

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

A magazine devoted

to the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism

EDITORIAL BOARD

MAX WEISS, *Editor*; V. J. JEROME, *Associate Editor*

ALEXANDER BITTELMAN, HENRY WINSTON

VOLUME XXVI, NO. 6

Contents

JUNE, 1947

- The Recent Wage Settlements and Labor's Course *John Williamson* 483
- The National Question in Europe *William Z. Foster* 493
- Truth and Trickery about High Prices *Max Gordon* 499
- Problems of Peace, Democracy, and National Independence
Alexander Bittelman 508
- The Struggle for the Urban Middle Class *Joseph North & A. B. Magil* 520
- FROM THE COMMUNIST PRESS OF OTHER LANDS:
Notes on Some Questions of International Development *Edward Kardelj* 531
- BOOK REVIEW:
A Contribution to the Understanding of Dialectical Materialism
Harry Martel 555

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.

MAINSTREAM

New Marxist Literary Quarterly

BEGIN YOUR SUBSCRIPTION* WITH THE SPRING NUMBER

There are essays by Roger Garaudy, Walter Bernstein, Harry Taylor, Eugene Almazov; stories by Alexander Saxton, Steve Nelson, Stefan Heym, Wilma Shore; poems by Millard Lampell, Olive Sutton, Isidor Schneider, Martha Miller; sketches by Jack Levine; communications from David Ryder and Jose Luis Gonzalez; and an editorial, "The Iron Heel," by Samuel Sillen.

* \$2.00 for a one-year subscription.

LITERATURE AND ART

by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels

The first collection in English of the writings of Marx and Engels on the foundations of a Marxist approach to art. Selections are included on such subjects as the origins and development of art, art in capitalist society, realism in art, and literary history.

Carefully arranged, these selections, published by International Publishers, are required reading for everyone who wants an understanding of Marxist esthetics.

Price: \$1.85

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

THE
SETT
LABO

A YEAR
won an
crease r
the first
gles. Th
strikes i
auto inc
tial vict
was ach
resistanc
were aic
and by t
strike-br
mining

THE SE

Today,
ago, settl
already h
sections
auto inc
round of
only an
very shar
big indu
agents in
to lower
people an
trade un

THE RECENT WAGE SETTLEMENTS AND LABOR'S COURSE

By JOHN WILLIAMSON

A YEAR AGO, the struggle which won an 18½ cent an hour wage increase represented the completion of the first round of postwar labor struggles. This struggle, which included strikes in the electrical, steel, and auto industries, resulted in substantial victory for the workers. This was achieved in the face of tough resistance by the employers who were aided by federal tax rebates and by the first steps of government strike-breaking in the railroad and mining industries.

THE SETTLEMENTS

Today, as distinct from a year ago, settlements without strikes have already been achieved in substantial sections of the electrical, steel, and auto industries. But the present round of wage struggles is clearly only an exchange of blows within a very sharp battle. In this battle, the big industrialists and their political agents in Congress are determined to lower the living standards of the people and decisively to weaken the trade union movement. This fact

emphasizes the significance as well as the limitations of the gains achieved to date by the C.I.O. unions.

In the face of the most determined reactionary offensive in Congress to destroy the trade union movement, and the lack of unity, or a common viewpoint, on the part of the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. as to the desirability of demanding wage increases, the new settlements—first achieved by the U.E.R.M.W.A., and quickly followed by the C.I.O. steel and auto unions—must be viewed as a positive gain for labor.

For millions of electrical, steel, and auto workers the gains include, beside the 11½-12½ cent increase, important new concessions. Some of these are the six paid holidays for the electrical workers, severance pay for the steel workers, and better call-in pay for the auto workers.

The *New York Times*, while dissatisfied with the settlements, has to admit that "industry in the past 20 years has not enjoyed such prosperity . . . as it has enjoyed in the last quarter of 1946 and the first quarter of 1947." In the last quarter of 1946, total corporate net profits were running at an annual rate of \$15 billion. In the first quarter of 1947 the annual rate had increased to \$17 billion (the wartime high was \$9.9 billion). In the steel industry, Big Steel admitted making \$30 million more profits in 1946 than in 1945. No wonder that the leading business organ, the *United States News*, says profits are so large that

"some businessmen are inclined to be apologetic about them."

The working class and the organized labor movement must avoid attitudes of complacency as a result of these settlements. Such attitudes would be dangerous indeed. Only continued vigilance and a real extension of activity by the labor movement can help it to solve the varied, urgent problems arising out of these new settlements.

URGENT PROBLEMS

What are some of these problems?

1. *Extend the "pattern" to all workers.* The employers have no intention of voluntarily granting even these inadequate concessions to workers in all the other industries. On the contrary, they will try to give less. On the other hand, the trade unions, in accord with the conditions in each specific industry, must use their strength to try to secure still further concessions. There still remain large sections of workers, as in the maritime, railroad, tobacco, and packing industries—as well as most A. F. of L. workers—whose wage demands have yet to be granted. Even in the steel industry, many steel fabricators still resist offering the 15½ cent "package"; and so far the Ford Motor Company vigorously refuses to grant what G.M. and Chrysler have already given. In the case of the Ford workers, they will correctly want to maintain the comparatively better wage rate they have enjoyed during the past few years.

2. *Guarantee the gains by extending union activity.* Important steps forward by the trade union movement on a number of major questions are necessary if the gains are not to be wiped out by new attacks. Answers have to be found to such problems as the pending anti-labor legislation and the way to defeat it, independent political action, trade union unity, labor-farmer unity, etc. This also places before organized labor a number of additional tasks. These are:

a. The fight against a new speed-up system. Mr. Fairless, President of U.S. Steel, signalized this renewed speed-up drive when he said, on the day following the steel agreement: "We must count heavily on the acceptance by our employees of their obligations to help absorb these new costs by increased effort and improved efficiency." The workers in these basic industries have already been subjected to increased speed-up over the past year, so that today it is again one of the most burning grievances. The men and the unions will have to fight all further efforts to intensify speed-up—usually attempted by retiming jobs—and put a stop to it.

b. *Defense of Negro workers.* Since V-J Day there has been a systematic downgrading of the Negro workers who entered industry to answer the nation's war needs. In no union in the mass production industries is this problem being satisfactorily handled and in steel and auto it is a particularly sharp issue. All trade unions, especially the

C.I.O.,
downg
peacet
won in
grading
jobs. C
need in
that N
tunity
paper)
posts o
c. Sp
lated
grievan
high in
pecially
to trem
the wo
utilized
anti-un
mate in
be direc
the con
unions
date th
that the
into eff
contract
d. St
chinery
only as
shop ste
teeing t
ation po
for the
true for
the situ
from in
this is
C.I.O.
broad s
mentary
"griever

C.I.O., must not only fight against downgrading but must renew in peacetime the fight that was partially won in wartime, for systematic upgrading of Negro workers on all jobs. Coupled with this is the vital need in all these unions to guarantee that Negro workers have the opportunity (in fact, and not just on paper) to be elected to the highest posts of union leadership.

c. Speedy settlement of accumulated grievances. The unsettled grievances that are piled mountain-high in some mills and shops (especially in the steel industry) lead to tremendous dissatisfaction among the workers. This situation is then utilized by the companies to create anti-union sentiment. The legitimate indignation of the worker must be directed where it belongs, against the companies. But to do this the unions must move swiftly to liquidate these piled-up grievances so that they are not a barrier to putting into effect the provisions of the new contract.

d. Strengthen the grievance machinery of the union. A contract is only as effective as the system of shop stewards is effective in guaranteeing that every phrase and punctuation point of the contract is utilized for the benefit of the workers. This is true for all the unions, even though the situation in this regard may vary from industry to industry. While this is elementary, there are still C.I.O. unions that discourage a broad shop steward system, supplementary to the contract-approved "grievers," because it encourages

rank and file initiative and activity. In other industries, the need is for a broader representation of shop stewards to settle more grievances at lower levels. Everywhere, a broad, functioning system of rank and file shop stewards (not merely a few full-timers) is the way to guarantee the most effective enforcement of every aspect of the contract as well as to achieve maximum involvement of the members in the affairs of the union.

e. Beware of class collaboration schemes. In the steel industry particularly, the spokesmen of the trusts have started a new ideological drive to promote class collaboration. Typical of this is an editorial in the April 23, issue of the Youngstown *Vindicator*, which says in part:

In years past, despite disagreements and occasional strikes, the steel industry had a traditional team spirit. . . . From president to floor sweeper, all took pride in a job well done, groaned at setbacks, cheered at new records. The revolution in the rise of the big unions was inevitable, but it endangered the spirit of cooperation.

This Pollyanish poppycock is reminiscent of the 1920's and is the prelude to Mr. Fairless' effort further to exploit the steel workers by greater speed-up.

3. *Trade union struggle against price increases and for a people's tax program.* The trade union movement, recognizing that the new wage increases do not even equal the price increases of the last years, should take the lead in organizing a

broad people's movement that will fight for a reduction in prices. The Bureau of Labor Statistics (never known to favor the workers) recently reported that average retail prices on March 15 of this year were 58½ percent higher than the August, 1939, average and were 20 percent higher than the same date a year ago. So-called appeals to Big Business, like those made by President Truman, will continue to fall on deaf ears. The N.A.M., the United States Chamber of Commerce, and monopoly generally, only understand one language—that of organized mass strength and struggle. The trade unions today have a new role to play, going beyond the limits of the wage and hour question. This must manifest itself, for one, in the 14 million members of the trade unions helping to organize a broad consumer movement in every block of the large cities and in every other town. Such a movement should employ a double tactic. It should demand government action and legislation to force down monopoly-controlled prices, and it should also take appropriate consumer protest action against the retail outlets of the trusts themselves.

Side by side with this, labor must protect its gains by helping to develop a people's tax movement for placing the tax burden on those who can afford it. Such a movement should at this moment particularly campaign for amending the Social Security Act to bring unemployment and old-age benefit payments up to present price levels, as well as for

the exemption from individual incomes taxes of all married persons receiving less than \$5,000 a year and all single persons receiving less than \$2,000 a year.

4. *Renewed attention to organizing the unorganized.* Precisely now, on the wave of the present struggles to secure and maintain new wage increases, there are opportunities and an urgent need further to increase union membership. The C.I.O. and A.F.L.-Southern organizing drives and the I.A.M. campaign for one million members, indicate an appreciation of this need. Equally important is the completion of the organization of the unorganized in the mills and shops by the unions that have just completed wage negotiations. A serious campaign to organize the millions of agricultural and white collar workers is also vital.

5. *Continue to win support for unfulfilled demands.* While a number of labor's new and major demands were not granted or were referred to joint study by employers and unions, the trade union movement should conduct an all-year-round campaign to popularize these demands among the workers as well as among the majority of the population. Just as the 8-hour day was achieved through years of agitation and struggle, so today, the first rejection of such new and basic demands as the guaranteed annual wage, the 30-hour work week (6-hour day), and a health and security program under the direction of the trade unions, should be countered by an

organ
the si
the p
For
other
with
the r
work
union
contri
work
officia
of the
ment
memb
still li
activiz
labor
opport
trade
role a
the str
again
trends

WHY
WIT
THI

Whi
that th
out re
that th
draw
These
do no
the ov
a strat
and th
the T
ment o
bill un
the inc

organized campaign to popularize the significance of such demands and the possibility of realizing them.

For all these immediate tasks and other more basic ones to be dealt with below, the urgent need now is the maximum activation of the workers in the affairs of their trade unions, with more emphasis on the contributions of the volunteer shop workers and less on those of paid officials. There must be no lessening of the vigilance of the labor movement and no furloughing of its members from the big battles that still lie ahead. Rather, the maximum activation of the members of the labor movement will provide the opportunities for the great American trade union movement to fulfill its role as the organized backbone of the struggle of the American people against the present-day pro-fascist trends in our country.

WHY WAGE RISES WERE WON WITHOUT A STRIKE IN THE BASIC INDUSTRIES

While it is of major significance that these gains were achieved without resort to strikes, it is decisive that the labor movement should not draw false conclusions from this. These wage and other concessions do not reflect any basic change in the over-all strategy of Big Business, a strategy of offensive against labor and the people. This is evidenced by the Taft-Hartley Bills, the enactment of the so-called portal-to-portal bill undermining the wage-hour law, the increased speed-up in the factor-

ies, the attack on civil liberties, and particularly the persecution of the Communist Party. All this is tied up with the Truman-Vandenberg Doctrine of U.S. domination of the world. American imperialism — whose subsidy of \$400,000,000 to the enemies of democracy in Greece and Turkey is only an initial down payment on what is to come—must take the cost out of the pay checks of American workers and off the table of every family.

That these settlements were arrived at without recourse to strike struggles arises out of a combination of factors. These are:

1. *The strength of the electrical, steel, and auto workers unions, and the support by the membership to the unions demands.* How true this is can be seen in reverse in the telephone workers strike. Here the union is weak, due to its decentralization, inexperience, separation from the main bodies of labor, and its A.C.T.U.-influenced leadership. Therefore, the Morgan interests, which control A.T.&T., decided to provoke a strike although in the case of U. S. Steel, which they also control, they decided to come to an agreement without a strike. Because of the weakness of the telephone union, not even the militancy of the rank and file could maintain the strike for its original demands, and, in a piecemeal fashion, unsatisfactory settlements have been forced upon the workers.

2. *The recognition by the employers that there was a growing mood on the part of the workers to fight,*

and that in some cases they were definitely ahead of their leaders. An important cause of this change in the attitude of the workers was an increased understanding by growing sections of labor that the N.A.M. propaganda about increased wages being cancelled out by price rises, was false.

3. *A gradual changing of relations between labor and the middle classes and farmers as a result of the wage-price developments.* Months ago, the N.A.M. propaganda that wage increases cause increased prices, definitely affected the thinking of the farmers and the middle classes and there was a growing gulf between them and organized labor. Over the past year, these groupings have seen prices continue to rise without wage increases and today, there is even a move by some Big Business circles to blame the farmers for the increase in the cost of living. Under such circumstances they were not a ready reserve for monopoly capital to use against the strike struggle of the workers.

4. *Fear by the bourgeoisie that strike struggles for increased wages could be rapidly transformed into mighty political struggles against anti-labor legislation, high prices and everything reactionary in the country.* Such a development in the present circumstances could well have speeded up the process of political realignment in the country as far as 1948 is concerned. This is especially true since it would have coincided with the renewed activity against the Truman Doctrine, being

expressed through Wallace, Pepper, Taylor, and others.

It was for these reasons that Big Business abruptly decided to grant concessions without strikes. But this decision was coupled with the adoption of a conscious policy of:

1. Using these wage increases to try to dull the edge of the struggle against reaction.

2. Taking back the wage concessions through intensified speed-up and greater exploitation.

3. Moving against what it considered weaker sections of labor, for example the telephone workers, the tobacco workers in North Carolina, etc.

4. Driving its anti-labor bills through Congress and preparing, at the appropriate moment, to move against all unions.

These plans of monopoly capital can be smashed. The gains achieved strengthen the union consciousness of the membership and spur other unions to demand similar increases. If given leadership that corresponds to the big tasks of the moment—tasks that go far beyond the limits of pure-and-simple trade unionism—labor will be activated and united as never before, enabling it thereby to fulfill its role as the leader of the democratic and anti-fascist struggles of the people.

It should be noted that the forces represented by the A.C.T.U. paper, the *Wage-Earner*, are working overtime trying to provoke antagonism between the component unions of the Big Three of the C.I.O. over the question of which is responsible for

break
ing t
and u
shoul
contri
sary
recent
tively
swun
tive f
their
howe
the vi
mane
The
not b
one u
that f
ers' s
round
role a
ers g
over-a
and e
the v
ability
combi
viousl
Dur
settler
unity
comm
day d
as in
not b
there
on the
bined
prepar
strugg
jockey
vantag
lar un

breaking the deadlock and achieving the first settlement. It is correct and understandable that each union should feel proud of its own role and contribution. It is correct and necessary to draw conclusions from the recent experiences as to how effectively the full membership was swung into motion to wage an effective fight against the employers in their industry. It would be folly, however, for any union to become the victim of this slick *Wage-Earner* maneuver.

The credit for the gains won cannot be claimed exclusively by any one union, even though the union that first breaks through the employers' stubborn resistance in any one round of struggle occupies a special role and is so credited by the workers generally. However, it was the over-all strength of the Big Three and especially the militant mood of the workers, combined with an ability to take advantage of the combination of circumstances previously described, that won the fight.

During the months preceding the settlements adequate Big Three unity had not been achieved, and a common strategy and joint day-to-day direction in negotiation as well as in preparation for settlements had not been developed. In some cases there had been too much dependence on the promises of employers, combined with a discouragement of real preparation by the workers for struggle. In other cases there was a jockeying for some partisan advantage within or without a particular union. In this situation, as in all

others of a comparable nature, the key problem was to involve the workers and local unions in the formulating of demands and then actively to mobilize the workers to support these demands while exposing the false propaganda of the employers. Combined with this, unity in the ranks and rejection of Red-baiting are indispensable as one of the main ways to force concessions from the employers without strikes and yet be prepared to use the full force of the workers' power if need be. These are elementary lessons of the American labor movement, learned over the years, that are still essentially sound today. Unfortunately, only a few of the large C.I.O. unions have this approach.

RELATIONSHIP OF WAGE STRUGGLES TO OTHER PROBLEMS OF LABOR

The experiences of these wage struggles and the accompanying activities against anti-labor legislation re-emphasize that labor must grapple more decisively with a number of major policy questions such as labor unity, independent political action for 1948, and labor-farmer unity.

The holding of the recent meeting of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. committees to discuss trade union unity was in itself a step forward and indicates the pressure from the rank and file for labor unity. It also reflects a certain concern among the leaders as to the future of the trade union

movement, which is now jeopardized by the Hartley-Taft Bills.

That such a meeting of C.I.O.-A. F. of L. representatives could adjourn without even issuing a joint statement calling for maximum activity to defeat these vicious bills, not to speak of a plan of joint mass activity, is a real indictment of those responsible—and the responsibility must be placed on the A. F. of L. representatives.

The C.I.O. proposals very correctly approached the problem of organic unity as the consequence of joint activities in common defense of the very existence of the two federations of labor. *The realization of united labor action—in various forms and at all levels—is the only path to organic unity of the trade union movement.*

The C.I.O. proposals had four main themes:

1. That the immediate pressing problem is to defeat the Taft-Hartley legislation, and for that purpose the C.I.O. outlined a detailed program that included the idea of "establishing a national joint emergency legislative committee to give direction and coordination to an over-all . . . fight. . ."
2. That while this joint struggle is going on, further exploratory work toward organic unity shall continue and "an agreement be perfected between A. F. of L. and C.I.O. to eliminate jurisdictional disputes."
3. That "the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. [shall] agree to . . .

democratic union principles as the basis for . . . organic unity" including the protection of the autonomous rights of each existing International and the creation nationally of a "new organizational structure."

4. That "parallel with efforts outlined above, we propose that committees of A. F. of L. and C.I.O. unions operating in the same field should also meet to explore the possibility of joint action in carrying out of the above program."

The outright rejection of these proposals by the A. F. of L., with its new arrogant suggestion that C.I.O. unions come back to the A. F. of L. and affiliate as individual unions, places the responsibility upon the A. F. of L. leadership for labor not exercising its maximum influence in the present life and death struggle to defend labor from reaction's attacks.

It is true that something new happened as a result of these attacks. That "something new" included alarm and concern in the ranks of the A. F. of L. bureaucracy as to what was in store for the trade union movement. As a result they were willing to talk of organic unity, with C.I.O. unions to "come in as they are now organized with their full membership." However, while they are fearful of what might happen to the trade union movement, they demonstrate that they are still motivated by reactionary considerations of refusal to deal with the C.I.O. as an equal, and they still fear the joint

mass
than t
There
the se
favori
fastl
tion t
ence o

The
tion r
urgent
ment.

This
expres
C.I.O.
that
Hartle
upheld
stoppa
ers, th
the C
and th
point
cess if
nation

Abc
ing ro
never
opene
ley Bi
labor
secure
only
the un
suppo
be rel
ley E
C.I.O.
will o
cessfu
wages
The
from

mass struggles of the workers more than they do the attacks of reaction. There is no other explanation for the seeming contradiction between favoring "organic unity" and steadfastly opposing immediate joint action to defeat the threat to the existence of all unions.

The struggle for united labor action remains the most immediate urgent task of the trade union movement.

This unity must find developing expression in united mass actions of C.I.O. and A. F. of L. to guarantee that Truman will veto the Taft-Hartley Bill and that this veto is upheld in the Senate. The protest stoppages of the Detroit auto workers, the Iowa A. F. of L. and C.I.O.; the Chicago packinghouse workers, and the Baltimore shipyard workers, point to the dependable way to success if such actions are extended to a national level.

Above all, labor must avoid placing reliance on Truman. It should never be forgotten that Truman opened the door for the Taft-Hartley Bill with his own brand of anti-labor legislation. If a veto is to be secured and sustained, it can be done only through mass pressure. Only the united strength of labor and the support of the common people can be relied on to defeat the Taft-Hartley Bills. United labor action of C.I.O. and A. F. of L. is now, and will continue to be, the key to successful struggles by labor as regards wages as well as political activities.

The main lessons to be drawn from all these developments is that

labor must boldly give leadership to the democratic people's forces in the next historic step forward of labor in the United States. This next step, following from the recognition that neither the Republican nor Democratic Party represent the interests of the people, is the organization of a third party representing the forces of progress, democracy, and anti-fascism.

