

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. 11

Contents

NOVEMBER, 1947

Restore American-Soviet Cooperation for Peace!	V. J. Jerome	963
Less Food—More Profits	Arnold Johnson	972
Once More on Wall Street's "Progressive" Role	Alexander Bittelman	981
Build the United Negro People's Movement	Benjamin J. Davis	996
The Trade Unions and the Negro Workers	John Williamson	1007
The International Trade Organization	Rob F. Hall	1018
Program for Coal	Gabe Kish	1029
TOWARD THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF MARXISM:		
Independent Self-Study of Marxism	William Weinstone	1040
The Mission of Czechoslovakia's Young Communists	Klement Gottwald	1047
Resolutions of the 9-Party Communist Conference		1051

Entered as second class matter January 4, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under 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.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

209

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC.,
REQUIRED BY THE ACTS OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS
AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946,
OF POLITICAL AFFAIRS, published monthly at New York, N. Y., for
October 1, 1947.

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

Before me, a Notary Public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Joseph Felshin, who having been duly sworn, according to law, deposes and says that he is the Business Manager of the Political Affairs and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily, weekly, semiweekly or triweekly newspaper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Acts of March 3, 1933, and July 2, 1946 (section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations), printed on the reverse of this form to wit:

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

Publisher, New Century Publishers, Inc., 332 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.
Editor, Max Weiss, 35 East 12th Street, New York 3, N. Y.
Managing Editor, V. J. Jerome, 35 East 12th Street, New York 3, N. Y.
Business Manager, Joseph Felshin, 332 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

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

New Century Publishers, Inc., 332 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.
Joseph Felshin, 332 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

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

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

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

JOSEPH FELSHIN, Business Manager.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 3rd day of September, 1947.

MAX KITZES, Notary Public.

(My commission expires March 30, 1949.)

(SEAL)

THE
Union
must b
ination
crucial
our tric
The his
that th
our sec
pend u
radical
cation a
and co
Truman
shall b
Americ
our pe
death
Americ
standin
Rooseve
The
Revolut
efforts
an end
known
Due t
circums
the Ru
by the
Stalin,
blow at
depths
for life,
world h

RESTORE AMERICAN-SOVIET COOPERATION FOR PEACE!

(AN EDITORIAL ARTICLE)

By V. J. JEROME

THE THIRTIETH BIRTHDAY of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics must be the occasion for a re-examination by every American of the crucial question of our relations with our tried and powerful wartime ally. The history of our epoch determines that the peace of the United States, our security, and our well-being depend upon our making a sharp and radical turn from a policy of provocation and hate to one of friendship and cooperation. The policy of Truman, Hoover, Dulles, and Marshall breeds war. The interests of America and the peace-aspirations of our people demand as a life-and-death necessity the resumption of American-Soviet amity and understanding, the course followed by Roosevelt.

The great October Socialist Revolution was born out of the efforts of anguished humanity to put an end to the imperialist carnage known to history as World War I. Due to a series of historical circumstances it fell to the lot of the Russian working class, led by the great Party of Lenin and Stalin, to strike the first shattering blow at imperialist war. From the depths of the yearning of the masses for life, the great turning point of world history translated the slogan

"Land, Bread, and Peace" into Socialism, the only final guarantee of peace to the nations, of true democracy, national security, a life of plenty, and a free future to the peoples.

The Soviet Power is advancing into its fourth decade. The "Bolshevik Adventure," the "Abortive Attempt," the "Soviet Experiment," has stood the test of thirty world-convulsing years. It has overcome the organized attempts from within and from without, first to prevent, then to destroy its Socialist achievements. It bore the brunt of the anti-Axis war and contributed most to victory; Stalingrad will symbolize for all time the deathless heroism of the Soviet people and their Red Army who prevented the enslavement of the entire world by Hitlerism. Consistently the Soviet Union stands at the head of the fight for peace, for the extirpation of fascism and for the security of nations. It struggles today to re-establish the unity principle of the wartime Grand Alliance, primarily of the two greatest Powers—the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.—for the fulfillment of the Big Three commitments in behalf of world peace.

