the Western farmers, forming an alliance with workers of the Eastern seaboard, endangered the control of the state by vested interests. But these interests, although they lacked the coercive power they

were to acquire in the industrial period, had one tremendous asset: the existence of an entrenched slaveholding aristocracy in the South. The bankers and speculators of the North entered into an alliance with the plantation owners; the key to the political value of the alliance was the two-party system; as long as the alliance could maintain the balance of power in both parties, limit their differences to non-fundamentals, and prevent effective third party action, its position was unassailable.

The alliance was broken in 1860, but it was reestablished in 1876, because the continuance of the plantation economy in the South served the interests of the industrialists, who were now undisputed masters of the coalition. The two-party system was institutionalized. The Republican Party appeared more or less openly as the representative of vested power, while the Democratic Party could channelize discontents and pose as the champion of agrarian interests.

The operation of the system is illustrated in the history of the Populist movement. The Populists had no chance of national success unless they could win the South. They achieved initial successes in that area. But the Bourbon politicians were able to secure key positions in the Populist ranks, preventing the growing solidarity of Negroes and poor whites, and forcing the movement into safe cooperation, and eventual merger, with the Democratic Party. In this way the “Solid South” defeated the

* *Victory—and After*, International Publishers, New York, 1942, pp. 118-119.

** *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 842.

agrarian revolt and preserved the two-party system.

The Southern balance of power operated in a somewhat similar manner in controlling the course of the Wilsonian "New Freedom," and in assuring the rapid dissolution of the petty-bourgeois reform movement led by La Follette in 1924. The alliance of poll-tax politicians and Republican reactionaries that defies the will of the people today is entrenched in the two-party system.

Browder's endorsement of the system concealed the special role played by the oppression and disfranchisement of the Negro in the economic and political policies of monopoly, and the *method* by which monopoly enforces these policies and maintains its stranglehold on the political life of the nation.

"COMMUNISM IS TWENTIETH CENTURY AMERICANISM"

The essence of this revisionist treatment of history is summarized in the slogan first introduced by Browder in an article in *New Masses* in 1935: "*We are the Americans and Communism is the Americanism of the Twentieth Century.*"* Three years later, Browder published a criticism of the slogan, which is even more revealing than the original declaration in exposing the bourgeois-liberal roots of his historical theory. The criticism is in no sense a rejection of the slogan or a serious attempt to ex-

pose and root out the basic error. It is a mild modification, on the ground that the statement is "scientifically inexact," and that, taken "literally and uncritically,"* it might lead to incorrect assumptions.

And what is the assumption that Browder specifically warns against? It is the implication that "Communism is a peculiar product of American development, which would reach the rest of the world by exportation."** But can we seriously suppose that there was any real danger that anyone in the old world or the new would think that "Communism is a peculiar product of *American* development"? Europeans have never talked about Communism as an importation from America, nor have American slanderers of Communism talked of it as anything but an importation from Europe. The assumption to which Browder called attention, although it might be logically deducible from the phrasing of the slogan, was in no sense the real danger. The dangerous error inherent in the slogan, an error which Browder never mentions or recognizes in an article supposedly devoted to an analysis of the inexactness of the slogan, is the opposite interpretation, that what passes for the "American tradition," with all its vague classless connotations and its illusion of an abstract and timeless democracy standing above class antagonisms, is

* *What is Communism?*, New York, 1936, p. 21 (italics in original).

* *The Communist*, December, 1938, pp. 1080-1081.

** *Ibid.*, p. 1081.

acceptable as a definition of Communism.

Browder not only ignored this danger of a revisionist distortion of Communist theory and practice, but he devoted the major part of his "corrective" article to reaffirming the belief that in a general way the classless "democratic tradition" may be identified with Communism. It is small wonder that the article concludes that "it is not the purpose of these critical remarks to end with the abrupt dismissal of the slogan. On the contrary, our purpose is only to put it in its proper place and perspective."^{*}

Browder's whole explanation shows the revisionist pattern with striking clarity. The slogan is not dismissed, because it serves the concealed purpose of blurring class lines, denying the class struggle, and falsely identifying the national traditions of the American people with the rise of "democratic" *capitalism*.