The recently concluded packinghouse workers union convention declared—and with all the greater significance because it is not a so-called Left union—that the Democratic and Republican Parties "are completely under the domination of reactionary interests" and that "for all practical purposes the major parties present us with a choice of Tweedledum and Tweedledee." It then went on record to work toward the establishment of an independent political party. This is symbolic of a growing trend in the thinking of American trade unionists. This trend toward independent political action needs to be speeded up in order that labor's influence shall not be dissipated in 1948.

Indicative of the deep thinking of these packinghouse workers when they adopted their third party resolution, was a later convention action urging the early convening of a national farmer-labor conference "for the purpose of discussing our mutual problems." This proposal merits the serious consideration of every other C.I.O. and A. F. of L. convention that meets, as it does all farm organizations.

At a moment when maximum unity is the decisive need of the hour, it becomes crystal clear that the same reactionaries who raise the "anti-Communist" cry are out to destroy the trade unions; that the same Congressmen who propose to outlaw the Communist Party want to outlaw the closed shop and national industry-wide bargaining. Yet there are still labor leaders who never learn, and in the midst of a life and death struggle, unwittingly play the game of the reactionaries. This was evident in the action of some steel workers union leaders in the Pennsylvania C.I.O. convention, who introduced an anti-Communist amendment to the constitution. It was seen in the action of Green and Grogan of the shipbuilders union in giving encouragement to union-busting and Red-baiting by chartering secessionists from a brother C.I.O. union. It is seen in the action of the Executive Board of the chemical workers union which, by a majority of one, adopted an unprecedented Red-baiting resolution which was contrary to convention policy. And unfortunately, when Walter Reuther, in the U.A.W. Executive Board, raised the issue of Section 8 of the U.A.W. Constitution (a section which has been inoperative for years) applying to the members of the Communist Party, it was not met forthrightly by the progressive majority and rejected. Rather the central question of inter-

pretation was allowed to be adopted unanimously, with a struggle against Reuther's splitting tactics being waged and carried merely on the question of procedure. By failing to reject the original Reuther move, the progressive majority—unless it retrieves its step—is not only allowing the unity of the union to be dealt a serious blow, but is opening the door to its own defeat.

The rank and file of American trade unionists could well ask some of their leaders: must we face the "unity" of the concentration camp and the lash of fascism before you will understand that Red-baiting and anti-Communism are the weapons of Big Business and reaction to split and divide labor and the progressives? In contrast to these capitulatory tendencies on the part of some labor leaders, the unanimous decision of the packinghouse workers convention outlined the path for American labor in rejecting Red-baiting, when it declared:

In this time of crisis to the free institutions of our country, we reaffirm our basic conviction that freedom, just like peace, is indivisible. Repression of any sort which attacks civil liberties is the weapon of reaction. We recognize and properly evaluate the present wave of witch-hunt hysteria as the weapon of reaction and monopoly whose goal is to destroy the trade union movement. We must close our ranks and unitedly act for the common good.

THE
QUE

ONE G
lems o
fact th
independe
chaos o
This c
to the
people
to the
to unif
to an
accusto
in one
First
travelli
veritab
numera
hard t
of exa
there a
and "r
sundry
to har
travelle
usually
test of
what v
ination
searche
rency,
ing for
cases th
sence o

THE NATIONAL QUESTION IN EUROPE

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

ONE OF THE GREATEST political problems of our times arises from the fact that modern Europe, with many independent countries, constitutes a chaos of conflicting national interests. This confusion is a major hindrance to the economic prosperity of the peoples concerned and also a menace to the peace of the world. The need to unify Europe is especially obvious to an American visiting that area, accustomed as the writer is to living in one vast, continent-wide nation.

First, due to national barriers, travelling in Europe has become a veritable problem, what with the innumerable borders to cross. Visas are hard to get, often entailing weeks of exasperating negotiations. Then there are various "exit," "re-entry," and "military" permits, as well as sundry other inventions of the devil to harass and trip up the unwary traveller. Crossing a border, which is usually done about 2 a.m., is a real test of one's patience and fortitude, what with double and triple examinations of passports, strip-tease searches for possible bootlegged currency, and endless customs rummaging for dutiable objects. In many cases the border officials, the very essence of bureaucracy, consider the

unhappy passengers as suspicious characters who, at best, need barely be tolerated. All these complications are, of course, serious obstructions to the free personal intercourse so necessary for a sane and ordered Europe.

Second, Europe's chaotic nationalism also erects major economic walls between the various peoples. There are mutually exclusive tariffs, quota import and export arrangements, minute and time-consuming inspection of goods in transit, monetary systems that have little or no relationship to each other, vigorous speculation in one another's currency, dog-eat-dog economic competition of one nation with another, and various other economic schemes designed to further the interests of the ruling class of one nation at the expense of all others. This chaotic economic nationalism prevents, of course, anything resembling an orderly development, much less a planned operation, of Europe's economic life.

Third, and this is the most dangerous aspect of the national problem, Europe's conglomeration of disconnected nationalities also gives rise to the sharpest political and military clashes. With various nations trying to expand at the expense of the others, there are inevitably many serious border disputes and repeated gangings-up by one group of states against another. Two scores of disastrous wars during the past century and a half testify eloquently to the explosive quality in Europe's confusion of nations and to its menace for world peace.

MONOPOLY CAPITALISM INTENSIFIES THE CONFUSION

It is clear that if Europe is to play an important role in creating a social system that will help to bring peace, prosperity, and freedom to the harassed world, it will have to find the way to harmonize and link together its many discordant nationalities.

Present-day monopoly capitalism, however, has no effective answer to Europe's great national problem. The same forces in the decaying capitalist system that throw the big capitalist powers into ever-more violent collision with each other, also sharpen up the antagonisms among the smaller countries and between them and the great powers. The further monopoly capitalism decays, the more intense, generally, become national antagonisms. Modern Europe, with its pattern of little national bits and pieces, is the natural product of capitalism.

The ingrained capitalist way of solving the national question, in Europe as well as all over the world, is to subordinate the smaller nations to imperialist domination by the larger ones. Upon this basis the pre-World War I Austrian, Russian, and German Empires in Europe were founded. Naturally, the smaller nations always resist such imperialist domination and they demand self-determination and national independence. Their militant opposition on this basis had much to do with the final overthrow of the Hapsburg, Romanoff, and Hohenzollern imperial dynasties. The achievement of

national independence by a whole series of small nations was one of the most significant features of the great revolutionary upsurge that followed World War I.

The League of Nations was unable to unite the nations of Europe. Within its framework France and Great Britain, true to their imperialist natures, strove to subject the smaller nations to their sway. Obviously they did not succeed, except for a time in the face of the stubborn resistance on the part of the smaller nations. Nor, in the long run, did Germany and Italy, with all their armies and national quisling traitors, accomplish their aim of forcing all of Europe into the ironbound structure of their "New Order." The welter of discordant and disunited European nations therefore remains. While the independent status of the various countries undoubtedly protects them to a considerable degree against the incursions of the big imperialist powers, nevertheless their lack of mutual coordination does great harm to the economic welfare, political liberty, and peace of Europe and the world.

As regards the national question in Europe, the United Nations is not faring any better than did the old League of Nations, and for the same basic reasons. This time, within the United Nations, it is the United States that is trying, with the help of Great Britain, to secure domination over the nations of Europe (and also of the rest of the world). While many of the nations, intimidated by American imperialist pressure, are

accord
quislin
make
still br
nation
difficul
The
cited b
lution
this cl
Actual
despite
is dom
tically
loose f
about a
ples o
The ri
tions t
proof o
Nor
States
the gra
intende
advocac
cial D
erals, s
defects
fice to
fulness
of Euro
present
be a to
ialism.
familia
big pow
would
plicate
tionalis
Second
Anglo-
United
an anti

accordingly producing a new crop of quislings, the general effect is to make the fires of nationalism burn still brighter and to make the whole national question in Europe more difficult of solution.

The Pan-American Union is often cited by capitalist apologists as a solution of the national question. But this claim is false and misleading. Actually the Pan-American Union, despite its basis of formal equality, is dominated economically and politically by the United States. This loose federation in no sense brings about a true collaboration of the peoples of the Western Hemisphere. The rising opposition of many nations to American imperialism is proof of these facts.

Nor does the proposed United States of Europe hold the answer to the grave national question. It is not intended to. This scheme, currently advocated by Churchill Tories, Social Democrats and confused liberals, suffers from two fundamental defects, either of which would suffice to destroy its progressive usefulness. First, such a United States of Europe as might be built up under present conditions would inevitably be a tool of Anglo-American imperialism. This means that the old familiar imperialist principle of the big powers dominating the little ones would prevail. This could only complicate still more the maze of nationalist contradictions in Europe. Secondly, by the same token, *i.e.*, Anglo-American domination, the United States of Europe would be an anti-Soviet bloc. This perspective

would kill at the outset any possibilities of its getting all or most of the nations of Europe together on a basis that would mitigate their national antagonisms. The so-called United States of Europe would be still-born, with many vital European states refusing even to join the organization.

Under monopoly capitalism there can be no solution to the national question, in Europe or elsewhere. For it is just as inevitable, under the domination of the trusts and monopolies, that the powerful nations oppress and exploit the weaker ones as it is that the capitalists exploit the workers.

THE WAY TO THE SOLUTION

The problem is not insoluble, however. It remained for Lenin and Stalin, whose principles are embodied in the life and structure of the Soviet Union, to find the answer to the national question. These principles may be briefly stated: to grant all the peoples concerned the right of self-determination and full economic, political, and social equality, and to inculcate among them a spirit of brotherly, Socialist cooperation. These principles apply whether the nations are parts of the same general political union or federation, or exist on an independent basis.

The successful application of this Leninist-Stalinist solution of the national question is one of the very greatest achievements of the Soviet Union. It has transformed the old czarist "prison-house of nations" into a freely cooperating, democratic multi-national union. The main peo-

ples that go to make up the Soviet Union not only enjoy full economic, political, and social equality, but, what is the heart of the whole system, they also possess a keen sense of concern for cultivating one another's welfare. One of the many examples of this dynamic quality of the Soviet Union is the way in which, under the various 5-year plans, the more advanced states of the U.S.S.R. systematically help in the economic and cultural development of the less advanced peoples. Such a cooperative relationship is quite unthinkable under monopoly capitalism.

The handling of the national question in the U.S.S.R. meets the basic needs of the lesser nations. It gives them greater political freedom and security, and it guarantees them faster and more all-around economic and cultural development than they could possibly achieve if they were on their own as independent nations. This explains why there are virtually no national, racial, or religious antagonisms within the U.S.S.R. It also explains why the peoples of Lithuania, Esthonia, and Latvia voted so overwhelmingly to become part of the Soviet Union (a vital fact which capitalist writers are desperately eager to obscure).

But the national question in Europe (and in the rest of the world) does not have to wait for solution until full Socialism is achieved. One of the most significant facts of the postwar situation is that the new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe possess within themselves

the capacity for solving the national question. This is because in these countries—Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Roumania, Hungary, etc.—although capitalism, as such, has not been abolished there, the power of the big capitalists and landowners has been either completely broken or seriously weakened. Consequently, the workers, small farmers, and intelligentsia, who are in full or partial control of the governments, are able to deal with the national question on the basis of the Leninist-Stalinist principles of self-determination, full economic, political, and social equality, and Socialist cooperation. These principles, applied to the new situation, it may also be remarked, form the basis of the policy of the Italian, French, and British Communist Parties toward the colonies of their countries and toward neighboring countries.

THE NEW DEMOCRATIC INTERNATIONALISM

Czechoslovakia offers a fine example of the developing solution of the national question along the foregoing lines. As never before in their history, the Czechs and Slovaks are working together in a spirit of equality and friendly collaboration. Characteristically, one of the most striking features in their planned economy is the systematic raising of Slovakia's economic status to that already achieved in the Czech lands, while the economic level of the whole country is being raised. It hardly needs to be added that the Communists are the most active

leaders
relation
who co
Yug
strikin
princip
the na
cades t
horribl
that c
gether.
world
seemed
was pr
which
ground
ples, q
themse
the boi
ism of
But
have
erstwh
ples. T
alities
first ti
harmon
born in
Hitler?
postwa
tween
yet bee
that re
and th
operati
economi
that in
country
veloped
placed
Inast
in Pola
garia,

leaders in thus developing the new relations between the two peoples who comprise Czechoslovakia.

Yugoslavia offers an even more striking example of Leninist-Stalinist principles applied in dealing with the national question. For many decades the Balkans have served as the horrible example of small nations that could not live peacefully together. If there was any place in the world where the national question seemed to be hopeless of solution, it was precisely in that vast territory, which was long a notorious breeding ground of wars. The Yugoslav peoples, quarrelling and fighting among themselves, were in the very heart of the boiling pot of national antagonism of the entire Balkan area.

But now order and cooperation have been established among the erstwhile discordant Yugoslav peoples. Today, the six major nationalities in that country, for the very first time are living and working harmoniously together. This unity, born in the fire of struggle against Hitler's army, continues into the postwar period. All differences between the various peoples have not yet been fully ironed out but those that remain are of a minor character and the trend toward unity and cooperation is decisive. In the planned economy of Yugoslavia, similarly to that in Czechoslovakia, the whole country is being systematically developed, with special emphasis being placed on the more backward areas.

Inasmuch as the new democracies in Poland, Roumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Albania are animated by

the same intelligent approach to the national question as that being put into practice by the Czechoslovak and Yugoslav Governments, a new day has undoubtedly dawned for the Balkans as a whole so far as the national question is concerned. The former cock-pit of nations in the Balkan area is well on the way to becoming a region of epoch-making international cooperation.

Weak spots in this general situation are the reactionary regimes in Greece, and Austria. In these countries Anglo-American imperialism is in control and it is making every effort to keep the old reactionary cliques in existence. But it is safe to say that these three countries will not be able to withstand very long the new spirit of democracy and international cooperation that is sweeping through the peoples of Central Europe and the Balkans. Another danger to European collaboration lies in the Anglo-American attempt practically to divide Germany into four pieces. This project, which could only increase national antagonisms in Europe, runs counter to the whole democratic development in Middle and Eastern Europe, and in the long run it will be defeated.

The new democratic international spirit prevailing in this great area is not only expressing itself in more cooperative activities between the different national groups within individual states, but also in more friendly relations between these states themselves. These countries are already developing a whole series of economic and cultural agreements

with each other and with their great neighbor to the East, the U.S.S.R. This augurs well for minimizing and eventual elimination of the age-old national antagonisms in these areas. One of the most remarkable developments in this general respect is the strong and developing movement in Yugoslavia and Bulgaria for an actual consolidation of the two states. If carried out, both countries would greatly benefit from such a move.

The deeper significance of this development of international cooperation in the new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe is that it points the way to the ultimate economic and political unification of that crazy-quilt of national antagonisms, modern capitalist Europe. The task of today, however, is not to come forward with grandiose blueprint plans for uniting Europe and overcoming its national chaos. Instead, what has to be done is to break the power of monopoly capital and to make the democratic forces victorious in the respective countries. To the extent and in the measure that this is done, democratic solutions of the national question will be put into effect by the democratic regimes, and the crippling economic, political, military, and social walls now dividing the peoples of Europe

will increasingly topple and fall.

As Lenin and Stalin pointed out, the modern capitalist state was created under the leadership of the capitalist class in its efforts to control the national and international market. In the main, this state-building coincided historically with the interests of the respective nations as a whole. But today the capitalists, specifically the big monopolists, are no longer the leaders of their respective nations in a constructive sense, for they systematically betray their peoples' interests for the sake of their own class interests. The present European hodge-podge of mutually antagonistic states is the maximum that their greedy, self-seeking capitalists can do in the matter of the national question.

The constructive leadership of the nations is now passing over into the hands of the working class and its democratic allies. They alone, now, can and do speak and act in the national interest. They have as a great task, therefore, the solving of the tangled national question in Europe and elsewhere, a heritage from a capitalist system which has exhausted its historical progressive role. And finding this solution to the national question is precisely what the workers in the new European democracies are now doing.

TRUTH AND TRICKERY ABOUT HIGH PRICES

By MAX GORDON

WITH THE PRICE INDEX continuing to soar, chief interest of the leading politicians of both major parties is centered, not on bringing prices down, but on how to shift the responsibility for high prices to the opposition.

In three well-publicized appeals for voluntary reduction of prices, President Truman has painstakingly attempted to establish in the public mind the legend that he is a foe of high prices and is doing all he can to get them down. Neither he nor his advisers are naive enough to think that pleas for voluntary action can actually reduce prices.

The President was also anxious to cover up his own part in bringing on current high prices through complete surrender to the pressures of monopoly capital for an end of price controls, a surrender in which not the least of his motives was to play what seemed to be "smart politics" last November.

Truman based his pleas for voluntary reduction of prices on the theory that lower prices would avert an economic collapse and would give

us enduring prosperity. Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder also predicted, at hearings of the House Ways and Means Committee, that a crash could be avoided for some time to come if only prices are lowered, and the idea has been repeated by conservatives and liberals alike.

In order to put the relationship between prices and the maturing crisis in proper perspective, it must be repeated that a reduction of prices cannot avert an economic crisis for the simple reason that crises are not a price phenomenon. The chief cause of crises is the contradiction between the social character of production and the private nature of appropriation. Hence, crises cannot be abolished so long as capitalism exists regardless of what the price level may be. Crises have occurred in the past without being preceded by high prices.

What is true, though, is that government policies on such matters as prices, taxes, housing, public works, social security, curbs on the monopolies, etc., can affect the tempo of development of the crisis, its depth, and the extent to which the working class and other sections of the people will suffer from its effects. A significant lowering of the price level, taken together with a number of other measures, would be an important factor in influencing to some extent certain of these aspects of the crisis.

Thus, the price issue and its effect on the future course of our economy

are catapulted into the political arena, with both parties jockeying to evade responsibility for high prices and the developing crisis while executing the Big Business mandate of keeping hands off the profiteering spree.

This refusal to act is symbolized in the failure of the Joint Economic Commission of Congress, under Senator Robert A. Taft's leadership, to make its report to Congress. The Commission was set up under the emasculated "Full Employment" Act of 1946. Its report was due, according to the law, in February. Trade union leaders and the few New Dealers still left in Congress have charged Taft with deliberate stalling in order to block any government action which might in the slightest way interfere with Big Business domination of the economy.

Ex-Housing Expediter Wilson W. Wyatt, on behalf of the Social-Democratic-influenced Americans for Democratic Action, recently wrote a letter to Taft and to Representative Jesse Wolcott, (R., Mich.), who is House leader of the Commission, charging it with inaction and apathy. Significantly, Wyatt did not include the ranking Democratic members of the Commission, nor did he criticize Truman, though they, too, are guilty of the same "inaction" and "apathy." The price policies of the Wyatt program did not call for restoration of controls, but simply for setting up an Adjustment Board which would allegedly aid an "orderly and equitable," and

apparently voluntary, reduction in prices averaging ten per cent.

This proposal is characteristic of the Wyatt program, for it indicates a refusal to propose measures to curb the monopolies and trusts by government action. Hence, it avoids the central question involved in any program designed to combat the effects of the maturing crisis.

In contrast to this, the 16-point program projected by Eugene Dennis to the National Committee of the Communist Party last December had as one of its characteristics that, taken as a whole, it proposed measures which would postpone the outbreak of the crisis and cushion its effects among the masses. Among the proposals were: substantial wage increases, restoration of food subsidies, continuation of effective rent controls, effective revision of the tax structure, expansion of social security, declare as public utilities the monopolized sectors of the food industry such as the dairy and meat trusts, establish public ownership of railways, mines, and present public utilities, a democratic foreign policy in both its economic and political aspects. Since that meeting, Communist leaders have added to the program restoration of price controls on the basic cost-of-living items.

REPUBLICAN ANTICS

While Truman has tried to escape responsibility for high prices through his appeals for voluntary action, G.O.P. leaders have been bumping into each other in their scramble to

get
suppo
costs.
Reece
troub
man's
cratic
prise,
Reece
"inter
that,
will l
On
chief
spoke
troubl
becaus
prices
Taft
amina
led th
summ
gress
which
Act be
Taft
said
made
flation
witho
passed
signed
chiefly
hatch
ardent
Repub
Have
his cr
with t
his m
sional
trols e

get out from under as their popular support wanes with rising living costs. G.O.P. Chairman B. Carroll Reece continues to cackle that the trouble rests with President Truman's failure to end earlier "bureaucratic interference" with "free enterprise," meaning price controls. Reece insists that the effects of this "interference" are still being felt and that, given time and patience, prices will lower themselves.

On the other hand, Senator Taft, chief Republican Congressional spokesman, blithely argues that the trouble rests with President Truman because he removed all controls on prices and priorities too hastily.

Taft's position deserves some examination. He is the gentleman who led the fight to cripple O.P.A. last summer. Truman's message to Congress vetoing the first monstrosity which carried the "Price Control" Act beyond June 30, 1946, singled out Taft as its special target. Truman said that Taft's amendments had made the bill "a choice between inflation with a statute and inflation without one." The second measure passed by Congress, which Truman signed, was no less a monstrosity, chiefly as a result of Taft's effective hatchet work, though he had the ardent support of the bulk of the Republicans and many Democrats.

Having saddled the nation with his crippling program, Taft, along with the rest of the G.O.P., directed his main fire in the 1946 Congressional campaign at the fact that controls existed at all.

