

# POLITICAL AFFAIRS

*A magazine devoted  
to the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism*

## EDITORIAL BOARD

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

ABNER W. BERRY, ALEXANDER BITTELMAN, JACK STACHEL

VOLUME XXVI, NO. 10

## *Contents*

OCTOBER, 1947

The Battle for the Youth	<i>William Z. Foster</i>	867
Student America Convenes!	<i>Marvin Shaw</i>	872
The Inter-American Conference	<i>Joseph Starobin</i>	887
Electoral Coalition Problems in New York	<i>S. W. Gerson</i>	894
Poland's Economy and Socialism	<i>Hilary Minc</i>	902
A Program for Agriculture	<i>Lem Harris</i>	910
Two Years of the Reconstituted Communist Party in the South	<i>Nat Ross</i>	923
The Social-Democratic Parties and Labor Unity	<i>S. Ivanov</i>	936
Current Economic Trends	<i>Labor Research Association</i>	950
BOOK REVIEW:		
Foster Reports on the New Europe	<i>Steve Nelson</i>	956

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.

## 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.

Required reading for an understanding of Marxist esthetics.

Price: \$1.85

---

## FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT— Selections from his Writings

By DR. PHILIP S. FONER

This, the latest in the "Builders of the Nation Series," consists of excerpts from President Roosevelt's writings, addresses, messages to Congress, etc.

A reading of the Roosevelt program in these excerpts exposes the pretensions of the Truman Administration and shows how completely the Roosevelt program has been abandoned in favor of reactionary policies.

Price: 40 cents

---

## LABOR FACT BOOK 8

Prepared by LABOR RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

Production and consumption figures, trends toward industrial concentration and monopoly, social and economic status of the Negro people, wages in relation to productivity, strikes, the leading organizations behind the drive for anti-labor legislation.

Price: \$2.00

**NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS**  
**832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.**

THE  
THE

THE M  
maturi  
can be  
titude  
try. It  
in all  
class a  
tions  
nomic,  
—are a  
scious.  
they co  
tion to  
at leas  
generat  
that th  
nifican  
the fut  
they sy  
of the  
and or  
eration.  
The  
world,  
ing te  
class, h  
fort to  
on its  
guard  
democr  
fill the  
propaga  
Its chu  
the yo  
seek ne

# THE BATTLE FOR THE YOUTH

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

THE MEASURE OF THE EXPERIENCE and maturity of any social movement can be accurately measured by its attitude toward the youth of its country. It is significant, therefore, that in all countries the capitalist ruling class and its subordinate organizations of all types—political, economic, religious, cultural, and others—are always very highly “youth conscious.” Almost without exception, they constantly pay very close attention to winning the support of, or at least control over, the younger generation. Their activities indicate that they are very alert to the significance of the truism that the future belongs to the youth, and they systematically take guarantees of the future by propagandizing and organizing the developing generation.

The capitalist class all over the world, as a vital part of its governing techniques as the dominant class, has always devoted much effort to the task of getting the youth on its side. Its schools, carefully guarded from revolutionary and democratic influences, systematically fill the youths' heads with capitalist propaganda, misnamed “education.” Its churches, along with teaching the young people religious ideas, seek no less to inculcate in their

minds a loyalty to the capitalist order of society. Its industrial system always places as a special point in its activities the ideological corruption of the working class youth. Its military organizations are vast systems for mobilizing and training the youth for armed defense of the capitalists' prerogatives and exploitations. Its radio, press, and popular literature incessantly sound the slogans of capitalism in the ears of young people, and its organized sports movement is saturated through and through with capitalist ideology. With these and many other means, the capitalists strive, with all too much success, to win the fighting, progressive qualities of the youth to the maintenance of its social system.

The intense cultivation of the youth, in all these various ways, has long been a characteristic of capitalism in every country, but this youth-consciousness of the capitalists reached its apex with the prewar growth of fascism in Italy, Germany, and many other countries in various quarters of the globe.

With the fascists, youth became a veritable cult. The fascists, to win their way to complete political dictatorship, needed mass enthusiasm, recklessness, and a bold fighting spirit. These qualities they found in abundance in the youth. Hence, everywhere, with resolute determination, they concentrated upon winning the young generation, girls as well as boys.

Often, in their eagerness to capture the youth, the fascists even ig-

nored or minimized the adult workers and other key sections of the masses of the population. They went out to capture the youth at all costs. Sometimes, in their eagerness, they even adopted absurd measures in order to give their movement a youth appearance, such as the systematic concealment of Hitler's birthdays (so that the people would not realize that he was aging), or the ridiculous publicized athletic stunt put on by the plump Mussolini and his puffing Cabinet members and other so-called glorifications of youth.

Fascism, of course, was (and is) the dictatorship of the most reactionary sections of finance capital; but by virtue of its intense attention to capturing the younger generation, it usually appeared very much in the guise of a youth movement. For it was primarily the youth who formed the fighting fasci of Mussolini and the stormtroopers of Hitler. It was chiefly the youth who fought the fascists through to power in every country where the latter managed to seize control. So youth-conscious were (and are) the fascists that during the late war they actually succeeded in winning the support, or at least the tolerance, even of many young people in the various countries occupied and downtrodden by Hitler's troops. And they accomplished this ideological corruption while the great bulk of the more adult population was violently anti-Hitlerite.

Although the capitalists, and above all their fascist agents, have

always been fundamentally youth-conscious, the same, unfortunately, cannot be said of the labor, cooperative, Socialist, and Communist movements. In the main, during the crucial prewar period, these movements grossly underestimated the significance and vital political importance of the youth. True, they all paid considerable attention to the youth, but their youth activities were relatively insignificant in comparison with the intense youth concentration of the fascists. The democratic movements before World War II, in their efforts to grow and to establish themselves, turned their major attention to winning the adult workers. They almost universally neglected the youth. A great exception to this neglect was the Soviet Union, which has always been highly youth-conscious, in fact even more so than the fascists themselves. But this was only an exception to the general rule, because even the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries, although they were not so negligent in this respect as the trade unions, cooperatives, and Socialist Parties, nevertheless grievously neglected work among the youth. The general result of all this underestimation of the youth by the labor movements of prewar days was that Hitler, Mussolini, and other fascist leaders largely ran away with the younger people, and the workers' organizations paid with their very existence for their negligence.

The various branches of the general movement of labor and the peo-

ple  
blind  
ler d  
much  
the y  
extre  
youth  
union  
the L  
ings,  
scious  
win t  
of de  
social  
that t  
the n  
happe  
Now  
bearing  
the A  
the po  
the po  
more  
the U  
talists  
man  
slavish  
embar  
gram  
regime  
tablish  
domin  
this th  
youth.  
reactio  
youth  
spirit  
would-  
their b  
the ur  
score o  
under

ple in Europe have not remained blind, however, to their whole Hitler development. They have learned much from the fascists' capture of the youth. They now recognize the extreme folly of neglecting the youth. As a result, the Left-led trade unions, the Communist Parties, and the Left-Socialist Parties and groupings, are today all very youth-conscious and are actively seeking to win the young people for the cause of democracy and Socialism. These social movements are determined that the prewar debacle regarding the neglect of the youth shall not happen a second time.

Now, all this has an important bearing, in a most direct sense, upon the American situation. Nowhere in the postwar world is the question of the political leadership of the youth more vital than it is right here in the United States. For the big capitalists of this country, with the Truman Administration and Congress slavishly doing their bidding, have embarked upon an aggressive program to set up an ultra-reactionary regime in this country, and to establish Wall Street's imperialist domination over the world; and for this they need the support of the youth. Their whole drive toward reactionary goals, including its youth aspects, is animated with the spirit of fascism. The American would-be world conquerors, like their brother-in-spirit, Hitler, realize the urgent necessity of having the score of millions of young people under their control if they are to

succeed in their plans of unbounded exploitation and domination. Hence, they are out to capture the youth with any means in their power. Their drive to win the younger generation has not, of course, reached the intensity that characterized the fascist movements of prewar Europe, but it is definitely heading in that direction.

The drive of American reaction to win the youth is proceeding along many channels. In the schools and colleges, a vigorous campaign is being pushed to extinguish all democratic ideals and to saturate the student body with Red-baiting and Soviet-hating ideas. In the realm of industry, the National Association of Manufacturers, with its protégé, the Junior Achievement (Inc.), is busily seeking to corrupt the youth for its own reactionary purposes. All the various religious and other large youth organizations are under the pressure of Jew-haters and Red-baiters. The American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, both agents of Wall Street big capital, are also sowing the seeds of imperialist, war-making poison into the minds of the millions of younger veterans under their leadership. And the Truman Administration, plus the Republicans in Congress, is trying hard to put across universal military training, which is a major part of the widespread campaign now going on in all the fields of publicity and education to mobilize the youth of this country behind the banners of Wall Street and

for a program that leads to economic collapse, fascism, imperialist aggression, and war.

Many signs indicate that the youth are highly resistant to Wall Street's attempt to enlist them as union-busters and cannon fodder. On the college campuses there are many strong and progressive youth developments; in the trade unions the younger elements are characterized by their militantly democratic spirit; and among the war veterans many popular polls, as well as various mass indications, show that this group of youth is definitely on the progressive side. In short, despite the terrific reactionary pressure and barrage of imperialist and anti-democratic propaganda to which the youth are at present being subjected, the young people are showing strong progressive tendencies. The youth of this country are now fairly clamoring for strong progressive support and leadership.

However, there is a grave danger, if this support and leadership will not be forthcoming, that the youth will become more and more susceptible to the wiles of the capitalists. The young people of this country face many difficult problems. They find both their present outlook and their future perspectives most uncertain and precarious. Hosts of them are unable to find homes in which to live. Millions more are unable to get married and to establish families. Already the deadly disease of unemployment is beginning to spread among their ranks.

As a result, there is a growing realization by the youth of the instability of present-day capitalism. This is to the good, but what can be dangerous is the wrong conclusions they often draw from collapsing capitalism. For militant, aggressive youth demand categorical and definite solutions to all these burning questions and problems. If satisfactory answers are not given them by the progressive forces, there is always the keen danger that the young people will listen to the blandishments of reactionary demagogues. The outstanding success of Hitler with the demoralized and confused youth of Germany and Europe should be a sufficient instruction for us on this point.

As matters now stand in the United States, the youth are being sadly neglected by the various sections of the labor and progressive movement, even more so, in many respects, than the way these same forces neglected them in Europe in the prewar days. Even the Communists share in this neglect, which is all the more inexcusable in view of the great influence they exercised in the powerful and progressive youth movement of ten or twelve years ago. Let our Party and labor generally beware of the danger of neglecting the youth.

One of the greatest weaknesses of all sections of the progressive movement of this country is the tendency to leave the youth to its own devices. The assumption is that the young people will take care of themselves

in an  
their  
not r  
This  
ror. M  
organ  
carry  
tivities  
The  
recog  
the b  
sive r  
given  
port v  
tion.

nore  
conse

The  
in this  
winni  
major  
trade  
to wa  
youth  
sibilit  
the A  
ceptio  
C.I.O.  
much  
intoler  
in de  
Ameri  
pay r  
the un  
Yugos  
pean c

The

tentive

in an organized way and look after their own problems. For, have they not many big youth organizations? This idea is, of course, a great error. Naturally, the youth have strong organizations of various kinds that carry on all sorts of progressive activities. But all this is not enough. The youth must be extended full recognition as a very vital part of the branch of the labor and progressive movement. And they must be given all the collaboration and support which goes with such recognition. Tendencies to isolate or to ignore the youth can have disastrous consequences.

The new third party developing in this country will have to make the winning of the youth one of its major objectives. Especially the trade unions, too, will have to start to wake up to the vital role of the youth and also to their own responsibilities. As it is, the youth work of the A. F. of L. unions, with rare exceptions, is about zero. And the C.I.O.'s work in this field is not much greater. All this constitutes an intolerable situation. The unions, in defense of themselves and of American democracy, must begin to pay real attention to the youth, as the unions of France, Italy, Poland, Yugoslavia, and many other European countries are now doing.

The unions should take care attentively of the demands of youth

in industry, especially on questions of wages, opportunities, and general training regulations. The unions, too, should develop a vast network of youth sports, organizations and activities. They should build up, too, elaborate activities to utilize the leisure and promote the culture of the youth.

Active youth work is a "must" for any trade union movement that is alert to the dynamic quality of the younger generations and that realizes the imperative task of winning them over to its side in the very difficult struggles ahead.

In the United States there are some 22,000,000 boys and girls between the ages of 16 and 21 years, of whom about 9,000,000 are workers. This is a stupendous force, full of the most dynamic potentialities. It must be won for the cause of peace and democracy. But there is no assurance that the youth will be automatically on the side of this progress. The most powerful reaction in our country is avidly striving to capture and use the youth for its own profit-hungry, warmongering purposes. Therefore, if labor and the progressive forces want the youth, they must fight for them. The question of who will win the Battle for the Youth now going on in our country, is one of the most decisive political issues that the American people have to confront.

# STUDENT AMERICA CONVENES!

By MARVIN SHAW

THE FOUNDING Constitutional Convention of the United States National Student Association, which was held at the University of Wisconsin from August 30 to September 7, marked a milestone in the development of the postwar American student movement. Nearly one thousand delegates, alternates, and observers, representing 1,100,000 students on 350 campuses, as well as 18 national organizations, wrote a constitution, adopted a program, and elected officers for an organization that can well become of decisive importance in both the American and international youth fields.

The Constitutional Convention was called by the National Continuations Committee of the precedent-breaking Chicago Conference of Students held last Christmas, which was itself a result of the World Student Congress that established the International Union of Students at a meeting in Prague during the summer of 1946.\* In the eight-month period since the Chicago conference, the embryonic N.S.A. began to es-

\* "The Reawakening of the American Student Movement," in the February, 1947, issue of *Political Affairs*, discusses the Chicago Conference of Students and the World Student Congress in greater detail.

tablish itself on both a national and regional level. The call to the convention met with a response which in itself was testimony to the efforts of the members of the National Continuations Committee and the student leaders cooperating with it.

## A YEAR OF GROWING ACTIVITY

It was much more than organizational efforts, however, that caused students to interrupt their vacations and come from every section of the country to the University of Wisconsin. The past year has been one of growing movement, activity, and struggle on the American campus.

Not all of this was by choice. In the case of the hard-fought battles for academic freedom and students' rights, reaction forced students to face the realization that the preservation of freedom of thought, enquiry, and organization was under serious and severe attack. Led by the modern obscurantists of the Thomas-Rankin Un-American Committee, and aided by a press campaign of incredible proportions, reaction has attempted in about a dozen states to ban college clubs whose policies do not meet with approval, or which are, perhaps, simply raising issues for the campus to discuss. The Intercollegiate Division of the American Youth for Democracy has been the particular butt of these attacks. Its chapters have been banned in Colorado, California, Pennsylvania, New York, Il-



linois. Especially in Michigan, repression reached its height in the intimidation of individual students and their organization. Groups of other and varying views have also been victimized, including Student Federalist, A.V.C., Students for Democratic Action, Communist, and other clubs. These new developments, together with the traditional efforts of students to keep their college newspapers and student governments free from administrative and outside control, have made democracy on the campus a major issue.

Democracy on the campus, of course, implies something more than academic freedom. American education has long been notorious for its quota system, segregation, and discrimination. Students of Negro, Jewish, and Catholic background are not admitted into hundreds of institutions, or, at the most, are allowed to enter only in insignificant numbers. Graduate schools are particularly stringent in their discriminatory restrictions. The problem has a special relevancy in the South, where the system of segregated education on all levels serves to deprive Negro students of adequate primary and secondary education, and severely delimits training on the college and graduate level. Inadequate educational appropriations, of course, sharpen the problem.

In both North and South, widespread movements against quota systems and for the breaking down of

segregational barriers have sprung up. At the University of Texas, nearly the entire student body participated in a campaign for the admission of a Negro student to the University of Texas Law School. In New York State, the Austin-Mahoney Bill prohibiting discrimination in tax-exempt schools achieved the support of a large and militant student movement. Hundreds of students journeyed to the State Capitol to lobby for the bill, and it was only last-minute open opposition by the Roman Catholic hierarchy that kept it from being passed. Generally, throughout the country, efforts have been made to break down Jim-Crow practices in barber shops, social centers, bowling alleys, and cafeterias. The growth of student chapters of the N.A.A.C.P. also testifies to the desire of the American campus for an integrated, equal, and democratic educational system.

Economic problems affecting all students were of especial importance to the student veterans who make up 50 per cent of the college student body. Almost without exception, they found themselves unable to live on the \$65 or \$90 monthly subsistence payment they received under the G.I. Bill of Rights. The spiralling cost of living affecting food, rents, and to an increasing degree, tuition, has already forced an estimated 300,000 veterans out of school.

The movement for increased subsistence payments became, during the

spring of this year, the most important legislative activity conducted on the American campus. State-wide conferences of student veterans were held in a score of areas. Delegations to Washington testified before Congressional Committees, presenting in cold, hard facts the dire situation faced by a million veterans. A national committee called "Operation Subsistence" was formed to coordinate the efforts of student veteran organizations and to guarantee that pressure would be put on the proper legislators at the proper time. A bill that was considered impossible of passage at the opening of this so-called "Economy Congress" was thus forced through the Senate, and failed of passage during the last days of the session only because Republican leaders did not allow it to reach the floor. Parenthetically, it might be added that the defeat of the attempt of Rankin-minded Congressmen to add a "loyalty" rider to the subsistence bill was due largely to the efforts of student veterans, as well as other veterans' groups.

A student generation so close to a war in which so many participated is naturally showing tremendous concern about the peace for which they fought. This has been expressed, sometimes, through political meetings. The speeches of Henry Wallace on campuses in Michigan, Illinois, Minnesota, California, Texas, North Carolina, and many other states, gave sharp expression to the support of

and interest in, what came to be known as the Wallace Program. The 60,000 students who participated in the Wallace meetings are, of course, but a small section of the hundreds of thousands of college students who, in class-room sessions, debates, and round-table discussions, express their anxiety over the Truman Doctrine and the general direction of American foreign policy.

More often than not, however, the concern for peace was shown indirectly. Hundreds of students journeyed to Europe this summer on study tours and in reconstruction units in order to make some concrete contribution to world peace and understanding. It should be pointed out that many hundreds more might have gone abroad had it not been for the policy of the State Department. Thus, a group of Harvard University students, whose conservative political beliefs had been testified to by their dean, were refused visas by the State Department because their destination was the Yugoslav youth railway project. Also, after first cooperating with the American committee concerned, the State Department withdrew permission for use of government-sponsored ships by young people attending the World Youth Festival in Prague. In spite of this, however, 200 Americans, mainly students, did attend the Prague Festival.

It must be emphasized that all of the actions mentioned above were

only  
move  
sand  
freed  
nomi  
more  
impl  
realiz  
sive  
contr  
lar c  
conce  
viet U  
unite  
Wh  
is th  
durin  
to de  
The  
lated  
main  
reache  
opme  
ISSUE  
CO  
The  
tion v  
task  
a Con  
region  
Conve  
work  
a Con  
can, i  
democ  
questi  
were,  
directi  
in the  
large :

only the first stirrings of the student movement. While hundreds of thousands were involved in academic-freedom, anti-discrimination, economic, and political activities, many more were not. Nor were the full implications of the activities always realized. Often the Left and progressive sections of a campus did not contribute sufficiently to each particular campaign. Ideological confusion concerning Communists or the Soviet Union sometimes obstructed the united action the issues demanded.

What is most important, however, is that an atmosphere was created during the spring of 1947 that helped to determine decisions at Wisconsin. The delegates from small and isolated universities, as well as from the main collegiate centers, had been reached and affected by these developments and trends.

#### ISSUES AT THE CONVENTION

The first few days of the convention were concerned with the first task set before it—that of writing a Constitution. Out of the wealth of regional discussions held prior to the Convention, as well as through hard work during the sessions themselves, a Constitution was approved which can, in general, be characterized as democratic, fair, and efficient. Those questions which aroused controversy were, in every case, decided in the direction of greater democracy within the organization. Attempts to play large schools, which are attended by

the bulk of American students and whose liberal tradition is strongest, against small private and religious schools, were defeated.

On one question, concerning relations between the National Student Association and the existing national student organizations, the Convention allowed itself to be disoriented. Every proposal for the Constitution concerning cooperation was voted down, leaving to the incoming Executive Committee the difficult and really unnecessary problem of re-establishing contact on a national level. This action was partially due to the fear of many students that the national organizations, with their adult personnel, might come to dominate the N.S.A. In addition, some felt that the participation of the national organizations within the N.S.A. would provide some students with double representation, that is, through both their student council and their organizations. Unfortunately much subtle Red-baiting helped create additional confusion.

It is quite obvious that if the N.S.A. is effectively to carry out its program, it must develop some formal means of close contact and cooperation with the long-established, active national organizations, *e.g.*, the National Intercollegiate Christian Council (Y.M.-Y.W.C.A.), the National Federation of Catholic College Students, Students for Democratic Action, Young Progressive Citizens of America, American Youth for Democracy, Association

of Internes and Medical Students, the Council of Student Clubs of the Communist Party, and others. These organizations were among the founders of the N.S.A. They have cooperated actively with it in the past, and have expressed the desire to work together with it in the future. The N.S.A. and the student population as a whole will lose if this is not accomplished.

Quite naturally, most attention at the convention was paid to the program that will determine the activities of this powerful new student organization. On many issues a wide area of agreement was quickly found, and a program was adopted with little controversy on questions of principle.

The N.S.A. approved a student Bill of Rights which included:

The right of every student to a college education.

The right to conduct research freely.

The right of every student to exercise his full rights as a citizen in forming and participating in local, national or international organizations for intellectual, religious, social, political, economic, or cultural purposes, and to publish and distribute his views.

The right of students and recognized student organizations to use campus facilities.

The right to invite and hear speakers of their choice on subjects of their choice.

The right of students to engage freely in off-campus activities.

The right of establishing and issuing regular publications free of any censorship.

The right to establish democratic student governments.

The right of equal opportunity to enjoy these rights without regard to race, color, sex, national origin, religious creed, or political beliefs.

An attempt to exempt private schools, in general, from the provisions of this Bill of Rights was defeated, but, unfortunately, the small number of schools of a specifically sectarian character (*i.e.*, religious) were excepted. Catholic students thus lose a measure of protection they in particular need.

The N.S.A. called for the revision of the G.I. Bill of Rights and an increase in subsistence payments. A scholarship program for non-veterans, on the G.I. Bill of Rights model, which would provide Federal tuition and subsistence aid to qualified students, as well as general Federal aid to the states for education, was agreed upon as entailing primary legislative issues for the coming year. Academic freedom for faculty members was considered a major responsibility of the student movement.

#### SEGREGATION IN EDUCATION

Even before the Convention took place it became evident that the program on educational opportunity and

disc  
of  
So  
Roc  
dust  
New  
tice  
betw  
If it  
able  
rega  
ship  
the  
gres  
cam  
poli  
that  
as in  
mus  
clear  
not  
discr  
M  
the  
felt  
calli  
of  
aide  
was  
rega  
an  
the  
equa  
segr  
only  
tem,  
and  
pens  
tems  
diffic

discrimination would arouse some of the most heated controversy.

Some observers, for example John Roche of the Student League of Industrial Democracy, writing in the *New Leader*, felt that "... in practice the N.S.O. will have to choose between being nationwide or liberal. If it is nationwide it would be unable to take a position on racial segregation without losing its membership in states where that practice is the law." On the other hand, progressives believed that the American campus had already decided on a policy of democracy in education, that this was true in the South as well as in the North, and that the N.S.A. must, from the very beginning, make clear that its principled stand would not compromise with Jim-Crowism, discrimination, or quota systems.

Many delegates, who had attended the Chicago Conference of Students, felt that the resolution adopted there, calling simply for equal opportunity of education, was insufficient and aided in creating the illusion that it was possible to have equal and segregated systems. This is, of course, an impossibility. Quite apart from the deeper, underlying meaning of equal opportunity in education, a segregated educational system can only be an inferior educational system, with inadequate appropriations and inadequate facilities. The expense of supporting two separate systems of education creates additional difficulties for both.

While quick agreement was possible in relation to working for the abolishment of quota systems and discrimination in the North, some Southern delegates, threatening to refuse to affiliate to the new organization, attempted to force the Convention from a stand which it in overwhelming majority supported. An attempt was made to eliminate from the written Convention record any resolution, constitutional provision, or by-law relating to segregated educational systems. This was completely unsatisfactory to those delegates who felt that to compromise to this extent would be to eliminate the N.S.A. as a positive force for the abolition of segregation.