The attempt to give "progressive" capitalism an apparent historical continuity leads Browder to make one of the most astonishing statements in the whole course of his writings: "Both the Monroe Doctrine and the Open Door originated in the resistance of American democracy to monopolistic and aggressive policies of the older imperialist powers."^{**} Here we have the usual juggling of the terms, *democracy* and *capitalism*.

If the word *capitalism* is substituted for *democracy* in the quotation, the passage becomes intelligible. As far as the Monroe Doctrine is concerned, it had certain democratic implications at the time of its promulgation, in asserting American national interest against the reactionary designs of the Holy Alliance. But even in its original form it was a unilateral declaration, intended to promote the unilateral extension of the commercial power of the United States, and it later became a weapon of imperialist policy, utilized as a means of legalizing the domination of the Western Hemisphere in the interest of American monopolies.

The assertion that the declaration of the Open Door in 1899 had any democratic purpose is a blatant falsehood. It signaled American entry into the imperialist struggle for world domination. In demanding a share in the spoils of colonial oppression and participating in the bloody suppression of the Boxer Rebellion in 1900, the United States inaugurated the course of policy that led to the first and second world wars.

Browder admits that during the Twentieth Century, the Monroe Doctrine and the Open Door were "transformed into instruments of a matured American imperialism." But the trend can be reversed:

In the present world situation we witness their transformation again, a process going on under our eyes, into instruments of democratic defense

^{*} *Ibid.*, p. 1084.

^{**} *Ibid.*, p. 1083.

against the aggressions of world fascism.*

Here again we have a statement, which, if studied *historically* and in relation to the real development of social and economic forces, is revealed as a masterpiece of revisionist misrepresentation. Two documents which appeared three-quarters of a century apart are abstracted from their historical context and given a false "democratic" meaning at the time of their original promulgation. Thus the whole course of capitalism in the nineteenth century, even up to the beginning of imperialism, is called *democracy*. "Twentieth Century Americanism" is merely a return to this democratic-capitalist tradition; the old documents are given their true "legal" meaning, and the course of imperialist policy is democratized.

Here is the core of Browder's revisionism. His theory of history is an historical defense of the bourgeois democratic state, which leads to a misrepresentation of the origins of imperialism and an apology for contemporary imperialist policy as an expression of national needs. "Twentieth Century Americanism" becomes a pseudonym for "the American Century."

The class struggle, according to this theory, is outmoded. Class differences can be adjusted, and a single national interest advanced in the "traditional" American way. And what is the American way? It is an

amalgam of three concepts: Jefferson's social philosophy, parliamentary democracy, and capitalism. Browder (and his bourgeois mentors) assure us that these three concepts are identical. The trinity is labelled the American tradition, and we are asked to bow before it.

In *A Letter to American Workers*, Lenin recognized the greatness of the American revolutionary tradition: "The history of modern civilized America opens with one of those great, really liberating, really revolutionary wars. . . ."* He points to the world-significance of the Revolution in breaking the bondage of the British colonial system and releasing potent productive forces. But Lenin does not identify this gigantic forward movement of history solely with its legal and constitutional superstructure. He places it in its proper perspective in relation to the further development of capitalism:

Bourgeois civilization has borne all its luxuriant fruits. By the high level of development of the productive forces of organized human labour, by utilizing machines and all the wonders of modern technic, America has taken the first place among free and cultured nations. But at the same time America has become one of the foremost countries as regards the depth of the abyss which divides a handful of brazen billionaires who are wallowing in dirt and in luxury on the one hand, and millions

* International Publishers, New York, 1934, p. 9.