Just a few days before Truman capitulated, in mid-October, to G.O.P. and Big Business pressures, for decontrol, Taft said at a *New York Times* Radio Forum on the Congressional race:

The one great issue between the Republicans and the Democrats is whether progress in this country shall be based on American principles of freedom and justice, or on a constant growth and concentration of power and unrestrained spending in a Federal bureaucracy.

They [the Democrats] would continue price controls and controls over wages and employment.

But the senior Senator from Ohio, shrewd enough to sense the moods of the people and sufficiently free from considerations of principle and consistency to exploit politically Truman's surrender to his own pressures, does not hesitate now to attack Truman for removing controls too hastily.

Truman has left Taft ample room for attack. After giving way initially to the meat trust on October 14, the President wasted no time in ditching virtually all controls. Within a single week, 90 per cent of all foods were decontrolled. Clothing, shoes, soaps, and other things followed in short order. By mid-November, about the only items remaining under price control were sugar, rice, and rents. O.P.A. was making preparations for its burial.

There is no doubt that the price question was one of the central issues in the elections last November.

Most of those who switched to the G.O.P. did so because they were disheartened and disgusted with the abandonment of the Roosevelt program by Truman, one of the results of which was his refusal to fight against the sabotage of the food trusts, particularly the meat packers.

Aided by the well-heeled publicity campaign of the National Association of Manufacturers, the G.O.P. leadership succeeded in putting across the idea that price controls were the source of the shortages suffered by the public, and that lifting them would increase goods, hence lowering prices. Public opinion polls were unanimous in reporting that the price-scarcity angle was one of the decisive factors in the decision of the voters that it was "time for a change," though many other issues played an equally significant part.

Its very victory, however, put the Republican Party on the spot in connection with prices. It had to deliver or suffer the political consequences. The signs are that it is suffering the political consequences. Both recent election results and the public opinion polls show a marked drop in G.O.P. popular backing as price indices continue their upward trend.

TRUMAN "APPEALS"

The fact that the price index shot up from 148.4 in October to 152.8 in February, and is still rising rapidly is closely related to the fact that Truman's "popularity" went up, according to a Gallup poll survey from 32

per cent in October to 48 per cent in February. And this is not because of anything Truman did, but because of G.O.P. failure to prove its election thesis regarding prices and controls, and because of the G.O.P. program for meeting the inflation problem.

Newspaper commentators have tried to give wide publicity to the polls on Truman's "popularity." They have tried to sell us the idea that Truman's stock went up according to these polls because of his tough handling of the miners' strike and his "hardening" attitude toward the Soviet Union. But the miners' strike took place in the early part of December, and the big "decrease in Truman's popularity," according to these polls, took place between January and February. Between October and January, the polls showed no great change in his "unpopularity." Nor did anything happen in the foreign policy field between January and February which could have had any sharp impact on the popular attitude toward Truman.

The two big headline issues that did agitate the people that month were the Republican proposals to jack up rent ceilings 15 per cent, as well as its plans to cripple the unions. Continuation of rent control was being discussed at public hearings of both the House and Senate Banking Committees. The real estate lobby was sounding off with high-pressure demands for scrapping controls altogether, or at least raising

ceilings
courts
Cong
Th
and
to or
jacke
were
Th
was
and
aban
ing i
ods
admi
uring
opini
Th
not a
larity
G.O.
the p
vemb
thing
man
reco
shifts
based
and a
ures a
If
lar o
these
to ref
these
and t
Bec
cratic
aware
G.O.P.
been
throu

ceilings, and was getting much encouragement from G.O.P. leaders in Congress.

The C.I.O. Auto Workers Union, and other unions were threatening to organize rent strikes if rents were jacked up, and tenants' movements were forming everywhere.

The G.O.P. recognized its attitude was causing wide public bitterness and suddenly shifted its tactics. It abandoned the idea of a straight ceiling increase and worked out methods of crippling controls through administrative decentralization, figuring this was too subtle for public opinion to grasp.

Thus, the poll trends indicated not a growth in Truman's "popularity" but a revulsion against the G.O.P. for its refusal to deliver on the price question, just as the November elections were, among other things, a revulsion against the Truman Administration for its sorry record on the same problem. Both shifts of popular sentiment were based, not on any positive program and appeal, but on reaction to failures and betrayals.

If we have discussed these popular opinion polls, it is not because these polls are accurate but in order to refute the political uses to which these polls are being put by Truman and the Democratic Party.

Because Truman and the Democratic high command are so acutely aware of this big chink in the G.O.P.'s armor, the President has been hammering away on prices through his appeals for voluntary

action. The Democrats are also featuring such material as Chester Bowles' article in the May issue of the *Democratic Digest*, in which the former O.P.A. Director charged that the G.O.P. cost the people of the country \$8,000,000,000 in ten months as a result of the scrapping of price controls.

"Unless I badly underestimate the intelligence of the people," Bowles wrote, "the Republican Party will pay heavily at the polls in '48 for their reckless disregard for the welfare of Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public."

Gael Sullivan, executive director of the National Democratic Committee, echoed Bowles' denunciation of the G.O.P. for its wrecking of controls and went on to add that the Democratic Party would have to do something about it. He did not say what it planned to do for the simple reason that it does not plan to do anything.

The Truman appeals were, needless to say, hardly effective in achieving any price drops of substantial or permanent importance. The Newburyport Plan, whereby retail merchants were supposed to take the lead in cutting down prices, proved to be abortive. It was hogwash to begin with. Big Business sneered at the Truman pleas and refused to budge. American capitalists were obeying the fundamental law of bourgeois economics everywhere, *i.e.*, they were driving ahead to squeeze out for themselves the highest possible rate of profit, irrespective

of the effects on the economy as a whole.

MONOPOLY TRIES TO SHIFT THE BLAME

Confronted with the resentment of a harrassed people, Big Business has been trying to shift responsibility for the high price situation upon other classes.

Thus, the effort is made, sometimes simultaneously and sometimes separately, to place the onus on labor and on the farmers.

In the case of labor, it is claimed that its pressures for higher wages and its "failure" to maintain maximum productivity are holding up the price level. The wage angle ignores, of course, the elementary fact that pay increases have constantly lagged behind price increases since we entered into the war economy and that they are still considerably behind today, despite the recent increases granted to a small proportion, as yet, of the nation's workers.

Every wage increase demanded by labor since 1939 has been based on a previous rise in the cost of living. Moreover, the enormous, unheard-of annual profit rate of \$17,000,000,000 after taxes, which corporate business has been maintaining in the past few quarters, is evidence enough that wage increases are not the basis of high prices. The profits are better than four times as much as capital made before the war, and top the highest war figure by several billion.

The productivity argument rests on the theory that if labor produces more through greater intensification of effort without getting higher wages, the supply will increase without a commensurate increase in demand. Hence supply will catch up with demand, and prices will come down. Labor is taken to task because its productivity is not great enough, it "interrupts" production by striking, and it allegedly persists in all kinds of "featherbed" practices that add to production costs without increasing supply.

The theory was recently given a lift by Bernard Baruch, American capital's elder statesman, who proposed that labor agree to working a forty-four hour week and declare a moratorium on all strikes at least until January 1, 1949. This, according to Baruch, would solve our international and domestic problems since it would allow us to produce enough to rehabilitate the world. The theory is so widespread that even a liberal like Fiorello La Guardia endorsed it.

Increased production, under present conditions, will not lower prices but will simply further enrich the bourgeoisie at the expense of the rest of the population and will catapult us at even greater speed toward a new crisis of over production.

The enormous increase in productivity in the past year, without commensurate expansion of the market, is one of the main factors in bringing us so quickly to the brink of crisis. Government sources calculate pro-

duct
than
produ
hikes
the g
and w
buy.
Nor
down
prover
keep
possibi
tied th
reserve
crisis

Repr
to cov
ord of
mythic
tion, i
and its
the ex
lation.
to try
tion fr
of the
more b
the un
ers are
against
tices, a
neck to

FOOD

At t
tions a
are cal
prices
giganti
counter
pay. T
account

ductivity is 20 to 25 per cent higher than in 1939. To demand that labor produce more without big wage hikes will simply mean to increase the gap between what is produced and what the people will be able to buy.

Nor will greater productivity bring down prices. The monopolies have proven that they are prepared to keep prices rigged at the highest possible level until they have emptied the pockets of the people of all reserves. When that happens the crisis will be upon us.

Republican leaders in Congress, to cover up their own miserable record on prices, are making labor's mythical "slowing down" of production, its "high wages," its "strikes" and its "featherbed" practices one of the excuses for their anti-labor legislation. The aim is also, obviously, to try to gain support for this legislation from non-working-class sections of the population, as well as from more backward workers, particularly the unorganized. The G.O.P. leaders are also getting set to legislate against alleged "featherbed" practices, as though they were a bottleneck to production.

FOOD PRICES

At the same time, the corporations and their political spokesmen are calling attention to high food prices as a cover-up for their own gigantic profits and as a means of countering labor's demands for more pay. Their claim is that since food accounts for 40 per cent of the aver-

age family's budget, and since food prices have gone up considerably faster than other items, the problem can be solved by reducing the income of the farmers. The government is also blamed because, under the price support program, it is allegedly keeping farm prices at their extraordinarily high level.

While it is certainly true that food prices are too high, this hardly justifies the \$17,000,000,000 annual profit rate of the corporations, including, incidentally, the corporations that process and distribute food products, which are responsible for the high food prices.

Actually, most farmers find themselves today in a worse position than they were when price controls were lifted and food subsidies eliminated. They have to pay higher prices for the things they consume, as well as for the things they need in order to produce. Prices received by them have not increased at the same rate. The Farm Research Bureau estimates that purchasing power of farmers has declined 10 per cent since September, 1946.

Though farm income has increased enormously compared with prewar days, it must be remembered that the farmer occupied an extremely poor position economically before the war, a position that had to be considerably improved when his market expanded.

But the improvement in the economic position of the farmer bears little relation to the tremendous jump in food prices since the share

of the consumer's dollar taken by the food producing and distributing monopolies has jumped. In the New York milkshed, for instance, it is estimated that before the war, the "spread" between what the farmer received and the consumer paid for milk was about 40 cents out of every dollar spent for food. It is now calculated as close to 50 cents.

As regards government food price practices, the point of attack is the price support program. Under this program, voted by Congress, the government guarantees to farmers a floor under prices for a period of two years after the war. The period ends on December 31, 1948. The purpose of this guarantee was to get farmers to increase production since a farmer must know a year ahead of time what his market is going to be.

Actually, the price support program has been used only to peg potato prices and, to some extent, eggs. The great bulk of farm products have been established way above the floor price and have not required any pegging. Thus government policies can hardly be blamed for high food prices, except in the negative sense that it is not controlling them.

While it is ridiculous to blame government price support policy for the high price level of foods, there is no doubt that the government could adopt methods for bringing prices down. For instance, instead of pegging potato prices at a high mark by buying up a large supply and letting them go to waste, it could guarantee the floor price to the farm-

ers by permitting the market price to go down and give the farmer a subsidy. This would enable people to increase consumption of foods instead of letting them go to waste, and still give the farmer a decent price.

The subsidy method would reduce the price level of foods substantially. But the very people who now claim to be so upset by high food prices are the ones who fought most bitterly against food subsidies during the war. In killing the subsidy program, they themselves became responsible for the huge jump in food prices, much of which never got back to the farmer at all.

A considerable section of business is undoubtedly worried about the present price level. It knows this is one of the big reasons why we are moving rapidly to an economic crisis. When Harold Stassen told Stalin that a crisis could be averted under a "regulated capitalism," he was not advocating measures of regulation but merely expressing his fear and concern with the workings of the capitalist system. President Truman's pleas for lower prices also contained the element of fear of coming events, as did a similar widely-publicized plea by twenty-three businessmen under the auspices of the National Planning Association.

CONCLUSIONS

But it is also obvious that Big Business will not and cannot regulate itself in the interests of the entire economy. Monopoly capitalism

just d
cally,
twent
tary p
Plann
Elect
son. C
on se
comp
of 19
was
years
tion"
to be
gover
by m
Bot
under
Neith
reint
wise
a wa
The
lican
to pu
Dem
leade
for v
gram
W
have

just does not operate that way. Ironically, the top industrialist among the twenty-three who pleaded for voluntary price cuts through the National Planning Association was General Electric President Charles E. Wilson. G.E. had itself just raised prices on several electrical items, though company profits for the first quarter of 1947 were at an annual rate that was higher than the fabulous war years. If there is to be any "regulation" of the economy, if prices are to be controlled, it will have to be by government action forced through by mass pressure and struggle.

Both parties are, however, firmly under the control of Big Business. Neither has the slightest intention of reintroducing price controls or otherwise regulating the economy in such a way as to limit prices or profits. The chief contribution of the Republicans is to yell "free enterprise" and to put an end to "free labor." The Democratic Party, under Truman's leadership, relies upon pious pleas for voluntary action and has no program for action at all.

While many individual groups have spoken out demanding restora-

tion of controls at least on basic items making up the cost of living, what is tragically lacking is an independent political force that can spearhead the fight for such a measure, as well as a bloc of progressive, politically independent Congressmen that would battle for it inside of the national legislature.

Without such a progressive political force operating as a third party, the people are caught in the trap of negatives. If one party fails to control prices properly, permits Big Business to get away with huge profits at the expense of the people and the economy, they can only switch in disgust to the other party, only to find themselves up against the same thing.

The present price situation glaringly demonstrates that to break through this blockade of negatives, to go ahead with a positive program that will check the power of the monopolies and develop an economic program in the interests of the people, the country needs an independent political party based upon an anti-monopoly outlook.

PROBLEMS OF PEACE, DEMOCRACY, AND NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

(On Earl Browder's book, "War or Peace with Russia")

By ALEXANDER BITTELMAN

BROWDER'S BOOK puts the very problem of world peace falsely. It is not true that the problem of world peace is the same as the problem of war or peace with Russia. Nor is it true that the problem of peace is whether there should be an American peace, a Soviet peace, or a joint peace. This way of putting the question conceals the most essential factors in the whole situation.

The problem of world peace, correctly stated, is this: shall there be a democratic and people's peace based upon national independence and freedom, a stable and lasting peace enabling the peoples of all lands to solve their problems in a democratic way and to proceed freely on the road of social progress? Or shall there be a reactionary and imperialist peace based upon national oppression and world domination by one power, robbing the masses of all lands and obstructing their social progress, giving rise to a new fascist menace and leading to a new world

war? This is the problem of peace. It is the problem of fighting and defeating those war-inciting forces of world reaction, headed by the Wall Street monopolies, which seek to impose upon the world a reactionary and imperialist peace. It is the problem of promoting and attaining the victory of those democratic, anti-monopoly, and progressive forces, here and abroad, which are advancing toward a democratic and people's peace. Browder's book deliberately obscures this fundamental struggle between the democratic and reactionary forces, *between an imperialist peace leading to war and a democratic peace leading to lasting peace and social progress.* This is the old Browder revisionism in a somewhat fresh setting.

Naturally, the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union play a tremendously important, almost decisive part in the problems of struggle for a democratic peace. This is so, not only because these are the two most powerful countries in the world, but also because the policies of the government of the United States are directed toward imposing a reactionary and imperialist peace upon the world, whereas the policies of the Soviet Union are directed toward the establishment of a democratic and people's peace. This fact, too, is obscured by Browder's book which therefore poses the problems of American-Soviet relations in a false and distorted fashion.

What is the real problem of American-Soviet relations from the stand-

point of the American people and the true national interest? It is not whether there should be a "Russian" peace, of an "American" peace, or a "joint" peace. These are artificial, non-existent, fictitious alternatives. The Soviet Union is not looking for a Russian peace but for a democratic and people's peace, the same kind of peace that is desired by the democratic and progressive forces in this country. The ruling circles here—the monopolies—are not looking for an American peace but for an imperialist peace, a peace that will enable them to dominate the world, a peace that will spell the enslavement of the American people itself by a native fascist imperialism at home. These are the facts of the situation.

In the face of these facts as distinct from Browder's fictions, what is the problem of a "joint" American-Soviet peace? It certainly cannot mean the "joining" of the Soviet policy of a democratic world peace with Wall Street's policy of world domination. It can only mean that the American people have to combat, check, and defeat Wall Street's policies, expressed and enforced by Truman, Vandenberg, & Co. It can and must mean, further, that the American people have to consolidate a democratic and anti-imperialist coalition capable of materially influencing and, eventually, determining the policies of the American government in the direction and in favor of a democratic and people's peace. Thus and only thus will the American and Soviet policies begin to be

"joined." But then the product of this process will tend to be *not just* a "joint" American-Soviet peace *but a democratic and people's world peace*. And this is exactly what is dictated by the national interests of the American people as opposed to the selfish imperialist interests of the American monopolies.

Browder attacks the official American attitude "which denies equality to the U.S.S.R.," but he never throws light on the fact that this attitude is a basic component of Wall Street's drive for world domination. He writes: "The recognition and acceptance of the Soviet Union as an equal are the precondition to all wisdom in international relations." But he keeps silent about the wisdom itself, which is for the American people, headed by labor, to combat, check, and defeat the Truman Doctrine. Here, too, we have a clear expression of Browder revisionism.

Most misleading is the rehash of the standard Browderisms to the effect that because American capitalist economy needs markets and foreign trade in order to survive, "therefore" the Wall Street monopolies will have to see their way to collaboration with the Soviet Union for world peace. But what do we find in real life? Urged on by the almost doubled capacity of American industry and by the approaching economic crisis, American imperialism is indeed seeking markets, opportunities for capital investments, and control of raw materials. It is engaged in a ruthless drive to get possession of the positions formerly held by German, Jap-

anese, and Italian imperialism; it is penetrating the positions of British imperialism, at the same time collaborating with Britain as its junior partner in the Anglo-American imperialist bloc. In real life, we see the working out of the so-called Truman Doctrine which is an open and brutal expression of the drive of American imperialism for world domination, a drive which has already created a serious situation in the Middle East and is threatening the peace of the world.

This, and not collaboration with the Soviet Union for world peace, is the road taken by the Wall Street monopolies and their political spokesmen—Truman, Vandenberg—for securing the much needed markets for American production. Whether this can succeed, or not, is a different question. In the lands governed by the new peoples' democracies risen to leadership in the war against fascism, the economic drive of the Wall Street monopolies has already failed and will remain a failure as long as official American policy remains what it is. It is also certain that, in all the rest of the world, Wall Street's imperialist drive and the Truman Doctrine are upsetting and destroying opportunities for American foreign trade rather than creating them. This, too, has been proven by life itself. But this does not mean that the Wall Street monopolies will abandon their drive for world domination. On the contrary, they will press the American government for more aggressive policies, for sharper weapons of attack,

for more extreme reaction at home. They will press, as some of the monopolies already do, *for a policy of Hitlerization of the United States and of the world*. These, and not Browder's revisionist fiction, are the facts of life.

Consequently, the hope and real basis for American-Soviet collaboration for world peace does not lie in the non-existing ability of the American monopolies to perceive that their true interests lie in collaboration with the Soviet Union. The real basis for American-Soviet collaboration for world peace, which is at present the only sure way of promoting stability and peaceful foreign trade, lies in the real ability of the American people, headed by labor, to consolidate a democratic coalition of such strength as will substantially affect American policy, eventually determining it altogether. Such a coalition of labor, farmers, professionals, and middle classes will most certainly contain certain circles of the bourgeoisie, since the historical objectives of this coalition are of a general democratic and anti-monopoly character, and not of a socialist character. This coalition will embrace as one of its major forces the Negro people struggling for freedom from national oppression and discrimination, as well as the basic forces of all national groups striving for equal rights and full citizenship. Yet American Marxists, unlike Browder, will not fail to understand, and to act upon that understanding, that the struggle to check and defeat the imperialist offensive of the Amer-

ican
toric
transf

ANTI
IM

Per
of the
point,
anti-c
The
these
econo
States
establ
rected
colon
ism"
nitely
found
and c
States
117-14

This
ance,
the
braze
Brow
imper
fled ge
emplo
bomb
mean
tration
portin
force
secure
milita
ploitat
Spain,
forcin
imper
and

ican monopolies constitutes an historic stage on the road to the Socialist transformation of American society.

ANTI-COLONIALISM AND IMPERIALISM

Perhaps the most outrageous part of the book, from a Marxist standpoint, is its "original" theory of the anti-colonialism of the United States. The American monopolies—and these are the forces dominating the economics and politics of the United States—are supposedly "in process of establishing a long-term policy directed toward the dissolution of the colonial system." This "anti-colonialism" Browder considers as "definitely progressive" and as offering the foundation for "a long range peace and cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union" (pages 117-141).