Truth would not be truth, if falsehood did not revile it; and Socialism

would not be Socialism, if imperialism did not slander it. Left to the imperialists and their scribes, the thirty years of Soviet Power would be chronicled, "From the Bolshevik Nationalization of Women to the Soviet Smuggling of the Cholera into Egypt." One might think that a system which, in a little over three decades, has visited upon the world the Great Economic Crisis, the scourge of fascism, and two world wars, would seek counsel from modesty in vaunting its own virtues while decrying any social order that is built on non-monopolist foundations. But brazenness is never better joined than with imperialism. Indeed, the more capitalism in decay is put on the defensive by the logic of history, the more it bares its predatory nature. And the more it blusters and threatens with the Big Stick, the more it charges "aggression" at those it is preparing to assault. And so we have now the latest of all such "peace-pursuing" catchwords: "Containment of Russia"! With such demagogic methods the Wall Street monopolies, which are flagrantly intervening in Greece, Turkey, China, and other countries, hope to deflect from their imperialist Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan the kleig light of accusation.

This cynical device to represent the Soviet Union as the aggressor professes to argue that the Soviet system as such is based on "expansion" and the "export of Socialism," and that hence there is

no basis for cooperation or peace between it and the capitalist world.

* * *

Some apologists for imperialism presume to find authority for this contention in the writings of Lenin himself. Thus, in the *New York Times* of October 16, 1947, special correspondent C. L. Sulzberger offers as Exhibit A, so to speak, a statement from Lenin made in his report to the Eighth Congress of the Russian Communist Party, in March, 1919:

We are living not merely in a state, but in a *system of states*, and the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end supervenes, a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable.*

Exhibit B is a passage from Lenin's address, in November, 1920, to nuclei secretaries of the Party's Moscow organization:

We are at present between two foes. If we are unable to defeat them both, we must know how to dispose our forces in such a way that they fall out among themselves; because, as is always the case, when thieves fall out, honest men come into their own. But as soon as we are strong enough to defeat capitalism as a whole, we shall immediately take it by the scruff of the neck.**

* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. VIII, p. 53

** *Ibid.*, p. 282.

The
promi
its ent
dently
the "e
Show
Lenini
priced,
journal
been a
the ye
and 'fo
program
minist

But
shall sh
differen
hands
vators.

In p
on the
bourgeo
Nine
article
herent
sionism
ing to
York 7
see th
"the en
cies an
after th
torial a
of Stal
in one
tain bo
one co
socialis
Soviet
to "con

But I

The *New York Times* gave prominent display to the "trove" of its enterprising correspondent, evidently to set the world ablaze with the "exposé" headline, "World Reds Show Continuity of Adherence to Leninism." Like all such high-priced, though low-valued, detective-journalism, this "revelation" has been at hand for all to see through the years of the 'twenties, 'thirties, and 'forties, in the freely published programs and policies of Communists everywhere.

But adherence to Leninism, as we shall show, means something entirely different from its distortion at the hands of bourgeois "news" excavators.

In passing, it is well to comment on the consistency or earnestness of bourgeois "discussions" of Leninism. Nine days after the Sulzberger article purported to show the inherent "aggressiveness" or "expansionism" of the Soviet State according to Lenin's teachings, the *New York Times* editorially professed to see the Soviet policy since 1939 as "the end of the anti-imperialist policies and principles pursued by Lenin after the last war." The same editorial also deplored "the liquidation of Stalin's own policy of 'socialism in one country'"; evidently in certain bourgeois quarters "socialism in one country" means restriction of socialism to one country, with the Soviet Union acting as policeman to "contain" the spread of Socialism!

But let us turn to the theme of our

discussion. Let us examine the basic meaning of the statements quoted from Lenin. In the first place, let us establish the historical context in which they were uttered.

It was the period of Civil War, blockade, and foreign military intervention against the young Soviet Republic. The Red Army, with the support of the partisans in the rear, was fighting the invasion forces of Britain, France, Japan, and the United States, as well as the counter-revolutionary Whiteguards financed and equipped by the Entente governments. Lenin's cited statement at the Eighth Party Congress called for the formation of a regular, strictly disciplined Red Army, led by military specialists. Lenin and Stalin took a strong stand against the Leftist "Military Opposition" who favored only partisan forms of organization and methods of warfare. Lenin ridiculed the charge of Kautsky and other reactionary Social-Democrats that the Bolsheviks had militarism and not Socialism: "As though history has ever known a big revolution that was not involved in war!" And in the sentence following the passage Sulzberger quotes, Lenin said: "That means that if the ruling class, the proletariat, wants to hold sway, it must prove its capacity to do so by its military organization also."