Debate on this question was thorough and lengthy. The resulting decisions provided that the Constitutional Preamble state that the N.S.A.: "Aid in securing for all people equal rights and possibilities of primary, secondary and higher education regardless of sex, race, religion, political beliefs or economic circumstances, inherent in their human dignity as individuals." The by-laws read that the N.S.A. would work:

To secure and maintain equal rights for all people and to secure equal opportunities for education at all levels regardless of race, sex, national origin, creed and political belief or economic circumstances; especially by securing the eventual elimination of all forms of discriminatory educational systems anywhere in the United States, since

the United States National Student Association is opposed in principle to such systems.

It became the responsibility of the national as well as regional organizations to take action to implement these principles.

This stand, in its unnecessary use of the word "eventual," and by the substitution of "discriminatory" for "segregated," is not as strong or direct as might have been wished. It marked a real advance, however, for a national student organization of the broad and representative character of the N.S.A. The democratic trends among all students, as well as the strong and fighting position of the Negro and Left and progressive delegates, made this possible. Many groups at the Convention, in spite of their initial support to an anti-segregation provision, found themselves compromising some of the very principles they had agreed to support. It must especially be pointed out that accusations that Left delegates at the Convention were attempting to split or disrupt it by forcing Southern white students out, were entirely without foundation. In fighting for their position, they first of all demonstrated their confidence in the American student body, North and South. It was their feeling that the campus was prepared and ready to accept a minimum program of this type, and that to accept anything else would be to cater to its most backward sections. The unanimous agreement on the

the compromise adopted testifies to the correctness of their approach.

There is certainly no need to regard the discussion on this question as unfortunate or unnecessary. It forced every student leader there to examine his own conscience and his own approach on one of the most important questions facing every American. We can be sure that out of it can come greater understanding of the problems of minority groups and more consistent efforts to guarantee that the shame of discrimination is lifted from U.S. education.

#### AFFILIATION TO I.U.S.

Of equal importance was the discussion on relations between the National Students Association and the International Union of Students. At the Chicago conference last December the principle of eventual affiliation was accepted. Mr. William Ellis of the National Intercollegiate Christian Council returned to Prague to serve as Vice President of the I.U.S. and a delegation of American students participated in the summer, 1947, meeting of the I.U.S. International Council. This convention was to decide upon affiliation and the methods and conditions under which such affiliation might take place.

Students have more than once demonstrated their interest in furthering international understanding and friendship. The desire to know and work with students of other countries has long been a strong one on the American campus. The war and

the esta  
tions n  
the oth  
aided b  
movem  
past y  
sentati  
the ch  
ganiza  
nearly  
world  
portray  
tion of  
studen  
ments  
period  
concer  
"too n  
In a  
tion E

...  
organiz  
tical st  
a defe  
underl  
necess  
touche  
will r  
of the  
versity  
I stu  
dents  
that  
long  
colleg  
introd  
to an  
intern  
dents  
look  
cisco  
parts

the establishment of the United Nations have added to this feeling. On the other hand, the American press, aided by some sections of the student movement, organized during this past year a campaign of misrepresentation and misinterpretation of the character of the I.U.S. This organization, representing students in nearly every major country in the world and on every continent, was portrayed as being simply a "federation of Left and Eastern European students." The very real accomplishments of the I.U.S. during its brief period of existence were ignored. Its concern with democracy was termed "too much attention to politics."

In a written report to the convention Ellis said:

... It [the I.U.S.] is a world student organization which will engage in practical student work. However, at times a defense of the principles which must underlie the University in society do necessitate a certain stand which touches on politics. . . . To fail in this will mean the complete emasculation of the sources of strength of the University and the I.U.S.

I sincerely hope that American students affiliate to the I.U.S. I believe that international cooperation begins long before one has graduated from college. I believe that it is necessary to introduce all segments of our society to an appreciation of the problems in international work. I believe that students should develop an habitual outlook which extends beyond San Francisco and New York to the farthest parts of the world. I believe that stu-

dents should develop this international frame of mind by practical work in an international organization like the I.U.S. I believe that as future leaders American students owe this mental development and practical work to themselves. I believe that the I.U.S. can offer all this to American students.

The discussion on the I.U.S. was frank and sharp. Only a small minority opposed affiliation under any conditions. Catholic student leaders, however, supported affiliation for the announced purpose of rallying opposition to I.U.S. policies and leadership from within.\* They attempted to characterize the I.U.S. program as "contrary to the interests of American students," citing anti-imperialist resolutions on Indonesia and Egypt as particular examples. The majority of the delegates, while recognizing the differences between the American student movement and those in most other countries, rejected such an approach. Expressing their concern with the preservation of peace, they emphasized the necessity of entering the I.U.S. "desirous of wholehearted and fullest coopera-

\* In the pamphlet *Operation University*, published by the National Catholic Youth Council, the authors call for the organization of a Catholic-led Western bloc in the following circumspect manner:

... Catholic organizations and individuals should make the maximum effort to have an effective influence in national unions of students and other constituent members of I.U.S., with an eye to getting a fairer proportion of Catholic representatives in the governing bodies of both national organizations and I.U.S., or at least obtaining representatives who will present and fight for the principles of Christianity and western democracy.

tion with students throughout the world."

By a vote of 401 to 35, the convention voted for provisional affiliation and the opening of negotiations for full affiliation. In a "statement to American students," it said:

Mutual understanding and acquaintanceship with other countries, particularly with those like the Soviet Union which, up-to-date, has been most inaccessible to, and in frequent disagreement with the U.S., can be decisive in helping to avert even more intensified friction which may lead to a disastrous atomic world war. . . . The Convention felt that it [affiliation] must be based on a sincere and wholehearted intention to work with I.U.S. and other member countries in friendship and without hidden purpose. Attempts at division into blocs with consistently differing points of view may well defeat the entire purpose of U.S.N.S.A. affiliation with I.U.S. . . .

In addition to voting for I.U.S. affiliation, the convention adopted an extensive and thorough program on student relief, travel and cultural exchange. Particular efforts are to be made to secure an exchange of student delegations with the Soviet Union.

The entire approach of these 1,000 representative students was in refreshing contrast to the "Truman Doctrine" mentality that characterizes so much of public discussion on foreign policy. Based on a sincere desire for friendship and peace, the student movement rejected both isolation and "bloc building." If there

are lessons to be learned, students in this case can be the teachers.

Any convention of such a widely representative character would quite naturally reflect the many varied trends in the American student movement.

### CATHOLIC STUDENTS

As at the Chicago Conference, delegates from Catholic institutions and Catholics elected by non-sectarian schools made up over one-third of the total attendance. Realizing that the caucuses they had conducted in Chicago had aroused distrust and antagonism, they held no such meetings in Madison. On most controversial issues, however, a previously agreed-upon position was quite evident. Unfortunately, it too often was the most conservative attitude brought forward. On constitutional questions, a greater degree of proportional representation and participation was opposed; on program, special political interests rather than the general welfare, seemed primary.

The individual Catholic student however, on those issues where no preconceived "line" was visible, often found himself in quick agreement with his fellow student. Many of them, honest, sincere, and generally liberal, will undoubtedly feel misgivings as they review the positions taken by the leaders of their group at the convention. Internal organizational democracy is certainly not a religious issue. Cooperation between the N.S.A. and other organizations

would  
well a  
resent  
every  
Cath  
learn,  
respec  
a posit  
did on  
a few  
baiting  
also th  
ward  
and n  
a min  
they c  
purge  
The  
tween  
has b  
ther d  
health  
camp  
The  
cated  
the h  
a lette  
editio  
chairm  
of th  
Conf  
Cushi  
. . .  
colleg  
a sym  
the re  
studen  
tion o  
purpo  
leader  
order  
this r  
trative



would benefit Catholic students as well as others. The election of representative officers was important to every group present.

Catholic student leadership must learn, as well, that they do not win respect for themselves if they desert a position they had supported, as they did on segregation, in order to garner a few votes, and because of Red-baiting. They will have to recognize also that although students of a Leftward orientation, both Communist and non-Communist, make up only a minority in the student movement, they cannot be isolated, ignored, or purged.

The desirability of cooperation between Catholic and other students has been more than proved. Its further development would create a far healthier situation on the entire campus.

The problem, however, is complicated by the open intervention of the hierarchy in student affairs. In a letter published in the June 1, 1947, edition of the *Newman News*, the chairman of the Youth Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, writes on the N.S.A.:

... I am sure that authorities of our colleges and universities will exercise a sympathetic and prudent interest in the relationship of their students to a student movement beyond the jurisdiction of the Church. Moreover, it is my purpose to consult with educational leaders individually and collectively in order to obtain their best judgment in this matter. If necessary, the Administrative Board of Bishops will be asked

to render an opinion as to the best course to pursue in the interests of our student groups.

Therefore, I would ask you to kindly instruct the student leaders of the national club federation, together with those active in the Joint Committee of these two federations, that they adhere to the prudent guidance of the responsible authorities of their respective campuses. . . . Beyond the initial participation and exploratory activities at the Chicago meeting, any future activities or alliances of our student groups must be subject to the direction of institutional authorities and subject to final review by the hierarchy.

Attitudes such as these are disturbing to Catholics and non-Catholics alike. Even the chairman of the hierarchy-sponsored Joint Committee for Student Action, Martin McLaughlin of Notre Dame—perhaps the major Catholic student leader—is moved to protest in the September 13 issue of *America*.<sup>\*</sup> He writes:

Perhaps the educators are afraid of student initiative. Why, for example, was it necessary for the N.C.W.C. Youth Department to insist that a veto power over the National Federation of Catholic College Students' activities in matters of "faith, morals and discipline" be written into the new constitution of the Federation? Is there in someone's mind the fear that the action of this organization might shake the foundations of the Church in the U.S.? That the Catholic students will be too "liberal," too radical, too prejudiced, or too secular? . . . Why are the educators reluctant to have Catholic

<sup>\*</sup> Authoritative Catholic weekly, published by the Jesuit Fathers.

college students participate in non-sectarian student activities?

Mr. McLaughlin objects and calls for greater freedom of action for Catholic students. Progressives will certainly agree, since it has become more than obvious that the general reactionary political program of the hierarchy decisively influences the Catholic student leaders. Such interference has no place in, and can only harm the student movement. Freed from hierarchy control, Catholic students cannot fail to see that the problems of the student community cut across religious and political lines. As they develop their own programs, they will find no high barriers between themselves and students who may differ with them on general ideological questions.

#### THE ROLE OF VARIOUS GROUPS

Members of the A.D.A. student division, Students for Democratic Action, made up a small but active segment of the convention. The program advanced by their officers was a good one, both in its organizational and political aspects. Liberals who have joined the S.D.A. will be disappointed in the manner many S.D.A. leaders conducted themselves, however. In much the same fashion as their adult counterpart, a pathological fear of "Communists" vitiated much of the positive contribution they might have made. S.D.A. will not win the respect and support of American students merely with ad-

mittedly attractive literature. A progressive program, militantly and courageously carried out can S.D.A.'s rank and file, if they begin to take more of an interest in the organization they have joined, can be the best guarantee of this.

Some of the S.D.A. aberrations can perhaps be attributed to its seemingly close connections with the representatives of the Dubinsky-oriented Student League for Industrial Democracy. Chief among these was a Mr. Jesse Cavileer, the S.L.I.D. national secretary. Mr. Cavileer, not a student, was not a delegate. His time was spent in behind-the-door "politicizing," in the surreptitious distribution of an inaccurate and Red-baiting article on the N.S.A. that appeared in *Plain Talk*, a magazine edited by the infamous Isaac Don Levine of the Hearst press, and in general personal character assassination. Perhaps his two greatest disservices to the American students at this convention was first, his attempt to compromise away the heart of the anti-segregation position, and then, his unsavory and unsuccessful election bargain with the Catholic group. Here in the student field, as in its activities in general, Social-Democracy tossed its boasted progressivism to the winds, and worked with and for the most reactionary elements present. In many ways these antics were amusing, yet if it had not been for the good sense of the average delegate they might have had a serious effect on the entire N.S.A.

The  
tional  
cil (Y  
hand, f  
a regre  
pecially  
fense o  
its reje  
250,000  
remain  
largest  
life in  
forward  
has al  
the ye  
large  
doubt  
of the  
Neg  
not p  
they e  
is to  
contri  
not a  
gates  
N.A.  
ern N  
tantly  
on se  
whel  
temp  
gress  
other  
tion  
equa  
the r  
mak  
great  
gro i  
fit o  
gani

The delegates of the powerful National Intercollegiate Christian Council (Y.M.-Y.W.C.A.), on the other hand, played a constructive, although a regrettably moderate, role. An especially signal contribution was its defense of minority political groups and its rejection of Red-baiting. With its 250,000 members, this organization remains outside of the N.S.A., the largest center of organized student life in this country. Its program is a forward-looking and liberal one; it has already affiliated to the I.U.S. In the years ahead, its influence among large numbers of students will undoubtedly positively affect the course of the N.S.A.

Negro students were unfortunately not present in as large numbers as they eventually must be if the N.S.A. is to be truly representative. Their contribution to the convention was not a small one, however. The delegates of the Student Division of the N.A.A.C.P., and those from Southern Negro colleges in particular, militantly led the fight for a strong stand on segregation in education. Overwhelmingly, Red-baiting and attempts to split them from white progressives were rejected. On the many other problems faced by the convention as well, their participation was equally active. It is to be hoped that the regional and national officers will make special efforts to bring about greatly increased participation of Negro institutions. It will be to the benefit of all students and the entire organization.

Any evaluation of the Southern white student delegation must, in spite of the vigorous debate that took place, be a positive one. Aside from a minute clique of white supremacists, who momentarily exerted inordinate influence, they sincerely attempted to find an equitable solution. One might only say that they perhaps underestimated the progressive trends developing on their own campuses. The factual statement of the very real accomplishments that have taken place in Southern regional N.S.A. meetings in breaking down segregation, presented to the convention, makes one confident that the unanimously adopted N.S.A. program can become a living force in the South. The deep respect won by the chairman of the National Continuations Committee, Jim Smith of Texas, and the overwhelming election to the chairmanship of the N.S.A. of Bob Welsh of Kentucky, are additional testimony to the reserves of progressive leadership within the student movement in the South.

Many delegates were obviously disturbed by the attendance of various non-student groups who attempted to influence the proceedings. A few college administrations, in addition to prior instructions to the students participating, sent observers to Madison. Pressure was put on many delegates to reverse positions already decided upon, or to support proposals approved by the particular administration. The Michigan delegation,

faced by a severe crisis in student rights at home, was especially beset by this problem. In addition, various Big Business organizations, such as the Detroit Economic Club, were active. And, of course, the ever-present gentlemen from Mr. Hoover's F.B.I. From the beginning, it seems, the N.S.A. must frankly face and reject the interference of those elements who cannot trust, who are afraid of America's young people. Their Red-phobia and reactionary policies blind them to the very real contributions an organization such as the N.S.A. can make to the welfare of our country.

Left and progressive students, in keeping with their modest strength on the campus, were present only in small numbers. It would be correct to say, however, that they contributed much to the successful outcome of the convention. With confidence in the American student, they fought hard for their principles. When compromises were necessary, they were made, but only after the most thorough discussion. In debate, they won respect, if not always complete agreement. The two representatives of the Council of Student Clubs of the Communist Party, in democratic contrast to the procedure on many campuses, were able to participate actively in the convention, contributing both to the Constitution and to the program.

#### KEY PROBLEMS

Although the Constitution must

still be ratified by the local student government or student body, the N.S.A. can already be considered a reality. It begins life with a democratic Constitution, a good program, and a representative and liberal group of officers. These are real and important accomplishments.

Omissions and deficiencies are there however. They are partially due to the very character of the organization. The N.S.A. is a non-partisan, non-political federation of student governments. In spite of the adoption of a program with important political implications, students retain a vague fear of "politics." To a degree this is a healthy sign. The unity of the student generation must not be split along partisan lines. The problems faced demand cooperation and united action. On the other hand, the American student, if he is not to fight but half a battle, must soon learn that the most important issues—of peace or war, of economic security or crisis, of democracy or fascism—face him as well as all other Americans, and call for action in the political arena.

Affiliation to the I.U.S., therefore, is an important and significant contribution to world peace, but more direct struggle against those who are trying to foment a new world war is needed as well. Again, the excellent program on domestic affairs will mean all too little if reaction strengthens its hold on the Presidency and Congress in the 1948 elections.

On these issues, as well as others, the N.S.A. will reflect the thinking and understanding of the campus. The program it adopts will not be far in advance of this, but, as in Wisconsin, it can express them at the highest level. Student America is democratic and progressive; it wants peace; it rejects imperialism and fascism. If the approach is still limited and vague, it is because the campus is still groping for answers.

As the crucial 1948 elections approach, the progressive student political organizations must help provide those answers. There is no substitute for their work. A million student voters can be won for progress; students can contribute much to the defense of democratic rights and a peace safe from the threat of atomic war.

What happens on the campus, among the rank and file of the student body, will thus determine the future of the N.S.A. As they move ahead, seeing the issues more clearly, resolving their confusions, so will the N.S.A. advance—in program, in understanding, in activity.

#### THE YEAR AHEAD

After the summer lull, we can expect renewed violations of student rights. The first wave of attacks was met with resistance, but in no way can it be said that this was either as widespread or as effective as it must if civil liberties are not to disappear from the campus. Only in Michigan has any sort of state or regional con-

ference been called. The very success of that meeting however, the wide variety of differing groups that cooperated, shows what can be accomplished. The N.S.A.'s Bill of Rights is a charter that every student can support. It itself is a sufficient program, but only if it becomes a living document.

Similarly, the campus is ready and anxious to support the program of the N.S.A. on discrimination in education. The N. Y. State Bill for a Fair Educational Practices Commission has been written into that program, as a model for other legislation. In how many areas will the N.S.A. work for the introduction of such bills? And what conferences and activities will the N.S.A. conduct to break down the vicious discriminatory practices that mar so much of college life?

Students all over the nation will watch with approval, and help in every way possible, as their Negro and white fellows in the South work for the improvement of educational facilities and for the breaking down of segregation barriers. What has already been accomplished only indicates the tremendous job remaining, and the great contribution students working together can make. As the cost of living goes continuously higher, students will increasingly face the choice of—education or eating! The student veterans' organizations are already making plans for an over-the-top legislative drive to put the Senate-passed Morse Bill, for increas-

ing subsistence, through the House of Representatives. The proposal for Federal subsidies for worthy "civilian" students will also become more urgent. American education, after experiencing its recent tremendous growth, can go forward or backward. American students will undoubtedly expect their new organization to take the lead in guaranteeing that the recent gains are kept, and that new strides ahead are taken.

The closer connection of American students with those in other countries, especially through the I.U.S., will undoubtedly strengthen the sentiment for peace, and aid in the development of discussion and activity around American foreign policy. There is much the N.S.A. can do. Its present program, however, does not deal with a particularly vital issue concerning both peace and the immediate welfare of millions of present and future students. For every attempt will be made during the coming year to force a peacetime conscription bill through Congress. Its effect on American education will be as dire as its effect on democracy and world peace in general. Already nearly all major educational, religious, and labor organizations have declared their opposition to military training in a nation at peace. Many student groups, particularly the National Intercollegiate Christian Council, A.Y.D., Y.P.C.A. and denominational religious organiza-

tions have passed similar resolutions. But more than resolutions are needed. If the military training bills are not to be passed, students must join hands with other groups in effective and large-scale activity. Pressure on Congress is an immediate necessity.

On all these issues much can be done on a regional and national scale. The N.S.A., other national student groups, and the many regional, organizations are all of tremendous importance. It is on the local, individual campus primarily, however, that the real struggles to win the participation of American students in the fight against reaction and war will be waged.

Democratic student councils must be built and strengthened. They must become more of a force in campus life if the N.S.A. program is to mean anything. Progressive students and their organizations can and should cooperate with the Student Councils, and at the same time develop independent activities.

Yes, apathy, confusion and many illusions still exist, but the possibilities are there. Students struggling for their own needs will find they have friends in the labor movement. As they lobby on legislative issues, they will find that more and more political action is needed. And there will be allies in this field as well, who will join with them because they face the same reactionary opponents.

TH  
CO

At  
can  
durin  
appea  
show  
comp  
not  
of N  
and  
the m  
Mars  
tine,  
fore,  
why  
part  
their  
of th  
Braz  
Bu  
Janei  
Sept  
sequ  
Depa  
Ame  
imp  
very  
spher  
sidel  
and  
conf  
(mor  
call

# THE INTER-AMERICAN CONFERENCE

By JOSEPH STAROBIN

AT FIRST GLANCE, the Inter-American conference in Petropolis, Brazil, during the second half of August, appeared to be something of a sideshow. Latin America is a great and complex world of its own which does not ordinarily occupy the attention of North Americans, as do Europe and the Far East. This seemed all the more true in the summer of the Marshall Plan and crises in Palestine, Greece and Indonesia. Therefore, it was not immediately plain why President Truman and his bipartisan entourage should go out of their way to spend important weeks of this crucial period in faraway Brazil.

But the "sideshow of Rio de Janeiro" now appears, at the end of September, to fall into a definite sequence in the strategy of the State Department's policy. The Inter-American conference now shows its importance for reasons beyond the very important issues of the hemisphere: it throws an illuminating sidelight on the aims, the methods, and the very serious problems confronting American imperialism (more properly, we should always call it "un-American imperialism").

## U. S. IMPERIALISM'S MOTIVES

This was not a meeting on the real and pressing problems of the hemisphere, and to the extent that these questions burgeoned up at all, they were in the form of issues that were either absent from the agenda or were deliberately postponed.

It was a conference to consolidate the position of "un-American imperialism" among the 120,000,000 "other Americans" for the purpose of utilizing that position in the world struggle for power.

It was called and managed with an eye to the United Nations General Assembly meeting in New York, where the votes of twenty Latin-American states form an important element of those "freely associated majorities" which the State Department needs so much in its diplomatic warfare with the Soviet Union and the other democratic forces of Europe and Asia.

It was called with an eye to the Marshall Plan, the essence of which is the organization of an American-dominated western Europe around a rebuilt and reactionary Germany. In such a project, the foodstuffs and raw materials of Latin America are expected to play a big role.

The conference was intended to produce a juridical agreement of mutual assistance among the American states. But since there is no evidence of a danger of aggression in the hemisphere, it is clear that the

State Department desired such a pact at this time in order to serve as a model for a global treaty of the same kind — undermining, and intended to replace, the United Nations.

It was a conference to persuade the American people that the nations of the hemisphere are “one, big, happy family.” And it was supposed to give an example of the Administration’s “successful” foreign policy by contrast with the disappointments, deadlocks, and stalemates on the European and Far-Eastern issues where the Soviet Union is directly involved.

Finally, the mutual assistance treaty of Petropolis was carefully calculated to lay the basis for implementing it with a renewed demand for President Truman’s arms standardization and training plan. The last Congress, it will be remembered, failed to act on Truman’s ambitious proposal that all the American states turn in their old weapons to us, and send their naval, air, and military personnel up north, in return for which our brass-hats will train them and supply standardized weapons aplenty.

But once the mutual assistance treaty is ratified, it will be possible to argue in Congress that we cannot “go back on our commitments” and “disappoint our friends,” and we simply must go through with the Truman plan.

As Milton Bracker put it in the *New York Times* for September 1:

A ticklish question from the military standpoint grows out of the shelving, so far, by Congress in Washington of legislation to carry out President Truman’s proposals for the providing of United States arms and armament to the other American republics — and also Canada — on the principle of standardizing equipment.

Both as a soldier and a statesman, Secretary of State Marshall is fully aware of the potentially awkward position of the United States should the Congressional majority led by Sen. Robert Taft continue to balk the flow of arms and other material which the small Latin American countries now take for granted will be forthcoming.

But if these were the purposes of the Petropolis parley, it did have one result quite contrary to what its planners intended.

Latin America is today in a deep economic and political crisis, much worse than most Americans realize, and the spectacle provides an excellent refutation of the State Department’s arguments for the extension of American imperialist power to other parts of the world.

In Latin America, where U.S. influence has had decades to perform its wonders, the world has an excellent occasion to see the fruits of imperialist domination. What Latin America is today, and worse, Europe would become tomorrow under Wall Street domination.