This is a most amazing performance, which develops to the full all the absurdities, unrealities, and brazen revisionist opportunism of Browderism. At this time American imperialism is engaged in a full-fledged drive for world domination; employing for the purpose atom-bomb intimidation; using food as a means of securing economic penetration and political influence; supporting every reactionary and fascist force (feudal, monarchist, etc.) to secure positions—economic, political, military—for imperialist rule and exploitation (Greece, Turkey, China, Spain, Latin America, Europe); and forcing its junior partner, British imperialism, to *share colonial rule and exploitation* thus augmenting

Wall Street's *colonial* empire. At this time American imperialism is threatening the *national independence* of all Asiatic and African peoples, and tightening its hold upon Latin America. At this very time the economic independence and national freedom of even France and Italy are menaced by the unlimited imperialist ambitions of the American monopolies, and the main line of official United States policy is to rebuild a fascist fortress in central Europe with which to dominate the continent and to prepare military adventures against its new peoples' democracies and against the Soviet Union. At this time, finally, American imperialism is working hand in glove, in an alliance, with the most sinister forces of world reaction, including the fascist forces of the Vatican and the extreme reactionaries of the Catholic hierarchy which embody a most menacing combination of medieval reaction and "modern" fascism. At this precise time, then, Earl Browder, still claiming to be a Marxist, has the audacity and shamelessness to tell the people that American imperialism in following a progressive policy of "anti-colonialism." Worse still, he even tries to use quotations from Lenin to justify his brazen revisionism,

Take the peoples and countries oppressed by American imperialism as *colonies*—the Philippines and Puerto Rico, for example. According to Browder, the Philippines are no longer a colony because an act of formal independence has been enacted by the United States Congress. But

what is the actual situation? Under the cover of formal independence, the Philippines are today *more* oppressed by American imperialism than before. They are robbed and exploited by Wall Street monopolies with the assistance of the most reactionary and fascist and corrupt landlord-capitalist forces of the Philippine islands. And this is called by Browder "progressive anti-colonialism."

As in many other instances, Browder seized upon a real, an objective feature in American life, but artificially magnified it out of all proportions and placed it in the service of an opportunist, a revisionist orientation. Take this matter of colonialism. Marxists have commented on the fact that one of the specific features of American imperialism is that it operates only partly through colonial rule, made classic by British imperialism; that Wall Street imperialism used to operate mainly by economic, financial, and political pressure and penetration, supplemented by military pressure.

The reason for this was that American imperialism was a late-comer on the world stage—Britain, Germany, France, and Japan having already seized most of the available "colonial" areas—and that the developing national liberation movements from the beginning of this century in the colonies and dependent countries were making it extremely difficult to establish new colonial empires. Another major reason why American imperialism was operating only partly through colonial rule was the fact that this

imperialism was in control of great economic and political reserves (the size and natural wealth of the United States, its agricultural and industrial plant, its high technical development). This enabled it, for a considerable time, to maneuver almost exclusively with the power of its economic and financial strength to penetrate and subjugate foreign economies and to extend its political influence.

Thus it came to pass that American imperialism was not of the same colonial type as British imperialism. This did not make it any less reactionary and imperialistic or any more acceptable to the peoples of the world, even though for a long period of time it was British imperialism, because of its size and strength, that constituted the main imperialist menace on a world scale, until Nazi imperialism made it appearance. The so-called anti-colonialism was only a weapon of American imperialism—an "ideological" and political weapon—for imperialist penetration, used against its rivals to supplement economic, financial, and military pressure. This is how Marxists treated this matter, as can be seen from the writings and speeches of Comrades Foster and Dennis.

But what is even more important is the fact that precisely in this period, especially following the conclusion of World War II, American imperialism began to assume a number of new features, which made it more reactionary, more aggressive, and more menacing to national independence, to peace and freedom.

Wall
inher
perial
anese
Street
itself
Britai
maki
on a
ism is
tiona
Italy,
well
In
peria
the c
the r
natio
of p
impe
the s
ize t
the l
at th
histo
has b
peace
to th
that
"orig
sive
impe
An
from
But
they
again
(pag
"imp
pare
ism.
Capi
pare

Wall Street imperialism is out to inherit the colonial domains and imperialist positions of German, Japanese, and Italian imperialism. Wall Street imperialism is already forcing itself into a *colonial partnership* with Britain (the Middle East, Africa), making the latter its junior partner on a world scale. American imperialism is trying to get control of the national economies of France and Italy, and of Europe as a whole, as well as political control.

In other words, American imperialism in this period has become the center of world reaction and the main obstacle and threat to the national freedom and independence of peoples and nations. *American imperialism is seeking to Hitlerize the world as it is trying to Hitlerize the United States and to enslave the American people itself.* And it is at this particular juncture in world history, when American imperialism has become the main obstacle to the peace and progress of the world and to the national freedom of peoples, that Browder comes forth with his "original" theory of the "progressive anti-colonialism" of American imperialism!!!

And he is trying to use quotations from Lenin for his Browderisms. But these quotations, even though they are torn out of context, speak *against* Browder. One quotation (page 140) is supposed to show that "imperialism is progressive compared with pre-monopoly capitalism." Quite true. But what of it? Capitalism itself is progressive compared to feudalism, but no Marxist

will conclude from this that we must make peace with capitalism, become its apologists and glorifiers, and tell the people to follow the progressive leadership of capitalism. This is what Lenin teaches. Yet, is it not true that *Browder's* conclusions from the fact that "imperialism is progressive compared with pre-monopoly capitalism" are that we have to become apologists and glorifiers of American imperialism, make peace with it, and follow its "progressive" leadership? Browder is thus violating and vulgarizing basic principles of Marxism-Leninism.

Another quotation from Lenin (page 139) is intended by Browder to show that the question of the possibility of a stable peace is now posed in a different way than in the past because of the existence of the socialist Soviet Union and the strength of world democracy following the military defeat of fascism in World War II, and also because there is now only one imperialist country that really matters, the United States. Again, we must ask, what of it?

Marxists have been saying right along that the strength of world democracy, in which the Soviet Union occupies such a basic and leading place, contrasted to the weakening of world reaction in which American imperialism occupies such a basic and leading place, has created new and unprecedented *opportunities* for establishing a democratic and stable world peace. Our own Party, beginning with its emergency national convention (summer, 1945) which defeated

and rejected Browder revisionism so unanimously and decisively, has taken this position. But it also said something else which Browder still conceals, namely, that the opportunities for a stable world peace have to be realized in struggle; that this means fighting and checking and eventually defeating the reactionary drive of American imperialism for world domination. There is no other way; and life has fully confirmed it, while further discrediting the absurdities and opportunism of Browder revisionism.

It is also necessary to expose further another Browderism. It is the repeated assertion that the only imperialist power that matters is the United States, that British imperialism does not count any more, nor any of the other capitalist countries. This is one of those simplifications, vulgarizations, and one-sided distortions that are the very life-blood of opportunism, whether Right or Leftist. American imperialism is, of course, the major power in the camp of world reaction and, hence, the major menace to peace, national freedom, and progress. But it is not the only power. British imperialism, grievously weakened and in crisis, is a major force in the camp of world reaction. There is an Anglo-American imperialist bloc, in which British imperialism is only a *junior* partner, but which is driving for world power as a bloc. Moreover, in this bloc there are serious rivalries and contradictions which are pregnant with imperialist conflicts of grave import. And, in the camp of world reaction,

there are numerous other rivalries of an imperialist nature which are of great political significance.

To Marxists the meaning of all this is clear. It means that the danger of imperialist wars *is still with us* and will continue so until capitalism disappears. It means, further, that the world democratic forces fighting for a stable peace can and must make use, for this aim, of the rivalries and conflicts within the reactionary camp. It means, finally and most importantly, that some of the inner imperialist rivalries *may become interwoven with or grow over into*—as Lenin taught—currents and movements of national liberation, which are a major ally of the forces fighting for a democratic and stable peace. By discounting all these forces and developments, Browder discounts actual and potential forces for a stable world peace. He is thus hurting the fight for a stable world peace.

He is hurting the fight for a stable peace by his attacks upon the Communist Party which is the most consistent and vanguard fighter for a democratic and stable peace. He tries to undermine the prestige and influence of the Party at the very time when every reactionary scoundrel in the land has made our Party his main target and when, on the other hand, every true progressive and anti-fascist is rallying to the defense of our Party as the sacred duty of all genuine fighters for peace and democracy.

To weaken our Party's prestige, Browder invents a story, absurd and fictitious in the best Browder style,

to the effect that the Communist Party was not in favor of the campaign to draft Roosevelt for the fourth term. He even insinuates (page 51) that the campaign to draft Roosevelt, which developed in 1943, not only took place without the Communist Party taking a prominent part in it, as was actually the case, but was progressing in opposition to the Party, under the leadership of "a few bold supporters of Roosevelt" headed by Earl Browder.

Important here for us are not, of course, the ridiculous self-assertions of Browder the individual. These we can smile at and forget. But we cannot forget or ignore his outrageous attempt to write off the highly important role played by the Communist Party *as a party* in the mass movement to draft Roosevelt for the fourth term as well as in his re-election. We must add this, however. Had we been free of Browderism at that time, the fourth term election of Roosevelt would have produced not alone Roosevelt's re-election but also a much stronger *politically independent* labor movement and a much stronger *vanguard* Communist Party, both of which are incompatible with Browder revisionism.

ROOSEVELT, TRUMAN, AND THE PEOPLE'S COALITION

There is perhaps no better way of exposing the utter absurdity and bankruptcy of Browder revisionism, as embodied in this book, than by quoting a portion dealing with Truman. This will also show that Browderism is endangering the very

struggle for the restoration of Roosevelt's progressive policies.

Here it is:

President Truman has carefully refrained from assuming direct personal responsibility for the departures from Roosevelt's foreign policy. His only active part has been to restore and apply Roosevelt's commitments. He has kept the door open for a possible resumption of command over foreign relations in the spirit of Roosevelt. His caution in exerting his constitutional powers could be, and had to be, respected for a certain time to avoid certain difficulties which had taxed the capacities of a bigger man.

Now, how does this look in the face of actual life? True, it was written before the promulgation of the Truman Doctrine, but it was written sometime in 1946, that is, *with the Truman-Byrnes-Vandenberg line in full bloom and operation*. In other words, Browder already knew, as did millions of other Americans who do *not* claim to be Marxists, that Truman had already abandoned and betrayed Roosevelt's foreign policies, even though he was still maneuvering with Roosevelt's domestic policies in order not to lose all contact with labor and the people. And yet the above is what Browder saw fit to write and publish. Furthermore, it was written, as Browder himself notes after Truman "walked out on his approval of Henry Wallace's famous foreign policy speech." According to Browder this break with Wallace was not Truman's personal act of departure from Roosevelt's foreign policies. But, then, does

Browder know what these policies were? Or does he mix them up with the Truman-Vandenberg policies?

What about the Truman Doctrine? Is that also in accord with Roosevelt's foreign policies, according to Browder? This Doctrine did not just fall down from heaven, but was a culmination and full development of an imperialist line of aggressive struggle for world domination which Truman had been following for a long time. True, he was following that line under the pressure of the more extreme imperialists and reactionaries—Dulles, Vandenberg, & Co.—*but he was following that line*, the "get tough with Russia" line, which contains all the elements of the Truman Doctrine.

Browder knows that, and still he persists in saying that Truman is not personally responsible for the departure from Roosevelt's policies. The fact of the matter is that the Truman Doctrine contains little new in substance as far as the major policies of American imperialism are concerned. The new and important things are these: First, the Truman Doctrine says openly and brazenly what official American policy was saying and doing in more concealed form. Secondly, by promulgating this doctrine of world domination for American imperialism, Truman undertook to place himself and his Administration *in the lead* of the imperialist drive of the United States monopolies, and to force the Vandenberg to follow Truman instead of the other way around, as was the case up to now.

These are very important *internal political developments*, bearing heavily upon the outlook for 1948 and the people's tasks, but they change nothing of *substance* either in the objectives of American imperialism or in the Truman policies. Browder discusses the substance of these policies and finds that Truman is not personally responsible for the departures from Roosevelt's line in foreign affairs. Why? The answer is: **BROWDERISM.**

THE 1948 ELECTIONS

With an audacity that partakes of recklessness and irresponsibility, the same Browder steps into the problems of the 1948 national elections and unburdens himself of a whole flock of opinions and predictions. Thus, he rules out altogether a third, a people's presidential ticket, or a third party of the anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist classes of the American people, or any other kind of effective independent political action by labor and its democratic allies in the national elections in 1948. He leaves labor and the people *only one alternative* for 1948—support for Truman and the Democratic Party as the only means of fighting effectively for the Roosevelt progressive policies. This support of Truman, Browder dresses up in a typical opportunist—and unrealistic—scheme of: a Center (Truman); Left of Center (Liberal and Labor Independents); Left (the Communists and sympathizers). And this he calls "a Roosevelt Coalition."

To Marxists and responsible anti-

fascists and progressive generally, *the exact forms* in which the people's anti-fascist and anti-imperialist coalition (to be strictly differentiated from Browder's fictitious monstrosity) will participate in the 1948 election struggles, are still under discussion. Why? Conditions are very much in flux and changing almost daily as far as the rapidity of political realignments is concerned and as far as the moods of the people are concerned. Many surprising developments—favorable to the cause of the people's coalition—may yet take place between now and the 1948 elections. But it is equally obvious to responsible anti-fascists and pro-Roosevelt progressives that the forces of the people's coalition will have to act as *an independent political force*—a democratic, progressive, anti-fascist, anti-monopoly, anti-imperialist force—in the election struggles of 1948; that the forces of this people's coalition must strive to bring into existence a pro-Roosevelt progressive united ticket for 1948; that the people's coalition must make the election struggle of 1948 a major stage in the process of consolidating a third, a people's anti-monopoly party in the United States.

Browder, however, is all in a hurry. He is already prepared, if he is allowed, to tie up the people's coalition, to bind it hand and foot, and to deliver it helplessly into Truman's hands and on Truman's conditions. This is Browderism again.

Contrast this with the attitudes of such Roosevelt progressives as Henry Wallace or Senator Pepper.

Wallace said, when asked in London if he will support the Democratic party in 1948, "I shall be campaigning in 1948 with all my power, but I will be campaigning for the ideals of one free world and the men who best express these ideals. I hope, but I cannot guarantee that they will be on the Democratic ticket" (*New York Times*, April 12, 1947). Thus spoke a leader, a fighter for the Roosevelt policies, who is in no hurry with the creation of a third party or even ticket, but who is determined that the people shall have the opportunity to support in the 1948 elections Roosevelt men and policies whatever the party ticket, even though he hopes it may be the Democratic Party ticket. Wallace is in no hurry to leave the American people, as Browder is, with no choice but Truman.

Take also the attitude of Senator Pepper on the question. He is determined to continue the fight inside the Democratic party "to make it the truly liberal party of the nation." But he sees what Truman is doing to the Democratic party as he abandons and betrays the Roosevelt policies. Hence, the Senator issues this warning: "Let the Democratic leadership remember that if the people of this country, who really believe in democracy, cannot find expression for their sentiments in the Democratic party, they will find them somewhere else, no matter what we think about it" (*New York Times*, April 14, 1947). Thus spoke another progressive leader who, whatever his own party preferences—and they are

definitely Democratic—can see the masses of the people breaking away from that party because its official leadership abandons the Roosevelt policies of democracy and peace.

American Marxists cannot fail to see that the Truman Administration is seeking to consolidate a political realignment based upon the monopolies and their hangers-on, in alliance with the reactionary forces of the Catholic hierarchy and of the Vatican—a realignment which maneuvers with domestic issues in such a way as to retain or gain the support of large section of labor and the farmers and the middle classes of the large cities. Marxists cannot fail to see, furthermore, that under the Truman leadership basic sections of American finance capital, together with the reactionaries in the Catholic hierarchy, have not only influenced decisively major policies of the Truman Administration, but have also re-established in a large measure their domination over considerable parts of the Democratic Party organization. This development is still in process. But Browder sees no such thing. To him Truman is the same as Roosevelt, and the political alignment which Truman is building is in Browder's estimate the same as that which supported Roosevelt.

Consequently, while the Republican Party continues as the first and chief party instrument of the monopolies, the Democratic Party under Truman has assumed once more, the character of the second party of the monopolies—the character which the Roosevelt leadership had modified

considerably for a while with the support of the labor-progressive alignment that came into being in that period. Even then, these modifications were chiefly in national policies and in the larger industrial centers of the country, but not in all Democratic Party organizations (the South, for example) and not in all of the policies of the Democratic Party. *And these new developments are operating powerfully among the masses of the people to produce large scale independent political action, to stimulate the growth of independent people's and labor's political organizations, to create condition favorable for the further growth of that new political realignment called the people's anti-monopoly coalition, to create favorable opportunities for a united, pro-Roosevelt, progressive ticket in 1948, and for the consolidation of a third, a people's party.*

Furthermore, for Marxists there can be no question of the objective necessity and need for a third, a people's party in the shortest possible time. Only such a party can make fully effective in the political life of the country the objectives and policies of the people's anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist coalition. But Browder says no. We can achieve these aims with the Democratic Party and Truman. And as to a new party in general, Browder volunteers the prediction that it will be a labor party of a socialist character, when it comes, and not a people's anti-monopoly party. This, too, is a characteristic Browderism. The struggle for peace and democracy

will be led by the "progressive" American imperialists and by Truman, says Browder, and so we don't need a third party for that. We shall need a third party to fight for socialism, when and if that time ever comes which commits Browder to nothing except the old revisionist idea of liquidating the Communist Party.

The question of the exact forms of political and party organization to be created and adopted by the people's coalition in the national elections of 1948 is one of major importance, and is now being discussed very intensely in the ranks of the coalition. It is becoming clear that whatever will be the final decision by the basic forces of the coalition, *the objective need and possibility for a third, a people's ticket in the national elections of 1948 is becoming ever more urgent and favorable.* It is also becoming clear that the forces of the people's coalition must therefore concentrate their energies on creating all necessary conditions—political and organizational—for the launching of such a ticket in the 1948 elections.

Naturally, this does not prejudice any of the tactical questions of form or alliances which the coalition forces will finally decide upon. Much will be happening all the time. But one

question needs decision now. It is the question of creating all necessary political and organizational conditions for the successful launching of a third, a people's ticket in the national elections of 1948. It is necessary to decide now that the main efforts, all efforts, of the independent forces in the coalition must be directed toward creating the conditions for a third ticket. *We must make absolutely sure that when the people of this country decide or indicate that they are about to decide in sufficient numbers that they cannot find expression in the Democratic party, they will find a people's ticket or a people's party through which to express themselves in the national elections of 1948.*

Thus we have once more seen Browder revisionism at work. We have seen that it is not only incompatible with Marxism, which did not need another Browder book to prove, even though we now have now demonstrations of the old and known truth about the opportunist nature of revisionism. This new book supplied additional proof of our contention that Browderism, to the extent that it can influence progressive people, is not a help but a hindrance to the struggle for the Roosevelt foreign policies and to the development of the people's anti-monopoly coalition.

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE URBAN MIDDLE CLASS

By JOSEPH NORTH and
A. B. MAGIL

THE UNPRECEDENTED MARCH of the teachers in the spring of this year represented a profoundly significant phenomenon of postwar America; it marked a rising popular resentment against the deep corruption of a capitalism which expends ten times more money for destruction than it does for education. Proud America has fallen far behind the Soviet Union and even Great Britain in the sums expended to teach the young. And this is not all: the magnates of hunger expected, as their foreordained right, a suppliant middle class that would promptly acquiesce in the concerted assault upon organized labor. They also expect to enlist the great mass of white-collar workers and professionals. For the men of the trusts know they must destroy the organization of the men of labor as the first step in annihilating democracy in America. Wall Street confidently expected the urban middle class and intermediate strata to behave as auxiliaries in its aggression, counting upon the "middle-class mind" to stay "safe and respectable." A million teachers on the march is a danger signal. And this

was not all: even the Holy of Holies is imperiled: picket lines revolved around the Stock Exchange!

For the need to win a decent living is inexorable, and has proved more compelling than painfully inculcated petty-bourgeois prejudices which have long barred middle-class people and white-collar workers from actions associated solely with industrial labor. These prejudices have long been a deterrent to united actions with the working class.

Millionaire and priest, police spy and renegade, philosopher and publisher, are mobilized to prevent the coalition against hunger, fascism, war. The battle for America's mind is being furiously pressed in newspapers, radio, pulpit, book, stage, and movies.

And it is at this time, more than any other in history, that every progressive organ must be treasured. One of the most important is *New Masses*. To help weld unity against the common enemy is the purpose of this Marxist publication. This has been its traditional responsibility since the days of John Reed who first brought the truth of socialism's advent in the new Russia to millions here, and who was one of the founders of the magazine, then the *Masses*, in 1911.

This publication acquires special significance these turbulent days when the unity of the American middle classes with the working class stands at the top of history's agenda. Success in this task, today, requires a multi-pronged counter-attack: politically, economically, ideologically,

Not o
the p
also a
Rarely
univer
tion's
is ma
heritag
signifi
Tom
velt. F
man;
demor
cultur
pessim
zines a
the m
sages,
to the
class.
jects p
manki
New
counte
variety
posing
people,
captain
strip t
fascists
the va
fields—
in the
Hence
cultural
to brin
ence b
tical ar
fic art
art, lit
bourge
lined to
led by

Not only is the bourgeoisie robbing the people of their pocketbook; it also attempts to steal their mind. Rarely has there been so violent, so universal an assault upon our nation's culture as today. Every effort is made to destroy our democratic heritage and tradition, to erase the significance of men ranging from Tom Paine to Franklin D. Roosevelt. For they inspired the common man; the aim of reaction today is to demoralize him. Hence the postwar cultural patterns that spell defeatism, pessimism, hopelessness. The magazines and books roll off the press by the millions with their dark messages, and they go, overwhelmingly, to the great masses of the middle class. Every spurious idea that rejects progress, that pictures a lost mankind, is hawked at premium.