* *Ibid.*, p. 1083.

of toilers who are always on the verge of starvation.*

Our revolutionary tradition retains its power. The struggles and achievements of Americans, the hatred of entrenched power and privilege that has marked the whole course of our history, the pioneer spirit that conquered the wilderness in search of bread and land, the spirit of Bunker Hill and King's Mountain, the heroic slave revolts, the Underground Railroad and old John Brown at Harper's Ferry, Gettysburg and the March through Georgia, the great days of Reconstruction, the humble heroism and

sacrifice of the men and women of labor, the struggles for the eight-hour day, Pullman and Homestead and Paterson, the docks and steel mills in 1919 and the San Francisco waterfront in 1934, the Americans who died on the Ebro and before Madrid, the rising tide of hatred for fascism that culminated in the destruction of the Axis—these are portions of a story that has never been completely told. The greatness of our heritage is hidden from us. The whole pattern and meaning, the interrelationship of this vast complex of events, can be revealed only through the use of historical science, through the method of historical materialism.

All history must be studied afresh. . .

* *Ibid.*, p. 9-10.

AV
TO
WH
by
gu
At
write
destr
ideol
tiona
birth
zons
press
value
duci
falls
By
city
was
look
gold
in th
prog
Chri
ther
ture
The
place
W
by t
Ages
disap
statio
to b
will.

BOOK REVIEWS

AVALUABLE INTRODUCTION TO EARLY HISTORY

Review by JOSHUA STRAUSS

WHAT HAPPENED IN HISTORY,
by Gordon Childe. New York: Pen-
guin Books, 1946. \$.25. 280 pp.

At the dawn of the modern world, writers were deeply conscious that the destruction of feudal institutions and ideologies meant a sweeping, revolutionary change. A new society was in birth, with new values and new horizons for the human race. They expressed their realization of the new values, among other ways, by introducing the notion that man's history falls into distinct stages, or periods.

By way of contrast, in the slave society of antiquity historical thinking was primitivistic. That is to say, it looked backward and not forward. The golden age was something irrevocably in the past, and society was becoming progressively worse. In the Judaeo-Christian theological version, to be sure, there was an optimistic note of a future redemption, but not in this world. The return to Paradise was to take place in the "other world."

When the slave society was replaced by the feudal society of the Middle Ages, historical writing and thinking disappeared. The feudal world was static, hierarchical and ordered, deemed to be the eternal creation of a divine will. Hence there could be no history

except for one "event," the Biblical fall of man from grace. Everything else was incidental and historical writing was a matter only of annals, the birth and death of kings and abbots, wars and tournaments, well-poisonings and festivals. There were no trends or historical laws.

Emergent capitalism swept away the order and hierarchy of feudalism, and its ideological baggage, too. Progress and growth were now the unmistakable phenomena of social life. As capitalism developed and the bourgeoisie conquered more and more of the inhabited world, the concept of history and its division into well-demarcated periods became refined and deepened. By the end of the eighteenth century, economists and historians like Richard Jones in England and Fourier and Sismondi in France had even come to understand the role of classes and the class struggle in the historical process and in the separation of human history into distinct periods.

It was Marx who finally provided the key for a completely scientific analysis. The theory of historical materialism revealed the determining role of the mode of production in history. Engels summarized the theory in his preface to the 1888 edition of the *Communist Manifesto*:

. . . in every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be ex-

plained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently the whole history of mankind (since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership) has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes; that the history of these class struggles forms a series of evolutions in which, nowadays, a stage has been reached where the exploited and oppressed class—the proletariat—cannot attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling class—the bourgeoisie—without, at the same time, and once and for all, emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class distinctions and class struggles.

THE CONCEPT OF HISTORICAL PERIODS

The concept of historical periods was a progressive one, and like all progressive ideas of the bourgeoisie, it ultimately turned against the class that brought it forward in its own struggle for power. By the middle of the nineteenth century, the rise of the industrial working class and the Socialist movement required radical changes in bourgeois theory, even in the very notion of history itself. For if the history of man is in fact a series of qualitative, revolutionary changes from one form of society to a higher stage, then how can the eternity of capitalist society be defended against the argument that Socialism is the inevitable next stage?