While in Petropolis, I often imagined a European of the type that the State Department is now trying

so ha  
ferenc  
can le  
ined  
tuberc  
sons  
their  
or th  
suffoc  
mono  
imagi

Are  
Unite  
this w  
ship  
tury  
suppo  
thank

PETE  
CH

Fre  
affair  
It w  
Marc  
Chap  
Mexi  
layed  
The  
posee  
agree  
pulte  
natio  
other  
exter  
any  
spe  
By  
again



so hard to win, attending the conference to see the results of "American leadership" at first hand. I imagined this European studying the tuberculosis rate in Rio, or the reasons why Puerto Ricans are fleeing their homeland by the thousands, or the spectacle of little Venezuela, suffocating in her own oil which is monopolized by foreigners, and I imagined this European saying:

Are these the blessings that the United States has in store for us? Is this what undisputed American leadership has accomplished after half a century of Pan-Americanism? Are we supposed to be grateful for this? No, thank you!

#### PETROPOLIS AND CHAPULTEPEC

From the viewpoint of hemisphere affairs, what did Petropolis mean? It was the first such parley since March, 1945, when the famous Chapultepec conference was held in Mexico City. It had long been delayed, in fact three times postponed. The only item of business was supposed to be the spelling out of an agreement already reached in Chapultepec by which the American nations were bound to defend each other, not only against the threat of external aggression, but also against any aggressive act within the hemisphere.

By specifying mutual defense against an intra-hemisphere threat,

the American states were supposed to have made an advance over the Monroe Doctrine, and over previous Pan-American experience, which was always directed to mutual defense against aggression from the outside.

In any case, already at Chapultepec, the distinction between intra- and extra-continental aggression was supposed to have disappeared. And this new principle was formally accepted by Argentina when she signed the Chapultepec Act, although she had not attended the Mexico meeting.

If we bear in mind the commitments made eighteen months ago, we will see that much of the fanfare over the "immense success" at Petropolis is not warranted. It is not accurate to hail the Petropolis accord as some profoundly new juridical achievement in the relations between the United States and her weaker neighbors, as Secretary Marshall and Senator Vandenberg have done.

Neither is it entirely correct to view the hemisphere treaty as an already-completed military alliance by which the Latin-American states have pledged themselves, lock, stock and barrel, to a completely harmonized policy with that of the United States.

The first view overlooks the relationship between Chapultepec and Petropolis. The second view overlooks the important, and potentially

important, tendencies toward resistance to the United States which developed within the conference and will certainly develop further.

The remarkable thing is not that the Petropolis conference succeeded in codifying the Chapultepec agreement within eighteen days; the remarkable thing is that many Latin-American states tried hard to put much more genuine questions before the parley, and desired to limit their liability in case the United States becomes involved in war.

Even when these attempts were unsuccessful and did not show up clearly in the draft of the treaty, they nevertheless give a different picture from the happy family which our Senators and Secretary of State would like to convey to our people.

At the very outset, the United States was compelled to meet the Argentine demand for a recognition of the veto as far as the use of armed forces is concerned in case of aggression. Partly, of course, this reflects the fact that the Secretary of State could not bind the United States (since Congress alone declares wars) to any agreement providing automatic use of our armed forces.

Partly, however, it was a concession to the very real feeling of most of the Latin-American nations that if common action required the use of their armed forces, each one of them should retain a veto power. As the treaty now reads, "no state

shall be required to use armed force without its consent."

Then Argentina broached the distinction between intra- and extra-continental aggression. In the case of the latter only, said the Argentineans, was it necessary for the American states to prescribe specific and automatic measures of common defense; in the case of the former, relations among the American states are supposedly so harmonious that conciliation and arbitration are sufficient to end any threats to the peace.

The U.S. delegates fought hard and successfully to remove any such distinction. And the Argentineans—eager to "needle" the United States without returning to the former situation of complete hostility between the two countries—retreated gracefully.

The important thing, however, is not the argumentation of both sides, or their specific motives. More important is the fact that many countries tended at various times to support this distinction between two types of aggression—among them Peru, Chile, Uruguay, and Venezuela. Even Mexico, which, like Brazil, played the "conciliatory" role at various points in the conference, introduced an amendment which provided that any attack on the armed forces of any American power in such parts of the world as western Germany could not be the occasion

for a  
Amc  
Th  
disti  
tra-co  
appe  
the t  
geog  
in w  
Th  
belt,  
Anta  
the r  
in th  
case  
comm  
state  
the r  
zone  
or a  
juris  
only  
mean  
net  
disti  
sion  
It  
the  
tion  
whe  
Am  
of r  
case  
thre  
the  
B  
trea  
and  
part

for a full commitment by the Latin-American countries.

The upshot was that while the distinction between intra- and extra-continental aggression did not appear sharply in the final draft of the treaty, the draft does provide a geographical delimitation of the area in which the treaty operates.

This is the so-called "chastity belt," drawn from the Arctic to the Antarctic, including Greenland in the north and the Falkland Islands in the south. Inside this zone, any case of aggression requires automatic common defense of the American states in a series of measures up to the use of armed forces. Outside this zone, an attack on the armed forces or any territory under the effective jurisdiction of an American state only requires "consultation" on the means to be employed. This was the net result of all the debates on the distinction between types of aggression.

It would be wrong to overestimate the distinction between "consultation" and automatic action, especially when we recall that the Latin-American nations are under control of reactionary governments in many cases, and are under the constant threat of economic pressure from the United States.

But the distinction is there in the treaty. It reflected a much deeper and less visible calculation on the part of many Latin-American coun-

tries to avoid becoming too closely entangled in the global scope of U.S. policy. As the experienced Washington observer Blair Bolles says in the *Foreign Policy Association Bulletin* for Sept. 12:

It should be noted that, in essence, the inter-American treaty requires of its signatories nothing beyond consultation; they give up only the privilege of refraining from conference.

#### BENEATH-THE-SURFACE PROBLEMS

When we turn to questions that were not on the agenda of the Petropolis conference, we get a picture of beneath-the-surface problems that reveal a deep hostility toward the United States, much deeper than Americans here realize.

From the very beginning of the conference, the so-called "economic question" played a big role. Cuba, for example, wished to write a passage into the treaty denouncing economic aggression. Even such a close collaborator of Yankee imperialism as the Cuban ambassador, Guillermo Belt, was compelled to reflect the anger of his people over the infamous clause 202 of the Sugar Treaty, which makes the State Department a collection agency for the bad debts of American businessmen and gives the Department a lever against any attempts of the Cuban people to determine their economic policies as they wish.

On a separate plane, countries like Argentina, Mexico, Peru, Venezuela, Bolivia, and even Brazil favored the convocation of an economic conference, some of them desiring such a conference before the next inter-American meeting in Bogota.

The formula finally achieved is, of course, a cynical joke. An economic conference will be called some time in the second half of 1948, according to a resolution adopted at Petropolis. Viewing that the parley in Brazil was several times long delayed, and viewing that our country will have an election campaign during that same period, it is clear that the conference which so many American nations desire will not be called until well into 1949.

It would be wrong to say that an economic conference would of itself settle all problems. It would also be incorrect to say that what Latin America needs is a system of governmental loans from our country to governments, many of which are undemocratic and incapable of spending loans from abroad wisely or effectively in terms of the interests of their peoples.

Yet the pressure for such a conference — coming at Petropolis, where other matters were on the agenda — reveals a deep-down demand of the peoples of Latin America that something be done to alleviate the critical, inflationary situ-

ation in which they have been plunged since the war.

And when Secretary Marshall bluntly declared that all these problems would have to wait, and when President Truman talked pure mythology about the "young and vigorous nations" of the New World, and offered only a perspective that "private enterprise or groups" should continue to develop Latin America in the old, monopolistic way — the reaction was profound and will continue to be felt profoundly.

#### THE U.S. AND BRAZIL

Finally, there is a phase of the Petropolis conference, separate from the agenda and almost entirely concealed from public view. This consists of the negotiations between the United States and Brazil, and probably between the United States and Argentina, seeking to create conditions for the penetration of American capital, for the ending of tariff barriers, state monopolies of trade, and all obstacles which represent the defense of national economies against the inroads of imperialism.

Undoubtedly, the American-Brazilian negotiations are far more advanced; negotiations between Argentina and the United States are far more tentative and complex.

On the former, two types of U.S. designs on Brazil's economy are in the making. The first of these is the negotiation of a comprehensive

treaty  
of th  
ramm  
last  
Su  
each  
the p  
party  
natu  
every  
tecte  
ures  
In  
tions  
dom  
of th  
whic  
the  
Und  
izati  
itant  
gene  
com  
Si  
ect,  
prep  
Bra  
Ban  
Wo  
prof  
T  
zati  
of  
pro  
tion  
dep  
edl  
pro  
sive

treaty of reciprocity along the lines of the reciprocity treaty which was rammed down the throat of China last year.

Such a treaty would provide that each contracting party would allow the private corporations of the other party to organize the exploitation of natural resources and engage in every type of economic activity, protected from nationalization measures and discriminatory regulation.

In other words, Brazilian corporations would be given perfect freedom to exploit the natural resources of the United States, in return for which U.S. corporations would have the right to do likewise in Brazil! Under such a formula, the colonialization of Brazil, with its concomitant effects on the Communist and general democratic forces, would become a fact in a very short time.

Simultaneously with such a project, the United States is undoubtedly prepared to extend specific loans to Brazil, through the Export-Import Bank and use its good offices in the World Bank for certain special projects.

These projects involve modernization of the electric power plants of certain foreign firms, or the improvement of railway communications from the coast to the iron ore deposits in Minas Gerais. Undoubtedly, with these projects would go provisions for inspection and decisive control of the expenditure of

funds in the hands of U.S. fiscal and technical experts. Perhaps by the time these lines appear in print, projects of both the above types will be announced. They will be indicative of the kind of "economic aid" the United States is prepared to advance to other countries if they will take the same attitude as Brazil toward their own popular and Communist movements, and "cooperate" in the sphere of world affairs.

\* \* \*

Without expanding fully on the whole range of problems which arise for the North-American democratic and progressive movement, one main conclusion is clear: our people have allies in Latin America.

These allies are suffering the consequences of *our* own inability to stem the imperialist expansion in the hemisphere. They are allies who are ready and anxious to make their contribution in the common fight for a genuine Pan-Americanism, for a hemisphere which is united on a common program of peace and prosperity.

In our own interests, the present stage of Latin-American development demands the closest cooperation with all democratic forces of the hemisphere, especially the trade unions and all those broad circles who can be rallied behind the Roosevelt-Wallace program.

# ELECTORAL COALITION PROBLEMS IN NEW YORK

By S. W. GERSON

NEW YORK WITH ITS 14,000,000 population and 47 electoral votes, is without question the pivotal political state in the Union. If its population and weight in the Electoral College did not make it decisive, the fact that it has the largest labor movement in the nation, that it is the headquarters of American finance capital, and that it is the home state today of both Thomas E. Dewey and Henry Wallace, would place it in the nation's political center.

Key to understanding some of the political stresses and strains in New York State is the existence of the American Labor Party, the only practically effective third party in the country today. The A.L.P., with better than 400,000 voters, an eleven-year-old tradition, and an apparatus of growing political skill, constitutes no mean factor in the Empire State. Over a decade it has demonstrated that it generally can either elect or defeat major candidates. It is no wonder that in and around the

A.L.P. have swirled some fierce political hurricanes.

There are some who would question this, but a glance backward proves beyond question that the fact that the A.L.P., the chief vehicle of the progressive independents, is the balance-of-power in the state. In fact, that was the reason for bringing it into existence. Midwives at its birth in 1936 were a group of labor leaders, primarily from the garment trades, a number of New Dealers, and a group of organization Democrats. It was recognized then that the Democratic Party, even with President Roosevelt heading its ticket, could not hold the allegiance of a substantial portion of progressives, particularly trade unionists, and that another political instrumentality was required. This was later admitted to be true about the country as a whole when President Roosevelt said (April 19, 1939): "The Democratic Party of itself cannot elect a President."

## ONLY COALITION CAN DEFEAT G.O.P.

Time has justified that judgment, especially so in New York. Election after election has demonstrated that even with a coalition it is an uphill fight to defeat the Republicans in New York State. Without such a coalition it is virtually impossible. This coalition, furthermore, cannot be an electoral arrangement of political convenience. If it is to be suc-

cessful it must be a *coalition on program and candidates*. In short, it must be a progressive, pro-Roosevelt coalition in both fact and name if it is to obtain victory.

A brief examination of the figures since 1936, the last year the Democrats received the majority of the votes cast in a state election, will bury for all time any illusion in any quarters that the Democrats can "go it alone" successfully in New York. In 1936 President Roosevelt received on the Democratic line more votes than were cast for his Republican opponent on the Republican line. *This has never been true since*. The results in 1936 were:

Roosevelt (Dem.)	3,018,298
Roosevelt (A.L.P.)	274,924
Landon (Rep.)	2,180,670

But within two years the situation had changed and the Democratic Party became the minority party. In the gubernatorial election in 1938 the figures were:

Lehman (Dem.)	1,971,307
Lehman (A.L.P.)	419,979
Dewey (Rep.)	2,302,505
Dewey (Ind.)	24,387

It will be immediately noted that the Democrats ran more than 300,000 votes behind the Republicans and that victory came to the Democratic candidate only by reason of his endorsement by the A.L.P., *i.e.*, because of the policy of coalition between labor and the Democrats

around a progressive program and candidates. It is a matter of more than academic interest that the Communist Party withdrew its candidate for Governor, Israel Amter, and provided the margin for Lehman's victory (65,000).

In 1940 the balance-of-power role of the A.L.P. emerged even more clearly, for even with Roosevelt as a candidate the Democratic Party ran nearly 200,000 votes behind the Republicans. The 1940 figures are:

Roosevelt (Dem.)	2,834,500
Roosevelt (A.L.P.)	417,979
Willkie (Rep.)	3,027,478

In 1942, when the anti-Roosevelt forces, headed by James A. Farley, took over the Democratic Convention, boosing the name of Lehman, the bankruptcy of the anti-New Deal, anti-coalition policy displayed itself most clearly. It was at this convention that Farley rejected any alliance with the American Labor Party and other independents around a pro-Roosevelt candidate. He named John J. Bennett as his nominee and virtually forced the A.L.P. and the Communists to name their own candidate in order to provide labor and progressive voters with an alternative. The 1942 figures are:

Dewey (Rep.)	2,148,546
Bennett (Dem.)	1,501,039
Alfange (A.L.P.)	403,626

The 1942 campaign was a perfect illustration of what happens in New

York when the anti-Roosevelt, anti-coalition crowd takes over the Democratic Party. Dewey was handed the victory by a margin of about 200,000 over the combined Bennett-Alfange total—a margin that would have been wiped out had there been a united slate around a Roosevelt program. For unity creates not simply an arithmetical combination, but develops the forces for victory far beyond the mere addition of one party's total to another.

In 1944, Roosevelt was able to carry the state—but again only with independent support. The Democratic Party ran more than 500,000 votes behind the Republicans. The 1944 votes was:

Roosevelt (Dem.)	2,478,598
Roosevelt (A.L.P.)	496,405
Roosevelt (Lib.)	329,235
Dewey (Rep.)	2,987,647

The 1946 elections showed a catastrophic decline for the Democratic Party while the American Labor Party, percentage-wise, held its own. The A.L.P. not only re-elected Rep. Vito Marcantonio in the face of a precedent-shattering concentration of reactionary forces, but also for the time in the State's history elected a Labor State Senator, Kenneth Sherbell, an officer of the Local 65, C.I.O. clerks and warehouse workers union. In short, despite the Republican sweep nationally, New York progressives held their own, while those who sought to appease G.O.P. reaction fell by the wayside.

The figures:

Dewey (Rep.)	2,813,138
Mead (Dem.)	1,537,658
Mead (A.L.P.)	424,362
Mead (Lib.)	175,525

#### ANTI-COALITION POLICY SUICIDAL

While superficially the 1946 elections can be used—and have been—to argue the Farley-Flynn thesis that the coalition has outlived its usefulness, the fact is that the 1946 disaster came about not because there was a Labor-Democrat electoral alliance, but because the Democrats, the leading elements of the alliance, did not carry on a consistent fight for a pro-Roosevelt program. It is no secret that the departure of Truman from Roosevelt domestic and foreign policies cost the New York Democratic-Labor candidates heavily. Nor was it a secret that, despite the grudging alliance on state-wide candidates, strong anti-coalition tendencies existed in the Democratic State command. This was evidenced by their fight to remove the Communists from the ballot and the refusal to have joint local candidates with the A.L.P., especially in the Bronx, where the suicidal anti-coalition policy cost the Democrats one Congressman, one State Senator and four Assemblymen.

This anti-coalition tendency was an inevitable accompaniment of the drift of the Democratic leadership

away  
reactio  
domes  
F.D.R.  
during  
overco  
create  
A.L.P.  
course  
of a  
progr  
lyzize  
But t  
ganiz  
reason  
drive  
the o  
adopt  
which  
section  
the n  
tably  
In  
the r  
bipart  
Party  
Demo  
This  
aroun  
the S  
in th  
Demo  
Paku  
mem  
in th  
by p  
This  
resen  
man  
A.L.



away from the New Deal toward a reactionary bipartisan foreign and domestic policy since the death of F.D.R. This drift, already evidenced during Roosevelt's tenure but largely overcome by his political strength, created obvious problems for the A.L.P. The Labor Party could, of course, possibly obtain "coalition" of a sort by meekly accepting the program and candidates of a Farleyized Democratic organization. But this would stultify its own organization, deprive it of its very reason for existence, and inevitably drive all vital forces from it. On the other hand, the A.L.P. could adopt a narrow "go-it-alone" policy, which would separate it from large sections of voters who still cling to the major parties and would inevitably doom it to sectarian sterility.

In New York political circles after the 1946 elections there developed a bipartisan drive to isolate the Labor Party, an effort aided by the Social-Democratic-controlled Liberal Party. This drive to erect an iron curtain around the A.L.P. expressed itself in the State Legislature early this year in the passage, by Republican and Democratic votes, of the Wilson-Pakula law designed to prevent members of one party from running in the primaries of another unless by permission of the party bosses. This was aimed principally at Representative Vito Marcantonio, chairman of the New York County A.L.P., and is framed to keep Mar-

cantonio from entering the 1948 Democratic primaries. This anti-A.L.P. drive also expressed itself in the refusal of virtually every county Democratic leadership to have joint candidates with the A.L.P., even if it meant losing to the Republicans. It also expressed itself in a series of joint Democratic-Republican judicial candidates, thus "freezing out" the A.L.P. as a factor in most of these races. It also expresses itself in the campaign to wipe out proportional representation in New York City, the democratic method under which the A.L.P., the Communists, and other minority forces have succeeded in winning representation to the city's legislative body.

Chief fear, particularly of the Democrats, was that the A.L.P., which refuses to go along with Liberal Party drum-beating for President Truman, would declare for Henry Wallace and thus stimulate nationally the Wallace-for-President movement. There is no question but that there was—and is—a strong pro-Wallace sentiment in the A.L.P., a sentiment which would be ready to back Wallace even if he were not the Democratic nominee. It is equally true that within the A.L.P. and the progressive labor movement in New York there are people who wholeheartedly support the principle of a third party but are not convinced about the necessity for a third ticket now. It was this central issue that had to be resolved if the unity

of both the A.L.P. and, to no small measure, the State C.I.O. was to be maintained.\*

#### UNITY ON THIRD TICKET ISSUE

This was accomplished at the four big county committee meetings of the A.L.P. and at the Saratoga Convention of the C.I.O. in September. How was it resolved? By the two groups—the pro-third ticket forces and those who favored a third party but not a third ticket in 1948—agreeing on the necessity of building the A.L.P. as labor's political arm in New York State while deferring for future consideration the question of a third ticket. It was on the basis of this policy that the A.L.P. county organizations remained united, thus dashing the hopes of certain reactionary Democrats and the David Dubinsky-Liberal Party crowd, who had hoped that the A.L.P. would wreck itself over the third ticket issue.

In the State C.I.O. Convention the A.L.P. question, far from being a divisive issue, became under these circumstances a basis for uniting firmly the Center (mostly the Amalgamated Clothing and Auto delegates) and the Left forces. Both forces united against the Right Wing to place the convention on record for building the A.L.P. as C.I.O.'s

political instrumentality. This would have been impossible had the Wallace-for-President issue been placed before the convention for a vote. Had that issue been pressed under the given circumstances it would have been defeated and, in all probability, the unity necessary to adopt the pro-A.L.P. resolution would have been smashed. This would have been a situation made to order for the Right Wing and all other opponents of independent political action by labor.

Similar difficult situations arose in the A.L.P. and the C.I.O. over questions of foreign policy and a number of local political issues, not all of which have yet been resolved. Nevertheless, the unity achieved on the third party issue lays the basis for belief that a number of other questions can be resolved. The solution advanced at the A.L.P. meetings and the State C.I.O. Convention will not slow down the Wallace-for-President movement in the state. On the contrary, the refusal of the A.L.P. and the C.I.O. to give Truman a blank check or to adopt a "go-it-alone" policy strengthens the hand of the pro-Wallace and other New Deal forces in and outside the Democratic Party. These forces recognize the necessity of a two-sided approach—the building of the American Labor Party and the stimulation of the fight for Wallace-pledged delegates within the Democratic

\* For a detailed discussion of this question see the article, "Unity of Progressives—And 1948" by Robert Thompson in the *Daily Worker*, August 14, 1947.

Party. American frequent concentration with Wallace marriages.

While within yet no clear the and is bosses.

engendered pearance the base labor of will be spring gates.

The in a forty-f the s poses lems the m ing There this There quart favor Demo such third ory of the A in th small

Party. The Progressive Citizens of America, with which Wallace is frequently associated, is apparently concentrating its efforts on working with other pro-Wallace forces for Wallace delegates in the spring primaries.

While the Wallace movement within the Democratic Party has yet no organizational center, it is clear that it is a vigorous movement and is disturbing the old party bosses. The tremendous enthusiasm engendered by Wallace in every appearance in New York State lays the basis for a belief that in a number of Congressional districts there will be vigorous battles in the 1948 spring primaries for Wallace delegates.

The fight for Wallace delegates in a number of New York State's forty-five Congressional districts in the spring Democratic primaries poses some complex practical problems for progressive forces who, in the main, will concentrate on building the American Labor Party. There will be the concrete question this October of party enrollment. There may be a tendency in some quarters to abandon the A.L.P. in favor of mass enrollment in the Democratic Party on the theory that such is the best way to stimulate the third party movement. Such a theory of mass enrollment is false. If the A.L.P., the strongest third party in the nation, emerges weaker and smaller than last year from this reg-

istration, it will be a blow to the third party movement throughout the country. Furthermore, it will affect adversely pro-Roosevelt tendencies within the Democratic Party. The progressives within the New York Democratic Party must see on the outside a powerful force. If that force should weaken, the efforts of the Wallace Democrats inside the Democratic Party would proportionately diminish.

#### UNITY WILL DEVELOP AROUND ISSUES

But the whole struggle cannot be carried on simply as a series of political maneuvers, of tactics separated from broad issues. On the contrary, the differentiation within the Democratic Party and the gathering of third-party forces can develop primarily by a united fight on the basic issues facing the people of the state and nation. The all-embracing anti-monopoly movement against high prices now developing provides one of the most effective bases for such a struggle. In the course of such a fight there will be revealed, not only the prime wrecking role of the Republican high command, but also the accomplice character of the Truman Administration. Certainly the recent support given Senator Taft's "eat less" slogan by Secretary of Commerce Averill Harriman and Secretary of Agriculture Clinton Anderson will not endear the Adminis-

tration to the harassed consumer. The struggle around the question of foreign policy will undoubtedly create further differentiation within the Democratic Party.

It is obvious that the various elements necessary for the formation of a broad and effective third-party movement will *not* come together in one smooth process, at one time, and in one place. They can and will come together politically for effective third-party action only through a process of united struggle around specific issues. Obviously, this process will be an uneven one, and frequently the united front around specific issues will be much wider and develop more swiftly than the movement toward a third-party and support of a third-ticket tactic in the 1948 Presidential elections.

The path to unity around a pro-Roosevelt program in New York is made considerably more difficult in New York because of the existence of a relatively strong group of Social-Democratic-controlled unions, A. F. of L. and C.I.O., and the Social-Democratic-controlled Liberal Party, itself a product of a Right-wing defection from the American Labor Party. The Liberal Party leadership, while paying lip service to the memory of the late President Roosevelt, is actually the bearer of the bipartisan Truman-Hoover policies in the labor and liberal movements. Its function is to paralyze the growing awareness and unity of the labor-liberal movements

against the bipartisan reactionary policies of the Administration. Its specific role is to seek to elbow out the A.L.P. as a balance of power in New York politics.