New Masses contributes toward countering this assault through a variety of means, primarily by exposing the enemy common to all the people, the Economic Royalists, the captains of capitalism. It seeks to strip the mask from the concealed fascists, and from their abettors in the various political and cultural fields—in Washington, in the press, in the arts, in all the realms of ideas. Hence its definition as a "political-cultural" Marxist organ. Its goal is to bring clarity and heart to its audience by means of reportage, by political analysis, and through the specific art forms—the short story, poetry, art, literary criticism. Recognizing bourgeois philosophy—the streamlined tenets of the latter-day idealists led by John Dewey—as the source-

stream for the thinking of middle-class ideologists, *New Masses* has sought to bring forward the principles and the method of dialectical materialism. For progress in America must overcome the shibboleths, prejudices, and ignorance that result from idealism—lack of class consciousness, belief in the eternity of capitalism, identification of the "American way of life" with private enterprise, widespread misconception concerning socialism, currency of the libels on Communists as "foreign agents," as "advocates of force and violence," etc. These are the tenets the Big Bourgeoisie hand down to the people, the working class and especially to the middle classes to live by. The defeat of this barrage of demagoguery depends to a great degree on organized labor and the working-class vanguard, the Communist Party.

THE CITY MIDDLE CLASSES

Needless to say, the question of the urban middle strata is a big and complex one: it has many aspects, many subdivisions, which have gone relatively unexplored. There is the middle class which owns its enterprises, employs labor—the small shopkeepers, merchants, small manufacturers, etc. There are the professionals who are self-employed—the doctors, lawyers, architects, etc. There are the many categories whose social milieu, education, and aspirations are petty-bourgeois and who regard themselves in that class, but who work for salaries and often earn

less than the skilled or semi-skilled workers in trade unions. For example, many a Wall Street clerk earns less than the auto worker in Detroit, the school teacher less than the shipfitter. Each group has its specific characteristics and contains many gradations and distinctions.

But we know that the past decade, and particularly the war years, have caused great alterations in these groups. Many have moved closer to identification with labor; many took industrial jobs during the war and became acquainted with industrial labor and trade unionism, such as the telephone workers, the teachers, etc. Further exploration, analysis, and fact-gathering are necessary; but nonetheless we can set down a few basic considerations:

1. Though the middle classes cannot lead politically because of their intermediate position between the Big Bourgeoisie and the working class, which are basic classes in our society, they are decisive in importance as allies of either class. And, traditionally, they have wavered between both.

2. In the past decade they moved toward alliance with labor, and occupied an important place in the F.D.R.-labor-progressive coalition. This was the time when organized labor grew stormily from three to fourteen millions. The growing power of labor, the advent of the progressive trade union center, the C.I.O., with the accompanying movement toward labor's independent political action—these factors made possible the success of the coalition

and attracted millions from the middle class to its support.

3. Today, confronted with the necessity of re-creating the coalition on a new plane, in a more independent form, and in the direction of a new anti-monopoly, anti-fascist political party, labor must exert unprecedented efforts to win the middle classes, both the farming masses and the urban petty-bourgeoisie.

Such unity becomes a political imperative to destroy the offensive of Wall Street. Though that common front must be rooted in the working class, and led by it, it cannot successfully cope with the foe unless it enlists these millions from the middle classes. Too long has organized labor neglected this responsibility; our Party, too, has paid far from enough attention to help realize this natural alliance.

It must be further recognized that the middle classes will be won to the coalition to the degree that labor *proves* itself their ally. It is not enough to say that what is good for labor is good for them. They must see the workmen ranged at *their* side in *their* economic and political struggles, giving them specific, tangible aid in the solution of their many problems. Convention resolutions of support are not enough. We must study them, know them, help them in the manifold ways that are necessary. By and large they have remained something of a *terra incognita* in the great human geography of America.

As a starting point for remedying this situation a number of aspects of

professi
should
Many
forgotte
period.
general
nomic
through
grew,
emerge
strengt
But m
white-c
in the r
rising c
faction
acute i
thousan
joined
growing
sional
teacher
Worke
Archite
Techni
liate),
Guild,
guilds.
great
convinc
sponsib
million
travels
tion, tu
capitali
lied
increas
onus o
Admin
as the
progre
Democ
in labo

professional and white collar groups should be recognized:

Many millions of them were "the forgotten men" of the wartime period. Organized labor succeeded, generally, in enhancing its new economic and organizational position through 1939-45. The trade unions grew, won wage demands, and emerged from the war considerably strengthened as a force in the nation. But millions of professionals and white-collar workers, unorganized in the main, could not cope with the rising cost of living. Their dissatisfaction is becoming increasingly acute in the postwar period. Many thousands of them have already joined unions, as in the case of the growing United Office and Professional Workers-C.I.O., the various teachers' unions, the United Public Workers-C.I.O., the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists and Technicians (a U.O.P.W.A. affiliate), the American Newspaper Guild, the cultural craft unions and guilds. Because labor failed to reach great masses of these people and convince them of Wall Street's responsibility for the nation's plight, millions, disillusioned by the betrayals of the Truman Administration, turned to the G.O.P. Duped by capitalist press propaganda, they believed that increased wages caused increased prices. Reaction put the onus on labor's doorstep and on the Administration, which was depicted as the ally of labor. Because many progressives, middle-of-the-road Democrats as well as leading forces in labor failed to dissociate them-

selves from the Truman Administration, the propaganda of the trusts made considerable headway among the middle classes, as well as among certain strata of the workers.

The dissatisfaction of the middle classes is bound to grow as the offensive of reaction grows. It will rise by leaps and bounds as buying power continues to fall with the rise in prices. And when the economic crisis sets in fully, millions from these strata will be faced with unemployment, salary cuts; the small businessmen will be forced to the wall by the hundreds of thousands. (Five hundred thousand were squeezed out of business even during the war.) They will, increasingly, manifest their resentment.

Which program will they turn to? The democratic, pro-Roosevelt coalition? Or to reaction? The Progressive Citizens of America? Or to the American Action, Inc.? Will they be rendered impotent by the Social-Democratic influenced leadership of the Americans for Democratic Action, and the Liberal Party, or will they be brought to recognize the imperatives of unity and the necessity to abandon the Hitler weapon of Red-baiting?

So much is certain: they will be on the move. They have already begun. We perceive the mood of many professionals—the teachers, for instance. Numbering about a million, they won relatively small increases during the war, and in some cases, none. Hundreds of thousands forsook their profession to go elsewhere for higher wages. Those remaining

in the profession have been goaded to unprecedented strike actions, and in all instances Parent-Teacher Associations, chiefly middle class groupings, the vast majority of the citizens, and organized labor, supported them.

Likewise in other spheres: consider the amusement and entertainment fields, for example. The world-touted movie industry, fourth highest capitalized in the country, has cut thousands from the job rolls. In music and radio, mechanization (recordings, the juke box, etc.) have caused tremendous disemployment.

We must remember, too, a million and a half veterans have taken the opportunity for college training afforded by the G.I. Bill of Rights. Many will be emerging from the class-room about the time the economic crisis strikes. Equipped for professional duties, they will find no jobs. Where will they turn? And where will the other several million college students go? Unless labor ponders these factors now, and acts, reaction and fascism may well win the advantage. Have we forgotten Hitler Germany?

POSITIVE FACTORS

It would be a mistake, however, to overlook the underlying positive factors which, in the United States and in the world, basically determine the course of development. The victorious war against fascism has created a new situation in which capitalism on a world scale has been greatly weakened, even though in the United States it has been rela-

tively strengthened. The coming economic crisis in the United States is bound to rouse the American people and all peoples to sharper resistance to Wall Street oppression. Along with labor and the farmers, our urban middle classes will in the coming period be swept into struggle for their existence and the basis will be laid for the broadest unity against the trusts.

In addition, we should not ignore certain positive aspects too often disregarded. The middle strata of America, perhaps more than in any other capitalist nation, have close ties with the working class. The fluidity of classes in this country resulted in millions of working-class families counting in their midst white-collar workers and professionals. Immigrant families, by the hundreds of thousands, sacrificed to send their sons and daughters through high school and college to become professionals and white-collar workers. Millions in small business have sons, brothers, or fathers in factories. The middle classes have not, in the main, become stratified through generations as in Britain and France, for instance. Hence the greater possibility of winning the unity of the working class and large sectors of the middle class in the United States.

Furthermore, it should also be remembered that the urban middle classes and the farmers in our nation have strong anti-monopoly traditions which sometimes assumed the form of third parties. The Populist movement of the Nineties was pre-

domina
from th
workere
early y
drew i
farmers
They p
the Bul
party
nopoly
cent e
gressive
Rooseve
against
They d
of Righ
internat
unity a
Union.
And
this tim
will dis
1929. T
the peo
riched;
them.
the tren
union
Thirties
New
dition
vance i
have a
hind th
More
did not
white-co
record:
90,000 n
Worker
The tea
learned
unity, a

dominantly agrarian, with support from the city middle classes and the workers. The trust-busting of the early years of this century likewise drew its main support from the farmers and city middle classes. They played an important part in the Bull Moose and La Follette third-party movements. This anti-monopoly tradition found its most recent expression in the labor-progressive coalition which supported Roosevelt and his slogans directed against the Economic Royalists. They *did* vote for his Economic Bill of Rights and they *did* support his international policy of Big Three unity and friendship with the Soviet Union.

And when the crisis hits America this time, the Wall Street tycoons will discover that 1947 or 1948 is not 1929. This time the experience of the people, of all strata, is vastly enriched; great struggles have educated them. They have the experience of the tremendous surge toward trade union organization of the middle Thirties: they have the subsequent New Deal experience and the tradition of popular democratic advance in the Roosevelt period. They have a world war against fascism behind them.

More: they have today what they did not have in the early Thirties, white-collar organizations with a record: the U.O.P.W.A. with some 90,000 members; the United Federal Workers, and other such unions. The teachers have struck and have learned the need for organization, unity, and militancy; the scientists

have made a stand; the youth have battled for their rights in the colleges; the veterans have refused to be put off with empty promises. And the Negro people have reached a new level of political maturity and won ground in the struggle for their rights which they do not mean to surrender. In addition, the consumers' organizations that have fought against high prices, for rent control, and a host of other people's organizations have come on the scene since the early Thirties.

Under these circumstances, the monopolists will find it harder to stampede the professional and white-collar workers into reactionary or fascist setups. That they are trying and will intensify their endeavor is undeniable. That they will make headway with some is also undeniable. But the objective factors provide great opportunities to win the masses of the middle strata to the side of the all-people's struggle.

Nonetheless, we cannot underestimate the extent and depth of petty-bourgeois illusions flourishing among the middle-classes, illusions reinforced by the fact that they also infect the working class and organized labor. We have mentioned their identification of "the American way of life" with capitalism, etc. These illusions, unless countered in the ways indicated, render them susceptible to reactionary demagoguery, both of the N.A.M.-G.O.P. type and of the outright fascist brand, as Germany witnessed.

It must be recognized that professionals and intellectuals play a

special role in our country as ideological carriers. Lawyers, teachers, writers, journalists, doctors, artists, engineers, scientists, clergymen, etc.—these professionals are the most influential and politically active sectors of the petty bourgeoisie, wielding great influence among farmers and workers as well. The Roosevelt Administration drew many of its leading officials from their ranks. Most of the members and leaders of the new Progressive Citizens of America and Americans for Democratic Action are such professionals. In building the coalition and in the struggle to establish cooperation between Communists and non-Communists this group plays a role out of all proportions to its numbers.

MONOPOLY'S IDEOLOGICAL BLITZ

Big Business has already begun an ideological blitz to win them and those they influence. Reactionary ideas are increasingly being spread by the Luce publications, *Readers Digest* with its ten million circulation, the Roman Catholic hierarchy, etc. Many progressive-minded middle-class people are being infected with the virus of anti-Communism through "liberals" like Schlesinger and those in control of the Liberal Party, the Social-Democratic Federation, and the new A.D.A.

A great ferment is bound to develop among intellectuals. It will be intensified when the economic crisis matures. Monopoly capital remembers too well the Thirties when the Communists and their sympathizers,

as a champion of the peoples' struggle, won great influence among cultural workers, and it is determined to direct this growing ferment into reactionary channels, primarily through the divisive strategy of Red-baiting and Soviet-baiting. The recent organization of a new reactionary writers' group under the leadership of such people as Louis Bromfield, Clarence Budington Kelland, Clare Boothe Luce, Eugene Lyons, Benjamin Stolberg, Norman Thomas, John T. Flynn, and Louis Waldman, is indicative of the inroads that imperialism will seek to make through its apologists among professionals. The battle for America's mind is on in full fury.

Science? Witness the effort to gag scientists to press them into the service of the militarists in Washington. Free inquiry, the exchange of ideas, knowledge gained through the interchange of scientific experimentation—all this is branded taboo by the reigning warlords in the capital.

Education? Our Federal budget provides for learning one-tenth of its allotment for the engines of death. The plight of our teachers is an international scandal; millions of our children and of our youth suffer the dearth of proper equipment and schoolhouses. Big Business exorcises academic freedom. The effort to eradicate racism, the *numerus clausus*, in our colleges—is branded as "premature" in New York State, Red-baited by the hierarchy. The Supreme Court decision on transportation to parochial schools is a

omin
evalis
Const
separa
The
Street
the L
every
of our
decade
lionain
nation
status
now a
reactio
wood'
reactio
degrad
Boo
Louis
public
the sto
Fast, i
public
tion w
like T
infam
mystic
defeat
bourg
and p
novel,
imbue
of ma
Ameri
Eug
comes
drainp
tialists
passé
savore
the w
kets h

ominous surrender to clerical medievalism, and is a violation of our Constitutional principle of the separation of Church and State.

The movies? The moguls of Wall Street and their hierarchical allies of the Legion of Decency blue-pencil every effort to portray the realities of our time upon the screen. The decadent of Park Avenue, the millionaire playboy, is depicted as our national hero. Any criticism of the *status quo* is carefully deleted. And now a program of rampant political reaction is under way for Hollywood's output. And as for radio, its reactionary content and cultural degradation are notorious.

Books? Enemies of the people, like Louis Budenz, win ready access for publication of infamous libels while the story of Tom Paine, by Howard Fast, is barred from the New York public schools by a Board of Education which includes a Franco stooge like Timone. The premium is on infamy. The tome that reeks with mysticism, the sense of doom, of defeat, is eagerly preferred. The bourgeoisie engenders, welcomes, and promises handsome pay for the novel, the play, the treatise, that imbues the American with a sense of man's futility or that argues an America-dominated world.

Eugene O'Neill's gloomy Iceman comes to consign mankind to the drainpipes; the world-weary Existentialists, their philosophy already *passé* in the limited circles who savored it in France yesterday, cross the waters for more lucrative markets here. The literary Trotskyites

have ready access to the book review columns of the *New York Times* and other metropolitan publications.

Nevertheless, despite all corruptions and pressures, despite the effort to spread intellectual terrorism through frenzied Red-baiting, the attempts of American reaction to disorient writers, artists, scientists, etc., to prevent them from obeying their best impulses and siding with the people, are bound to meet with increasing difficulties.

The problems of winning large numbers of the middle class for progressive action are vast and will not be effectively met without determined struggle and a correct program. At the same time that we combat the reactionary ideology that "the middle-class is the backbone of the nation," we must enlist all that is most positive in the middle strata—their economic interests which conflict with those of Big Business, their democratic aspirations, their striving for peace, their yearning for progressive cultural expression—we must help the middle-class people find direction and the understanding that they are the natural allies of the workers.

NEW MASSES' ROLE

Toward this end *New Masses* has before it an outstanding role to perform. As a Marxist political-cultural weekly, directed mainly to the city middle classes, it challenges the ideologies and programs of its bourgeois contemporaries. With few honorable exceptions they are uni-

formly dangerous in their social perspective.

But to discharge its responsibilities adequately, *New Masses'* goals and efforts must be understood, and energetically supported, by the labor movement and all progressives. This Marxist organ begun in 1911 as a monthly, has since 1934, been published as a weekly, during which time hundreds of thousands have read its pages. In presenting the Marxist viewpoint on the issues of our time and in championing socialism, it has, simultaneously, been able to win the cooperation of non-Marxists as readers and contributors. This role—of Communists and non-Communists working in collaboration on specific issues for the welfare of our nation—must become even more pronounced in the coming period. And an editorial program has been adopted toward that goal.

The magazine today reaches into 1,100 communities in every state in the Union; readers are numbered among the most politically enlightened in their various circles. Coming primarily from professional and white-collar strata, there is, and has always been, a considerable portion from industrial labor and from the Communist Party. But more than sixty percent of its readers, according to a poll of a year and a half ago, do not read any other publication of the Communist press.

Their interest in the magazine, the same poll disclosed, derives primarily from its political and economic discussions, although they have a strong subsidiary interest in its

specifically cultural material—short stories, art, literary, movie and drama criticism. They expressed strong desires to know more about socialism and Marxist thinking on all the current phenomena of life. They asked for more material on labor, the Soviet Union, economics, international politics, science, and philosophy. Favorite writers listed were those who gave them lively, colorful reportage on current developments, and those whose analyses provide a compass through the maze of today's breathtakingly rapid events.

Despite severe restrictions of budget and manpower, the magazine was in the past able, with great struggle, to reach a sufficient audience to maintain this publication without organized support from any source. It is doubtful if any other non-commercial publication in America could equal this record. Its contemporaries among the liberal weekly publications enjoy big subsidies and pay writers and artists relatively well. One such magazine has for years had an annual subsidy of \$100,000 which has been multiplied in recent months.

New Masses had been obliged to make its way on its own power, securing articles and contributions without payment, or at nominal rates. This has always been a severe handicap, yet despite it, the magazine has played a considerable part in championing progress in America. Many outstanding writers of today first appeared in its pages. Many vital issues were clarified. Its crusade against monopoly capitalism, against

fascism
monger
can S
awake
icans
our tir

Its c
its rea
etc.)
the w
thousa
of int
neered
ture t
gles a
class
Ever
the r
Amer
viet U
Amer
nation
of wo
analyz
Marxi
sough
standi
scient

In
has a
tion s
Du B
ter, H
Herb
Palm
And,
ops,
artists
*New
Masses*
new
the p
are b

fascism, against racism, against war-mongering, its support for Republican Spain in the Thirties, helped awaken a generation of young Americans on the foremost questions of our time.

Its consistent campaign to mobilize its readers (their reportage, analyses, etc.) on behalf of the struggles of the working class has brought many thousands to recognize their identity of interest with labor. It has pioneered in the development of a culture truthfully reflecting the struggles and aspirations of the working class and the peoples' movement. Ever since the days of John Reed, the magazine has contributed to American understanding of the Soviet Union and has crusaded for American-Soviet friendship in our national interest and in the interests of world peace. Side by side with analyzing current happenings in the Marxist light, *New Masses* has sought to contribute to an understanding of the basic teachings of scientific socialism.

In the recent period *New Masses* has attracted to regular collaboration such noted figures as W. E. B. Du Bois, Louis Aragon, Dyson Carter, Howard Fast, Richard O. Boyer, Herbert Aptheker, V J. Jerome, R. Palme Dutt, and William Gropper. And, in fact, as the struggle develops, more such advanced writers, artists, and scientists will come to *New Masses*. In addition *New Masses* will seek to bring forward new cultural forces on the side of the people whose ideas and attitudes are barred from expression in most

other publications. A special task is to develop new writers and artists from the working class.

In today's context, *New Masses* becomes one of the most important of all progressive publications. It is seeking to improve its effectiveness, to rectify its shortcomings. The editors feel these fall into two main categories: one, the need to report with more consistency and scope the life, struggle, and aspirations of the American masses, with special emphasis on the arts and professions; two, to base our content more consistently and deeply upon the basic tenets of Marxism. This, in no sense, should preclude drawing in more non-Marxists as contributors.

It is felt that too often its articles merely "state" a position, do not argue convincingly enough to win the new reader. The editors are conscious of the need to campaign more consistently and more alertly to refute opponent ideas. Simultaneously, the editors feel the need to explore more intensively many vital areas requiring attention. Thus, more inquiry is required into the specific social, economic, and cultural problems of the middle strata. At the same time more is needed to reveal the true role of the working class in the nation in order to convince the people generally of its essential quality as the consistently progressive class, and why it is the only class capable of leading the democratic coalition. While supporting the middle classes in their current struggles for economic security, against monopoly oppression, fascism, ra-

cism, and war, the magazine must guide them toward an understanding that will dispel their illusions that ultimate solutions can be found within the framework of capitalist society. We must intensify our efforts to convince them that socialism means liberation for them as well as the working class.

To achieve all this requires even more than the efforts of the editors, and those contributing to the magazine. It requires consistent attention, and support, from all progressive organizations, from labor's ranks and particularly the Communist Party. It is a hard fact that the magazine today has no specific organizational support or ties. It is dependent upon its own resources. The result is that it has not reached anywhere near its potential audience, its possible circulation, as an educating

and mobilizing force for progressive action.

The progressive movement has to date, not sufficiently availed itself of the instrumentality of this.

Jack Stachel wrote recently in the *Daily Worker*: "What a blow it would be for the progressive movement of our country if this great and courageous voice should be stilled. None of us would want that. Yet it is a fact that most of us have placed the entire burden of this publication upon the shoulders of a small group of devoted men and women who publish the magazine and a small number of loyal supporters who sustain it." He urged greater support than ever to *New Masses*. "And certainly," he wrote, "the Communists must show an example to all by rallying them to the support of the *New Masses* in this critical hour."