Lenin's second quoted statement refers to the two foes between whom the Soviet Republic then found itself—the German and Entente imperialists. The Peace of Brest-

Litovsk had obtained for the Soviet Power a breathing space for consolidation, although by its predatory terms German imperialism deprived Soviet Russia of Latvia, Estonia, and part of Byelorussia, in addition to annexing the part of Lithuania it had occupied during the war. It furthermore cut off the Ukraine from the Soviet Republic and reduced it to a German vassal. Despite the peace treaty, the Germans worked assiduously to destroy the young republic, giving military aid to counter-revolutionary forces.

With Germany's defeat, the Soviet Power could begin to liberate its territories from German occupation. On the other hand, the victorious Entente Powers could now intensify their armed intervention against the Soviet Republic and tighten the hunger blockade. Working against both imperialist camps, to the advantage of the Soviet State, was the tide of revolution which was spreading over Europe.

Seen in their true frame of reference (which for the *New York Times* is news not fit to print), the citations from Lenin refute Sulzberger's construction that Leninism denies the possibility of cooperation. Lenin warned and mobilized the Soviet people in the face of the ravages that the imperialist Powers of three continents—among them the "democracies"—were inflicting on the new-born Soviet Republic. The possibilities for cooperation existed then, as they always exist; but it

takes two to cooperate. Lenin's analysis of the problem was based on his profound understanding of the nature of imperialism, formulated classically in his work, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. Lenin, accordingly, saw the continual danger of the most reactionary monopolist circles gaining dominance and undermining friendly relations and cooperation. Hence, Lenin, in essence, warned the Soviet people that their "1789" might have to be defended with arms in "1793," that their "1776" might have to consolidate itself on the field of battle in "1812." Therefore, his words of steel: "If the ruling class, the proletariat, wants to hold sway, it must prove its capacity to do so, by its military organization also."

In stating that "a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois States will be inevitable," Lenin, concerned with safeguarding and consolidating the gains of the Revolution, spoke *predictively* of the danger that imperialist encirclement would, in the event of the dominance of ultra-reaction, continue to spell for the Workers' State. Thus he wrote in the spring of 1918:

Of course, the peace achieved by the Russian Soviet Republic is unstable not because it is now thinking of resuming military operations; apart from bourgeois counter-revolutionaries and their henchmen (the Mensheviks and others) not a single sane politician thinks of doing that. The instability of the peace is due to the fact that in the imperialist

states born
and the
amous mili
tempted b
Russia and
state social
der, may
moment.*

Great a
taken pla
timely for
now char
America—
of Lenin.

The So
birth wit
Peace on
Revolution
ing all aim
peace poli
temporary
ected or
occasion:

cialist esse
Having ab
man by m
utes a ne
mocracy.

the means
Socialist S
ormal rig

ial guaran
enjoyment
et forth i
U.S.S.R. I
true, con
established
loiters an
agonistic

* Lenin, *So*

ates bordering on Russia on the West and the East, which command enormous military forces, the military party, tempted by the momentary weakness of Russia and egged on by capitalists who hate socialism and are eager for plunder, may secure supremacy at any moment.*

Great are the changes that have taken place since 1918. Yet how timely for the peace of the world—how charged with meaning for our America—are these profound words of Lenin.

* * *

The Soviet Power proclaimed its birth with the historic *Decree on Peace* on the day following the Revolution of November 7, renouncing all aims of conquest. The Soviet peace policy is not an expedient or temporary arrangement to be projected or withdrawn on this or that occasion: it is inherent in the Socialist essence of the Soviet State. Having abolished the exploitation of man by man, the Soviet State constitutes a new and higher type of democracy. The social ownership of the means of production enables the Socialist State, not merely to extend formal rights, but to provide material guarantees to the people for the enjoyment of the fundamental rights set forth in the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. For the first time in history true, consistent democracy has been established, a democracy without exploiters and oppressors, without antagonistic classes and class conflicts.