While the Liberal Party tips its hat to progressive domestic policies, its anti-Communist, anti-Soviet obsession colors its every act and word. Nevertheless, the Liberal Party leadership is hampered at every turn by the pro-Roosevelt feelings of their followers. Much as they disagreed with F.D.R.'s policy of Big Three unity in 1944, the Liberal Party leaders were compelled to name F.D.R. as their candidate. Similarly, today, much as they may inveigh against Wallace, the Labor Party, the Communists, etc., the logic of events makes it impossible for them to prevent all their followers from participating in united movements on the urgent needs of the people. The development of the united front among the pro-Roosevelt progressives, one of the tasks to which the late Fiorello LaGuardia dedicated his last days, is a prerequisite to the defeat of reaction in our State.

#### TASKS

New York labor and progressive forces today are concentrating their strength on a number of principal tasks, which may be outlined as follows:

1. A large registration of progressives during Registration Week, October 6-11 (New York City and

West  
10 (U  
ing  
in th  
of fo  
Liber  
close  
2.  
broa  
secti  
the  
the  
3.  
unity  
comi  
prim  
siona  
4.  
mun  
siona  
are  
5.  
rese  
refer  
port  
circl  
bon  
anti  
6.  
Pres  
Spr  
7.  
tion  
Yor

Westchester) and October 3, 4, and 10 (upstate). Special efforts are being made to increase the enrollment in the A.L.P., since the relationship of forces between the Labor and Liberal Parties will be watched very closely in all political circles.

2. Building the A.L.P. clubs and broadening them to include wider sections of the labor movement and the citizenry generally, especially in the A. F. of L.

3. Developing A. F. of L.-C.I.O. unity, particularly in relation to the coming legislative session, the Spring primaries and the 1948 Congressional elections.

4. Active participation in the 1947 municipal campaigns and Congressional by-elections wherever those are being held.

5. Retention of proportional representation in the New York City referendum. Despite some slight support for P.R. in some conservative circles, progressives will be the backbone of the campaign to reject the anti-democratic repealer.

6. Preparation for the Wallace-for-President primary fights in the Spring of 1948.

7. Preparation for the 1948 elections and the crucial contests in New York State: the defeat of a number

of Republican supporters of the Taft-Hartley Bill, and the crucial importance of the re-election of the nation's leading progressive Congressman, Vito Marcantonio. Along with Marcantonio, most progressives regard as vital the re-election of Rep. Adam Powell, or, in view of his illness and possible unavailability, another progressive Negro representative as well as additional militant progressives in a number of districts. The progressives are determined to return to the State Legislature labor's only State Senator, Kenneth Sherbell, and Assemblyman Samuel Kaplan, along with a substantial bloc of labor-progressive State legislators.

\* \* \*

In carrying through these tasks, New York's labor and progressive movement will find the Communists loyal, self-sacrificing, and indefatigable workers. To the creation and maintenance of a coalition of labor and all other progressives the Communists devote their efforts. For only by such a coalition can reaction be defeated and the United States kept on the path of peace, security, and democracy.

# POLAND'S ECONOMY AND SOCIALISM

By HILARY MINC\*

AMONG THE ACTIVE MEMBERS of our Party, one can sense a very sharp need for theoretical generalization of all those problems which we have had to resolve in the last two years, whenever we spoke of defining our economic system.

We said, in the first place, that our economic system had a specific character of its own, that it was already non-capitalist—since there were no big capitalists or landlords—but not socialist as yet, because our system provides for the existence and even for the development of small-small and even medium capitalist enterprises.

We said, in the second place, that our economic system is composed of three co-existing sectors: State, cooperative, and private. We said, in the third place, that our economic system may be called the system of People's Democracy. There is no doubt that today, after two years of existence of our economic system, these definitions are insufficient as a theoretical basis for our practical activity.

As regards the state sector, it comprises state trade, state banks, state

\* Polish Minister of Industry and Commerce.

transport, and, above all, state industry. What is the meaning of the formula we have used till now for the state sector? It means only one thing—that this sector is the property of the State of People's Democracy. It is a poor and limited formula, already insufficient for the generalizations which could serve as a basis for our practical activity. Such a definition says nothing as to which type of social system this State sector of ours belongs.

## IS OUR STATE INDUSTRY A SOCIALIST ONE?

Marxism has given us a scientific understanding of the system of capitalism and the system of socialism. We know that there may, and in fact do, exist mixed economic systems in which, in different proportions, various types of social and economic orders appear. We know from history examples of mixed systems in which there existed feudal as well as capitalist elements, and we may well imagine a system in which both capitalist and socialist elements would appear. We know that our present economic system is of a mixed type, that different structural systems appear in it, both socialist and capitalist.

But a concrete question arises which finally, after the last two years, requires an answer from us: Which elements in this new economic system of ours are socialist;

or, speaking more precisely, does our state sector, and especially our state industry, represent socialist elements or not.

Two forms of capitalist industry are known to the science of Marxism: the private-capitalist form, and the state-capitalist form. Under the private-capitalist form the means of production belong to a single capitalist or to a group of capitalists and the surplus value goes into the pockets of these private capitalists or groups of capitalists. Under the state-capitalist form, certain branches of industry, (*i.e.*, munitions, mining, transportation companies) belong permanently or periodically (*e.g.*, during the war) to the state. But the state is a capitalist one, its economy as a whole is a capitalist economy, and so these state enterprises are in fact the collective property of the capitalist class of the particular country, and serve the interests of this class as a whole.

It is clear that our nationalized industry is neither private-capitalist nor state-capitalist industry. The means of production do not, in this case, belong to the capitalists. Neither our state nor our economy is wholly capitalist; our industry is not a form of collective property of the Polish capitalist class, and does not, in principle, serve its interests. Thus, our state sector, and especially our state industry, is neither state-capitalist nor private-capitalist. Is it

then a socialist industry?

A socialist industry is an industry in which the means of production belong to a non-capitalist state, and the surplus value derived from production goes to the state, which distributes it according to a plan to improve the situation of the toiling masses; to extend the production apparatus; to develop the health services, education, and culture; to strengthen the security of the state; and to meet the requirements of other needs of the state, of a non-capitalist state. Can we, from this point of view, define our state industry as a socialist one? Undoubtedly we can and must define it as an industry *with considerable socialist elements*. Why? Because the first of the two conditions mentioned above has been fulfilled. Our nationalized industry is in the hands of a non-capitalist state, a state of the toiling masses, a state which we define as a state of People's Democracy. This is the factor which not only permits the definition of our industry as one with considerable socialist elements, but also forms a basis for our onward march, toward the transformation of our industry into a fully socialist one.

But why can we not as yet speak of our industry as a real socialist one? To answer this question one has to realize what happens to the surplus products created by our state industry. In principle—and, I

repeat, only in principle—this surplus product should be used solely for the needs of the state, to improve the standard of living of the toiling masses and for other state purposes. This is how it should be, theoretically. But it is not like this in reality. There is no doubt that in this mixed economic system of ours, reality very often and very painfully deviates from this principle. The state recovers the costs of production and the surplus products obtained in the process of production, not in the form of normal distribution, nor in the form of exchange for an equal value of agricultural products, but in the form of trade, by way of selling the articles produced by our state industry and purchasing the raw materials needed for the production, and its development, and to increase the numbers of those employed. As a result, the state industry sells mainly through the intermediary of the capitalist elements and purchases from the capitalist elements, not only abroad, but also at home.

It is clear that in this situation only a fraction of the surplus products of the state industry remains in the hands of the State and is distributed according to plan and social needs. The greater part of the surplus products goes into the hands of capitalist traders and buyers. What is more, the same happens sometimes even with the state investments, resulting thus in an

actual decapitalization of the state industry, an actual transfer of the material values to the market-capitalist sector.

We shall not describe in detail the forms in which this process of changing hands of the state industry's surplus products, and even sometimes of the state investments, takes place. There is a great variety of these forms, beginning with common thievery and embezzlement, through speculative raising of prices on reselling of State articles, through speculative increasing of prices of agricultural products by the capitalist elements in the countryside which causes the exchanges of industrial and agricultural products at an unfair rate, to forms so subtle and complicated that it is even difficult to define and classify them. At any rate, this phenomenon of snatching the surplus is quite common within some groups of state products, *e.g.*, within textile production, where we can easily see the surplus product being taken over by the speculators. But even in regard to such industrial articles as appear to be free from it, this plague in reality exists. Coal, for instance, is exported abroad, but its equal value returns home as consumption goods, and here already the surplus product changes hands and goes to capitalists. It is difficult to find a state industry product to which this does not happen in smaller or greater degree. In any case, the



snatching of the surplus product by the capitalist elements uncontrolled by the state is so common that it may be said that a part of the surplus product derived from production goes to the state and another part into the hands of the capitalist market.

This is why our industry at present may be defined as having only considerable socialist elements; it will become a really socialist industry only when the selling of the state product surplus by the elements of the capitalist market is either totally eliminated, or brought down to limited and comparatively harmless proportions.

#### THE STRUGGLE FOR CONTROL OF THE MARKET

Have we suitable conditions for the carrying out of this transformation? We undoubtedly have! These conditions are created by the fact that there exists here a state of People's Democracy, a state in which power belongs to the toiling masses, a state which holds in its hands the key positions of economic life. On the other hand, it is quite clear that this transformation cannot be carried out without a bitter struggle aiming to master the market and to force upon it certain State-defined rules of action.

The position is as follows: Either the strength of our State, the State of People's Democracy, the strength of its apparatus and its economy,

will be able to subordinate the market to the State, and then our industry will gradually change into a consistently socialist one; or the market will not be taken in hand and the unrestrained elements of the capitalist market will dominate. Then our industry, the industry with considerable socialist elements will change into state-capitalist industry, *i.e.*, its income will go to the capitalists, even though formally it belongs to the State. This would mean that our industry would change into a collective institution serving the capitalist class under the guise of a state enterprise. There is no need to add that such an evolution from an industry containing considerable socialist elements to a state-capitalist industry would certainly be followed by a further evolution, or rather a counter-revolution, from state capitalism to purely private capitalism, with all its consequences.

The struggle goes on and will go on to determine whether our industry will become a consistently socialist one or whether it will change into a state-capitalist and then into a private-capitalist system.

Does the struggle to take the market in hand, to regulate it, to control the capitalist elements, mean a tendency to liquidate these elements? Of course not. We do not aim at this. Does the right to master the market situation mean that we are aiming at an administrative limitation of the possibilities of dev-

elopment of the capitalist-market elements? Of course not. Had we set ourselves such a task as that of limiting the possibilities of development of the capitalist market, we would forbid the buying and selling of land in the villages, which, as is well known, we do not do. We would prohibit the leasing of land in the villages, and prohibit or restrict the possibilities of hiring labor in the villages, and we do not do this. In the towns we would prohibit or restrict the possibilities of purchasing machines by artisans and small traders, the developing and building of workshops, the engaging of new workers, the building of houses, the opening and developing of shops. We do none of these things. This is not one of the tasks we have set ourselves. Such a state of affairs is indispensable, is necessary, but on the condition that it take place under the control of the State of People's Democracy.

What must the policy of control be based on? It must be based, first of all, on such an economic and administrative organization of the market that the profit of the capitalist middleman would correspond to the costs incurred, with a certain margin of profit, large enough to develop the enterprise, but making it impossible to seize the surplus product created within the State sector. Secondly, it must be based on such an economic-administrative control of the market that the relation of prices of agricultural and in-

dustrial goods will correspond to the real relation between their values and would make possible the further development of industry—without leading, as it happens today, to the seizing of the surplus products of the state sector, primarily by the wealthy section in the villages. It must be based on such an organization of the financial apparatus and the financial system in general that, on the one hand, further development of capitalist-market elements would be rendered possible, but, on the other hand, these elements would take a considerable part in contributing toward the rehabilitation of the country, and particularly toward the rebuilding and development of the economic apparatus. Finally, it must be based on such an organization that would make it possible for the financial apparatus to avail itself of a part of the profits and use it for the needs of the working class and those groups of the peasantry whose conditions, despite the land reforms, are still difficult.

In other words, the struggle to master the market situation does not mean the liquidation of the capitalist-market elements. It does not mean the ending of the possibilities of development of the capitalist market elements. It only means the struggle for the control of these elements by the State of People's Democracy. This struggle must be won and then the capitalist-market ele-

ment  
ing  
ment,  
element,  
State  
the S  
state-  
condi  
Dem  
Th  
talist-  
dinat  
talist  
condi  
our i  
ist  
social  
twice  
follow  
the  
Polar  
want  
whic  
const  
we l  
be a  
of th  
Dem  
for t  
for t  
syste  
tran  
const  
curb  
yet  
conv  
Thi  
war  
ist  
men

ments in our economy, while retaining their possibilities for development, and still remaining capitalist elements, could be controlled by the State and by the economic sector of the State, and would become the state-capitalist elements under the conditions of the State of People's Democracy.

The transformation of the capitalist-market elements not subordinated to the State into state-capitalist elements is an indispensable condition for the transformation of our industry, which contains socialist elements, into a consistently socialist industry. The struggle between "us" and "them" involves the following: "We" want to convert the capitalism that still exists in Poland into state capitalism; we want to transform our industry, which has socialist elements, into a consistently socialist industry. When we have accomplished this, we will be able to say that the construction of the economic system of People's Democracy has been accomplished, for there are two elements necessary for the construction of an economic system of People's Democracy: the transformation of industry into a consistently socialist one and the curbing of capital which is not as yet subordinated to state control, converting it into state capitalism. This is what "we" want. "They" want to avoid conversion of capitalist elements into state-capitalist elements; they want to convert our in-

dustry with socialist elements into a state-capitalist industry, and later into a private-capitalist one. They want thus to create for themselves a basis from which to march backward from the economic system of People's Democracy to a system of capitalist economy. These are the issues in the struggle and none others.

### THE COOPERATIVE SECTOR

We have tried thus far to analyze the role and perspectives of development of the state and private sectors in our economy. In Marxist language we should rather call these two sectors: the sector possessing socialist elements and the capitalist-market sector. But how should we describe the third sector, the cooperative sector? If we analyze the division into sectors from the point of view of formal ownership, then and then only can we speak about a cooperative sector. From the point of view of property division we can say that a certain factory or shop belongs to a cooperative, and thus comes under the cooperative sector. But this is a formal point of view. This is merely a classification on the basis of ownership. This formal classification based simply on ownership only stands in the way of a real and truly creative classification. Such a real and creative classification is one based upon the structural types of society.

We have stated that we know of

feudal, capitalist, and socialist types of society, that we know of mixed economic systems. But we do not know and cannot know this additional type of society which is called a cooperative type of society. At the present stage, as far as the producers' cooperatives are concerned, especially in agriculture, it may mean a specific form of connecting the small producers with the state sector, socialist in its principles, and subordinating them to state control. Under such conditions and in this sense the cooperatives of small producers, especially agricultural ones, may represent a specific and progressive cooperative form which, in its further stage, would mean a step forward on the way toward the new structural forms, toward socialism. It must be understood, however, that under certain conditions the cooperative movement may become a form of struggle in the hands of the small producers, and especially of small capitalists, against control by the State.

As we can see, the struggle goes on precisely between these two alternatives: will the cooperatives become the form of evolution most comprehensible and profitable to the masses of small producers, toward the new forms of society, toward socialism; or will they turn out to be a specific form of breaking away from control of the People's State, a specific form of domination by the capitalist-market elements, a

specific form of return to the system of capitalist economy. The result of this struggle will depend not only on who will direct and how will the cooperative be directed; it will also depend on understanding that cooperatives are not a type of social system but merely a form of uniting small producers, either toward the strengthening of the economic system of the People's Democracy, or back along the way to capitalist economy.

In connection with the problems of the cooperatives, it is necessary to deal with the problem of which much is heard today, *i.e.*, the so-called "cooperativisation" and nationalization. As is known, we have here a large variety of different trends and political groups. Certain people either endeavor to counterpose "cooperativisation" to nationalization, or try to prove that "cooperativisation" is a higher social form than nationalization. It must be clearly stated that our Party not only has nothing to do with these "theories" but considers them to be detrimental and alien. According to Marxism, the socialization of the means of production was always understood to mean their becoming state property. Any other method of solving this problem would be a backward and reactionary method. The socialized means of production may be used on a national scale. Dividing them into separate cooperatives would mean but one thing: the return, in

a specific cooperative form, to capitalist economy. The highest and the only form of successful socialization of the present-day means of production is nationalization. We can speak about "cooperativisation" as a form of socialization only in the sense of uniting small producers.

Such a cooperative movement may mean progress in technique and, under certain circumstances, even social progress, providing that it is a step on the way to bind small producers with the State sector and to submit them to the State control. But a move which would mean progress for small producers would spell retrogression as far as the most highly socialized, the State means of production are concerned. Therefore, contrary to certain mistaken interpreters, the bill for the nationalization of industry, passed January 3, 1946, foresees a field of activity for the cooperatives in industry only within the bounds of local raw-materials and local interests.

Counterposing nationalization to socialization is nothing but an attempt to create an ideology for the transition from an industry with considerable socialist elements to state-capitalist industry, and then to private-capitalist industry. This we must fully realize.

#### SUMMARY

Summing up:

1. Our industry is an industry with considerable socialist elements.

2. It will be in a position to become a consistently socialist industry only through the mastering of the market by the People's State and through putting an end to the grasping of the surplus product by the capitalist elements.

3. We are not aiming at the liquidation or administrative limitation of development of capitalist-market elements. We fight to subordinate them to the control of the State of People's Democracy, to change them into state-capitalist elements.

4. The mastery of the market, the conversion of capitalist elements in trade into state-capitalist ones, the conversion of the industry with considerable socialist elements into a socialist industry, means the completion of the economic system of People's Democracy, and a basis for the forward march toward Socialism.

5. The cooperative movement is not a type of social system; it is, in fact, a form for the uniting of small producers; on the basis of it there takes place a struggle as to whether it will be a form binding with the state sector and the state control, or a form for breaking away from state control.

6. The struggle to conclude the building of the economic system of People's Democracy, for mastery of the market, for the conversion of our industry into a wholly socialist one, is a hard and bitter class struggle.

# A PROGRAM FOR AGRICULTURE \*

By LEM HARRIS

THE OUTSTANDING FACT confronting American agriculture today is the threat of renewed economic crisis and prolonged depression which oppresses every farm home. The Communist Party submits that a correct farm policy can do much to lessen the destructive effects of such crisis and depression, besides protecting the living standards of those millions of the farm population who even in normal times are close to the edge of bankruptcy.

The outlook for agriculture is clearly insecure. Already a few "gluts" have occurred, in spite of the widespread areas of hunger in the world. Simple addition is all that is necessary to see the result of the ending of the war demands for food and fiber, the closing off of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (U.N.R.R.A.), while American farm production has soared 25 per cent above prewar production.

Renewed farm depression, comparable to the nineteen-year farm slump—from 1920 to 1939—would

be a disaster to our farm population second only to the disaster of war itself. Farmers have not forgotten the toll of lost homes and rural poverty that led up to the great farm revolt of the early thirties. They are in no mood to be put through those man-made wringers a second time.

Some of the measures of the New Deal, and certain wartime agricultural provisions, were of substantial assistance to working farmers. These measures should be preserved and extended, not slashed in the manner voted by the House of Representatives. New measures which fit present conditions should be added so that our farm families may be protected from a repeat performance of the tragedy of foreclosures and evictions that followed the First World War.

Reaction proposes to give monopoly a free hand without regard to the fate of four million farm families. The Communist Party proposes that the power of the government be used to curb monopoly domination and to build up the living standards of American farmers. Present rural facilities for housing, education, and health are the nation's lowest.

The following measures are urged as a means of enabling American farmers to contribute the maximum to the world need for food, and also to make available to farmers and agricultural workers the full benefits of modern facilities which have been denied them for so long.

\* Submitted to the Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, by Lem Harris, on behalf of the Farm Commission, Communist Party, U.S.A.

## I. WORLD FOOD POLICY

With a third of our own people traditionally "ill-housed, ill-fed, and ill-clad," and with millions of people in Europe and Asia condemned to starvation, the Communist Party rejects all talk of general farm surpluses and all programs for restricting farm production as reactionary and against the national interest. We must not forget that today America is the only thickly settled part of the world that is not suffering serious food shortages, nor can we forget the solemn commitments made by our representatives in concert with those of 42 other nations at the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture, held in Hot Springs, Virginia, in 1943. There the United Nations unanimously resolved that all-out efforts must be made, not only to check hunger and famine which followed the world conflict, but also *to banish forever the scourge of hunger from the earth.* Had we led the way in implementing the Hot Springs decision, we would have won the warm and lasting gratitude of the common people of the world. America's moral contribution would have been the brightest page in our history. Our country's commitments at the Hot Springs Conference must be fulfilled and the program developed there implemented.

But unfortunately the influence of imperialist power-politics has been

more powerful than our solemn commitment at Hot Springs to banish hunger from the earth. In keeping with Hoover's proposals, U.N.R.R.A. was wrecked and a policy has been followed of using food as an instrument of international power-politics. The Truman Doctrine and the so-called Marshall Plan have officially recognized the Hoover policy. Food and arms are going to the fascist Greek government; more than a third of all food shipped last year went to former Axis nations; and now Secretary Anderson supplies the final touch by broadly inferring that shipments of food will be discontinued to Europe's newer democracies if they do not fall in with the Marshall Plan. In all these steps, the United Nations is being by-passed by our government.

The Congress should authorize a program of large-scale loans to the countries of Europe, free of political conditions and interference in their internal affairs, giving priority to those countries which contributed most to our common victory over Hitler. These loans must be used to raise the standard of living of those peoples who suffered most in the war, thus contributing to the expansion of peaceful world trade and hence to American foreign trade.

Congress must halt American funds for financing the splitting up of Europe, the creation of a western bloc, and the organizing of the Ruhr as a new industrial base at the ex-

pense of our allies in the war against Hitler.

## 2. FLOOR UNDER AGRICULTURAL INCOME

It should be amply clear that we cannot afford to return to the policy of just letting farm income find its own level. The sad experience of the period between the two world wars should be proof enough that the government must intervene to uphold the rights and interests of the mass of farmers in their struggle against giant monopolies. All during that period while the income of the bulk of farmers was sinking, Big Business and Big Agriculture tightened their grip on the economy. A hands-off policy by the government would guarantee a free hand to the corporate farms and the entrenched monopolies that dominate the farm equipment, processing, transportation, and marketing industries. A free hand to monopoly means disappearing income for the working farmer and the whole train of disastrous consequences that follow.

Postwar farm legislation should set up as a goal a minimum income of \$2,500 per farm family. The Communist Party proposes a whole series of measures to help attain that goal, including measures to curb the monopolies, to increase the efficiency and production of the small farmer, to increase the market for farm products, to modernize rural life:

a. *Pricing Policy:* Despite the fact

that government pricing policy is in the center of all current discussions of the farm problem, the Communist Party emphasizes that it is only one of a number of necessary ways to bolster the income of the small farmer.

There are approximately four million farm families, two-thirds of the total, whose gross production per farm in 1944 was under \$2,500, the average being only \$950. After deducting the costs of operation, this average farm family has something under \$500 for meeting its living expenses, and this for a year considered to be one of abnormally high farm income. Obviously, high farm prices—even as high as they were in 1944—do not mean appreciably higher income to the lower two-thirds of the farm population because of the limited volume of their farm production. Hence, as a determining factor in farm income, farm prices are of primary importance only to the larger producers. They are of proportionately less importance to the small farmers. Increasing the income of these small farmers requires much more than a correct pricing program. But if a correct pricing policy can be established on a stable basis, these smaller farmers can be helped to build up their income by raising their productive capacity. It is with this understanding of the limits of the price question that the Communist Party proposes the following:



Government price support pledges should be carried out in full. Pending a new program, the wartime promise of a 90 per cent parity floor under major commodities must be carried out. Farmers who were solemnly promised full farm production should not be required to reduce production in order to obtain these pledged price support payments.