NOT
TION
DEVE

The t
dent of
from the
theoretic
slavia. W
acquaint
ing Mar
countries
should l
fore the
—The l

MUCH
the fi
Fascis
world
blessin
still g
world
confere
relatio
nisms
today
World
extric
crisis,
even
been
capita
of its
action

FROM THE COMMUNIST PRESS OF OTHER LANDS

NOTES ON SOME QUESTIONS OF INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

By EDWARD KARDELJ

The translation of this article by the Vice-President of Yugoslavia is reprinted, somewhat abridged, from the January, 1947, issue of *The Communist*, theoretical organ of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. We publish it in accord with our policy of acquainting our readers with the thinking of leading Marxists abroad on the problems of their own countries and on international developments. It should be noted that this article was written before the promulgation of the Truman Doctrine.
—The Editors.

MUCH TIME has already elapsed since the final resistance of the Hitlerite Fascist Axis was broken, but the world still does not fully enjoy the blessings of peace. Bitter fighting is still going on in many parts of the world, while all the international conferences, and all the international relations reveal the profound antagonisms which are rending the world today. They show that the Second World War has not only failed to extricate capitalism from its general crisis, but has rendered this crisis even deeper. And—as has always been the case with capitalism—the capitalist world is seeking a way out of its predicament by increasing reactionary pressure and violence. This

explains the aggressive campaign against the truly democratic forces, a campaign launched on the morrow of the conclusion of the hostilities by international imperialist reaction, and which is reflected in all international relations and within each capitalist country.

All these phenomena are, however, but an introduction to the far more serious international crisis which the capitalist world will have to face. It is unlikely that the capitalist world is moving toward some sort of relative stabilization in the coming years. It is, on the contrary, far more likely that the economic crisis, and the sharpening of all the contradictions, will in the coming years result, not merely in a serious economic crisis, but also in extremely violent political upheavals for the capitalist world. . . .

Several fascist States, with Nazi Germany at their head, have been smashed in the war, *i.e.*, the fascist dictatorships in these States have been overthrown and crushed. Can it be said, however, that the fascist peril has been eliminated, and that the democratic principles, for which millions and millions of men from all continents fought and died, have

truly prevailed in the world? Unfortunately, this is far from being the case. On the contrary, it would be a very great mistake to identify the destruction of a concrete fascist set-up, such as Hitler's fascist axis and its satellites, with the destruction of fascism as a general phenomenon of imperialism, and with the destruction of its sources. It seems to me, moreover, that it is already becoming inaccurate to speak of the "remnants of fascism"—for the simple reason that what we have before us today are not merely the remnants of the former fascist dictatorships in Germany, Italy, Japan, etc., but, above all, that an entire system, which under certain conditions ineluctably gives birth to fascism, is in existence. It is a fact that the main sources of fascism in the world are still in existence, although they have been weakened; that these sources are now becoming more and more active, that they are gaining an increasing measure of influence in certain countries, and that they will constitute an increasingly grave peril for freedom-loving mankind—if the latter does not oppose them with the utmost resolution, both inside each individual country and in the field of international relations. . . .

Freedom-loving forces must, obviously, take these facts into account. They must wage a determined struggle in all parts of the world against the anti-democratic activities of the imperialist reactionary forces—if they wish to avoid the danger of finding themselves, once again, one day, in

a position similar to the one on the eve of the Second World War, *i.e.*, to be faced with the onslaught of the general reactionary and fascist offensive.

I

The law of the uneven development of the capitalist countries, with all the consequences this entails for the capitalist system, expressed itself powerfully both in the course of the war and after the conclusion of hostilities. Germany and Japan have disappeared from the world political scene as great powers. Italy has been thrown into a completely subordinate position, the role of France has decreased considerably, while certain circles in Britain feel that the only way to save the British Empire is to make it play second fiddle to the policy and strength of the United States. The old capitalist Europe is no longer the center of the capitalist world. The eyes of capitalist and other reactionary forces are now turning in another direction. They are turning toward the American continent.

Capitalist Europe has been weakened, while the role of the United States of America has increased tremendously. The U.S.A. has become, both by its economic power and by its political influence, the center of the capitalist world. We once used to say that the whole of the capitalist world was under the domination of a few imperialist States, where finance capital had been concentrated; today, it could already be said that there is an increasing tendency

on the
a single
of the
control
bring p
cally th
The co
has no
tions. A
the cou
over 50
kets, so
possibil
out the
alliance
the inte
organiz
with A
ing a d
econom
world
capitali
financi
penden
Capit
of the f
tact th
of the
gle wa
fields
ence o
capital
was n
positiv
the bl
weake
growth
Allied
the pr
pose o
garchy
democ

on the part of the finance capital of a single great capitalist power, *i.e.*, of the United States of America, to control to various degrees, or to bring pressure to bear upon, practically the whole of the capitalist world. The concentration of finance capital has now assumed gigantic proportions. American production has, in the course of the war, increased by over 50 per cent, and it needs markets, sources of raw materials, and possibilities of investment throughout the world. The great monopoly alliances of the United States, and the international unions of monopoly organizations of different countries, with American finance capital playing a dominant part, are conquering economic positions throughout the world and bringing large and small capitalist countries into a state of financial and general economic dependence.

Capitalist monopolies on both sides of the front maintained a mutual contact throughout the war, regardless of the fact that a life and death struggle was being waged on the battlefields, and exerted an essential influence on the war policies of the capitalist countries. This influence was not, of course, exerted toward positive ends, toward the victory of the bloc of anti-Nazi states. The weakening and the retarding of the growth of the war potential of the Allied countries, and the delaying of the progress of the war for the purpose of enriching the financial oligarchy and the weakening of the democratic forces in the world—such

was the policy pursued by the capitalist monopolies in the course of the war.

Today, these same monopoly alliances are bringing the defeated, and many of the large and small victorious, nations under their economic yoke, they are destroying the vestiges of independence the small "independent" countries may still have possessed, and are, in all the capitalist countries, linking themselves up with the most reactionary elements, bringing them to power, or attempting to do so, provoking civil wars and endeavoring to bring about a general offensive on the part of political reaction.

Even countries like Great Britain and France have, to a considerable extent, been brought into a state of financial dependence on the United States. Protesting against the conditions of the recent American loan to Britain, Lord Beaverbrook exclaimed that the Empire had been sold at a puny price, and that in the future the United States would reap what the British had sown.

The *Economist* wrote that it was sad that Britain, having lost a quarter of its total national wealth in the common struggle, had, by way of reward, to commit itself to paying for the next half century 35 million pounds a year to those who had enriched themselves in the war.

It was not, however, these 35 million pounds which so disturbed British public opinion, as much as the conditions Britain was compelled to accept in connection with the loan.

These conditions are such that they open the doors of all parts of the British Empire to the expansion of American capital.

The situation of France is similar, while the fifth "big" Allied country, *i.e.*, (Kuomintang) China, has, in actual fact, again become a semi-colony of the United States, particularly after the recent treaty of "Friendship, Commerce and Navigation" with the United States, which completely delivers China to exploitation by American capital.

In short, American monopoly capital has conquered a dominant position in the capitalist world. The American monopoly alliances had, during the war, greatly strengthened, in the first place, their position inside the country by liquidating a number of small and middle-sized firms, while at the same time conquering, one after the other, economic positions throughout the world. Such a high degree of concentration is obviously bound to have far-reaching consequences for the entire further development of the capitalist world. The greatest economic expansion in history is taking place before our eyes. American finance capital is not merely well on the way toward winning, all by itself, dominant positions in the economic life of the defeated countries; it has not only enslaved, from an economic point of view, practically the whole of South America, the Philippines, China, etc.; but it is also reaching for the "independent" capitalist countries, more especially for the British

and French colonies, Dominions, and spheres of influence. All the British Dominions, and particularly Canada, are more dependent today upon the United States of America than upon Great Britain. Having, moreover, built up a powerful industry in the course of the war, mostly with the participation of American capital, the Dominions are competing with the British metropolis on many of the world markets. Just as in the Dominions, the American capitalists are conquering economic positions in North Africa, in the Middle East, in India and Korea, and in all parts of the world.

Such economic expansion, obviously, not merely weakens the economic and political position of the other capitalist countries, which depend upon the export of commodities and of capital, depriving them of markets, sources of raw materials and investment possibilities. It also, as with any other colonial system, retards the economic development of the dependent countries. . . .

This gigantic octopus — United States finance capital which has stretched its arms throughout the capitalist world—of course, sucks huge super-profits. The process of concentration of finance capital thus develops spasmodically and at a great pace. The economic expansion of American finance capital is, naturally, accompanied by corresponding political actions, while various "political philosophies" are appearing more and more in the American press

and an
Ameri
same i
imper
of the
Ameri
day m
that in
achiev
the ca
being.

It we
say tha
to play
contrar
doing
the fo
Empir
gration
by the
and to
of raw
capital
in the
tempt
politic
among
endeav

This
reason
the co
Ameri
the w

All
menta
develo
Great
war,
sidera
pared
ica. F
debtor

and are explaining the necessity of American world domination with the same ingenuity which the German imperialists once displayed on behalf of the German *Herrenvolk*. The American bankers and trusts are today making every effort to achieve that in which Hitler failed, *viz.*, to achieve world domination, at least in the capitalist world for the time being.

It would, of course, be a mistake to say that Britain has completely ceased to play an independent part. On the contrary, British capitalist circles are doing their utmost to save and restore the former greatness of the British Empire, to stay the internal disintegration of the colonial empire caused by the expansion of American capital, and to save the markets and sources of raw materials which American capital is wrenching from them, even in their own colonies. They are attempting to do so by means of various political measures, and this was, among other things, the aim of the endeavors to create a "western bloc." This will, undoubtedly, for all the reasons we have just given, result in the constant appearance of Anglo-American antagonisms throughout the world.

All this, however, cannot fundamentally stem the process which is developing. Although production in Great Britain increased during the war, this country has suffered considerable impoverishment as compared to the United States of America. From a creditor, it has become a debtor, a debtor even of its own colo-

nies, such as India, for instance. Britain's foreign investments have decreased considerably. And the conditions which Britain was compelled to accept in order to obtain the loan from the United States have, to a large extent, disarmed it in the struggle against the pressure of American economic expansion. British production can, obviously, under such conditions, even less enter into competition with American production, which is on a far higher technical level.

France's position is, of course, still far more difficult in this respect, because her economic positions are being grabbed from her, not only by American capital, but also by British capital which is thus endeavoring to compensate for the losses it is suffering in its own domain.

Neither Britain nor France can, therefore, prevent American finance capital, under present conditions and with the present economic means, from establishing its economic domination over the capitalist world. Whether they will succeed in doing so by political means, is a question to which the future will provide an answer. However that may be, these antagonisms will still further exacerbate the general crisis of capitalism.

II

We must, however, note that these are not the only economic contradictions and antagonisms which are worrying and perturbing the capitalist world today.

We have already mentioned that the industrial production of the United States has increased by at least 50 per cent, as compared to pre-war production. Great Britain's production has also increased. At the same time, production in Canada, as well as in Australia and South Africa, has also augmented tremendously, owing to the remote position of these countries from the battle-fronts. Industry has also grown considerably, at least in certain branches, in some countries of South America, and even in such colonies as India, Korea, etc. It is a well known fact that the industry of neutral countries, such as Switzerland and Sweden for instance, has also increased considerably. And all this means that the struggle for markets will be more violent than ever before.

It is true, at the same time, that the industrial capacity of practically all the European countries which were under German occupation, or were Germany's satellites, has decreased. On the other hand, however, due consideration should be given to the fact that the European nations, which were under German domination, have been considerably impoverished, as a result of the war and that they cannot, therefore, despite their considerable needs, provide a rich market for foreign capitalists. In addition to this, industry is being revived in these countries, while some of them, which do not desire to permit foreign capital to exploit their destitution in order to enslave them, have embarked upon

a policy of industrialization. This especially applies to those countries of Eastern and Southeastern Europe which have freed themselves from imperialist domination.

All this means that the capitalist world is confronted with unsolved problems and with an economic crisis which will, perhaps, perturb it to a greater degree than any of the previous crises. The fear of the economic crisis is already haunting the entire capitalist world. . . .

The capitalist system does not, of course, have the economic means of settling the increasingly numerous contradictions which are characteristic of the present phase of imperialism. Only political means are left. And the political means of monopoly capitalism can only be—an increasing measure of reactionary pressure, new fascist tendencies. Imperialism generates reaction and fascism every day and continually. It would be a great mistake for the freedom-loving forces to lose sight of this fact, even for an instant. . . .

Fascism . . . did not confine itself merely to enslaving its own people. Its own country was too small for it. Monopoly and expansion are two inseparable phenomena. Monopolies strive toward a domination of the markets, of sources of raw materials, of production; they strive toward economic and political world domination. Hence the interference in the domestic affairs of other countries, hence the interventions, the bribing of foreign governments, the establishing and strengthening of the

dictator
cliques
instituted
the in
econom
of cou
policy,
wars, c
capital
if the
ciently
lead i
tion,
rights,
cist for
count
even e
ity, in
fluenc

Such
fascist
That
Can i
tender
lies h

To
under
of con
er of
increa
tries.
that
never
intern
This
Amer
which
of sin
and t
still
order

dictatorships of various reactionary cliques, the abolition of democratic institutions in the countries under the influence of these monopolies, economic enslavement, the drawing of countries into their expansionist policy, the preparing of conflicts and wars, etc. Monopoly rule in the big capitalist countries must therefore, if the democratic forces are not sufficiently resolute in their opposition, lead inevitably to aggression, reaction, the abolition of democratic rights, and to a fascist and semi-fascist form of government within these countries themselves, as well as, often even earlier and with greater rapidity, in the countries under their influence.

Such was our experience of the fascist dictatorship in Germany. That dictatorship has been broken. Can it be said, however, that the tendencies of the capitalist monopolies have also been destroyed?

To assert this would be to labor under a great illusion. It is a matter of common knowledge that the power of the capitalist monopolies has increased in the large capitalist countries. It is thus a well known fact that the monopoly alliances have never been so closely interconnected internationally as they are today. This applies particularly to the American monopoly organizations, which have swallowed up a number of similar organizations in Europe and throughout the world and are still waging a violent struggle in order to destroy or squeeze out their

rivals from economic positions in different parts of the world.

I should not like to draw analogies. However, is it possible to deny today the fact that the all-powerful American monopolies are linked up with those in charge of the Government policy of the United States? Who can doubt the influence that these monopolies exert on the policy of the American Government? Democratic forces within the United States are still too weak to be able to prevent this fatal influence, which is growing and developing along its own lines.

Thus only can we explain the present aggressive policy of certain circles in the United States, the constant tendency to interfere in the domestic affairs of other countries, the policy of intimidation by economic and political means including the atom bomb, the policy of restoring reactionary regimes in different "independent" countries, the rehabilitation of fascist elements, the setting-up of bases throughout the world, etc. This explains, too, certain occurrences in the sphere of home politics such as the *de facto* abolition of democratic rights and institutions, the frantic "anti-Communist" campaign which serves as a cloak for a hue and cry against all those who are offering resistance to the omnipotence of the monopolies and to their exclusive influence on government policy.

The only freedom which monopolies allow the masses of the people is the "freedom" to live in darkness

and political backwardness. And while this goes on, the imperialist agitators speak of democracy and of the "four freedoms." No sooner, however, do internal contradictions begin to assume a more acute form and to imperil the rule of the monopolies, no sooner does the political consciousness of the people begin to grow, than the democracy of the monopolies begins to disappear. And it is truly brazen to speak today, for instance, of "freedom from fear," when the entire foreign policy of certain big capitalist countries is based on methods of intimidation and all kinds of threats, including atom-bomb and war threats.

We have, thus, the paradox that the most extensive and far-reaching imperialist expansion which history has known is being carried on under the cloak of phrases on "the four freedoms," on the securing of democracy, on free trade and economic cooperation.

It is sufficient to glance at the practical consequences of such a state of affairs in international relations in order to convince ourselves of the serious danger which the trends of capitalist monopolies constitute for peace, and for the fate of democracy in the world, if they do not meet with the most resolute opposition on the part of freedom-loving people.

III

It goes without saying that the state of things which I have just described did not arise only after the

war. We all know that there is a vital and direct link between Munich and the present reactionary policy of certain circles in the large capitalist countries, and that these links are illustrated also by certain characteristic aspects of British and American policies in the course of the Second World War.

Although the Second World War was fundamentally a war of liberation, and an anti-fascist war, it would, nevertheless, be a mistake not to discern those imperialist elements which determined the quite specific development of this war. This development was influenced by two kinds of antagonisms: on the one hand, there was the antagonism among the capitalist countries in their struggle for the domination of the capitalist world, and, on the other, the antagonism between the capitalist world and the truly democratic, socialist, and anti-imperialist forces with the Soviet Union at their head. The first of these two antagonisms manifested itself more particularly in the first phases of the war, while the second became increasingly acute as the war was drawing to a close.

In the first phase of the war, Great Britain ceded a considerable number of its military bases in the world to the United States, and was unable to prevent the economic penetration of the latter into its colonies and Dominions. In the course of the war, the United States obtained a decisive naval superiority over Britain, leaving the latter far behind as re-

gards
the U.
whole
bases.

Despi
ever, th
circles
identica
lationsh
anti-im
eral.

I sha
with th
ers tow
war, as
known
the vic
subject
says, fo

Britis
objectiv
conceal
which
unoffici
cal stra
compan
matic o
Western
with th
feat of
were c
fascism
of Con
revolut
old soc
the Sov
the we
destroy
or fatal
that th
emerge
Europe

gards sea power. At the same time, the U.S.A. began constructing a whole system of military and naval bases.

Despite all the antagonisms, however, the policies of the imperialist circles of these two countries were identical in one respect: in their relationship to the U.S.S.R. and to the anti-imperialist movements in general.

I shall not here deal in any detail with the policy of the western powers toward the U.S.S.R. during the war, as this policy is but too well known. I should only like to quote the views of British writers on the subject. Here is what R. Palme Dutt says, for instance:

British imperialism pursued a double objective in the war, which was thinly concealed in official expression, but which was patently visible, not only in unofficial expression, but in the practical strategy of the war and in the accompanying Anglo-American diplomatic conferences. On the one hand, the Western imperialists sought, in alliance with the Soviet Union, to ensure the defeat of Hitler. On the other hand, they were concerned that the downfall of fascism should not lead to the advance of Communism or popular anti-fascist revolutions in Europe endangering the old social order, or the strengthening of the Soviet Union. They calculated that the weight of the war would not only destroy Hitler, but either equally destroy or fatally weaken the Soviet Union, and that the Anglo-American forces would emerge as the main victors to police Europe and control the world.

Dutt then goes on to say:

All the babblers and sycophants of official expression poured scorn upon the Communist campaign for the Second Front in the West and jeered at the "armchair strategists" who dared to intervene on matters of strategy when it was obvious that the military experts alone could judge and know what was best. Those babblers look foolish enough today when it has been revealed in the memoirs of Captain Butcher, the aide-de-camp of General Eisenhower, that General Eisenhower and his military experts favored the Second Front in Europe in the summer of 1942, that the opposition came primarily, not from military, but from political sources, and that the decisive opposition which blocked and delayed the Second Front came—what could not be stated at the time—from Churchill. When Churchill's decision to ban the Second Front in 1942 was conveyed to General Eisenhower, General Eisenhower called it "the blackest day of the war."

This decision prolonged the war. General Sir Gifford Martel wrote in his book *Our Armed Forces*:

The troops in England were ready a year before they were used, and were even becoming stale by 1944. Could we not have been ready sooner if we had settled on our main plan at an earlier date?

... When attempting to vindicate such a reactionary policy toward the Soviet Union and the democratic, national-liberation movements in occupied Europe, various obscurantists in the western countries were wont

to describe the policy as one of defense against "Soviet imperialism," to speak of a clash between two ideologies — western "democracy" and eastern "totalitarianism." In actual fact, however, what we had here was no "defense"—and least of all against the Soviet Union, which was threatening no one except the Hitlerite bloc—but a purely expansionist tendency of British and American finance capital to entrench itself in the ruins of occupied Europe. As was only natural, the national-liberation movements and the principled democratic policy of the U.S.S.R. constituted an obstacle to such expansionist tendencies. This explains why there was so much agitation in the course of the war to "wait" that the "right time" should come, that the "signal" should be given, before starting the uprisings for national liberation, etc. This policy was advocated by those leading monopolists who did not view the downfall of the Nazi Government as the aim of the liberation struggle of the democratic forces, but as a stepping-stone toward their domination of the world. . . .

The antagonisms in postwar world politics should also be viewed in this light. Struggling for supremacy and economic positions in the former Axis countries, as well as in other countries, the American and British finance capital circles are linking themselves up more and more with the most reactionary forces in these countries, and are conducting the policy of their country toward the

protection of reactionary, fascist elements, the concealing of war criminals, interference in the domestic affairs of the different countries—toward various anti-democratic actions and anti-Soviet outbursts. This explains the continual campaign of reactionary circles in the United States against all that is democratic and progressive in the world. This explains the tendency on the part of certain reactionary imperialist circles in Britain to make their country into an imperialist gendarme for the suppression of anti-imperialist and democratic movements and uprisings in different parts of the world, although it is obvious that such a role brings Britain into an increasing measure of dependence upon the United States.