It became necessary for bourgeois historians to revise their thinking and their theories. Immediately to deny the tremendous differences that were so apparent between the feudal world and the modern capitalist world was im-

possible. Instead, historians set about to conceal the underlying causes for the differences. National character, *Weltanschauung*, culture complexes and other criteria were offered in explanation, thus confusing and even obliterating the fundamental historical stages, on the one hand, and introducing endless new, and false, stages, on the other hand. If one were to read the dozen or two dozen most famous European histories written about 1900, let us say, and come to them unprepared by Marxist theory, one would finish the ordeal with a collection of mutually contradictory "systems" adding up to chaos and nothing else. A world that had reached the year 1900 along the paths laid out by such historians had no predictable or desirable future, least of all Socialism.

In the twentieth century, particularly in the United States, historians have succeeded in carrying this reactionary process even further. Thus, Carlton J. H. Hayes, America's wartime ambassador to, and apologist for, Franco and otherwise Professor of History at Columbia University, has devoted many years and untold energy to "disproving" the existence of the industrial revolution. Liberal historians like Harry Elmer Barnes provide the bourgeoisie with another line of defense. They glibly label every new advance in technology and government a revolution, thereby diverting attention from the fundamental role of the mode of production in all truly revolutionary changes.

The study of primitive man, both in contemporary primitive societies and in ancient, so-called prehistoric times, has been victimized to an exaggerated degree because anthropology was a very late arrival among the social sciences.

A MATERIALIST
ANTHROPOLOGY

The scientific study of primitive man scarcely goes back beyond the middle of the nineteenth century. In its infancy, Lewis Henry Morgan and others did begin to lay a firm foundation for anthropology. "It is Morgan's great merit," Engels wrote, "that he has discovered and reconstructed in its main lines this prehistoric basis of our written history. . . . His book . . . is one of the few epoch-making works of our time."* His researches in primitive property, family relations (particularly the equal and often dominant role of women), religion, etc., enabled Engels to formulate the revolutionary Marxist theory of the origin of the State and private property, upon which in turn Lenin elaborated in 1916 the scientific theory of State and revolution.

Imperialism stepped in before anthropology could develop along the lines laid down by Morgan. The imperialist exploitation of Asia and Africa, and of the Negroes in this country, obviously required another kind of "theory." All sorts of theories—racialism, other pseudo-biological doctrines, mysticism, Freudianism—took over the field. Anthropology was debased from a science into imperialist apologetics, and it has not yet recovered. That is not to say that anthropologists and archaeologists have not added a great deal to our knowledge of primitive institutions. They have learned much, but about surface phenomena. As a discipline, academic anthropology has been standing on its head.

The great merit of Gordon Childe's *What Happened in History* (originally published in England in 1942) and of his earlier *Man Makes Himself* (1936) is his effort to return to a truly scientific anthropology. What happened in history (specifically early history to the end of the Roman Empire, for that is the period the book covers, despite its grandiose title) was a series of "revolutionary innovations" in the "methods whereby the most progressive societies secure a livelihood" and these methods can "be used to mark off phases or stages in the historical process." Childe summarizes these stages, the framework, so to speak, of his book, as follows:

1. The emergence of the species *homo sapiens*, man, as a food-gathering being. This first stage corresponds to Morgan's state of savagery and to what traditional archaeologists call the Palaeolithic or Old Stone Age.

2. The stage of man the food-producer, Morgan's stage of barbarism, traditionally the Neolithic or New Stone Age.

3. The stage following the "urban revolution," subdivided into (a) the society of the ancient Orient and the Bronze Age, (b) the classical Greek and Roman period, (c) feudalism, and (d) capitalism.

Childe is a materialist. In the field in which he is one of the world's recognized masters, the periods of savagery, barbarism and the Bronze Age, he makes a particularly valuable contribution. Discussed in detail are the major developments in technology and production, both agricultural and craft; the interrelationship between technol-

* Friedrich Engels, preface to the first edition of *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*, p. 6 of the 1942 edition (New York, International Publishers). On the preceding page, Engels wrote: "Morgan in his own way had discovered afresh in America the materialistic conception of history, discovered by Marx" twenty odd years earlier.

ogy, population and social structure; the emergence of class divisions, starting with the earliest division of labor, that between the sexes; the shift in property relations from common to clan ownership and then to private property; the history of religion and science; the causes for conflicts between early communities. At times Childe reveals an understanding also of the dialectic of history, and those moments mark the peak of his achievement.