Since these price support promises have been assured the farmers until the end of 1948, the government is to this extent committed to a continuation of maintaining "parity" prices as a general principle. But after 1948, a more equitable pricing policy must be invoked, for parity cannot be said to afford an accurate basis for guaranteeing the farm income of the small farmer. The parity principle ignores the inequality of income between the small farmer and the big producers, especially the "factories in the fields." Instead of helping the small working farmer most in need of aid, the application of the parity principle accorded the lion's share of the benefits to the biggest farms least in need of aid and has thereby aggravated existing inequalities. Instead of correcting the inequality between farm and non-farm prices, parity strives merely to raise farm prices while leaving the way wide open for the monopolies further to increase the prices of their products, to mark up their price spreads, and thus to

rob both the poor farmer and the consumers generally of any benefits. Moreover, parity, in its present form, discriminates against some crops such as milk and favors others, such as wheat, due to the changes in the methods of production that have altered former cost relationships.

Instead of freezing inequalities and promoting further disparities in agriculture, we believe that vigorous measures must be taken to safeguard the small farms if Congress is to preserve the family type farm.

Furthermore, corporate farmers, meat packers, food processors, sugar corporations and other large corporate interests have been permitted to absorb the benefits of farm legislation designed to aid working farmers. Processors and food trusts have made a practice of pocketing subsidies without passing on the benefits either to farmers, in terms of higher prices, or to consumers, in terms of lower food prices. Now Big Business, in alliance with Big Agriculture, demands that the small farmers be denied the benefits of federal farm programs and that two-thirds of the farm families be plowed under.

After 1948, government purchase of farm commodities as a means of holding up farm prices should be discontinued. Government price pegging means a bonanza for the capitalist farmers, while city consumers have to pay high prices for food, thus lowering their buying power.

Market prices should be left free to seek their own level, while the smaller farmers should be given compensatory payments to make up the difference between the lower market price and a higher price calculated on the basis of a revised parity formula. These compensatory payments should be paid in full to farmers whose annual incomes are \$2,500 or less. On farms whose income is over this amount, compensatory payments should not exceed a total of \$500 in any one year. Instead of the present base period, 1909-14, a more recent period should be substituted in order to modernize the pricing formula and to iron out inequalities between crops. These revised price formulas should be submitted periodically for discussion and approval to farmers as well as to other specified groups before adoption. The basis of payments must be known to the farmer in advance of his crop cycle to guide him in making his farm plan and thus effectively take much of the gamble out of farming. In no case should crop reduction be required as a condition for compensatory payments.

b. *Cut Farm to Market Price Spreads:* Key to any permanent program for maintaining farm income and consumer buying power is the narrowing of the excessive spread of profit that is charged by monopolized food processors and marketing agencies. This has been a drain on the people of the nation

for a long period of time. Often these price spreads are concealed, as, for example, those calculated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for the meat industry which takes no account of inedible by-products manufactured by the packers, ranging from high-priced medicines at \$100 an ounce to fertilizer. Though these food processing trusts made immense earnings during the war, their successful knifing of O.P.A. garnered for them an even greater increase of price spreads, thus cheating farmers and cutting the real wages of labor. Such profiteering will more rapidly precipitate our economy into a postwar crisis of major proportions.

Among the measures we propose for curbing such excessive price margins are:

*Halt Grain Gambling and Speculating in Farm Commodities.* The recent corner on the rye market by Clarence Francis, head of General Foods, Inc., proves the inadequacy of present regulations over the commodity exchanges. These regulations should be tightened up, enforced, and backed up with penalties. Ever-normal granaries, government loans on sealed cribs and bins, should be available for all non-perishable crops so as to even out the supply and prevent speculators from cornering the market.

*Establish Public Ownership of the Railroads; Government Regulation of Trucking.* To end the long-stand-

ing ills suffered by the farmers and consumers at the hands of the railroads, the government should nationalize these carriers. This is necessary if the present tangle of contradictory and highly discriminatory rates is to be straightened out, if the practice of withholding refrigerated cars and box cars from various groups of growers is to be stopped, and if the trusts are to be prevented from using f.o.b. basing points to establish monopoly pricing patterns for the nation. It is necessary that other forms of transportation, trucking, and shipping be brought under government supervision, with mileage rates fixed on a uniform basis and with insurance against losses provided under a nationwide bonding system.

*Crackdown on Price-Rigging in the Commission Markets.* So powerful are the commission houses and food handlers now in control of the food markets in the big cities, that the Department of Justice has never followed up on the federal indictments which were returned against these rings back in 1943. Despite the efforts of newspapers and various public officials to lay the blame at the door of the labor unions, the government's own information clearly shows that the chain stores, commission houses, and big food handlers, in league with the transportation interests, operate these markets in gangster-fashion, "unreasonably and arbitrarily decreasing the returns to

growers" and "increasing prices" to the consumers.

To end this evil, we recommend that federal, state, and city authorities take immediate action. The federal government should press criminal charges of conspiracy against the interests previously indicted. These markets should be brought under municipal ownership, with all sellers (including farmers themselves) and all buyers allowed to bid freely without monopoly restraints, such as onerous fees, service charges, and denial of access. Cartage and trucking should be handled by city-owned vehicles, thereby eliminating excessive tolls. The state, in turn, should break up the present factor-system in the countryside, by which farmers are required to market through agents making advances to them. Instead, the state should make loans and advances in kind to these growers, at low rates of interest. Open-price contracts should be outlawed. Moreover, the federal government should use its power to prevent chain stores and other commission interests from driving down prices in particular areas and thereby depressing prices to farmers nationally.

*Put Teeth in the Pure Food and Drug Act.* Require grade-labelling of all products. Results of government testing by the Bureau of Standards should be made available to the public, and thus farmers should, for example, get government

findings on food, fertilizers, machinery, etc., with the manufacturer's name and brand indicated.

*Nationalize the Food Trusts.* Milk, bread, meat, fruit, and other basic foods are today under the control of privately owned monopolies. Numerous examples prove that it is common practice for these monopolies to subordinate the nation's health to what they consider to be an immediate financial advantage. One instance of such trifling with the national food supply should be enough to warrant the government stepping in to deprive that industry of its monopoly control. Yet the record shows long drawn-out but fruitless federal indictments against the big four meat packers and other food handlers, charging illegal monopoly practices damaging to the public welfare.

We propose that the food trusts be nationalized as a measure of public welfare and necessity. It should be the aim to operate them at actual cost, without draining off huge sums for executive salaries, dividends, advertising, inflated overhead charges, etc.

Similarly, it has become necessary to nationalize the farm machinery, fertilizer, and power trusts. For years, farmers have been the victims rather than the beneficiaries of the high price policy of these trusts. Farmers have long suffered from the outrageous prices charged for implements and spare parts; the

high freight rates for fertilizer which contains up to 80 per cent inert filler; and the refusal of power companies to extend rural lines until federally sponsored Rural Electrification Cooperatives stirred them up. Recently, organized labor has been calling the farmers' attention to the very small percentage of total charges for implements that goes to labor, in contrast to the mark-ups charged by manufacturers and dealers. This has exploded company sponsored efforts to blame labor for the high price of farm implements.

Only by government intervention can these necessities for modern, efficient farming be brought within reach of America's smaller farms. The technical means are now available for taking a good share of the drudgery out of farming, in the fields, in the barn, and in the home. Two-thirds of America's farm population should no longer be denied these necessities for a decent life. Properly to service smaller farms which cannot efficiently utilize the larger implements, there is need for government sponsored tractor and farm machinery pools, prepared to do custom work for groups of cooperating farmers, including the carrying through of expensive soil conserving projects.

*Support Farm Cooperatives.* Oppose the Wall Street inspired campaign to subject farm cooperatives to taxation on earnings refunded to patrons. This is one more step in

the long campaign of the trusts to take over and control the farmers' institutions. No unfair tax or other measure should be passed to hamper farmers in their right to organize and bargain through cooperatives.

*c. Supply Adequate Long-Term Credit at Low Rates of Interest.*

This measure is another necessary feature of an income-building program, especially for the farms which banks call bad risks. Such loans must be available for the purpose of transforming as many farms as rapidly as possible from uneconomic to efficient productive units, by financing the purchase of needed power implements, building terraces and other soil conserving projects. Though always hampered by inadequate funds, the Farm Security Administration did begin to meet this problem. The increased wartime production of tens of thousands of small farms is directly attributable to the liberal loan policy of this agency. A good test of whether public officials really support a program of abundance is whether they favor streamlining the small farm by such a loaning agency. The situation facing the small farms is so critical that, if they are to weather this postwar storm now threatening our economy, an agency similar to the F.S.A. must be restored and its operations greatly expanded. Instead of that, we have seen the work of its whittled-down successor, the Farm-

ers Home Administration, and its loans to veterans curtailed and hampered. We urge that F.S.A. be restored as an independent agency and that it be authorized to lend 500 million dollars a year to working farm families and veterans for the purpose of improving their present farms or helping them to settle on new farms capable of affording a decent standard of living.

In connection with such loans to farms with scanty or no cash reserves, we propose a variable crop payment plan, whereby the annual payments vary with the size of the crop and the income received in a given year. Thus, in a year of crop failure, no payments would be exacted, and, similarly, if prices fall, the scheduled payment would be scaled down in proportion.

*d. Establish Government Sponsored, Farmer-administered Crop Insurance.* This should be available to all farm operators in the event of partial or complete loss of a crop, with the proviso that farms having an income (gross value of products marketed) of \$1,000 or less the previous year, may get 75 per cent coverage, and those over that amount a sliding, decreasing coverage.

*e. Establish Special Safeguards in the South, Where the Negro People Have Been Prevented from Exercising Their Democratic Rights.* It must be remembered that half of America's farmers are in the South, a big percentage of whom live on the low-

est living standard known in the country. Here, above all places, there is need to apply these measures for building up living standards for all, without discriminating against any. Until the democratic and economic rights of Negro farm families are assured, the white sharecroppers, tenants, small farmers, and agricultural workers will also be held in poverty. This is why federal action against lynching, against Jim Crow in all its forms, and against peonage, as well as upholding every person's right to own land, and every citizen's right to vote, are all necessary parts of a farm program.

Immediate steps should be taken to fulfill the promises of land made during the Civil War but never kept. Now that the mechanization of cotton is threatening to dislocate thousands of farm families in the South, it is essential that a large-scale program of land purchase and resettlement be initiated in the South. Only through government intervention can these technical advances be made to serve the interests of small farmers, sharecroppers, tenants, and agricultural workers.

Instead of bolstering up the old plantation system by subsidies and cotton concessions, the government should halt its dole to the cotton magnates of the South and turn its attention to the welfare of the people who have been picking cotton all of their lives but still do not have enough to cover their bodies. By law,

the sharecroppers must have the right to a written contract with the landlord which adheres to minimum standards. Sharecroppers must not be hampered by crop liens or any other claim from freely marketing their own crop.

As a first step toward ending the tenancy system in the South, a land purchase program should be started under the government's right of eminent domain. Plantation lands purchased under such a program will require special safeguards to protect the interests of the Negro families and assure them a full measure of all benefits. Title must pass to croppers and tenants who actually work the land and not to the agents of landlords. Technical assistance must be provided where needed, as well as credit, machinery, work stock, fertilizer, seed, sprays, and cooperative marketing facilities under federal supervision. Government owned lands, suitable for cultivation, should be made available under this program wherever possible, including cultivatable land acquired under tax-delinquency proceedings.

One of the surest guarantees that purchases of land are made on the basis of real, as opposed to inflated, values, and also that transfers are made to those who actually intend to farm the land with their own labor, is to extend the system of local committees, democratically elected by local mass meetings of farmers in

which Jim Crow is completely banned as well as other forms of exclusion of those who have a right to participate.

f. *Establish Projects of the T.V.A. Type.* This is an additional important means of building up the earning capacity of smaller farmers in the hilly, cutover, or low-producing areas through vast government projects inspired by the success of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The great river valley projects, which have been approved by government engineers, bring a host of benefits to city and farm people alike. Back in 1937, President Roosevelt urged Congress to establish such authorities in seven regions covering the nation: (1) the Atlantic Seaboard; (2) the Great Lakes and Ohio Valley; (3) The Tennessee plus the Cumberland; (4) the Missouri River and the Red River of the North; (5) the Arkansas, the Red, and the Rio Grande; (6) the Colorado River; and (7) the Columbia River basin. Greatest of these, and most urgently needed, is the proposed Missouri Valley Authority. Control and use of the waters of the Missouri-Mississippi, the world's longest water-way, is no longer even debatable. Recurrent disastrous floods, climaxed by the great flood of 1947, would be reason enough for M.V.A. But when we add to flood control the benefits of inexhaustible power, irrigation, soil conservation, and navigation, the benefits to the nation appear star-

ting. Only private interests with special axes to grind oppose M.V.A. Railroads and power companies, assisted by Farm Bureau lobbies, have thus far blocked the way. It is the duty of Congress to respond to the broad interests of the people and ignore the pressure of Big Business.

An additional needed federal project is the reforestation of the cutover area, which eventually could restore forests capable of meeting the nation's needs for mature timber and would contribute to flood control at the head of the watersheds.

g. *Modernize Rural America.* It is time the nation faced the fact that most modern facilities are denied the bulk of our smaller farmers. There is urgent need for an immense rural program for modern housing, education, medical and dental service, and modern utilities, including electric power and telephones. An appropriation of two billion per year could start such a program. Besides grappling seriously with America's present low standards of rural living, it would also launch a huge train of industrial activity for equipping and servicing the new institutions.

h. Tied up with such a program is the need for social security which would combine crop insurance with health and accident insurance, and maternity benefits.

In a modern world, farm families eminently deserve adequate old age pensions. The present fate of old people, who after a lifetime of use-

ful toil must then suffer the humiliation of burdening their families, can be ended by old age security payments.

i. The only equitable way of supervising the administration of such government responsibilities as compensatory payments, loans for modernization of farms, crop insurance, old age security payments, etc., is through a system of democratically elected local, county, and state committeemen. Only through such a system can the interests of the individual sharecropper, tenant, or owner be protected.

### 3. AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

No farm program worthy of the name can afford to ignore the problems of the agricultural workers. They are the lowest-paid group in the nation, and their sub-standard wages serve, not only to subsidize Big Agriculture, but also to depress the living standards of the family-operated farms. The small farms have a direct and vital interest in joining with the agricultural workers to insist that their wages be raised and their living standards improved.

The three million farm workers are today almost completely lacking in organization, and hence are the victims of Big Agriculture. Instead of being excluded from all social legislation, the agricultural workers should be given the protection afforded by measures such as the Wag-

ner, Social Security, and Fair Labor Standards Acts. Instead of being treated as orphans and nomads, their civil and economic rights should be restored, and adequate school, health, and living conditions should be made available to their families. Furthermore, the right of migratory agricultural workers to vote must be safeguarded by amending present residential statutes.

### 4. FLOOR UNDER CONSUMPTION

In keeping with the promises of abundance and freedom from hunger, steps should be taken to safeguard the health of the American people. The large number of young men and women rejected by the armed forces during the war because of physical deficiencies traceable to poor diets, shows the need for such action, and America's productive capacity has reached the point where it can easily afford such protection to the people. According to Kettering, engineer and director of General Motors, the resources and "know how" are now at hand for providing the material needs (food, housing, clothing, and other requirements of modern life at decent standards) by means of only two hours work a day. It is, then, high time that we made some beginnings toward providing "Three Square Meals a Day for America," such as:

*A National Food Stamp Plan. The*



food stamp plan should be restored and extended. It should apply not only to so-called "surplus" foods but should be so designed that low-income groups can also afford additional quantities of all basic, protective foods as well. Food stamps should be geared to income, with all persons having an income of \$2,500 or less eligible without the stigma of a means test.

*A School Lunch Program.* This program should be continued, broadened, and strengthened. It should make hot lunches available in all public schools, with all caste stigmas carefully weeded out and removed. Moreover, the benefits derived from the better nourishment of children should be extended to those of pre-school age by reaching the child nurseries and by widening of the present child nursery facilities in rural and urban areas. We condemn the attempt of the House to slash the School Lunch Program. Not more than 25 per cent of the schools are at present included under this program, and, instead of whittling it down, the health of our children requires that it be greatly expanded.

*Factory Lunches for Workers.* All factories and plants having 200 or more employees should be required to make arrangements for serving one hot meal to the men and women on each shift, unless it can be shown that nearby eating places are capable of handling the eating requirements of the employees. Whenever foods

are available in "surplus" quantities, they may be made available to the employees of these plants, but the reduction in cost must be passed on to the workers. Such factory cafeterias and dining rooms should be subject to government supervision, with minimum dietary standards fixed and maximum prices determined.

## 5. FINANCING THE PROGRAM

Most people favor in principle the above proposals for raising the living standards of the depressed section of America's farm population. No doubt the question is arising, how will these huge projects be financed?

Besides emphasizing that our nation cannot afford to ignore these measures as an anti-depression bulwark, it can also be proven that these projects can be undertaken within the framework of the present budgeted Federal income, provided we are willing to face a marked change in our international policy.

The national budget, as presented by President Truman and supported by the G.O.P., is a war budget. For the fiscal year of 1948, 38 billions are anticipated as total receipts. Of this amount, 23.0 billions go for war purposes, past and future. The 11.6 billions allocated for future war preparation is the sensitive point. Compare this 11.6 billions with .2 billion for housing, or 1.5 billion for all forms of agricultural aid. Of course,

Congress is modifying the proposed budget, but clearly no change is being considered of the underlying principle of billions for future wars and pennies for socially useful projects.

Drastic cutting down of the 11.6 billions for future wars would provide ample funds for financing the projects necessary for modernizing masses of small farms. Health, housing, food control, reforestation, electric power, and modern equipment, all can be financed. Another part of this same budget allocates 2.1 billions as estimated tax refunds to corporations, steeply pyramided on the largest monopolies. Here is another example of wrong and harmful use of billions while the people's needs remain unfilled.

This war budget, combined with the Administration and G.O.P. bipartisan policy of hostility toward the world's newer democracies, is dissipating the reservoir of good will toward the United States built up during the victorious war against world fascism.

In the interlaced economy of today, farm policy is a vital part of our domestic and foreign policy. The penalty for rash continuance of present policy is the speeding up of economic crisis and the development of an American war party. The people's welfare requires that this policy of disaster be changed to one based on international good will, curbing monopolies at home, and making the benefits of advanced

modern technique available to everyone.

While pressing for such a people's policy through every means at its disposal, the Communist Party holds that only under Socialism will the problems of the farmers, along with the rest of the working population, be fully solved. Small farmers, especially, have everything to gain from a Socialist government, one of whose first acts will be the guaranteeing of every farmer's right of full ownership of the land he farms. No matter what debts he may owe, nor what claims there may be against it, his farming of the land would constitute his full title. The Communist Party seeks to convince the American people of the necessity of reorganizing society on a socialist basis. Because this policy is consistent with the basic aspirations of the American people, we are confident of its ultimate success.

But the immediate question is whether Congress and the Administration will respond to the demands of monopoly or the common people. The reactionary character of the present Congress, the punitive Taft-Hartley slave labor measure, the refusal actively to push major programs for aiding farm production, farm living, river valley development, etc.—clearly indicate the need for labor and farm forces to unite for the purpose of electing in 1948 a new, progressive Congress that will respond to and enact a people's program.

TW  
RE  
CO  
IN

AN  
the C  
ern s  
years  
for o  
It als  
test t  
of th  
tion  
as th  
recon  
South  
The  
the S  
of 19  
the r  
the S  
Comm  
assoc  
ber  
taken  
result  
Brown  
tion  
prece  
of th  
non-  
zatio

## TWO YEARS OF THE RECONSTITUTED COMMUNIST PARTY IN THE SOUTH

By NAT ROSS

AN EXAMINATION OF THE WORK of the Communist Party in the Southern states since its reconstitution two years ago suggests important lessons for our tasks in the coming period. It also offers a practical means to test the soundness of the general line of the Emergency National Convention held in July, 1945, which served as the political foundation for the reconstitution of the Party in the South.

The major Party organizations in the South were dissolved at the end of 1943. In the six months thereafter, the remaining Party organizations in the South were dissolved, and non-Communist educational and press associations were formed in a number of states. These actions were taken directly and primarily as a result of the revisionist policy under Browder's leadership. The dissolution of the Party in the South, which preceded similar action in the rest of the country, and the setting up of non-Communist anti-fascist organizations in the South, were also in-

fluenced by other factors. These were the lack of growth of the Party, its weakness in face of the difficulties and violence of the struggle in the South, and especially the retreat from a Marxist position on the Negro question.

The anti-fascist educational associations actively supported the war effort and played a certain positive role on various immediate issues. But these organizations were characterized in the main by virtually a complete theoretical and political retreat from Marxism and the militant class struggle, and by extreme organizational looseness and absence of discipline. In the face of the difficulties of the struggle, they gradually evolved into talking societies. Petty-bourgeois elements became more and more dominant in the leadership and more preponderant in the membership. Most glaring was the development away from a Marxist position on the national character of the oppression of the Negro people. While this process was to be noted in the Party throughout the country, it naturally had its sharpest expression in the Jim-Crow and lynch-ridden South. For the brutal oppression of the Negro nation in the Black Belt, based on the backward share-cropping plantation system and strong slave survivals, served as the springboard for spreading and tightening the whole Jim-Crow and lynch setup in the South. Under such extremely difficult circumstances, only the soundest theoretical clarity on the

Negro question could stand the test.

In the early Forties, even prior to its dissolution, the Party in the South began to veer away from an understanding of the national character of Negro oppression, of the potential might of the Negro liberation movement and its role as an indispensable ally of the labor and progressive movement. It tended more and more to a position of bourgeois-liberalism on the Negro question, reaching its climax in the educational associations in 1944-45. By the time of the Party's reconstitution, these educational organizations were permeated with white-chauvinism and were operating on the basis of a thoroughly bourgeois-liberal policy, expressed essentially in the abandonment of the struggle for the complete national liberation of the Negro people and in a patronizing approach of "helping the Negroes" out of their plight.

#### THE RECONSTITUTION OF THE PARTY IN THE SOUTH

The reconstitution of the Party organizations was begun in the summer of 1945. Six state and district organizations were set up in the South that year and two more were added in 1946. In this work it was necessary to conduct a vigorous struggle against revisionist and bourgeois-liberal thinking and policies. The validity of Marxism-Leninism and the role of the independent Marxist political party of the working class had to be clearly affirmed.

The general Marxian principles were translated into concrete policy

to meet the immediate postwar situation in which the Party was being reestablished. The various illusions that had been bred, especially during the war, about the new postwar South had to be dashed against the hard rock of reality. The significance of the emerging postwar offensive of American imperialism, and a militant line of policy to combat this reactionary offensive that was already developing after V-E Day, had to be put forth as a precondition for the reestablishment of the Party. In the very process of reconstituting the Party, Southern Communists, although few in number, centered their attention on combating the reactionary efforts to destroy the wartime economic and political gains of the Southern toilers, especially the oppressed Negro people. Southern Communists came forward with a program of struggle for adequate wages, for jobs and security, for equal rights for the Negroes, during the reconversion period.

The most important single task during the period of the Party's reconstitution was to smash the white-chauvinist practices and attitudes in the movement in the South, and the bourgeois-liberal policies which underestimated the importance of the struggle for Negro rights and the relationship of this struggle to the labor and democratic movement. This was achieved by a Marxian analysis of the national character of the oppression of the Negro people, an oppression that has its founda-

tion  
tation  
Belt,  
tiona  
and  
this  
for  
rather  
strug  
Pl  
Mar  
rect  
betw  
men  
ocra  
the  
out  
and  
ticult  
and  
for  
datic  
lasti  
be  
Uni  
barb  
sion  
inta  
agai  
dire  
whi  
no  
shor  
syst  
to r  
gro  
ind  
pro  
and  
In  
con

tion in the sharecropping-plantation economy of the Black Belt, and its profoundly reactionary effect on the economy and life of the entire South. Nor was this an idle or abstract discussion for Southern Communists; it was rather a springboard to action in the struggle for Negro rights.

Placing the Negro question on a Marxian foundation called for a correct explanation of the relationship between the Negro people's movement and the working-class and democratic movement of the South and the entire country. It meant to point out to the Southern white masses, and to the labor movement in particular, that the system of Jim Crow and lynch terror was the very means for the impoverishment and degradation of the white masses, that no lasting and decisive progress could be made in the South or in the United States as a whole while the barbarous system of national oppression of the Negro people remained intact. It meant that the struggle against the lynch system was in the direct and absolute interest of the white workers and that there was no other way for their own salvation short of putting an end to the lynch system once and for all. It meant to reaffirm emphatically that the Negro liberation movement was the indispensable ally of the labor and progressive movement of the South and the country.