This latter consideration is gaining increasing importance in Britain's home politics. The clash of interests between the U.S.A. and Great Britain in all parts of the world is obvious and should not be underrated. The tendency of American finance capital to obtain equal treatment, in the countries of the British Empire, with that enjoyed by British capital, is tantamount to ousting Britain from its own colonies and the countries of its Empire—and this is actually a trend toward the destruction of the British Empire. In Japan and China, which means in the Pacific in general, Britain's voice is heard but feebly. The Americans have gained a firm foothold in the Arab countries and in the Mediterranean—to such an extent, in fact,

that pe
Americ
saying
"Medit
means
to hold
can lin
the Su
And th
British
many
the Bri
penetra
capital
We
facts.
whelm
U.S.A.
the sea
routes.
the fac
onics
word,
extensi
tary, n
various
through
was ob
such ba
term o
of this
and po
far mo
imperia
style c
day.
All
have pe
the Fir
succeed
Nation
policy.

that particularly ardent advocates of American imperialism are already saying that the U.S.A. is becoming a "Mediterranean country." And that means that Britain is no longer alone to hold the keys of the Mediterranean lines of communication through the Suez Canal toward the Far East. And the so-called "merging of the British and American zones" in Germany has opened wide the doors of the British zone in Germany, to the penetration of American finance capital and of the American trusts.

We could cite many more such facts. We should also add the overwhelming military superiority of the U.S.A. over Great Britain—both on the seas and along the world sea routes. By way of compensation for the fact that it does not possess colonies in the former sense of the word, the U.S.A. has built a whole extensive system of interlinked military, naval, and air force bases of various types in key positions throughout the world. Britain itself was obliged to lease a number of such bases to the United States for a term of 99 years. A system of bases of this type, coupled with economic and political pressure, are obviously far more effective strong points for imperialist expansion than the old style colonial system would be today.

All this, of course, is bound to have political consequences too. After the First World War, Great Britain succeeded in making the League of Nations into an instrument of its policy. Now the situation is com-

pletely different. The United States and Britain appear, it is true, to collaborate very closely and on a basis of equality, as in the United Nations Organization for instance. Nonetheless it is easy immediately to discern which of the two plays the decisive and which the secondary part. And this is the case today throughout the international scene. It is obvious, too, that Great Britain's dependence on the United States increases in the measure in which certain reactionary circles impel the former country to adopt an anti-Soviet attitude, and to play the part of a counter-revolutionary gendarme in the international field.

All these facts go to show that the Anglo-American antagonism still exists, that it will develop, and that it will, in connection with a number of other imperialist antagonisms, give rise to all kinds of conflicts among the capitalist countries.

It would, however, be a mistake to overestimate the significance of these antagonisms. Two factors which have today an essential bearing on the development of these antagonisms, should be borne in mind in this connection: first, the bonds uniting American and British finance capital, and, second, the difficult internal contradictions within the British Empire, and within many of the countries under British influence in general.

This has led to the appearance of two trends in British political life. One school of thought holds that Britain's only chance lies in linking

its fate to that of the United States; Britain is bound constantly to lose through this partnership, but will nevertheless succeed in saving the Empire. This school of thought has of late—in connection with the agreement regarding United States concessions in the Middle East oil fields—been particularly noticeable in a section of the British press. One would have expected to hear this press express dissatisfaction at the fact that British capital was being squeezed out of the Middle East by American capital. The opposite occurred, however. The press welcomed the action of the United States, in the hope that the U.S.A. would henceforth also be interested in the "pacification" of the Arab world and in saving Britain's positions in that area.

Fully in line with this school of thought are the various plans regarding the future of Anglo-American relations—including the plan for the setting up of an "Anglo-American Federation" or of an "Anglo-American Military Alliance."

Even the most die-hard reactionaries in Britain are showing apprehension at this increasing degree of dependence on the United States. Hence the various plans for a so-called "western bloc," which is, on the one hand, directed against the U.S.S.R., while, on the other, it is intended to buttress Britain's independent role as against the United States.

All these and similar "ideas" go to show that the former imperialist

methods no longer provide a way out. Many people in England, including people in responsible political positions, and particularly in Parliament have grasped this. Within the Labor Party itself, the number of those who realize that Britain can hope to play an independent part only if it abandons its present policy and embarks upon a new course, *viz.*, upon one of peace and friendship with the U.S.S.R., is growing steadily.

Herein lies the crux of the problem, because it would mean a fundamental departure on the part of Great Britain from the policy it has been pursuing, more or less consistently, subjectively, ever since Munich. This was, fundamentally, the policy which rendered possible fascist aggression and the Second World War, and the subsequent domination of American monopoly over the capitalist world.

The second school of thought is aware of the fact that the reactionary policy of the Anglo-American "Holy Alliance" against the anti-imperialist and progressive forces in the world, behind which lurks the economic and political expansion of American finance capital, is bound to increase the economic and political dependence of Britain on the U.S.A., and, automatically, still further impair its international position. The clash between these two fundamental trends within British policy, will, undoubtedly, assume greater proportions in the future and its outcome will, to a large extent, determine the fate of

futu
It sh
connect
icy of c
Americ
increas
within
people
policy
trophe
upon t
change
ernmer
ing sh
ences o
There
which
old free
ing th
through
is, mor
jety an
progres
will gr
itself.
As th
democr
ing na
with t
democr
which
the fiss
rialist
therefo
talist n
invaria
This
interna
curred
and th
speech
chill sa

future cooperation among nations.

It should be pointed out, in this connection, that the aggressive policy of certain of the most reactionary American circles is meeting with an increasing measure of resistance within the United States itself. Many people in the U.S.A. feel that such a policy is liable to bring a new catastrophe both upon the U.S.A. and upon the entire world. The recent changes in the United States Government are evidence of the increasing sharpening of internal differences on questions of world politics. There is no doubt that the forces which are averse to a country with old freedom-loving traditions becoming the hope of reactionary forces throughout the world—a fact which is, moreover, causing increasing anxiety among the freedom-loving and progressive people of all countries—will grow within the United States itself.

As things now stand, however, the democratic forces and freedom-loving nations of the world are faced with the fact of a consistent anti-democratic, and imperialist policy, which is all the more violent as the fissures within the present imperialist system widen. Experience, therefore, shows once again that capitalist monopoly and political reaction invariably go together.

This became apparent in all the international events which have occurred between the end of the war and the present time. In one of the speeches he delivered last year, Churchill said that the decision on the use

of the atom bomb had been taken by President Roosevelt and himself, and that from that moment their views on the future had changed.

And, in fact, it is from that moment that the well-known policy of intimidation, which has attended all the efforts made hitherto to build up peace, started. . . .

This policy, obviously, boils down to a desire on the part of certain capitalist circles to force their will upon those who do not show due respect toward the "blessings" of imperialism. In other words, they wish to impose a new imperialist "peace" on the world, a "peace" based on world domination by finance capital, instead of a truly democratic peace, based on the freedom and independence of nations, on cooperation among nations and respect for their mutual interests.

Such a policy can no longer, however, be pursued without encountering opposition. This was possible at the time of the Versailles Conference and to a certain extent after the First World War, when the imperialist forces succeeded in blockading the Soviet Union and maintaining it in a state of comparative isolation, and also of keeping the anti-imperialist forces confined within certain limits. Conditions have changed now—the Soviet Union can no longer be isolated. In addition to this, a number of new people's States have arisen, and they have completely wrenched themselves from the sphere of imperialism, while anti-imperialist and democratic movements

have conquered such powerful positions in many countries that they considerably circumscribe the freedom of action of the leading imperialists.

It is clear that the only policy which the democratic forces can follow is a policy of struggle for a just, a democratic peace and cooperation among the nations, based on mutual respect for the just interests of the different countries. According to this conception, the existing antagonisms between the two worlds should not be allowed to constitute an obstacle in the way of the general effort of freedom-loving mankind to secure peaceful cooperation among the nations. Peace and democracy in the world are not endangered by social differences, but by imperialist economic and political expansion. Two trends, two methods, two schools of thought have thus taken shape in the sphere of present-day international politics: on the one hand, there is a tendency toward world domination, the tendency toward covert and open expansion, toward imposing one's will on other nations and states; there is the policy of intimidation and out-voting. On the other hand, there is the striving for peaceful cooperation among nations, toward mutual understanding and respect for the just interests of every nation, the striving to achieve the freedom and independence of the dependent and backward colonial peoples. These two different trends are, of course, but the reflection of two different systems, *i.e.*, of the system of imperial-

ism, which is seeking a way out of the general crisis through a policy of reaction and violence, and of the system of socialism and of people's democracy where capitalism has been overthrown or is rapidly disappearing under a democratic people's authority, and where the entire activities of the country are directed toward internal construction and the increase of internal welfare. These two different trends in international politics have been apparent in all international relations since the end of the war.

The new Yugoslavia, being a progressive people's State where the roots of capitalism have forever been cut and which has freed itself of the influence of foreign imperialism, has particularly felt the pressure of international reactionary forces. The negative attitude, which a part of our war Allies oppose to many of the justified claims of our peoples, is, of course, quite easy to comprehend when viewed in this light.

What is here involved, therefore, is neither a "clash between two ideologies"—as certain people like to imply, who either consciously or not endeavor to shroud in a cloak of ambiguity that which is perfectly clear and obvious; nor is it that the world is divided into adherents of dialectical materialism and those of idealism, or into the adepts of collectivism and those of individualism; but a clash between imperialist expansion and the striving of nations for independence, the striving of freedom-

loving peace.

"What Tito, 'at democracy various of the W (Speech ust 20, 1

All th oly cap phase of than evenal con litical against progress

What v is but p is withr dented finance It shoul time, th perialist as they World Not War fa capitali it still ened th tem. T the near and co econom The among

loving mankind for a democratic peace.

"What we have today," said Comrade Tito, "are two fronts: the front of democracy and the front of reaction and various provocateurs, and not the front of the West and the front of the East." (Speech delivered in Jesenice, on August 20, 1946.)

All this goes to show that monopoly capitalism will, in the present phase of its development, seek, more than ever before, to iron out its internal contradictions by increasing political reaction and by struggle against the forces of democracy, progress, and socialism.

IV

What we have just said, however, is but part of the truth. The world is witnessing today the unprecedented economic expansion of the finance capital of a single country. It should be pointed out, at the same time, that the foundations of the imperialist system were never so weak as they are today after the Second World War.

Not only did the Second World War fail to bring stabilization to the capitalist world but, on the contrary, it still further deepened and sharpened the general crisis of the system. There can be no doubt but that the near future will see much tension and conflicts, will witness violent economic and political struggles.

The Second World War has, among other things, resulted in a

further number of countries throwing off the imperialist yoke. This has considerably undermined the imperialist rule in the rest of the world, particularly in the colonies and dependent countries, and led to an increase in the internal contradictions within capitalist economy.

There can be no doubt but that the emergence of people's democracies in certain countries of Eastern and Southeastern Europe, and the beginning of similar processes in other countries—in different forms and at various stages but with the same trend of development—is the most momentous and significant qualitative change which has occurred in the capitalist world after the Second World War. The significance of this change does not so much lie in the fact that it has modified the relation of forces in the world, to the benefit of democracy and socialism, and to the detriment of imperialism, as, particularly, in that it reveals certain specific ways of liquidating the rule of capitalist reaction, new forms of development toward socialism. The construction of socialism is no longer an isolated phenomenon confined to the U.S.S.R. It is no longer something which still has to prove its value in practice. The great socialist achievements of the October Revolution have not only stood the test of history, but have already become the substance of the entire genuinely democratic development in the world. There are no longer many governments today which venture openly to defend the

capitalist system. On the contrary, capitalist reaction is resorting to all kinds of pseudo-socialist forms and phrases, in order to delude the masses. Even the fascists liked to hide, and are hiding again today, behind socialist signboards and phrases. This means that it is becoming increasingly difficult for imperialist reaction to wage an open struggle against socialism. This means, further, that the ideal of socialism, first realized in the Soviet Union, has stood the test of history and emerged triumphant.

On the other hand, of course, all this is evidence of the internal weaknesses of the capitalist system. In the period after the great October Socialist Revolution, the imperialist system was still sufficiently powerful to make a frontal attack against the revolution in Russia and against the various other revolutionary socialist movements. Today it is no longer in a position to fill in the crevices within the imperialist system and to stem all the numerous processes which are undermining it. And this relative weakness of the capitalist system enables the struggle for a true people's democracy, and for socialism, to assume the most varied forms.

The genuine democratic forces can now rely on broader reserves, they can make a far more effective use of the increasingly wide and numerous crevices which are appearing within the imperialist system. The Communist Parties in many countries have become a factor capable of

having a decisive bearing on the policy of the State. The democratic forces are now in a position more successfully to expose the anti-democratic maneuvers of the capitalist monopolists.

All these facts acquire their full significance when we bear in mind the part the U.S.S.R. now plays in international relations, a part which in many ways differs from the one it played before the Second World War. The Soviet Union was, from the very first day it came into being, the hope of all freedom-loving people, and an example showing the whole of progressive humanity the way out of the general crisis into which it had been brought by the imperialist system.

At that time, however, the Soviet Union was separated from the rest of the world by the high wall of capitalist encirclement, and its influence in the field of international relations was far smaller than its strength would have warranted. Today, on the other hand, we may say that the capitalist encirclement of the Soviet Union no longer exists. We have here in mind, not merely the fact that the Soviet Union is to a large extent surrounded by friendly countries, in which capitalism has also been overthrown or is increasingly losing a foothold, but above all, two other considerations.

The first is the tremendous influence the Soviet Union now wields in the field of international relations, an influence which the U.S.S.R. achieved in the first place through

its victo
by it d
the adv
and of

The
bounda
between
the wo
tional
clear-cu
U.S.S.R.
as was
no lon
side, a
on the
cialist
rather,
tries, w
at their
on the
headed
obvious
the isol
become
imposs
founda
tional r
tion of
thereby
interna
And
in this
imperia
with i
pidity,
such re
sibilitie
democr
socialis
more v
creasin
ist for

its victories in the recent war, whereby it demonstrated the strength and the advantages of the Soviet system and of socialism.

The second is the fact that the boundary between the two worlds, between the world of socialism and the world of capitalism, in international relations is no longer the clear-cut frontier-line between the U.S.S.R. and the rest of the world, as was the case before the war. We no longer have, today, on the one side, a united capitalist system and, on the other, a single, encircled socialist country; what we have is, rather, a system of capitalist countries, with the most imperialist forces at their head, on the one hand, and, on the other, a democratic system headed by the Soviet Union. It is obvious why, under such conditions, the isolation of the Soviet Union has become impossible. It has become impossible to take decisions on fundamental questions of international relations without the participation of the Soviet Union, without thereby destroying all possibilities of international cooperation.

And what is particularly important in this connection, is the fact that the imperialist chain is bound to break with increasing frequency and rapidity, in view of the existence of such relations of forces, that the possibilities of the victory of a people's democracy, as the starting point of socialist development, will become more varied, and it will become increasingly difficult for the imperialist forces to stifle and curb such

processes in different parts of the world.

That is why the emergence of people's democracies in the countries of Eastern and Southeastern Europe, as well as the beginnings of such democracies in certain other countries, are significant, not merely in that they constitute a quantitative change in the relation of forces in the sphere of international politics, but also in that they introduce a new element into the latter, breaking the system of capitalist encirclement of the first country where the construction of socialism has been achieved, and opening up new vistas for the struggle of the democratic, progressive, anti-imperialist forces in the world.

After the war, the colonial question has again arisen in a very acute form. Its acuteness has a double aspect: on the one hand, as regards relations between the colonial peoples and the ruling imperialist countries, and, on the other, as the object of the political and economic struggle between the leading capitalist monopolies, *i.e.*, between the great capitalist countries.

When we used, before, to speak of the centers of anti-imperialist struggle and of wars for national liberation, what we had in view were, in the first place, India and semi-dependent China. Now, in addition to these two countries, centers of this kind have appeared, in various forms and at different stages of development, in Indonesia, Indochina, in the Philippines, Korea, the

Arab countries, North Africa, etc., which means that the anti-imperialist movement has embraced practically the entire colonial world. It is not of fundamental importance in this connection, whether the present colonial rulers will occasionally succeed in temporarily quelling the uprisings for the liberation of the colonial peoples. What is essential is the fact that a conscious and organized movement has embraced the entire colonial world, that the colonial rulers will find it increasingly difficult to maintain the colonies in a state of subjection, and that this will seriously affect political and economic conditions in the home countries and in the whole of the capitalist world.

This powerful growth of the liberation movements in the colonies, is to be explained, on the one hand, by the fact that the political consciousness of the broad masses has increased rapidly in the course of the war, and, on the other, and particularly, by the considerable growth of industry in the colonies, which has brought the proletariat and the national bourgeoisie onto the political scene, and this has, in its turn, hastened the development of national culture, and of the national intelligentsia. The traditional methods of colonial policy, the methods of maintaining backward relations and feudal particularism in the colonies—the former being the mainstays of colonial rule—have, under such conditions, become increasing inadequate. That is why the colonial

question is ever more disrupting the foundations of the imperialist system as a whole, while it constitutes a particularly arduous problem for the colonial rulers.

The development of the working class and of the labor movements in the colonial and dependent countries has raised the colonial liberation movements to a higher democratic level, as compared to those of the past. Many of these movements are heading, not merely toward political liberation from foreign imperialism, but also toward the victory of the anti-imperialist forces, the victory of people's democracy, which would wrench these countries completely from the influence of imperialism. The colonial rulers are no longer succeeding in achieving a more or less lasting victory over these movements by means of military and police measures. Even if they do succeed in quelling an uprising here and there, the colonial world no longer—under the old forms of colonial rule—offers sufficient security to the finance capital of the home country. That is why the imperialist circles must seek to lean more and more on the national bourgeoisie and the other reactionary circles in the colonies and other dependent countries, making them concessions in return.

It therefore occurs more and more frequently that certain colonial or dependent countries obtain so-called "independence." Great Britain, in certain cases, resorts to giving formal "independence" to the dependent

country
viously
ruptin
newly
country
capital
country
nomic
Such
eral tr
politics
making
anti-de
of the
imagin
ple wo
it not
abroad
The
attaine
tremer
talist
themse
with t
exploit
centrat
has to
nopolit
former
sion e
narrow
world,
what t
all fro
where
rivals
ally f
That i
upon
ial syst
is why
of the

countries. Such measurers are, obviously, accompanied by the corrupting of the ruling classes in the newly established "independent" countries, which enables the great capitalist powers to maintain the country in a state of actual economic and political dependence.

Such methods have become a general trait of present-day imperialist politics. Present-day imperialists are making every endeavor to support anti-democratic regimes in all parts of the world and in all countries imaginable, regimes which the people would long have overthrown had it not been for the support from abroad.

The high degree of concentration attained by finance capital, and the tremendous extension of the capitalist monopolies have, it appears, themselves become incompatible with the former methods of colonial exploitation. For a degree of concentration of finance capital, such as has today been attained by the monopolies in the United States, the former system of the territorial division of colonies has become too narrow. What they need is the world, and not just certain colonies; what they need are free routes across all frontiers because they are everywhere able to oust their capitalist rivals from the markets, and gradually from all economic positions. That is why the United States looks upon the British and French colonial systems as impediments and that is why they are coming out in favor of the "independence" of colonial

countries. What this amounts to in practice would be to give the present colonial countries under the rule of Great Britain, France, Holland, etc., formal independence, so as to bring them into a state of economic, and even political dependence, on American finance capital.

For Britain, France, and the other countries in possession of colonies, which have become strongly dependent upon American finance capital, the question is, naturally, different. For them, to maintain the greatest possible measure of political control over the colonies, amounts to the question of whether they will, in general, still be able to play some kind of an independent role as against the United States, and to the question of preserving at least part of their economic and political position in the world. That is why they are fighting so tenaciously to keep their colonies. . . .

Hence the paradoxical situation that the American financial magnates and monopoly leaders, who are conquering the capitalist world by means of their dollars and their commodities and carrying out the most extensive expansion, are parading with the "democratic idea" of the "liberation" of colonies, of giving "independence" and "freedom"; while Britain, which is fighting for its positions before the onslaughts of the U. S. dollar with the only weapons left to it as an imperialist power, is compelled to play the unpopular part of a gendarme of imperialism. It is obvious, therefore, that the U. S.

slogan on the "independence" of colonies, actually reveals a high degree of capitalist concentration, and coupled with this a tendency toward real world domination, concretely—a tendency of the U. S. monopolies to dominate the whole of the capitalist world. The American financial magnates believe they will succeed where the German imperialists failed.

Alongside these developments in the colonies and dependent countries, there is yet another process in progress—that of the increasing economic enslavement of independent countries, large and small, their formation into *de facto* dependent countries. Such a process, of course, does not mean anything fundamentally new in the capitalist world. But this process has now assumed tremendous proportions, and is developing, in the main, to the benefit of the finance capital of a single country — of the United States. Trade, monopoly unions, loans, investments, obstacles to the development of local industry, various forms of economic pressure, etc.—all these are the means through which American finance capital expands into the different capitalist countries.

That this economic enslavement spells the backwardness, the poverty, that it retards the development, of certain countries—is obvious. The economy of these countries does not serve the people but the finance capital of foreign countries. . . .

The political consequences are clear. Where economic interests

exist, political interests must also exist. That is why interference in the domestic affairs of the "independent" countries has today become the principal method of imperialist policy.

Speaking, for instance, of American investments in South America, and of the political advantages of joint investments—*i.e.*, of joint investments of United States and local South American capital in certain concerns, the *Economist* wrote on June 8, 1946:

How to be safe, as well as profitable, has long bothered foreign investors in Latin America. . . . United States businessmen have turned to new and less risky forms of investment. Most popular is the technique of joint investment—the organization of companies with both United States and local capital and, typically, more native participation in management than has been usual in the past. . . .