Childe has not freed himself, however, from the archaeologists' traditional overemphasis of the material tools and instruments of culture, and mechanical materialist approach. Neither the origin of slavery nor the origin of the state is correctly formulated, although the essential dialectic is hinted at more than once. Childe is so intent on tracking down the maxima of technological achievement that he sometimes overemphasizes the superficial and transitory at the expense of the dominant character of a given epoch. For example, what Engels accurately called the "occasional excursions" of the Greeks into the sphere of commodity production become the center of Childe's discussion of the Greek economy.

One illustration will show concretely how Childe tends to slide into mechanical materialism, even though he never loses his grasp on reality completely. "Greek philosophy of the Iron Age," he writes, "was the personal speculation of individuals emancipated from complete dependence on the group by iron tools and coined money." The latter half of the sentence is unfortunately not just an apt figure of speech but a literal statement of his belief. As such it is erroneous. The translation of iron from a luxury metal,

jewelry if you will, to the material of arms and tools, and the invention of coinage, a social and not a technological invention, were the results of the breakdown of tribal communities into a society of individual property owners. Coined money and iron, in turn, expedited the social process that gave them birth, as fundamental inventions always do, the steam engine and the industrial revolution for example. The mechanical formulation, "individuals emancipated from complete dependence on the group by iron tools and coined money," is therefore one-sided and false.

The dialectical process as a whole, however, had precisely the effect on philosophical speculation that Childe indicates. This is a most important insight into the history of Greek thought, and though not original with Childe, it sets him off quite markedly from academic historians. Yet his failure to understand the full dialectical cause-and-effect relationship is a serious weakness, particularly today when the social impact of the colossal invention of the harnessing of atomic energy has become so paramount a problem.

THE ERROR OF MECHANICAL MATERIALISM

Childe's fundamental framework of three major revolutionary changes in history suffers from the same error. His third stage he calls the era of the "urban revolution." It is immediately apparent that such a classification necessitates lumping the whole of recorded history into one category, within which the ancient slave economy, feudalism and capitalism are merely sub-headings. Even socialism would be nothing more than sub-division of

The error is that Childe conceives

of the city in purely quantitative and physical (topographic) terms: x number of people living on x acres of consolidated territory, usually surrounded by a wall. But walls do not make a city. The Assyrian capital of Ninevah covered some 1800 acres in the seventh century B.C.; Alexandria, 2275 acres four hundred years later. For Childe the quantitative similarity is all-important; the possibility that qualitative differences may lie concealed behind the numbers is not raised. In actual fact, Ninevah was not a city at all but an agricultural-political district surrounded by a brick wall.

"City" is above all an economic concept, or more correctly, a phenomenon of political economy. A city is a community of people living within a concentrated area on the basis of a division of labor between agriculture and industry, with a marked relation between the two. The merely physical fact of a large number of people living together in one community is not basic. Neither a walled agricultural community like Ninevah nor a feudal capital like Charlemagne's at Aix (Aachen) was a city in the scientific sense.

Childe's four sub-divisions of "urban" society are in fact four completely distinct historical periods, set apart by qualitative changes in the mode of production, each revolutionary in character and each constituting a leap in the way man has organized his life. The "urban" factor is non-existent in any but a minor, superficial way in two of the four periods, the Asiatic and feudal. Nor is it the key factor in the other two; for, despite the fact that the ruling class in capitalist society takes its very name, bourgeoisie, from the city, it is capitalist production, not urbanism, that sets this form of society apart

from the non-urban feudal world, and from the partly urban ancient world. And what of a socialist world? It too will be "urban," but without a bourgeoisie.