In a decisive sense, success in reconstituting the Party could be meas-

ured by the degree to which this Marxian approach was carried out in practice, and the degree to which bourgeois-liberal paternalism and white-chauvinist practices were combated.

Another essential factor in reestablishing the Party was the need, especially important for the South, to give our organization a fighting character. It was necessary to make our Party an organization of action and struggle, to infuse it with confidence that even a young, small Party can overcome big obstacles and difficulties and lead mass movements if it has a correct policy and a fighting spirit. The reconstruction of the Party was, in the main, carried through on the basis of a modest and realistic policy of concentration on main political areas, industrial centers, and industrial workers. The growth of the Southern labor movement gave special emphasis to concentration on the development of native white and Negro workers, as well as returning G.I.'s, for leadership of the Party in the South and for overcoming the inroads of petty-bourgeois elements during the revisionist period.

The reconstitution of the Party in the South in the face of many difficulties, of limited forces and a relatively new membership, as well as the depth and gravity of the revisionist mistakes, was obviously no easy task. On the contrary, it required a bold and persistent political struggle and extended political clarifica-

tion to rid the movement of the revisionist confusion, especially on the Negro question, as well as on the role and character of a Marxist political party and on the Socialist objective.

In brief, the complex and difficult task of reestablishing the Party in the South was successful because the Party policy was correct, because it reacted to the political realities of the Jim-Crow and lynch-ridden South and reflected the needs and aspirations of the working class and oppressed Negro people.

#### SOME MAJOR PARTY ACTIVITIES

In the past two years the Party in the South has reached a membership of over 2,000, the highest it has ever attained. Most Southern districts doubled, and one or two tripled and quadrupled, their membership during this period. This growth was due primarily to the fact that the Party was active in defending the needs of the people and successful in getting results in the course of the struggle.

In a number of districts where the Party was under attack (Louisiana, North Carolina, Texas), the militant and public defense of the constitutional rights of the Communist Party helped to strengthen the Party organization. For example, in New Orleans the Party was under sharp attack last winter. Public meetings were broken up and many were arrested. Goon squads roamed the city

and Communists were threatened and beaten. The Party fought back by going to the people with the issues and by its militant court defense, especially symbolized in the stand taken by the State Chairman of the Party, James E. Jackson, who, as Communist and Negro, had been the main object of attack. As a result, the Party grew, became consolidated, and strengthened its mass connections.

One of the major activities of Southern Communists was their participation in the fight for labor's rights and needs, in the wage and strike struggles (maritime, tobacco, furniture, transport, mining, etc.), and in labor's historic drive to organize the unorganized millions in the South.

In connection with labor's organizing drive, certain sectarian tendencies developed among Left and other progressive forces. These tendencies toward sectarianism and retreat were given impetus by the Red-baiting activities of some of the leaders of the C.I.O. drive, by their hesitant approach to organizing the Negro workers, and by the vicious and terrorist opposition to labor's drive by the employers. The Party had to carry on a struggle against these tendencies which also reflected a lack of understanding of the political significance of organizing the unorganized in the South.

However, in every instance where the Communists fought persistently to overcome sectarianism and certain

capit  
able  
other  
sults  
On  
ment  
izatio  
house  
area  
the p  
with  
helpe  
instan  
tant  
rank  
more  
the N  
a poi  
the u  
Negro  
Comm  
tively  
drive  
Fro  
tution  
distr  
the w  
ple,  
and  
peopl  
The  
Comm  
Negro  
hance  
Natio  
the N  
of ou  
Negro  
chara  
gro n  
puttin

capitulatory tendencies, and were able to participate in the drive with other progressive forces, splendid results were achieved.

One of the outstanding achievements in this respect was the organization of 10,000 Negro tobacco leaf house workers in the Black Belt area of Eastern North Carolina. In the past year Communists, together with other progressive forces, have helped to achieve results in these instances because they relied on militant struggle and the initiative of the rank and file in the plants. Furthermore, they had a correct approach to the Negro question, which served as a point of departure for organizing the unorganized, white as well as Negro. In a number of instances, Communists also participated effectively in the Southern organizing drive of the A. F. of L.

From the moment of its reconstitution, the Party in every Southern district has made the fight to defend the wartime gains of the Negro people, the fight against lynch terror and for equal rights of the Negro people, a central part of its work. The effectiveness of the Southern Communists' immediate struggle for Negro rights has been especially enhanced in the past ten months by the National Committee resolution on the Negro question. The deepening of our Marxist understanding of the Negro liberation movement and the character of the oppression of the Negro majority in the Black Belt, the putting forth of the slogan of self-de-

termination for the oppressed Negro nation in the Black Belt, not as an immediate slogan but as a long range and fundamental educational slogan, has given a new impetus to the struggle for Negro rights in the South. A few salient examples will show the living connection between our basic position and the everyday struggle for Negro rights.

In Winston-Salem the organization of the 7,000 Reynolds tobacco workers into the Food, Tobacco, Agricultural, and Allied Workers-C.I.O., their struggles, and finally their strike of last spring, under militant leadership, served as an example of the leading role of the Negro working class in the Negro liberation movement. The organized Reynolds workers spearheaded the drive to organize the 10,000 Negro tobacco workers in the leaf houses in the Eastern North Carolina Black Belt. This forged a link between organized labor and the share-croppers in the common fight against the tobacco capitalists and tobacco plantation owners. The politically conscious and militantly-led Reynolds workers initiated the movement last spring, in the Winston-Salem city elections, that formed both the United Negro Citizens Committee and the United Labor Committee. This led to the historic election victory of the Negro veteran, Reverend Kenneth Williams, as well as that of the labor candidate for the City Council, R. E. Denny.

The Left Wing was an effective

part of these movements because it understood that they were part of the larger struggle for the complete liberation of the Negro people from their special national oppression and for the advancement of the labor movement in the South. Furthermore, these struggles were uniting the Negro people, heightening their national consciousness, and preparing the ground for the later struggles for broader political rights and freedom, for the right to the land and self-government in the Black Belt, for complete liberation.

Another important fact was that the basis of the day-to-day work of the North Carolina Communists was a sound understanding of the national character of the oppression of the Negro people. For example, in big advertisements in the two main newspapers of the state, the Communist Party pointed out the base of Negro oppression—the semi-slave share-cropping system—and how this is the means that keeps the whole state and the South backward. On the basis of government per capita figures, the Communists pointed out that *Jim Crow and lynchings cost the white workers \$10 a week in lower wages*, and showed how the fight for higher wages is interconnected with the fight for Negro liberation.

It was this correct approach to the Negro question and its relation to the labor and democratic movement that, despite important shortcomings and unfinished tasks, enabled the

Communist Party of North Carolina to withstand the unprecedented, combined employer-Bourbon and House Un-American Committee Red-baiting attacks that were launched against it during the spring and summer of this year.

A similar understanding of the living connection between the daily struggles and the ultimate struggle for the right to self-determination characterized the work of Southern Communists in the fight against Bilbo and Talmadge. In the latter case the newly formed and small Communist Party of Georgia played an important role in defeating the K.K.K.-fascist coup of Herman Talmadge for the governorship last winter. Inspired by an understanding of the whole nature of the struggle for the national liberation of the Negro people, the courageous Georgia Communists waged a vigorous and principled fight against the so-called white primary and mobilized tens of thousands with their fighting message. The Communists understood that the fight against Talmadge and the white primary was part of the fight against the Monroe (Ga.) quadruple lynching, against the drive to push wages to \$1.00 a day on the plantations. They knew that this fight was part of the larger fight for land reform, for Negro-white solidarity, for complete Negro liberation, and for the advance of the entire South from its present unequal and depressed status.

These few examples demonstrate



the unity of theory and practice on the Negro question. The fundamental understanding of the national oppression of the Negro people and the basic struggle for land and freedom for the oppressed Negro majority in the Black Belt gave clarity and courage to the immediate struggles for Negro rights and against lynch terror, against Bilbo and Talmadge, for the election of Reverend Williams, etc. The interplay between the present struggle for the right of Negroes to vote and hold public office and the ultimate movement for self-government and majority rule, for complete liberation of the Negro people in the Black Belt, becomes more apparent as the immediate struggles spread and the national consciousness of the Negro people rises. Furthermore, to the extent that Southern Communists, as well as progressives generally in the labor and Negro people's movement, deepen their understanding of the real national character of Negro oppression and its relation to the labor-progressive movement, to that extent will the fight against lynch terror, for Negro rights, for the defense of labor and all toilers in the South, be advanced and the development of the ultimate movement for the complete liberation of the oppressed Negro people be brought closer.

Despite the immense difficulties of the struggle in the South, the Communists emphasize this basic fact: The struggle of the oppressed Negro people against lynching, for equal rights and national liberation,

is not an obstacle and hindrance to labor's struggles, which is essentially the position of reactionary Social-Democracy and bourgeois-liberalism. *It is, on the contrary, a priceless and indispensable asset to the labor and democratic movement of the South and the whole country.*

The work of the Party in the South since its reconstitution is proof of the enormous progress made in overcoming the revisionist mistakes on the Negro question and the invaluable aid of the National Committee resolution on the struggle for Negro rights and the question of self-termination. However, it would be absolutely impermissible to rest content with the substantial progress made so long as lynch terror reigns supreme and the Wall Street-Bourbon combination dominates the South. The Negro question is one of the most urgent and complex questions that faces American Communists—and especially Communists in the South. Daily throughout the South, in a thousand ways, the reactionaries poison the air with white-supremacy propaganda, à la Hitler. And in the huge prison called the rural Black Belt, the brutality and lynch terror against the Negroes, which are hidden from the American people by a heavy cotton curtain, are reminiscent of Dachau and Buchenwald. Under such difficult conditions, constant vigilance and re-examination of our work in the fight for Negro rights is a primary obligation for Southern Communists.

Only recently, in one Southern

district where a number of important struggles for Negro rights had been led in the past two years, strong bourgeois-liberal tendencies on the Negro question cropped up again, including paternalistic and white-chauvinist tendencies. Above all, under the severe pressure of the lynch atmosphere, tendencies were revealed in the day-to-day work which expressed a failure to understand that the fight against lynch terror and for Negro rights is a powerful asset to the labor and democratic movement. Undoubtedly, if a self-critical examination were made, similar wrong tendencies could be found in other sections in the South, especially where the membership is new.

The major shortcoming that still remains in our work in the South is the inability to convey adequately and concretely to large sections of the white workers their own interest in the fight for Negro fights. At present this is most sharply expressed in the inadequate struggle in the South to put an end to the lynch terror. The rapid overcoming of this weakness, which exists in one form or another in every Party organization in the South, is the central task of Southern Communists. The urgency of this struggle is shown by the fact that lynch terror is a pace-setter for advancing fascism throughout the United States. Lynch terror is the secret of the moral strength of the Wall Street-Bourbon combination. It is the secret of the weakness of the Southern working class.

Any American in the South or elsewhere who does not stand up and fight to put an end to the barbaric lynch terror, in effect by this failure assists reaction in its drive toward fascism in the United States.

A recent Southern Party conference critically examined our work in the South in the fight against lynching. It emphasized the fact that the key to the successful struggle against lynch terror is the winning of the labor movement and the white masses in the South for united mass action against the lynch terror, for punishment of the lynchers, for Federal action to defend the lives and property of Negroes, and for state and Federal anti-lynching laws. This emphasis was made on the basis of an analysis of the present relation of forces in the South.

The oppressed Negro people in the South, especially in the cities and towns, are more united and politically active than ever before. Organized labor, as well as sections of the white students, veterans, teachers, and other professionals and various church and women's groups, have made considerable progress and have frequently joined, even though sometimes hesitatingly, in the struggle against the Wall Street-Bourbon rulers of the South. But the fact is that at the present stage the movement of the white masses lags far behind that of the Negro people. The main task of all progressives, and the Communists in the first place, is to bring the labor move-

ment into closer alliance with the advancing Negro people's movement, in their common interests. (In this connection note the statement by George Googe quoted below.)

### SOME KEY WEAKNESSES

In line with its industrial concentration policy our Party has made considerable progress in a number of important industries in the South. But it has made little progress in the largest industry, namely textile, whose labor force is composed almost exclusively of white workers. There are many real difficulties involved in the work in the scattered textile mill villages, due to limited forces, etc. The major reason for our weakness in this industry is an insufficient ability in practice to show the textile workers, on the basis of their own grievances, that they have common interests with the Negro people. For the Jim-Crow system is the cause of low wages and pellagra among the textile workers. The Negro-haters and the labor-baiters, the inciters to lynching, and the supporters of the Taft-Hartley Bill, the K.K.K. and the open-shoppers, are one and the same. Finally, in their own interest, in defense of their families and children, the textile workers must join with the Negro people in the struggle against the common Wall Street-Bourbon enemy. Nor should it be forgotten that the raising of the wages and the general improvement of the conditions of the workers in this key Southern in-

dustry, would be a tremendous impetus in raising the economic and political level of the entire South.

This weakness of Communist work in the textile industry, which derives from our weakness in winning the white workers, is directly connected with another major shortcoming of our work, namely, an underestimation of, and inadequate struggle against, reactionary Social-Democracy and Trotskyism in the South. It is precisely in the textile industry that reactionary Social-Democrats have their main base in the South, and it is precisely on the Negro question that they carry on their damaging work. They do this either by trying to ignore the Negro question among the white textile workers, thereby giving the employers and the Ku Klux Klan the initiative; or by condoning Negro-baiting; or by a paternalistic approach, and sometimes opposition to Negro-white solidarity, as well as by frequent covering up of these actions with "Left" phrases about the struggle for Negro rights.

In short, in order to overcome our many weaknesses, it is imperative for Southern Communists to deepen their understanding of the fundamental national character of the oppression of the Negro people. They must be able to relate the struggle against lynching and for Negro-white solidarity to the common interests of all Southern toilers and to the conditions, needs, and interests of the working class and the white workers in particular.

### POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS IN THE SOUTH

The current offensive in the South, which is a domestic counterpart of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, is characterized not only by the open lynch terror with government support. It is seen in the intensified anti-labor drive inspired by the Taft-Hartley Act, by the unconstitutional efforts of the poll-taxers to maintain control in the 1948 elections, and by the continued anti-Communist hysteria. At the same time a new wave of struggle among the Negro people, and in the ranks of labor as well as other sections of the population, is rising to challenge the Wall Street-Bourbon domination in the South.

In an editorial in the *New Republic* of July 7, Henry Wallace sums up the situation in the South adequately when he says:

The opposition [*i.e.*, the reactionary polltax Democrats] is capable, well organized and well financed. But it cannot withstand a united attack by organized labor and its allies. A dynamic program, vigorously implemented, can sweep aside the existing reactionary machines in every state. . . .

When reactionaries cannot be beaten in clublike Democratic primaries, they should, wherever possible, have the opposition of independent Democrats running in the final elections.

In the same editorial, Mr. Wallace gives additional sound advice to labor and the progressive forces of the nation. He says:

. . . the AFL, the CIO and the railroad brotherhoods must join to organize, educate and politically activate the workers and the small farmers of the South. . . . An alliance of labor, the farmers and small business is necessary. . . .

The success of labor's organizing drives in the South and the intensity of its political-education work will . . . determine the future of the nation itself.

One of the most significant political developments in recent months in the South is the progressive stirrings in the A. F. of L., which in the past acquiesced in the Jim-Crow system and often even supported it. At the North Carolina Federation of Labor Convention in August, George L. Googe, the conservative Southern director of the A. F. of L., stated that a Negro vote of 2,500,000 would be polled in the South in 1948 and would "naturally drift into the same bracket as the labor vote."\* The achievement of this labor-Negro people's political unity, Googe went on to tell a cheering audience, would mean that "*there will be no longer any Pappy O'Daniels, any Bilbos or any Talmadges in the South.*"\*

That this statement is not a passing remark but part of a significant development in the A. F. of L. is seen by the South Carolina Federation of Labor Convention held this summer, which formed itself as a state labor political club and urged local unions to set up labor political

\* My emphasis—N.R.

clubs  
of th  
State  
cludi  
Railro  
in C  
The  
held  
progr  
white  
ginia,  
Negro  
recent  
separa  
The  
A. F.  
South  
includ  
larg  
skilled  
highly  
sentim  
domin  
bodies  
the A  
tant r  
Taft-H  
suppor  
most  
the pr  
of L.  
Negro  
unity  
the Ne  
all, in  
votes o  
the el  
Kenne  
Salem,  
past p  
public

clubs to fight the poll-tax Bourbons of the state. Immediately after the State Convention a political club, including the A. F. of L., C.I.O., and Railroad Brotherhoods, was formed in Columbia to carry on the fight. The Texas A. F. of L. Convention held in July also made considerable progress on the question of Negro-white unity. And in Richmond, Virginia, the formerly separate white and Negro A. F. of L. central bodies recently merged after functioning separately for many years.

These important changes in the A. F. of L. reflect its growth in the South to a membership of 2,200,000, including half a million Negroes and large numbers of unskilled and semi-skilled workers. The old, small, highly skilled locals, where K.K.K. sentiment still exists, are no longer dominant in many of the A. F. of L. bodies in the South. The changes in the A. F. of L. also reflect the militant mood of struggle against the Taft-Hartley Act and its poll-tax supporters. Together with this, the most significant factor influencing the progressive currents in the A. F. of L. is the rising militancy of the Negro liberation movement and the unity and political consciousness of the Negro people. This is seen, above all, in the estimated 700,000 Negro votes cast in the South in 1946; in the election victory of Reverend Kenneth Williams in Winston-Salem, N. C.; in the fact that in the past period Negroes have run for public office in Virginia, North and

South Carolina, Florida, Texas, etc.; and in the right-to-vote movements of Negroes from one end of the South to the other.

All of these developments pave the way for still further strengthening the united action of labor, the toiling farmers, and the Negro people as the basis for a broad democratic coalition in the 1948 elections. Such a broad democratic coalition, which would include spokesmen for the liberal bourgeoisie, can play an effective part in helping to break the unholy alliance between the poll-tax Democrats and the Republicans in Congress.

#### PARTY TASKS

The Communist Party in the South is small and it faces greater difficulties than the Party in other sections of the country. But it has enormous opportunities.

In the central political task that faces the people of the South—the 1948 elections—the Communists will help to strengthen the broadest democratic coalition against the reactionary poll-tax Democrats, and especially against the Talmadges, Rankins, *et al.* This can be achieved by strengthening the pro-Roosevelt and pro-Wallace forces in the Democratic Party, as well as the independent forces of labor and the Negro people, with a view toward the isolation and defeat of the reactionary poll-taxers in the Democratic Party and the development of a new political alignment in the South.

Effective results in the struggle against the poll-tax "Republocrats" in the 1948 elections can be achieved by developing the struggle for the daily needs of the people. A fighting program for action for the South—centered around the struggle against high prices and for jobs and adequate wages, for the right of Negroes to vote and to run for public office, against lynch terror and for democratic land reform, and for peace—must be concretized on a state and city scale. In the neighborhood, factory, and on the plantation, the struggle for the most pressing needs of the toilers, especially, at this moment, against the sky-rocketing of prices, must become the basis for developing real statewide united political action of the Negro people and of the labor movement.

At a time when organized labor in the South with its 3,000,000 members, of whom almost 750,000 are Negroes, faces sharp economic and political attacks, the Communists need to increase their militant defense of labor's rights and needs, and the very existence of the trade unions. They must advance united labor action on local issues and against the Taft-Hartley Act. They must take a bold approach to labor's organizing drive despite increasing pessimism in some sections of labor, and show themselves to be dynamic organizers of the masses.

In all their mass activities the Communists must keep in the forefront the imperative and historic

need to build a fighting mass Communist Party in the South. The spirit of the All-Southern Party Conference in the winter of 1946, which initiated a successful recruiting drive, must be revived and heightened. Use must be made of the rich experiences in recruiting in the past two years, the policy of concentrating on winning industrial workers, veterans, and women, of planning the recruiting campaign, of good preparation of recruiting meetings. We need to learn how to build our Party in the course of action and struggle, how to consolidate our organization and integrate each member as an active Communist. In such cities as Birmingham, Winston-Salem, Atlanta, etc., we must work out concrete plans to make real progress in recruiting white workers, which will also help in intensifying our work in recruiting Negroes.

One of the most important things to remember is that our Party has a real history and tradition of struggle in the South, beginning twenty years ago, which is known to tens of thousands of workers.

In the late Twenties the Communists blazed the trail in the Gastonia strike and other textile struggles for trade union organization and in defense of the workers' needs. In the historic Scottsboro case, in the Herndon case, and in the organization of the share-croppers in the early Thirties, the Communists paved the way for labor-Negro cooperation in the

U.S.

In  
ties S  
vital  
strugg  
in the  
anti-K  
politic  
munis  
the wa  
dation  
other  
tivities

In t  
stituted  
more  
ism of  
carried  
the fra  
and ag  
particip  
organiz  
against  
Rankin  
alist bi  
Truma  
minist  
overcor  
the So  
tions of  
ers thr  
eration  
be pro  
They  
Souther  
pressed

With

U.S. during the Roosevelt period.

In the late Thirties and early Forties Southern Communists played a vital role in the mass unemployed struggles, in the birth of the C.I.O. in the South, in the anti-poll-tax and anti-K.K.K. fight and other major political struggles. Southern Communists contributed vigorously to the war effort, even though the liquidation of the Party severely crippled other militant and constructive activities.

In the past two years the reconstituted Communist Party has once more held aloft the banner of Marxism on the Negro question. It has carried on a vigorous struggle for the franchise for the Negro people and against the lynch terror. It has participated effectively in labor's organizing drive and in the fight against the Bilbos, Talmadges, and Rankins. It has exposed the imperialist bipartisan foreign policy of the Truman Administration. The Communist Party has pointed the way to overcoming the unequal status of the South and the depressed conditions of the white workers and farmers through the path of Negro liberation. Southern Communists can be proud of their fighting record. They are flesh and blood of the Southern working class and oppressed Negro people.

With pride in their fighting tra-

ditions, Southern Communists must intensify their pioneering and trail-blazing spirit in the present drive to build our Party. In addition to pursuing a correct fighting policy, it is necessary drastically to improve organizational practices and methods of work and, above all, the work of the Party clubs and each individual member.

The numerous experiences of Party clubs in the past two years in action and struggle on prices, housing and rent, on wages and the organizing drive, in the fight for Negro rights and against lynch terror, the distribution of the Southern edition of the *Sunday Worker* and of simple leaflets on burning issues—all of this has laid the groundwork for building the Party. The strengthening of the mass activity of the Party clubs in the more difficult conditions of the Jim-Crow South, and the activity of each club in its own name, is the key to recruiting. At the same time, the club meetings must be made interesting by means of well-prepared agendas, and Party education must be linked with the issues of struggle. Steps leading toward the training and promotion of Negro and white cadres to Party leadership in the South must be boldly undertaken. In this way we will build a fighting mass Communist Party in the South.

# THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC PARTIES AND LABOR UNITY\*

By S. IVANOV

THE SIXTH International Socialist Conference met in Zurich from June 7 to 9. Socialist (or Labor) parties from nineteen countries were represented. One of the items of the agenda was the "definite reconstitution of the Socialist International."

The first International Socialist Conference, held in London in December, 1944, with the express purpose of discussing the question of reviving the International, postponed the examination of this question. The second conference, which met in London in March, 1945, set up a commission to prepare for the resurrection of the International. But at the third conference, convened at Clacton-on-Sea (England) in the middle of May, 1946, which was attended for the first time by representatives of Socialist parties of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, the discussion of the Socialist International took a different turn. The recommendation was no longer to restore the prewar international organization of the Socialist parties,

but only to establish cooperation among these parties. The conference discarded the idea of establishing an International, and confined itself to setting up a Socialist Information and Liason Office—something in the nature of a subsidiary bureau of the Foreign Policy Department of the British Labor Party Executive.

At the fourth International Socialist Conference, which met in Paris in August, 1946, the question of the International was not raised at all. At the fifth conference (Bournemouth, November, 1946) the views of the delegates diverged, and the conference was forced officially to admit that the resurrection of the International was neither possible nor expedient. The conference, however, formed a Consultative Committee (also linked up with the Foreign Policy Department of the Labor Party Executive) to serve as a liason between the British Labor Party and the other Socialist parties and to maintain contact among the latter. This committee was to summon periodical conferences of delegates of the Socialist parties for the purpose of mutual information and exchange of views.

It should be observed that both at Clacton and Bournemouth the attention of the delegates of the British Labor Party and the Socialist parties of Belgium, Holland, Austria, and the Scandinavian countries was chiefly taken up with the problem of German Social-Democracy.