Its very nature makes the Socialist democracy of the Soviet Union the antithesis and enemy to-the-death of fascism, of "totalitarianism." A distinctive feature of Soviet democracy is the active participation of the whole people in political life and the involvement of the broad masses in the administration of the Socialist State. Founded as a free and voluntary union of equal nations, the Soviet State has torn out the social roots of racism. All ideas of domination, of violation of the sovereignty of other nations are alien to its very nature and interests.

In the thirty years of its existence, the Soviet Union has engaged in no predatory war or act of aggression, which cannot be said of the record of Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, or the United States. The oft-heard charge that the incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R. represents aggression is baseless. The facts of history are undeniable. The Baltic states, in common with all nations formerly subjugated by Czarist imperialism, were granted by the "Declaration of Rights of the Nations of Russia," issued on November 15, 1917, the right of self-determination, including the right of separation. Their voluntary union with the Soviet Republic was violently terminated by the German military occupation in 1918. After Germany's defeat, their separation from Soviet Russia, against the will of their peoples, was continued through the collusion of the coun-

* Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. VII, p. 313.

ter-revolutionary leaders with foreign imperialists.

History has also written its unmistakable verdict on the Finnish war. Finland clearly was but the pawn of great imperialist powers for whom the British-built Mannerheim Line was an advance war-base at the gates of Leningrad. The insolent intransigence of the Mannerheim-Tanner clique in rebuffing the many efforts of the Soviet Union toward a peaceful solution of the points at issue was clearly dictated by Hoover and the Men of Munich who sought a conflict between the U.S.S.R. and Finland in order to change the direction of the war away from Hitler to the Soviet Union. And how fortunate for all mankind was the elimination of the Mannerheim Line as a powerful fortress for the Nazi drive on Leningrad!

The Socialist land born in the struggle for peace has for thirty years unwaveringly championed the cause of peace. Its voice, and its alone, was raised in the League of Nations for disarmament and world peace. It roused the world to the danger of fascist aggression. Its slogan "Peace is Indivisible" was a rallying call for collective security. It warned of the precipice to which Munichism was leading the world. Its non-aggression pact with Germany, made necessary by the evident determination of the Munich Powers to direct Hitler into war against the Soviet Union, gained for the Red Army the needed

time to meet and crush the inevitable Nazi onslaught.

Today, the voice of the Soviet Union speaks out in the United Nations as leader of the world's peace forces in sharp rebuke to the war mongers in defence of the peace, sovereign equality, and cooperation of nations.

From its very birth the Soviet Republic became the object of attack on the part of world imperialism.

Winston Churchill, chief instigator of "the invasion of fourteen states," wrote with cold-blooded cynicism in after-years:

Were they [the Entente and associated Powers] at war with Soviet Russia? Certainly not; but they shot Soviet Russians at sight. They stood as invaders on Russian soil. They armed the enemies of the Soviet Government. They blockaded its ports, and sunk its battleships. They earnestly desired and schemed its downfall. But war—shocking! Indifference—shame! It was, they repeated a matter of indifference to them how the Russians settled their own internal affairs. They were impartial—Bang!

And throughout the years—behold the record of sanctimonious imperialism! *Cordon sanitaire*; financial blockades and embargo on Soviet exports; frontier incidents provocations; spying, sabotage, and wrecking operations "Sisson Documents" and "Zinoviev Letter" forgeries; assassinations of Soviet representatives; Locarno diplomacy for Soviet isolation

* Winston Churchill, *The Aftermath*, New York, 1929, pp. 243-4.

tion; Vatican-directed clerical "crusades" against the Soviets; Fifth Column conspiracies with White Guards, Mensheviks, and Trotskyites; encouragement of the German *Drang nach Osten*; rejection of collective security; "appeasement" of fascism and the climax of Munich; the designs to "switch the war"; the protracted delay of the Second Front; and now, the undermining of the peace basis established at Yalta and Potsdam and the Wall Street pressure for world domination through the instrumentality of the Truman Doctrine and its enabling act, the Marshall Plan.