All this is not to deny the historic significance of "the establishment of a permanent opposition between town and country as basis of the whole social division of labor."* Childe's mistake is to elevate this one characteristic of all societies engaged in commodity production (until the achievement of socialism which will finally eliminate the contradiction) into the decisive historical factor. The mode of production thus recedes into a secondary position, a sub-division, whereas it is actually the determining element. Even the character of the city and of town-country relationships change from period to period. Changes in the form of the state, in culture and in class relations similarly follow from the mode of production, not from the factor of urbanism.**

VALUABLE DESPITE SHORTCOMINGS

Early in the book Childe throws in the following sentence without point or warning: "An obsolete ideology can hamper an economy and impede its

Ibid., p. 161.

** The difference between Childe's conception of the early periods of civilization and Engels', with which it has a superficial similarity, is immediately apparent when one reads the two works together. It is the fundamental difference between a mechanical and a dialectical materialist. Engels' *Origin of the Family* remains the one theoretically correct introduction to the field covered by Childe's book, despite the fact that a wealth of new anthropological materials has become available since Engels wrote his work in 1884. These materials make it possible for us to answer questions Engels admittedly could not, to fill out his analysis with a richness of new illustrations, and if necessary to correct details. Above all, they serve to substantiate the whole of Engels' theoretical structure, for all the academic anthropologists and their cynical silence about Morgan and Engels.

change far longer than Marxists admit." Quite apart from the fact that the final phrase is gratuitous (the only remark of its kind in the book), it points up a most significant paradox. Childe is parroting the standard "criticism" of Marx. It is as nonsensical as it is monotonous. Far from refusing to admit the "hampering" effect of an "obsolete ideology," Marxism has always insisted that this subjective element exerts far-reaching influence on the economy that engendered it. That is essential in historical materialism. What Marxists deny, however, is either a mechanistic or a deterministic theory, on the one hand, or, on the other, the idealism that raises ideology into an independent entity.

The paradox is that Childe, in common with all the other "critics," often descends to the vulgar materialism and economic determinism he erroneously attributes to Marxism. That, in fact, is the most serious criticism a Marxist can make of this particular book.

Nevertheless, Childe is fundamentally a materialist, though not a Marxist, and has written what is by far the best popular work available in English (or French or German too for that matter) on man's early history. Furthermore, it was written without the technical jargon that makes so much of the writing in this field unintelligible to the non-specialist. The fact that it is a twenty-five cent pocket book, on sale at news stands and in drug stores, is important. Because it is a book in paper covers, furthermore, it is not reviewed or even mentioned in the bourgeois newspapers and magazines, although it is an original publication.

There is ample evidence in the work that Childe has read widely in Marxist literature. He has learned much from

Marxism, and shows signs of dialectical thinking on many problems. It would be unfair to close this review without at least one illustration. Childe introduces his discussion of Greek philosophy and science this way:

... Bronze Age speculation had taken nature as a whole, as society was a whole, manifestly united in dependence on the divine monarch, and as the temple estate was a whole collectively exploited in the interests of the household and its divine head. But Iron Age philosophy broke nature too into parts as the community was divided into individuals and the city's territory into private holdings, and estates. In Ionia Anaximander already explained qualitative differences as due to 'thickening and thinning,' i.e., as quantitative, like the differences in political status based on the property qualifications of citizens. . . .

Although the book ends with the breakdown of the Roman Empire 1500 years ago, it is in a sense more current than the great mass of "current" books forced on the public by the millions. Childe is trying to understand, and help others to understand, the most of history and social change, the interrelation between the economic base and the political and cultural superstructure of society, as revealed in the epoch on which he is an expert. Although it misses on many crucial points, even his errors remain far outside the realm of bourgeois apologetics and obfuscation. At a moment in history when the colonial and "backward" peoples occupy the center of the political arena, the insights Childe achieves help to light up the theory and enrich understanding for anti-imperialist political action.

dialectical
It would
y without
elde into
k philan

tion has
society was
a depend
and as the
collectively
the hour
Iron Age
into pan
d into in
itory ma
In lon
ed qual
hickenin
ative, lie
tus bas
s of cit

with the
pire 194
re cur
int" bo
million
and, m
the run
the int
base as
erstruct
ne epos
though
ints, es
the rea
obtain
ory wh
" peop
ical ara
s help
ch und
: politic