\* Reprinted from *New Times*, Moscow, No. 25, June 20, 1947 and No. 26, June 27, 1947.



They deemed it necessary to include Schumacher's German Social-Democratic Party in the contemplated International and to render it moral, political, and other assistance in combating the influence and activities of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. This concern for Schumacher's party was so challenging that a representative of one of the Socialist parties of Eastern Europe wanted to know whether Britain was not designing to utilize the German Social-Democracy as a weapon against the Soviet Union.

The Bournemouth Conference decisions gave official form to the liquidation of the long defunct Second International, and at the same time categorically rejected the idea of creating a new Socialist International.

Labor Party leaders, in their visits to European countries, particularly stressed the significance of the renunciation by the Bournemouth Conference of the plan to create a new International. Nevertheless, at the Zurich Conference the question was raised again. This conference met behind closed doors, and no information is yet available as to its deliberations. It is known, however, that it decided to set up "a commission to define the ideological basis, methods of action, and functions of a Socialist International." This commission is to present its report within a year after its formation. In other words, the question was again raised, and again postponed.

Thus, at all the International So-

cialist Conferences summoned on the initiative and under the auspices of the British Labor Party Executive—from the one in London in December, 1944 to the latest in Zurich in June, 1947—we find the same thing happening: the question of the International is raised, discussed, and deferred. And each time a rather strange procedure is observed: the non-existent and officially liquidated International decides to accept or not to accept new members into its non-existent ranks. The Zurich Conference, for instance, examined the application for affiliation to the "Socialist International" of the German Social-Democratic Party led by Schumacher. The application was supported by the British, Belgian, Scandinavian, and Austrian delegates. After discussion it was rejected by ten votes to five, with four abstentions. Immediately after the vote, a "liaison commission" was set up to aid "the efforts of the German Social-Democrats."

If Schumacher's party is making any efforts at all, it is to split the German labor movement. Schumacher spoke at the Zurich Conference. His speech was one long malicious and slanderous tirade against the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. The existence of this party worries the Right-Wing Social-Democrats most of all—far more than the activities of the fascist groups and semi-fascist parties in the Western zones of occupation of Germany.

But the conference was much

more circumspect in regard to the application of the Bulgarian Social-Democratic Party. It resolved to send a "commission of inquiry" to Bulgaria before deciding the question of admitting the Bulgarian Socialists into the "International."

Here, then, we have two facts: on the one hand, the failure of the attempts to resurrect the Second International, or to create a new Socialist International; on the other, the existence of an undefined, elastic, uncontrolled, but nevertheless, functioning, substitute for an International.

Evidently, such a state of affairs falls in at the present juncture with the plans of the more reactionary leaders of the West-European Socialist parties. In particular, it is extremely advantageous to the international maneuvers of the British Labor Party. Its leaders and press have been, and still are, upholding the thesis that an international Socialist organization which would have broad political powers and whose decisions would be binding on all its national sections is undesirable and unfeasible. The official justification for this thesis was given by Denis Healey, international secretary of the British Labor Party, in an article on the Clacton Conference. His arguments are roughly as follows: The creation of a Socialist International is impossible and undesirable because the Socialist parties have no common and uniform interests. Many of them are actual (or prospective) government parties and are responsible

for the national policies of their countries, and therefore can under no circumstances be guided by the decisions of any international body. Furthermore, the British Labor Party and the Socialist parties of the bigger countries cannot consent to abide by the decisions of an International which is based on the equality of all its sections, because the Socialist parties of the smaller and weaker countries would be in the majority. On the other hand, Healey pointed out, many of the European Socialist parties would not be willing to subordinate themselves to an International, the leadership of which would inevitably be in the hands of the Western Socialists (meaning the British Laborites).

Healey's arguments fairly accurately sum up the situation. They explain why the British Labor Party leaders have devised and put into effect a system of "loose" relations among the Socialist parties. By this means they will be able in all circumstances to retain the leadership of Socialist Parties in a number of countries, without binding themselves to observe the rules, program, or decisions of an international organization. This suits them all the more, since such an organization might in some measure be a vehicle of expression for those Socialist parties whose policies are not to the liking of the Labor Party leaders, especially their policy of uniting the democratic forces of their countries. We know that in postwar Europe there are

Social  
with  
cial-D  
the la  
The  
ward  
deter  
policy  
nothin  
merely  
policy  
emplo  
attemp  
conser  
and to  
sive d  
of the  
placab  
leader  
shape  
and C  
and th  
create  
Hence  
give to  
leader  
their t  
Sociali  
this p  
Comm  
examp  
the Br  
list  
ties of  
when  
and th  
stake,  
Italian  
to torp  
Sociali  
Gius

Socialist parties that have broken with the traditional Right-wing Social-Democratic policy of splitting the labor movement.

The policy of the Labor Party toward the other Socialist parties is determined exclusively by its foreign policy, which, as we know, has nothing socialistic about it, and is merely a continuation of Churchill's policy. Among the chief methods employed for its realization is the attempt to secure the support of the conservative and reactionary forces, and to prevent a bloc of the progressive democratic forces and the unity of the working class. Hence the implacable hostility of the Labor Party leaders to unity of action in any shape or form between the Socialists and Communists in any country, and their resistance to the efforts to create united working-class parties. Hence, too, the strong support they give to reactionary Social-Democratic leaders, to inveterate splitters, and their tendency to regard every honest Socialist who does not agree with this pernicious policy as a "crypto-Communist." We have an eloquent example of the policy encouraged by the British Laborites within the Socialist parties in the splitting activities of Saragat, who, at a moment when the fate of Italian democracy and the independence of Italy are at stake, has broken away from the Italian Socialist Party and is striving to torpedo unity of action between Socialists and Communists.

Giuseppe Saragat was one of the

representatives of the Italian Socialist Party who on October 25, 1946, signed a pact for unity of action with the Italian Communist Party. If there had not been unity of action between the two parties of the working class, there would not have been a republic, nor any progressive reforms, in Italy today, and Italy herself would have been in the same position as Greece. This is clear to all. It was clear to Saragat too, yet he decided to break the unity pact. Saragat calls the group he split off from the Socialist Party "a section of the Socialist International," and recommends it to seek ideological and political inspiration in—the British Labor Party! What Saragat did in Italy, Karoly Peyer and his group tried to do, evidently at the behest of the same external forces, in the Hungarian Social-Democratic Party.

The subversive, anti-popular, and anti-democratic activities of the "opposition" Socialists in Bulgaria have the fervent blessing of the West-European Socialist press. The Zurich Conference indirectly took them under its protection. It refused to admit the delegates of the Bulgarian Social-Democratic Party to the sittings of the conference, solely because that party is affiliated to the Patriotic Front.

\* \* \*

The attitude of the leaders of the French Socialist Party toward the international labor movement in the main coincides with that of the British Laborites. Shoulder to shoulder

with the latter, the Right-wing French Socialist leaders are waging an obstinate fight against working-class unity both in France and in other countries. Such unity, they say, is fraught with the danger of "splitting the nation into two camps" and stirring up civil war. At the same time, the coalition with the Catholic M.R.P. and other Right-wing bourgeois parties, the edge of which is directed against the working class and the Communists, is represented to the public as the very embodiment of democracy. How low the French Socialist leaders have sunk is shown by the fact that Leon Blum's theory of the "anti-national nature of the Communist parties" constituted the main argument in justification of the suppression of the Communist Party in Brazil. This theory also figures as one of the counts in the indictment in the trial of the leaders of the Communist Party of South Africa.

As a measure of preparation for the Zurich Conference, Blum published an article in *Populaire* in which he set forth his views on the role and functions of a Socialist International:

I am now speaking to my socialist comrades, and particularly to the great European parties [he wrote]. Again I point out to them the urgent necessity of adopting a position which should be that of international Socialism. As regards a new American lend-lease, as regards the United States of Europe, the European Federation, and the Eu-

ropean Economic Commission, it would be deplorable that our different parties in Europe should air their differences in the press, at the tribune, or in the government.

He then explained what should be the "position of international Socialism" on these questions. It is, apparently,

... to take the lead of a large movement of opinion which should show the way to the American initiative instead of discouraging it.

Leon Blum's foreign policy ideas have been developing very fast. On April 23 he expounded his thesis of "American imperialists of peace." One of his arguments in support of it was that the United States measures in Greece and Turkey are allegedly being undertaken with the consent and under the direct control of the United Nations. A month later, in articles in *Populaire* on May 25 and 27, he appealed to the Socialist parties to start a mass campaign in the European countries in favor of American loans, and declared that the latter were "an instrument of international order, international prosperity, and international pacification."

And now, as we see, Blum is calling upon the Socialists to swing public opinion in favor of the European policy of the American bankers, and of a "European Federation." Inasmuch as Blum reckons on the "self-expulsion" of the Soviet Union from the "European Federation,"

and on the "self-expulsion" of the Communists in the various countries from the governments, it is not difficult to divine against whom the activities of an International to which he recommends such a policy would be directed.

Strictly speaking, Blum's new idea contains nothing new. He is merely proposing to clap the label of "international Socialism" on the wares of Churchill and de Gaulle. Blum's conception of the role and functions of a "United States of Europe" is identical with that of de Gaulle, Churchill, and the Austrian Social-Democrats. The only difference is that Blum serves up the "European Federation" with a "Socialist" sauce.

The Right-wing Social-Democrats are working to undermine unity of action of the working class, nationally and internationally, under the pretext of striving to preserve the "independence" of the Socialist parties, and also of protecting "national sovereignty." These are demagogic catchwords, and are in howling contradiction to the fact that the now functioning substitute for a "Socialist International" is completely under the control of the British Labor Party Executive and the British government.

The attitude and policy of the Right-wing Socialist leaders on the matter of the International were almost paradoxically reflected in the views of Benedikt Kautsky, son of Karl Kautsky. While the preparations were being made for the Zurich

Conference a long article by him, entitled "Do We Need a New International?" appeared in several issues of the Zurich *Volksrecht* (beginning with May 16, 1947). He opened the article by pointing out that the Socialist parties had no common line on the "basic principles" of the future International. He then went on to express his "personal views" on the subject, and also on "problems of the day." These views were a conglomeration of the most vulgar fabrications and rank slanders that were ever disseminated by the worst enemies of the working class, democracy, Socialism, and the Soviet Union.

Benedikt Kautsky vilifies the governments of Yugoslavia, Poland, Bulgaria, and Rumania. The Polish Socialist Party, the Polish Workers' Party, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the Swiss Party of Labor are all inveterate enemies as far as he is concerned. He even takes Harold Laski to task for admitting that there is a planned economy, and no capitalist exploitation or unemployment, in the Soviet Union.

It would not be worthwhile dwelling on Kautsky's libelous assertions were it not for his definition of the tasks and functions of the future Socialist International. He said aloud what others only think. He conceives the International as a world center for a campaign against the Soviet Union and Communism, a center engineering and maintaining the division of the labor movement. Kaut-

sky wrote that which other Right-wing Social-Democrats usually keep to themselves, but for which they are actually working.

The policy of the Right-wing Social-Democrats is accompanied by intricate maneuvers, and its real objectives are carefully masked. This is quite understandable, for it finds no support or sympathy among the masses, and meets with resistance on their part. The labor movement has been through the bitter experience of the war. Millions have come to realize the necessity for united action of the working class. Today, in every country and internationally, this urge for united action is not only a slogan, it is a broad and powerful movement breaking down all the numerous barriers and obstacles. The schemes and machinations of the reactionary wing of the Social-Democratic leaders are not only encountering the resistance of entire Socialist parties—those of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe and Italy, for example; they are also encountering resistance among the rank-and-file of those Socialist parties whose leaders today constitute the Right-wing of the Social-Democratic movement.

\* \* \*

The Italian Socialist Party, headed by Pietro Nenni, has played, and is still playing, a very important role in the resistance of the working class of the European countries to the assault of international reaction and its lieutenants in the Right Social-

Democratic camp. In its press and at its congresses, as well as at international Socialist conferences, its leaders advance weighty objections on the grounds of principle and political considerations to the plans to revive the Socialist International in its prewar form. They vigorously oppose those who, behind the screen of "international socialism," are endeavoring to organize a subsidiary center of reaction in its fight against the democratic conquests and aspirations of the masses, and against the Soviet Union. At the congress of his party in Florence in April, 1946, Nenni exposed the attempts of certain leaders of the West-European Socialist parties to organize a sort of "Western bloc" under the guise of an International.

The last congress of the Italian Socialist Party (January 9-13, 1947) unanimously adopted a resolution sanctioning the participation of the party in the London Socialist Information and Liaison Office. But that same resolution specifically stressed the necessity of creating "an International of all proletarian parties, based on the principle of the unity of the workers of the world."

Thus the Italian Socialist Party is in favor of a united international organization which would embrace all working class parties—Socialist and Communist.

This attitude follows logically from the whole policy of the Italian Socialist Party, from its practical ac-

tivity  
ward  
lems  
Th  
the c  
move  
libera  
illa c  
great  
tween  
The g  
tigue i  
and c  
develo  
tiative  
for pr  
politic  
The  
able t  
to the  
sentim  
to the  
the R  
its ran  
men w  
with th  
ing cla  
the str  
the co  
wise. U  
munist  
unificat  
ment.  
mutual  
amalg  
General  
bracing  
democr  
and org  
power  
ore no

tivities at home and its attitude toward the major international problems of the day.

The Italian Socialist Party grew in the course of the popular anti-fascist movement, the armed struggle of liberation of the working class guerrilla detachments. It has gained a great deal from unity of action between Communists and Socialists. The growth of its numbers and prestige is in proportion to the support and encouragement it gives to the development of the democratic initiative of the workers in their fight for progressive social, economic, and political reforms.

The Italian Socialist Party was able to consolidate its ranks only to the extent that, responding to the sentiments of the working class and to the demands of the times, it ousted the Right reformist elements from its ranks and advanced as its leaders men who did not fear to cooperate with the vanguard party of the working class—the Communist Party—in the struggle for the resurgence of the country. It could not be otherwise. Unity of action between Communists and Socialists facilitated the unification of the trade union movement. In place of the former four mutually antagonistic trade union amalgamations, there arose the Italian General Confederation of Labor, embracing six million workers. Italian democracy thereby acquired a firm and organized social foundation and a powerful motive force. It is therefore not fortuitous that since the

summer of 1943 all decisions of the conferences, congresses, and other leading institutions of the Italian Socialist Party have primarily stressed the necessity for still closer unity of action between the two working-class parties, and even the creation of a united party of labor, although perhaps in the more distant future.

The latest congress of the party endorsed an appeal to the Italian workers which declared that, while it strove for cooperation with all genuinely democratic forces, the Socialist Party considered the Communist Party its natural ally in the factories, rural districts, municipal governments, and parliament.

Inside the Italian Socialist Party, views prevail which differ from the vulgar bourgeois-liberal views of other West-European Socialist parties. The problem, as it sees it, lies not in verbal and juridical recognition of formal democracy; real democracy must have a corresponding social content, and that in the first place means turning the land over to the farmers and nationalizing industry and the banks.

As to the alignment of parties and political forces in the country, the Socialist Party, Nenni holds, must work with the Communist Party at the head of a bloc of democratic organizations, and not occupy a centrist position and maneuver between the camp of reaction and the camp of democracy. Nenni and *Avanti*, the party's central organ, have repeatedly

criticized the Centrist tactics of the French Socialist Party.

The attitude of the Italian Socialist Party toward major internal political problems and questions of general principle was bound to find logical reflection in its attitude toward international affairs. Unlike the leaders of other West-European Social-Democratic parties, the Italian Socialist press is deeply appreciative of the value and significance of the social, economic, and political reforms in the new democracies. Speaking of the situation in these countries in connection with the Polish elections, *Avanti*, in its issue of January 19, said:

In the language of our press, from that of the extreme Right to that of Saragat, what is going on in Poland is a duel between "totalitarianism" and the Western idea of democracy. Actually, what we are witnessing is a battle between the supporters of agrarian reform and the nationalization of industry, on the one hand, and the champions of the interests of the big landlords and industrialists, on the other. . . . The common feature of democracy in Eastern Europe is its courageous and heroic effort to change the foundations of economic life, and thus to change man himself.

Having demonstrated the progressive nature of the economic reforms carried out in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia, *Avanti* declared:

For us the one important thing is that an analogous movement should

develop in this country, too, without encountering obstacles in the shape of "Centrist" deceit, which misrepresents the meaning of liberty and makes it a barrier to the concrete and practical achievement of Socialism.

Let us recall, incidentally, that *Populaire*, the French Socialist Party's newspaper, printed articles on Poland by Charles Dumas in which he vilified the working-class parties and took Mikolajczyk under his protection.

In regard to the Soviet Union, the position of the Italian Socialists is to develop in this country, too, without variance with the anti-Soviet line of the reactionary leaders of the majority of the Social-Democratic parties of Western Europe.

Profound ideological and political differences are typical of relations among the Socialist parties. The parties grouped around the British Laborites are headed by men for whom it is difficult to find a common language with many of the European Social-Democratic parties, especially the parties of the new democracies.

Leaders of some of the big Socialist and Labor parties have had a long career of revisionism and opportunism. Having become the ruling parties of bourgeois states, these parties, behind a screen of social-democracy, are carrying out the policy of the bourgeoisie of their countries. This policy has its laws and its logic. It is not directed toward a Socialist system, and it finds the great land of Socialism a nuisance. It refuses



to reconcile itself with progressive democratic or genuinely Socialistic movements in any country, since these movements are inimical to the economic and political rule of the big capitalists and landlords and are a menace to the internal forces of reaction and the agents of foreign finance capital.

Pursuing and championing a policy of this kind, the Right leaders of the West-European Socialist parties, in the ideological field too, do not rest content with attempts to revise Marxism. They have declared open war on scientific Socialism, on Marxism, and combat it with spiritualism and other rusty weapons borrowed from the arsenal of the reactionary witch doctors of political economy and philosophy.

\* \* \*

Different is the policy, the course and the fundamental principles of the Socialist parties of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe. They participated in the popular movement of liberation from the fascist intruders and their servitors, and are continuing their progressive advance. They are advancing in a united front with the Communists and other anti-fascist parties, and are actively helping to carry out far-reaching social, economic, and political reforms in their countries.

In their practical activities these Socialist parties are striving to facilitate the creation in their countries of conditions and prerequisites that will

ease the development toward Socialism. Their policy also has its laws and its logic. To assure its success, the economic and democratic political reforms already enacted must be perfected and consolidated. This means that the two-year or three-year plans for economic rehabilitation and development must be effectively accomplished. It means that reactionaries must be completely driven out of social and political life, and the alliance between the working class and the peasant masses strengthened. It means that effective resistance must be offered to the pressure and intrigues of foreign finance imperialism, that national independence and sovereignty must be upheld. All this not only presumes, it imperatively demands the preservation and further strengthening of the bloc of democratic forces, greater unity of action between the working-class parties, and greater solidarity between Socialists and Communists.

Unity of action of the working class and the alliance between workers and peasants constitute the vital condition and foundation of the existence, the progressive development, and the independence of these countries. Should this foundation collapse—for which international reaction and its accomplices are working—the countries of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe would be plunged into profound crisis, they would become the prey of stagnation and retrogression, and would be threat-

ened with the prospect of being reduced to a state of servitude. This is realized both by Communists and Socialists, as is manifest from the utterances of their leaders and their press, and both Communists and Socialists are striving for closer unity of action.

Speaking at a district congress of the Polish Socialist Party in Cracow in the early part of April, 1946, Cyrankiewicz, the party's general secretary, declared:

Nor do we forget those who today profess a deep love for the Polish Socialist Party. But they love us not because we are Socialists. They flirt with us because, flattered by imaginary hopes, they expect that we will, in the interests of Polish reaction, start a fight, say, against the Polish Workers' Party. The reactionaries hope that first we will dispose of the Communists, and then, when we stand alone, the reactionaries will be able to dispose of us, just as they wanted to do prior to September 1939, when the Communists were driven underground.

Another thing that substantially distinguishes the stand of the Socialist parties of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe from that of the reactionary leaders of many of the West-European Social-Democratic parties is their attitude toward international affairs, and especially toward the Soviet Union. They look upon the Soviet Union, the only country in the world where Socialism has been realized, as the might and strength—and this is affirmed

by their leaders, their members of parliament, their government Ministers, and their press—that played the decisive role in the defeat of Hitler-Germany and her satellites, saved European civilization, brought national liberation to the peoples of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe and made it possible for them to develop freely along democratic lines. They look upon the Soviet Union as a staunch bulwark of the independence and security of their countries, as a bulwark of international peace, as a mighty pillar and naturally of democracy all over the world. Accordingly, the Socialist parties of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria emphasize that friendship and firm alliance with the Soviet Union are and must be the cornerstone of the foreign policies of their countries.

There is therefore nothing surprising in the fact that in respect to the creation of a Socialist International its composition, functions, and objectives, the position of the Socialist parties of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe also radically differs from that of the majority of the West-European Socialist or Labor parties.

The Socialist parties of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria and Rumania are opposed to the resurrection of the prewar Socialist International or to the formation of an international Socialist organization which would give shape and encouragement to a division of the

working  
forces, whi  
anti-Co  
instru  
policy of t  
the wa  
ent figur  
democrati  
voboda  
43), a C  
ondon:  
Certain S  
resuscita  
ey are on  
life and  
ggers of  
any rat  
ity is bo  
ting clu  
ward un  
ne consi  
another p  
r. Hajel  
posing t  
the We  
ve the p  
d Inter  
ological  
pc of S  
ion, wh  
The des  
nds wit  
arty can  
emies of  
reject  
nt to see  
ternation  
One ca  
press  
ropean

working class and the democratic forces, which would serve as a center of anti-Communist activity and as an instrument of the anti-Soviet policy of the imperialist states. During the war, B. Lausman, a prominent figure in the Czech Social-Democratic Party, wrote in *Nova Svoboda* (November - December, 1943), a Czech journal published in London:

Certain Socialists are doing their best to resuscitate the Second International; they are only galvanizing a corpse back to life and themselves acting as grave-diggers of international Socialist unity. In any rate, it should be realized that unity is born in action, and not in debating clubs, and that the progress toward unity among the people has gone considerably farther. . . .

Another prominent Czech Socialist, Karel Hajek, member of parliament, opposing the efforts of certain leaders of the West-European parties to revive the putrid traditions of the Second International and to form an ideological and political Western bloc of Socialists against the Soviet Union, wrote on May 8, 1946:

The desire to combine anti-Soviet demands with orientation on the Labor Party can only work in favor of the enemies of Socialism. . . . True Socialists reject this orientation and do not want to see the traditions of the Second International revived.

One can find ample material in the press of the East and South-East European Socialist parties confirm-

ing that these parties want only such an International as would unite the workers' parties of all countries. Then, as *Narod*, organ of the Bulgarian Social-Democratic Workers Party, wrote on January 23, 1947, it will serve

. . . the basic interests of the working people, the fight for peace, the fight against fascism and reaction and for Socialism, and not imperialist blocs, as it does when it is a shield for reactionary capitalist interests, or represents a new split in the ranks of the workers of the world.

Writing, on February 20, 1947, in reference to the international Socialist conferences at Clacton and Bournemouth, *Libertatea*, organ of the Rumanian Social-Democratic Party, said:

Having learned from the mistakes of the past, we Rumanian Social-Democrats and the other four Socialist parties of the Danubian countries [Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Poland] proclaimed our view on the revival of the International: only one International is possible today, an International that will embrace all the workers' parties—Socialist and Communist.

In the May 10, 1947, issue of *Robotnik*, central organ of the Polish Socialist Party, Szwalbe, chairman of the Central Council of the party, speaking of its attitude towards labor unity, said:

The Polish Socialist Party, of course, stands in principle for a single workers' party with a Socialist-Marxian ideology,

just as it stands for a single International.

Representatives of the Polish Socialist Party and the Czech Social-Democratic Party at the Clacton, Bournemouth, and Zurich international Socialist conferences sharply differed with the representatives of the British Labor Party and of the Scandinavian and Austrian Social-Democratic parties as to the respective roles of Schumacher's German Social-Democratic Party and the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. They hold that Schumacher's party is thoroughly infected with the spirit of German revanchism and chauvinism, that it is an instrument of domestic and foreign reactionary forces and a potential threat to democracy and to the national independence of the countries of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe. On the other hand, they regard the Socialist Unity Party as the only big party in Germany which is really striving for the democratization of the country and for the creation of conditions making for good-neighbor relations with other countries. On June 8, 1947, *Rzeczpospolita*, writing editorially on the stand of the Polish Socialists at the Zurich international conference, said:

We believe that not only the Polish Socialist Party delegates, but delegates from other countries as well will be opposed to cooperation with the German Social-Democrats, who are conducting at home a chauvinist, anti-democratic, revanchist policy which is

directed primarily against Poland and which is a policy of reviving aggressive German imperialism.