The reality of our policies in Europe and Asia belie the pious professions of the Marshall Plan proponents in behalf of the starving peoples. It is a plan, not for sincere and generous assistance, but for wholesale bribery and the blackmail of withholding economic aid to force nations to surrender their independence and take the course of reaction. In France and Italy, the conditions for the Marshall Plan loans involved the exclusion of the majority party of the working class, the Communists, from the government, because they are the valiant fighters for the sovereignty and independence of their nations. This act, perpetrated by the reactionary Social-Democratic and clerical flunkies of American imperialism, has stimulated the resurgence of neo-fascism in both countries. The logic and aim of the Marshall Plan is to fo-

ment civil wars, à la Greece and China, to intervene on the side of royalists, fascists, and feudalists, as an integral part of Wall Street's drive to world domination. A cardinal feature of the Marshall Plan is, therefore, the re-cartelization of Germany under the supremacy of American monopoly. The rebuilding of the Ruhr center of Germany's industrial war potential in the service of a Western bloc under American hegemony could then be directed against the Soviet Union and the new peoples' democracies. The Truman-Marshall plans for world domination must increasingly render impossible peaceful relations with any nation; for even America's allies in imperialist aggrandizement are increasingly subordinated to Wall Street.

The question is: *Who has to be contained?*

The facts in the record show that not containment of the Soviet Union, but containment of imperialism and its aggressive designs is the crucial task of all people to whom peace and freedom are dear.

* * *

Had Mr. Sulzberger been more diligent in his research, he might have discovered that for Lenin, notwithstanding the contradiction between the capitalist world and the Socialist world, the practical perspective was cooperation between the two systems. In his report to the Eighth All-Russian Congress of So-

viets, in December, 1920, Lenin said:

We are convinced that by continuing our peaceable policy and by making concessions (and we must make concessions if we wish to avoid war), in spite of all the intrigues and machinations of the imperialists, which of course are always capable of provoking a quarrel between us and some other state, the basic line of our policy and the fundamental interests resulting from the very nature of imperialist policy will come into their own and will increasingly compel the establishment of closer ties between the R.S.F.S.R. and a growing number of neighboring states. And this is a guarantee that we shall be able to devote ourselves wholeheartedly to the cause of economic development and that we shall be able for a long time to work calmly, steadfastly and confidently.*

Most recently Lenin's position on cooperation was reaffirmed by Stalin in his conference with Harold E. Stassen, in April, 1947. To Stassen's inquiry whether he thought "these two economic systems can exist together in the same modern world in harmony with each other," Stalin answered:

Of course, they can. The differences between them is not of essential importance insofar as cooperation is concerned. The systems in Germany and the United States are the same, yet war broke out between them. The U.S. and U.S.S.R. systems are different, but we have not waged war against each other and the U.S.S.R. does not pro-

pose to. If during the war they could cooperate, why can't they today in peace?

Speaking further of the difference in the two systems, Stalin said to his American interviewer:

Let us not criticize mutually our systems. Everyone has the right to follow the system he wants to maintain. Which is the better will be said by history . . . To cooperate one does not need the same systems. One should respect the other system when approved by the people. Only on this basis can we secure cooperation.

With this position every democratic and peace-striving American can agree. It is the basis on which Roosevelt ended the Wilson-Harding-Coolidge-Hoover non-recognition policy and established the U.S.-Soviet relations that culminated in the victorious coalition. Those at the helm of our State today are destroying that basis: Roosevelt's successor has united with Hoover. The bipartisan policy of deliberately preventing the possibility of composing differences with the U.S.S.R. and reaching agreement reflects the Truman acceptance of Hooverian war-breeding imperialism. Dulles scheme, Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan add up together to aggression for world domination.

The warmongers seek to divert the abhorrence of the American people for imperialist aggression by raising the stop-thief charge of "Red imperialism" against the Soviet Union. The slave-labor law-

* Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. VIII, pp. 251-52.

maker
exploit
the Am
the labe
lice Stat
the new
like mar
un-Ame
their fas
of labor
cry of d
Constitu
menace.
control,
scenario
nopoly p
are the
imperial
There
democrac
fascism,
against
movement
American
that ther
no abstra
ive of r
now con
domestic
alist fore
the Trum
stabilized
The fight
Hartley
arization

makers and the thought-controllers exploit the anti-fascist sentiments of the American people by attaching the labels "totalitarianism" and "police State" to the Socialist State and the new peoples' democracies. In like manner the Tafts, Hartleys, and un-American witch-hunters cover their fascist-like attacks on the rights of labor and progressives with the cry of defending "freedom" and the Constitution from the "Communist menace." Fascist-patterned thought control, slave-labor bills, book and scenario suppression, and the monopoly plunder of the people at home are the inseparable counterpart of imperialist policy abroad.