But the method of "joint investments," which is now being mainly applied by U. S. finance capital, has another significant aspect. It enables American finance capital to merge with the finance capital of other countries, and to intertwine the entire economic life of different countries. It is no longer a guest because it has the protection of the local bourgeoisie. In this way it not only exerts pressure on the domestic policies of the different countries, but also on the foreign policy and on the foreign economic connections. Those who have had the opportunity of watching the disciplined manner

in which, not only the vast majority of South-American, but many other countries as well, voted at recent international conferences for the proposals put forward by the U.S.A., and the manner in which the policy of the latter was frequently carried out through these very States, will have no difficulty in discerning the hand of American finance capital at the back of the attitude of the delegations of these countries.

Although such a policy of "independence" of colonies, and of economic dependence of "independent countries" is proving successful today, from the point of view of big finance capital and of the imperialist system, it nevertheless also affects capitalism very unfavorably in many ways. All these occurrences reflect, it is true, the gigantic concentration of finance capital and its expansion on an unprecedented scale, but they, at the same time, reflect the weaknesses of the imperialist order. Open annexations, the bringing of colonies under political rule or political and military pressure, were far more reliable weapons of imperialism in the past. These weapons are no longer adequate, although this does not mean, of course, that the imperialists will not make very extensive use of them if no other means are available. On the other hand, however, the methods of economic expansion we have just described involve constant interference in the domestic affairs of certain countries on the part of imperialists. It can achieve a certain

measure of success, but is bound to expose the national bourgeoisie and the local reactionary forces, as agents of foreign imperialism, in the eyes of the people, and isolate them from the masses. Such methods, therefore, contribute to the sharpening of internal contradictions in the different countries. On the one hand, the reactionary forces resort to violence and to the violation of democratic rights, while, on the other, the democratic and anti-imperialist movements embrace increasingly large masses of the people and draw them into the struggle against foreign imperialist pressure and the local agents of foreign imperialism.

And, thus, some of the trends of present-day imperialism contain a typical and ineluctable contradiction: striving for world domination, imperialism creates conditions in the colonies for the growth of resistance against the imperialist system. All this, of course, can only still further sharpen the general crisis of capitalism.

V

Such are the perspectives facing the capitalist world as it is moving toward a new economic crisis whose consequences are still difficult to foresee, but which will undoubtedly result in even greater and more numerous political crises in different parts of the world. To believe that the capitalist world will in the near future achieve stability and internal peace, would mean to harbor a great

illusion. For, the antagonisms of which we have already spoken are bound to lead to new conflicts in all spheres. And so the world, which had so eagerly yearned and still yearns for peace, is in danger, although it will not have war now, of not acquiring peace either—unless democratic mankind opposes the pernicious activities of the capitalist monopolies. We have "peace" today, but war is raging in Greece, in Indonesia, in China, in Indochina, in the Philippines, in Palestine, in Spain, in Iran, etc., because such are the laws of imperialist expansion. Who can say but that to these centers, new ones will not be added tomorrow, far more important ones which will perturb the imperialist system far more deeply. In short, the capitalist world is faced with a period of unrest and turmoil in which more or less sharp clashes between the imperialist reactionary forces and the democratic, anti-imperialist forces will take place. These forces of democracy will still increase in strength, and it is also obvious that the labor movement, particularly in the European countries, has not yet reached its post-war peak.

It is essential that freedom-loving mankind should grasp the full extent of the peril of the present expansion of capitalist monopolies and finance capital. The democratic forces in the capitalist countries could make no greater mistake than to allow themselves to be deluded by the fact that they still have formal democratic rights, that their country en-

joys formal independence, and forget whence the main danger arises. There is today practically not a single second-rate capitalist country into which foreign monopolies have not penetrated and placed it to a greater or lesser degree, in an economic, and, hence, in a political state of dependence upon foreign finance capital. Today this expansion is still, in a certain measure, concealed in phrases about democracy and freedom. Tomorrow, in the measure in which the internal contradictions of capitalism acquire an increasingly acute form, because of the economic and general crisis of capitalism, the monopolies will display an even greater tendency to thrust one country after the other into an ever deeper state of political reaction and toward fascism.

The main target of these monopolist circles will be the progressive democratic forces in all countries, and more particularly in the countries where these forces are in power. There can be no doubt but that the leading monopolists will, more than ever, endeavor to settle their internal imperialist contradictions by increasing their struggle against the progressive forces. And this for the simple reason that they are impelled to do so by the internal weakness of the imperialist system, which is, in its turn, a result of the sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism.

This tendency makes itself felt every day in the home affairs of the capitalist countries. If we leave aside

such c
is pract
which v
sharp s
strivings
called "
the reviv
organiz
and inc
reaction
Behind
finance
trusts a
First W
financed
ency is
contradi
Obvious
political
is in a c
fusion a
among
masses
of the
more th
like to
It is pe
regime
palatabl
as the
while c
as a clo
exploita
trampling
parasitic
present
however
the tru
political
and wh
scious
their c

such cases as that of Greece, there is practically not one country in which we do not see a more or less sharp struggle between democratic strivings and tendencies toward so-called "strong governments," toward the revival of semi-fascist and fascist organizations, toward the grouping and increased activity of extreme reactionary Right-wing elements. Behind all this stand the circles of finance capital and of monopoly trusts and cartels, just as after the First World War, they backed and financed Adolf Hitler. This tendency is all the more active as the contradictions increase in acuity. Obviously, the more backward the political consciousness of the masses is in a certain country, the more confusion and lack of activity there is among the masses, the more these masses have been deluded by phrases of the reactionary politicians—the more the ruling capitalist elements like to rant with democratic phrases. It is perfectly clear today, that the regime of bourgeois democracy is palatable to imperialism only so long as the masses live in darkness and while democratic phrases can serve as a cloak for the shameful picture of exploitation and oppression, of the trampling of justice and truth, of parasitism and decay, offered by present day imperialism. When, however, the masses begin to discern the truth, when the level of their political consciousness begins rising, and when they begin to play a conscious part in the political life of their country, then the monopolist

propagators of "freedom from fear" begin forgetting their "democratic principles." . . .

For all these reasons, the reactionary forces have made, and are still making, every endeavor to turn the United Nations Organization and its institutions into a sort of international police organization—possibly into something reminiscent of the Holy Alliance in the first part of the nineteenth century. . . . No effort was spared in order to abolish the right of "veto." It is, however, perfectly obvious what lies at the back of all this. It is, in essence, a tendency to make the United Nations Organization, by means of the method of out-voting, into the instrument of a bloc or grouping of States, or even of a single State. The organization for the collective safeguarding of peace would thus be transformed into an instrument of imperialist expansion, into a weapon for preparing new wars. The very principle of collective security would thereby be discarded and sacrificed to imperialist aims.

It is the task of the democratic forces to frustrate all such attempts and to wage a tenacious struggle in order to make the United Nations Organization into a genuine collective custodian of peace. The struggle for true democracy within each capitalist country, and the struggle for a democratic peace and democratic cooperation among nations, are obviously closely bound up.

All these facts, therefore, confront all the democratic, freedom-loving

forces of the world with important tasks in the sphere of international politics, tasks upon whose solution, ultimately, hinges the result of the struggle between the forces of reaction and the forces of progress inside each country. It is, in the first place, essential that democratic forces should cooperate closely, and give one another active support in the struggle for a genuinely democratic peace and cooperation among nations. It is clear where the main danger lies, and freedom-loving mankind must see to it actively that

it is not once again driven into a catastrophe by the forces of imperialist reaction and of fascism. Any attempt to underrate the importance of the factor of international politics, or to confine oneself exclusively to domestic problems, or to withdraw into some sort of "neutrality" in the field of international politics, is bound to result in the defeat of those who make such an attempt. Just as peace is indivisible, so is the struggle for genuine democracy indivisible. . .



A CO
UNDE
LECTI

SOVIE
OF
by Jo
brary

Dr.
(narrow
with i
principl
they are
tinct co
and cor
cal mat

To w
equippe
Marxism
self-evid
pointed
and soci
without
read his
who ha
dice tha
thing a
contain
let alon
ville, co
has stu
Marx, I
is able
without
It migh
Somerv

BOOK REVIEWS

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE UNDERSTANDING OF DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM

SOVIET PHILOSOPHY, A STUDY OF THEORY AND PRACTICE, by John Somerville, Philosophical Library, Inc., New York, 1946. \$3.75.

Dr. Somerville's *Soviet Philosophy* (narrowly entitled, since what it deals with is Marxism-Leninism, whose principles are as valid in the U.S. as they are in the Soviet Union) is a distinct contribution to the dissemination and correct understanding of dialectical materialism in this country.

To write this work, Dr. Somerville equipped himself with a study of Marxism. Lest this be considered a self-evident pre-requisite, it may be pointed out that there are philosophers and social scientists who "refute" Marx without having taken the trouble to read him. And there are many others who have read Marx with such prejudice that they are unable to assert one thing about Marxism which does not contain the grossest errors of reporting, let alone of interpretation. Dr. Somerville, contrary to these men, not only has studied carefully the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, but is able to transmit what he has learned without resorting to academic jargon. It might also be pointed out that Dr. Somerville visited the Soviet Union,

learned the Russian language, and discussed the theory and practice of Soviet society with leading scholars in that country. In short, Dr. Somerville's book is a product of ripe thinking over a philosophy that guides the life of the Soviet Union and that is organizing and mobilizing hundreds of millions of people to fight for their emancipation from imperialist exploitation and oppression.

Dr. Somerville knows how to deal with the interpretation of theory and practice, the bedrock of dialectical materialism. He, therefore, is able to refute false notions about Soviet practice effectively and convincingly. This is indeed the reason that Sidney Hook fell afoul of Dr. Somerville in an ethically low "review" in the *Nation*. Sidney Hook, who can no longer distinguish between fact and nightmare and whose corroded imagination causes him to see diabolic gappayoo men disguised as ink in Soviet fountain pens, clearly objects to the fact that Dr. Somerville presents the basic principles of dialectical and historical materialism without slanderous attacks on the Soviet Union and without insinuating that he knows more about Marxism than Marx did himself.

It is Dr. Somerville's honesty of approach that makes his book so important today. Prompted as he was by his recognition that friendship between America and the Soviet Union is the urgent need of the world, Dr. Somer-

ville makes it his task to clear away many misconceptions about the Soviet Union which are assiduously circulated throughout America by reaction, by the "liberal" dupes of reaction, and by the Trotskyites.

Therefore, though in form *Soviet Philosophy* is not polemical, it is an effective weapon in the struggle against those who live by trampling on life and truth. The very arrangement of the book is designed to aid the reader intent on finding a philosophy which answers the urgent questions of social existence. Instead of starting with an account of dialectical materialism, Dr. Somerville launches his book with a simple and vivid account of the class struggle, its connection with the forces of production, its pervasiveness in the entire superstructure, the nature and causes of revolution, and the meaning of socialism and communism. With this clean-cut rendering of what he calls "Basic Perspective: The Theory of Historical Materialism," Dr. Somerville provides a basis for the examination of the theory and practice of the Soviet Union. Then, in part two, Dr. Somerville proceeds to discuss dialectical materialism, its laws and logic. This part contains also a summary of the Soviet Union's major philosophical discussions which centered about the struggle against mechanical materialism and idealism in Marxist guises. The work concludes with some indications as to how philosophy is taught in the Soviet Union and a listing of source materials, briefly characterized.

• • •

Such is the framework of Dr. Somerville's book. Its style is easy, sober, and

objective, aside from one or two short literary flights which render its thought less transparent than it might be.

What is the merit of this work? The answer is: in that Dr. Somerville demonstrates that he was guided by the Marxist-Leninist idea that truth is concrete and therefore the scientific analysis of any subject must bear in mind that everything depends on conditions, time, and place. With this idea as his guiding lines, Dr. Somerville examines the meaning of democracy, dictatorship, freedom, "totalitarianism," ethics, art, formal logic, etc.

A fine illustration of Dr. Somerville's approach is his discussion of democracy. He insists that democracy has a history, and that if it is to be anything more than a beautiful phrase, must have relevance to the life of society as a whole, and not to mere governmental forms. He shows why the one-party system in the Soviet Union was an absolute necessity in order to guarantee democracy in economic, politics, in social, racial and national relations. Dr. Somerville examines Lenin's penetrating distinction between democracy as a *state* and the principle of the subordination of the minority to the majority. As a state, that is, as an apparatus involving armed forces, police, and criminal courts, and prisons, democracy will wither away after Communism is established on a world scale. But this does not by any means signify that the principle or spirit of democracy will wither away. On the contrary, says Dr. Somerville, "This principle may permeate social life whether there is a state or not, and, under Communism, will be expected to." And he adds: "Moreover, so

long
a dem
sense
letariat
Dr.
that th
of not
dictato
simply
swayed
by rea
ville n
league

Ab
ceedin
spread
some
democ
tions o
by de
our ov
on the
cratic

Dr.
bring
tangle
gives
deed i
Selsam
Ethics
citation
deeply
and s
indivi
ity. A
discus
quite
moral
salacie
teristi
the p
Th
been

long as a state is necessary, it must be a democratic state. Lenin speaks in this sense of the dictatorship of the proletariat. . . ." (Pp. 43-4.)

Dr. Somerville makes quite clear that those who accuse the Soviet Union of not being democratic because it is a dictatorship of the working class are simply permitting themselves to be swayed by linguistic imaginings, not by realities. And surely, Dr. Somerville must have had some of his colleagues in mind when he wrote:

Above all, we must avoid the exceedingly childish but rather widespread notion that if we admit that some other country has attained any democratic objectives through institutions different from ours, we are thereby derogating from the greatness of our own country, or casting aspersions on the principles familiar to our democratic tradition. (p. 49.)

Dr. Somerville knows, too, how to bring clarity into such a traditionally tangled subject as ethics, of which he gives a succinct summary, the best indeed in this country since Dr. Howard Selsam's comprehensive *Socialism and Ethics*. This chapter is enlivened by citations from Gorki's passionate and deeply thought-out views on bourgeois and socialist humanism, on bourgeois individualism and socialist individuality. And Dr. Somerville, refusing to discuss anything abstractly, makes quite clear the difference between sex morality in the Soviet Union and the salacious treatment of sex as a characteristic form of capitalist enterprise and the product of that "free" enterprise.

This fine chapter might well have been rounded out by a paragraph or

two on John Dewey's ethical notions, since Dr. Somerville mentions them, in the name of Soviet thinkers, as "weak." This, of course, is insufficient. Dewey's notion that the nature of the end is determined by the nature of the means, and that "bad means" can result only in bad ends, is reactionary. For if we were to follow this notion through, we should have to say that the means used to get rid of fascism, namely, shooting the fascists out of existence, were bad. Indeed, John Dewey's notions of the relationship of means to ends boils down to the following: a classless society is good, but if you use the class struggle as a means of attaining it, you will never get to the classless society. In short, what Dewey advocates is passivity in the face of the *status quo* of imperialism. For that reason, Soviet thinkers condemn Dewey's philosophy as a subtle servant of reaction. By pointing this out, Dr. Somerville could have strengthened his argument.

* * *

One of the most rewarding chapters deals with socialist realism and the arts. Since there is still a vast amount of confusion on this topic, Dr. Somerville has performed a service in including it within the scope of his work. Clearly expounded is the controversy between the vulgar sociologists who narrow down the Marxist-Leninist class approach to problems of literature, and the dialectical materialists who insist that works of art reflect reality and that this reality is not co-extensive with the class psychology of the artist. It is shown that if the views of the vulgar sociologists were accepted, they would render impossible any explanation of how a Shakespeare or a Balzac can

have any value whatsoever to the working class, except as mere historical figures who produced mere historical documents. Indeed, it is because art is a rendering of objective reality in certain forms, which rendering often forces the artist to transcend his class origin, that it becomes possible for an artist to leave his class and to identify himself with the working class.

Following his account of the deficiencies of vulgar sociology in the arts, Dr. Somerville, basing himself on Lenin, gives a clear picture of the Soviet attitude to the art and artists of the past, and also how and why Soviet writers are socialist realists in their works. This is so well done that the reader is eager for an analysis of a very important question for the writers and artists in the world dominated by capitalism, namely, how are the creative talents in the bourgeois sphere of influence to be judged? Dr. Somerville's insight in his chapter on the arts makes one hope that he will take up this point in a future book, publication of which is hinted at in his preface.

On the question of the relationship of politics and art, it is held, as Dr. Somerville puts it, that the most artistic works have the most political value, for "their political value consists primarily in the fidelity with which they reflect the complex reality in and through which politics moves." This thought is important, for, from it, we may conclude that art is neither nightcap nor bludgeon, but a sensitized weapon for the expansion of beauty and progress against those who would enchain history.

• • •

Of major importance in Dr. Somerville's brief exposition of dialectical

materialism is his flexible handling of the basic law of dialectics, the unity and conflict of opposites. This flexibility is most evident in his brilliant discussion of the nature and limitations of formal logic and its relationship to dialectical logic. It would be difficult to find anywhere in the English writings on Marxism a clearer statement of the meaning of Lenin's profound note to the effect that the *unity* of opposites is relative, while the *conflict* of opposites is absolute. This distinction is of the utmost importance for the understanding of modern revisionism which is rooted in the notion that the unity of opposites is becoming absolute, while the struggle of opposites is diminishing. In other words, that the classes are getting together on a permanent basis, while their struggle tends to die down. The harmony of opposites is the essential meaning of Browder revisionism which tries to stand Lenin's proposition on its head.

Dr. Somerville also presents to the readers a short summary of the struggle against mechanistic materialism and against the idealist distortions of Marxism in the Soviet Union. Although this interesting chapter enumerates the major points at issue, it does not tie up these points in the crucial knot of all the controversies. This was the failure of both the mechanical materialists and the "menshevizing idealists" to understand that Leninism is a further and higher stage in the development of materialist dialectics. Because neither had been able to grasp the significance of Lenin's achievements as a philosopher, they adopted positions that deviated from dialectical materialism itself. The mechanists tried to do away with philosophy altogether; the "mes-

shvizing
Marxian
lectics.
were un
tice, sci
ist man
does no
standing
ship in
Lenin's
theory
was to
concrete
epoch
the no
philoso
of the
acter o
Failu
higher
leads I
ing of
terialis
struggl
talism,
other v
That
all pos
day. I
crisis i
a resu
Lenin
in sci
dologi
achiev
longer
idealism
What
tists t
their
cal ph
theref
revolu
were
bourg

shevizing idealists" tried to convert Marxian dialectics into Hegelian dialectics. Both, as Dr. Somerville shows, were unable to link up theory and practice, science and philosophy in a Marxist manner. Neither, as Dr. Somerville does not show, had the slightest understanding of Lenin's idea of partisanship in philosophy. And yet, one of Lenin's contributions to the Marxist theory of the class nature of philosophy was to render that conception more concrete under the conditions of the epoch of imperialism by introducing the notion of the party character of philosophy. This means the deepening of the Marxist thesis of the active character of dialectical materialism.

Failure to deal with Leninism as a higher stage in dialectical materialism leads Dr. Somerville to an underplaying of the significance of Lenin's *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* in the struggle against positivism, instrumentalism, and the thousand and one other varieties of shamefaced idealism. That work is a decisive refutation of all possible forms of obscurantism today. It is so because it analyzed the crisis in science which brought about a resurgence of idealist doctrines. What Lenin demonstrated was that the crisis in science was predominantly methodological in character. The colossal achievements of science could no longer be confined in mechanistic, idealistic, or mystical frameworks. What was necessary was for the scientists to see that the dialectic results of their experiments necessitated dialectical philosophical conclusions. The crisis therefore resided in the fact that the revolutionary achievements of science were in conflict with all forms of bourgeois thought, and that only

through dialectical materialism could the crisis be solved. Further, Lenin conclusively demonstrated that the idealist seizure of science could not be stopped by vulgar materialism, since the fixed notions of matter entertained by this materialism were shattered by the developments of science. Here Lenin made a tremendous contribution in distinguishing between the structure of matter and matter as a philosophic category.

Dr. Somerville does not make enough of this important distinction. The former is the province of the sciences, the latter of philosophy. What we know about matter at any given moment is relative, is a closer approximation to the complete truth about it, but that matter exists independent of our consciousness and is the objective source of our sensations is absolutely true. Dr. Somerville deals with this in various places in his book, but not always with sufficient clarity. And somehow, he arrives at a definition of matter in which the theory of reality is separated from the theory of knowledge. "Matter," he says, "is the general name of the objective source in which all things are rooted." This definition is inadequate, for it lends itself to the implication that a distinction is present between matter and "all things." All things *are* matter; they are not "rooted" in matter. Kant might agree with the formulation and say: We can know all things, but we cannot know the objective source (matter) in which these things are rooted. Lenin's simple statement on this point: "Matter is that which, acting upon our sense-organs, produces sensation; matter is the objective reality given to us in sensation," is important because it shows that for

Lenin, any separation of the theory of reality (ontology) from the theory of knowledge (epistemology) was unreal and, hence, scholastic. Dialectical materialism looks upon them as constituting a unity.



Summed up, *Soviet Philosophy* is a first-rate contribution to an understanding of dialectical materialism. It is a mine of stimulating and suggestive thinking. In addition to its qualities of scholarship and penetration, which are

revealed from the very first page, it is earthy in illustration and practical in the Marxist sense of the term. Its appearance is a tribute to the integrity and honesty of thought of really democratic scholars whose numbers in America are greater than is calculated by the superficial observer.

Dr. Somerville has set a bold example to his colleagues in the universities and colleges. We hope it will stimulate the writing of more works of *Soviet Philosophy's* attainment and caliber.

page, it
practical
firm. Its
tegrity an
democrac
America
the sup

a bold
he univer
will stim
works
ment