On March 2, 1947, *Avanti*, organ of the Italian Socialist Party, said in an editorial that Kurt Schumacher

. . . very much reminds one of Ebert, President of the Weimar Republic. . . . Schumacher is again feeding the smouldering flame of nationalism and doing nothing to extinguish the Nazi wildfire. . . . The German Social-Democrats evidently consider the political development which places Germany in the hands of Hindenburg and then of Hitler was right and historically justified.

It cannot be asserted of course that the Socialist parties of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, or at any rate some of their leaders, are altogether free from vacillation on the subject of the International, as well as in respect of other important problems of international and domestic politics. Such vacillations undoubtedly do exist in these parties, and, even to a greater extent, in the Italian Socialist Party. There are, as we know, some leaders who succumb to the arguments and promises of the Rightist leaders of the West-European Socialist parties. There are more or less numerous groups within these parties that are continuing their conservative and schismatic activities. They are governed by the spirit of reactionary opportunism in domestic and foreign policy and in their attitude toward the International.

But it trends c development of East Europe. W of appr omic, a put in th the wor generally undoubt indusse Socialis for unit class, ter forces, peace.

Lastly Socialist factors Europe should be opposition member Western Labor Par and spl

But it is scarcely likely that these trends can substantially influence the development of the Socialist parties of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe. We have to note the chorus of approval which the social, economic, and political reforms carried out in these countries evoked among the working class and the masses generally all over Europe. This will undoubtedly help to stimulate progressive trends within the Western Socialist parties, too; it will make for unity of action of the working class, tend to cement the democratic forces, and promote the cause of peace.

Lastly, in speaking of the Zurich Socialist conference and of the new factors in the development of the European Socialist parties, mention should be made of the growth of the opposition among the rank-and-file members of the Socialist parties of Western Europe and the British Labor Party to the reactionary policies and splitting tactics of their leaders.

This is a fact of no small importance. Significant in this respect is the state of affairs in the French Socialist Party, which is in the throes of a profound internal crisis. It is hardly possible that Blum and his colleagues, for all their skilful maneuvers, will succeed in stifling this opposition. It is steadily growing in breadth and depth and is insisting on unity of action to repulse the offensive of reaction and big capital against the social and economic conquests of the workers and against the democratic liberties, to bridle the inciters and instigators of war among nations, and to expedite economic rehabilitation.

The struggle for the unity of the workers and the consolidation of the democratic forces in all countries is not a "private affair" of the Communists or Socialists; it is the common task of democracy and vitally important to all the nations of the world.

# CURRENT ECONOMIC TRENDS

By LABOR RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

IN SURVEYING the current economic situation in the United States, we must first analyze the gross national product estimates, which have recently been revised by the U. S. Department of Commerce and are now available for the second quarter of 1947.

In order to get the proper perspective we may compare the first two quarters of 1947 with the last quarter of 1946 and also with the full year of 1946. The quarter figures are seasonally adjusted at *annual rates*.

GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT (billions of dollars)

	1946		1947	
	Full Year	4th Qtr.	1st Qtr.	2nd Qtr.
Gross national product .....	203.7	218.6	222.0	226.0
Personal consumption expenditures .....	143.7	154.9	156.8	159.0
Durable goods .....	14.9	18.2	19.0	19.0
Nondurable goods .....	87.1	93.6	94.0	94.0
Services .....	41.7	43.1	43.8	44.0
Gross private domestic investment .....	24.6	30.4	29.6	29.6
New construction .....	8.5	9.3	10.3	10.3
Residential non-farm .....	—	—	4.4	4.4
Other .....	—	—	5.8	5.8
Producers' durable equipment .....	12.4	15.7	16.6	16.6
Change in business inventories .....	3.7	5.4	2.7	2.7
Net foreign investment .....	4.8	5.2	9.2	9.2
Government purchases of good & services.....	30.7	28.2	26.6	26.6

Source: Department of Commerce, *Survey of Current Business*.

Let us first concentrate on recent developments. During 1947 the gross national product has increased from \$222 billion in the first quarter to \$226 billion in the second. But this increase is more than accounted for by the continued rise in prices. In

other words, the expansion in dollar terms does not represent any growth in the *physical volume* of economic activity.

This point is very clear in regard to personal consumption expenditures, which represent the aggregate payments of private individuals for goods and services. If we correct the second quarter figure of \$159 billion by the rise in the index of consumer prices, it is reduced to \$156.9 billion and represents practically no change from the first quarter. Consumers must pay more money for the same amount of goods.

This process has already produced some serious effects. First, the rate of increase in personal consumption expenditures which characterized the year 1946 seems to have tapered off. Then the steep rise

in prices, although it has not yet affected sales measured in dollars, has had a marked effect upon the physical volume of retail trade. The following table makes this point clear.

	Retail Trade	
	Combined index of sales (1935-39=100)	Eliminating price changes
January, 1947	276.2	160.2
December, 1947	275.3	153.8

Source: Department of Commerce, *Survey of Current Business*.

There has been a distinct drop in the physical volume of retail trade, even though, measured in dollars, it has remained fairly stable during the first half of 1947.

Prices increased only about 1% during the first half of the year. But the summer months came another upward spiral with steep price increases especially for foods. The buying power of the dollar is getting steadily weaker. The American people's ability to purchase goods at retail is being sharply curtailed. (See our *Economic Notes*, September, 1947.)

#### GROSS DOMESTIC PRIVATE INVESTMENT

Let us turn now to that sector of the gross national product called gross domestic private investment. Here we find that the figure shows the first decline for any quarter since V-J Day. Since the end of the war, each quarter has witnessed a rapid expansion in private investment, reflecting in general, the reversion from wartime production. Plant and equipment were renewed and changed over. Inventories of military goods were dispersed, to be replaced by new stocks to fill the pipelines of civilian trade. The rate of increase in private

investment, however, slackened during the first quarter of 1947, and actually turned down in the second quarter.

The most noticeable change has occurred in inventory accumulation. Throughout 1946, stocks piled up at various levels in the economy at a very rapid rate. But in the first quarter of 1947 increase in inventory was cut in half, and it fell even further during the second quarter. In fact the trend actually went into reverse; and it is only the seasonal adjustment factor that kept the rate of inventory change on the plus side for the second quarter of 1947. The unadjusted figure would have been minus \$1.2 billion. This means that one large field of private domestic investment, which accounted for nearly \$5 billion during 1946, has passed out of the picture, and may even turn into a negative amount.

The figure for new construction also declined somewhat from the first to the second quarter of 1947. In view of the unprecedented need for housing, this is a very disappointing performance. Under the auspices of private enterprise, the construction industry seems to have become entangled in a hopeless knot of super-profits and excessive costs, which the prospective home owner cannot support. This means two things: Not only are we deprived of much needed housing, but also a powerful potential prop under the present high rate of economic activity has been whittled down. The

obvious solution is a new expansion of government-financed and directed housing.

So far this year there has been an increase in outlay for producers' durable equipment, but it was not sufficient to counterbalance the declines in new construction and inventory accumulation. Note also that the first two quarters of this year saw the smallest rate of increase in producers' durable equipment for any quarter since the end of the war. It may be fairly concluded that the factors which have brought about an unprecedented expansion in this field have been nearly exhausted. Reconversion is certainly complete, and new plant expansion seems to have played out already, if the index compiled by the Securities and Exchange Commission is reliable. This shows that the new plant and equipment expenditures of all industry have been lower in each of the first two quarters of 1947 than in the final quarter of 1946.

It should be clear from the foregoing that there is danger of gaps showing up in the United States economy if present trends and tendencies continue. Here we must emphasize the crucial nature of gross private domestic investment. Any marked decline in this sphere would lead to immediate serious repercussions in other sectors of the economy. Production would slow

down, wages would immediately decline, and purchasing power would be further curtailed.

#### FOREIGN INVESTMENT

The tendency for the gross private domestic investment to decline during the first half of 1947 was accompanied by the rapid expansion of net foreign investment during the same period. This has been the main factor in maintaining the total gross national product. Representing the net difference between imports and exports of goods and services, this figure is now the most crucial single item in the gross national product balance sheet.

For the year 1946, net foreign investment stood at \$4.8 billion. In the final quarter of the year it represented an annual rate of \$5.2 billion. But in the first quarter of 1947, it jumped to an annual rate of \$9 billion and continued to rise to \$10 billion in the second quarter.

This means that it has more than counterbalanced the above-noted drop in inventory accumulation as the falterings of the construction industry.

We should note, however, that the great expansion in net foreign investment came in the first quarter of 1947 and the rate of increase levelled off in the second quarter. Furthermore, exports declined 13% in June, and 7% in July. Should this trend continue we can see that other element of the investment



## INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION

These estimates of gross national product measure the economy in dollar terms. We have hinted above that this may not give us the entire picture. If we turn to the most reliable physical measure of our economic activity, the Federal Reserve Board's index of industrial production, we find that it is going in a different direction from the gross national product.

Taking the average of the seasonally adjusted index for the two quarters, we find this decline:

## Industrial Production Index\*

	(1935-39=100)
1st quarter, 1947	189.3
2nd quarter, 1947	185.3

\*Federal Reserve Board *Bulletin*.

This industrial production index has moved downward during the first half of the year. And the July index fell six points below the June level and 12 points below last March's postwar high point of 190.

The index of new orders received by manufacturers was also declining during the first two quarters of the year, the Department of Commerce reports:

## Manufacturers' New Orders

	(1939=100)
1st quarter, 1947	247.6
2nd quarter, 1947	240.3

A further decline in new orders to an index level of 231 in July has since been reported.

component capable of filling the economic gap.

The abnormal situation, in which we export but do not import in anything like the same degree, can certainly not last very long. Either foreign countries must send more goods to us or they must cut down their imports. If under the Marshall plan we expand credits to overseas countries, then they must increase their exports all the more in order to repay the loans.

Should there be any approach to normal trade, our net export figure must decline.

Our present high rate of economic activity thus depends upon our present high figure for net foreign investment, which in turn depends upon the continuation of a highly abnormal and temporary condition in international trade.

In our consideration of gross national product we should note also the trend in government expenditures. This element of the gross national product has been reduced considerably from the wartime days when it accounted for nearly one-half of the total. Under the pressure of reaction, government expenditures and employment are being driven down and down. An important by-product of this process is that the more the government share is reduced the more the stability of the gross national product is subject to the vagaries of the private sector of the economy.

From these indications we see that even though the current level of economic activity is exceedingly high, the over-all tendency is downward.

One good reason for this decline lies in the redistribution of the national income brought about by the present policies and practices of Big Business against the people. The Department of Commerce, in its series on personal income, shows roughly what share of national income goes to the workers:

Share of Workers in All Income  
Payments to Individuals

Total Personal Income		Wages and Salaries	
(in billions)		(in billions)	
1945	\$171.6	100%	\$115.2
June, 1947	193.0	100%	119.3
			67.1%
			61.8%

When we compare the latest available figure with the year 1945, the final war year, we find that the share of personal income received by wages and salaries has fallen from 67.1% to 61.8%.

This is the tangible result of the two years of postwar policy carried out by the National Association of Manufacturers and a subservient government.

To this shift in distribution of national income are attributable the weaknesses in our economy which are beginning to show through the current inflationary boom.

One of these soft spots in the economy, as we have already noted, is found in foreign trade. The heavy demand on the part of the war-devastated countries has removed

the danger of surpluses, at least temporarily. What could not be easily disposed of abroad. This has enabled the big corporations to squeeze the domestic consumers unmercifully. But the same treatment has been accorded the government abroad. It appears now that the domestic market is beginning to falter at the same time that overseas governments are running out of money. Loans under the Marshall Plan could temporarily replenish the buying power of overseas governments and maintain the same cruel squeeze upon domestic consumers. In this sense the Marshall Plan might serve to continue the present feverish rate of economic activity. But this could not have long-term effect since the Marshall Plan has as its main aim the domination of other countries, not the expansion of world purchasing power.

### EMPLOYMENT

One of the by-products of our present boom phase has been the high level of employment. The U. S. Census Bureau has been estimating about 60,000,000 people at work during the summer months. Everywhere here, however, there are reasons for caution in assessing the stability of the boom. For one thing, July and August are always the peak months for employment, with large numbers of agricultural workers coming

to the labor force and students seeking summer jobs.

But let us look at the estimates, based on Census Bureau samples.

As the figures for August, 1947, have just been published, let us compare them with August, 1946. (Figures in thousands.)

	Total population over 14	Total labor force	Total civilian labor force	Employed	At work	Not at work	Unemployed
1946	106,470	62,200	59,750	57,690	54,430	3,260	2,060
1947	107,590	63,387	62,035	59,914	55,809	4,104	2,121

Note that the estimated numbers show a smaller difference between 1946 and 1947 than we might expect from the wider difference in the figures for *civilian labor force* or *employed*. Furthermore, the figure for those *with a job but not at work* indicates that it is larger than at any time since these statistics have been compiled. The great majority of these workers are on vacation, but it is important to note that the difference between the 1946 and 1947 figures is mainly accounted for by "temporary" layoffs, industrial disputes, etc. In other words, there are a million or so workers who for all intents and purposes are unemployed, since they are receiving no income.

We should note also that the usual decline in employment following the summer peak in July has begun, and still more significant is the fact that during the first half of 1947, there had been some decline in employment in manufacturing. Here are the figures for this period, as reported by the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics:

#### Employees in Manufacturing

January	15,372,000
February	15,475,000
March	15,510,000
April	15,429,000
May	15,237,000
June	15,317,000

In July there was a decline to 15,232,000, followed by a rise to 15,480,000 by mid-August. But even with these gains the total employment in manufacturing was only 15,480,000 by mid-August, or well under the peak of last March.

It would seem that at least manufacturing, the basic sector in our industrial economy, has not been enjoying the boom in employment reported by the Census Bureau.

It is in the factors outlined above—anomalies in the private investment sector of the national economy, uncertainties in the realm of net foreign investment, the further advance in prices, declining retail trade, intensified maldistribution of national income, and the growth of concealed unemployment—that we find the makings of a full-fledged crisis.

## BOOK REVIEWS

### FOSTER REPORTS ON THE NEW EUROPE

By STEVE NELSON

THE NEW EUROPE, by William Z. Foster. International Publishers, New York. \$.35.

*The New Europe* is Comrade Foster's report to the American people on what is really going on in Europe. It is the first major book published in this country since the war's end that discusses all the burning questions facing the people of Europe. It deals with these questions, not merely from the viewpoint of the European peoples themselves, but also from that of the American people. And on all of these problems the Communist position is stated with Comrade Foster's customary clarity.

The vitally interesting character of this book—which is based on Comrade Foster's three months' tour of Europe early this year—is readily indicated by the titles of some of its chapters: "The New Democratic Governments"; "The New Democratic Economic Systems"; "The Mass Communist Parties"; "The Worker-Peasant Alliance"; and "The Catholics in the New Democracy."

In a brief introductory chapter on "The War's Devastation" Comrade Foster brings before the reader a picture of the desolation brought on by the war and the misery left in its wake. Italy lost 85 per cent of its locomotives

and 81 per cent of its freight and passenger cars. Poland lost 70 per cent of its livestock. European annual agricultural output dropped from 60 million tons before the war to 31 million in 1945. While the average diet in the U.S. is about 3,200 calories a day, that of most of eastern Europe is about 2,000.

Thus, great human hardship continues even after the guns have been silenced, and it is in this situation that U.S. imperialism uses food as a club to demand economic and political concessions from peoples who have been recently emerged from the hell of fascist slavery. It is understandable, therefore, as Foster says, that

... in Europe, the great reserves of mass good will toward America which Willkie noted upon his famous trip around the world, is being dissipated by the reactionary follies of American imperialism.

While one of the key chapters is entitled "Whither Europe?" the book really poses the question—"Whither the U.S. travelling away from its declared war aims?" This question is dealt with in connection with the most discussed in the bourgeois press—"Soviet Influence in Europe."

In analyzing the rise of Soviet influence in Europe, Comrade Foster effectively refutes the false reasons ascribed to that rise by reactionary politicians and commentators. The growing prestige of the U.S.S.R. in Europe, makes clear, does not result, as the

bourgeois press charges, from "the pressure of the Red Army and fear of" or because "the Communist Parties function as a fifth column for the Soviet Union." If the European peoples more and more turn to the Soviet Union as their only reliable friend among the great powers, it is for a number of basic reasons growing out of the war and its aftermath.

The peoples of Europe have seen their countries freed from the Nazis by Soviet armies. The U.S.S.R. played the decisive role in defeating Germany, and just as decisively acted to render possible assistance to the peoples of the countries it liberated toward the elimination of every vestige of fascism and reaction.

The Soviet Union has become the longest country in Europe, economically, politically and militarily. And the peoples of Europe have seen the U.S.S.R. use that strength to aid them in reconstruction and rehabilitation. They have seen it use that strength to fight against reaction and oppression throughout the world.

In contrast, the U.S., in Germany, has broken the pledges and agreements made at Potsdam. It refuses to carry through the policy of denazification, keeps the German trusts intact, while U.S. monopolies maneuver to make these industries part of their own imperial domain. The big estates of the bankers are not being broken up in the S. zone. What this adds up to is what Low, the famous British cartoonist, pictured when he showed U.S. General Marshall making a clay model for the Führer, a large artillery shell. Here cartoonist Low, who cannot be accused of excessive pro-Soviet sympathy,

expresses the fears of the European peoples. Is it not logical then that the peoples of Europe should be turning toward the U.S.S.R., and away from Wall Street imperialism? As Comrade Foster says:

The war-harassed impoverished millions of Europe will not easily allow their fate to be decided for them by the financial kings in Wall Street. The people did not develop their new democratic governments and programs, and their new socialist perspectives, simply out of idle whims. . . . They cannot be bought off by Wall Street's mess of pottage, nor can they be driven backward by Wall Street's threats. (Pp. 118-19.)

In most countries of Europe, Comrade Foster points out, the central task is to rebuild the country and to advance democracy to a new and higher plane. In this the Communists play a key role.

It is no accident that the bourgeois press must make daily mention of such Communist personalities as Thorez and Duclos, of France; Togliatti, of Italy; Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia; George Dimitroff, of Bulgaria; Wilhelm Pieck, of Germany; Mathios Rakosi, of Hungary; Anna Pauker, of Rumania; Klement Gottwald, of Czechoslovakia; Gomulka, of Poland; and Passionaria, of Spain. Some of these Communist leaders are heads of Governments, and some will achieve that position soon, Foster assures us.

A number of the Communist Parties have had the most phenomenal growth. The Communist Party of Italy, for example, has grown from a membership

of 5,000 in the days of Mussolini to 2,100,000 today. The influence of the Communist Parties is strong, not only among the workers, but also among the peasants, intellectuals, youth, and women. This influence is growing in all phases of life; the Communist press is the most powerful in the New Europe.

Notwithstanding their growing strength, the Communist Parties do not operate by themselves. Their strength has grown precisely because they have found ways of working with forces they have not been able to approach successfully in the past. Thus, there are strong tendencies among ever wider circles of Catholics to cooperate with the Communist Parties, notwithstanding the opposition from the upper circles of the hierarchy. Likewise, some Social-Democratic parties are accepting the policy of united action.

Just as the Communist Parties were the most clear-minded, and most self-sacrificing fighters in the war of liberation, paving the road to victory with their blood, so today wherever the Communist Party is strong, that is where the most rapid progress toward recovery is being made. In France, Comrade Foster points out, general recovery is at 90 per cent of prewar production. In the nationalized sectors of industry, production has reached the following percentage of prewar levels: railroad transportation, 110 per cent; coal, 125 per cent; gas, 126 per cent; and electricity, 130 per cent.

These figures should answer the lie that the Communists are interested in spreading chaos. For if that were so, why is it that the Communists of France, who are not in power and who

have the greatest influence over the industrial workers, are the strongest holders of orderly reconstruction?

The State Department is backing every pro-fascist, reactionary, and Communist element the world over—in China, in Italy, in France, as well as in the new peoples' democracies of Europe. In China, U.S. imperialism is responsible for the bloody civil war. In Greece, the Truman Doctrine has been taken over as hangman of the democratic forces. In Italy and France, U.S. pressure was exerted to force the Communist Parties out of the government. But, Foster points out, this United States policy must be changed, and unless changed it is going to be defeated. It is resulting in a bitter anti-U.S. sentiment everywhere. Even in England, where Bevin has tried to carry through the "Junior Partner" policy of U.S. imperialism, much bitter antagonism is being aroused toward the United States because American monopoly capital is using precisely the critical economic situation in England it has itself helped to create, in order to halt, and reverse the trend toward nationalization.

On the subject of the new peoples' democracy Comrade Foster supplies an abundance of striking detail to demonstrate the markedly distinct features that characterize this new and advanced type of state. While dealing with the theoretical problem (pp. 94-96) of the character of these new democracies and the road which they will travel toward socialism, Comrade Foster also summarizes their practical accomplishments, which reveal why they have the support of the people and the hatred of reaction. He tells us, for instance, that in Yugoslavia, with the

abolition of the monarchy, a people's republic has been established, with a parliament consisting of two houses, one elected by the people generally, the other of representatives of Yugoslavia's national components. Nationalization has been carried through in the major economic industries and institutions, the wealth of the Quisling capitalists has been appropriated without compensation, and the financial and industrial apparatus is now being conducted according to plan. The big monopolies and cartels have been eliminated; big landed estates have been divided up among the peasants, and without compensation to the landowners. Church and state have been separated, and complete religious freedom prevails. New advanced democratic rights are guaranteed the people by the Constitution; the Yugoslav army is a new, people's army; and the former domination of the smaller peoples by the more powerful Serbian nation has been ended, with the equality of nations now being the law of the land.

Such achievements are not to the liking of U.S. reaction, for they help guarantee the real independence of Yugoslavia from that imperialist pressure which has subordinated smaller states, if not by military, then by economic pressure. Yet such democratic progress, typical of the new democracies, and not the threat of "Communism" to the U.S., has caused U.S. imperialism to single out the New Europe for such violent attack.

No reactionary government has ever had such pressure applied to it by our State Department. In the darkest days of the rise of fascism, U.S. reaction never proposed to boycott Hitler's Ger-

many, Mussolini's Italy, or Japan. And even today the United States is the major backer of the Franco regime, even though the majority of the United Nations has voted for action against it.

The reasons for the U.S. policies are to be found in its violent opposition to everything implied in the term, "The New Europe." As Comrade Foster correctly emphasizes:

... the big American capitalists ... view with the gravest alarm the rising democratic tide throughout Europe and the world, and they know that the U.S.S.R. is the main bulwark of this new world democracy. They correctly see in this expanding democracy a formidable threat to their perspective of imperialist expansion. In the reactionary spirit of Hitler, therefore, they have embarked upon a crusade to crush democracy and socialism and to set up reactionary political systems that will conform with their plans for establishing world domination by Wall Street. (Pp. 97-98.)

The peoples of Europe want peace. They want economic security. They want a democratic life. They want friendship with the United States. But as Comrade Foster points out (p. 122):

... The peoples of the world are refusing to be bought by Wall Street money or to be intimidated by Wall Street's atom-bomb diplomacy. Persistence by the State Department along these imperialistic lines is a sure road to national disaster for our country.

In order to develop a democratic

constructive foreign policy, the American people must defeat reaction here at home.

Comrade Foster closes his book with the warning that "As a people we must not try the impossible job of turning back European history." On the contrary, as he indicates, we must learn from the lesson of the progress of *The New Europe* that we here must begin to clear our own path toward the establishment of democratic rule by the people in the U.S. on a new and a higher plane. Only as the people begin

to move in that direction will they be able to anticipate the breaking of the power of monopoly capitalism, the root source of hunger, fascism and war.

To draw that lesson from his book of Europe is, perhaps, Foster's main objective in this work; it is the theme upon which its last page ends. Surely this is a vital lesson which, through the medium of Comrade Foster's book, we must bring to the widest possible circle of readers, and make a central part of their thought and action.



ll they re  
breaking  
pitalism,  
fascism

n his me  
oster's m  
is the  
e ends.  
esson wh  
Comrade  
to the  
rs, and  
thought