There can be no fight today for democracy, for labor's rights, against fascism, except as part of the fight against imperialism. The labor movement, every worker, every American democrat must realize that there is no abstract fascism and no abstract anti-fascism. The offensive of militarism and fascism we now confront in our country is the domestic counterpart of the imperialist foreign policies incorporated in the Truman Doctrine and its respectabilized version, the Marshall Plan. The fight for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, the fight against militarization and thought control, can-

not be separated from the fight against the Marshall Plan. It is one fight against the same monopolies, enemies of labor and the people.

Labor has a vital concern with foreign policy. Foreign policy involves the questions of jobs, prices, living standards, labor's rights, and our democratic liberties. Foreign policy involves the lives of our youth and the honor of America among the nations.

The Wall Street fomenters of war hysteria are brazen and insolent; but the people are stronger. The American people desire peace and cherish freedom for themselves and for all the nations. But the sentiments of the people must be organized and given effective political expression. That requires the broadest unity of the forces of labor and the people generally, of Communists and all anti-fascists. Such a coalition can compel a change in our foreign policy, to implement the principles of the Atlantic Charter and to honor our commitments at Potsdam which charted the course for world peace and the freedom of the nations. Such a coalition can restore American-Soviet cooperation and amity for enduring peace and mutual respect for the sovereign equality of all nations big and small.

LESS FOOD—MORE PROFITS

By ARNOLD JOHNSON

On October 1, President Truman addressed the opening session of the Citizens Food Committee. He blamed the people for wasting food and said nothing about the profiteering food trusts.

On that same day the President received the report of his Council of Economic Advisers. According to newspaper reports, Dr. Edwin C. Nourse, Chairman of the Council, said "that the small grain harvests of this year were not an unmixed fiscal evil. He declared that another bumper crop might have cost the Federal Treasury as much as two billion dollars in subsidies to the farmers and that the amount might be reasonably offset against the cost of food relief to Europe." On that same day on which the President kept silent as to controls and the role of the trusts, the price of grain, livestock, milk, and some vegetables continued to go upward. On the Chicago Board of Trade there was hesitancy in early trading. Then grains for future delivery advanced sharply, partly on the basis of the President's speech and the report that the export goal of grain might be 570 million bushels.

Thus, the issue of the high cost of living continues as a major problem

facing the American people, with all its relations to domestic and foreign policy. What are the facts, and what policies are determining the trend of events?

In all the speeches and figures that are being released today the obvious fact is that food is being used as a weapon. At home in America, the price of food is being used as a weapon against the living standards and security of the people. In foreign policy, food is being used as a weapon to make governments submit to the will of U.S. monopoly capital. This is a policy of disaster for our people as well as those of other nations. It exploits the desire of the American people to send food to the hungry people who gave as much as our allies in our fight against fascism.

FALSE PROPAGANDA

Every housewife, consumer, worker, and farmer feels the pinch of high prices. The profiteers use every kind of false propaganda to create a smokescreen behind which they grasp at the last bit of savings and credit of the masses. They create confusion and continue the robbery of the people.

At one stage, the major effort of the newspapers was to blame wage increases for high prices. That argument just did not hold water. It confused many during periods of wage struggles, but now even broader sections of the population know that such propaganda is false.

In the more recent stage, the effort of the capitalist propagandists was to blame the farmer. The facts are that during the past year the prices farmers have received have risen somewhat, but not as rapidly as the prices farmers have had to pay for necessities. Farm prices were 273 in October, 1946, dropped to 260 by January, increased to 280 in March and dropped again to 271 in June, and then increased to 276 in August, 1947. The prices farmers pay for goods increased from 207 in October, 1946, to 235 in August, 1947. Such are the Department of Agriculture figures, which understate the inflationary squeeze. The farmers' share in the consumers' food dollar has also declined.

At the same time, the Department of Labor figures show that the average take-home pay of the worker was only \$41.52 in May, 1947. On the basis of purchasing power in May, this amounted to no more than 26.46 based on 1939 figures. The tremendous increase in food prices, since May, has wreaked havoc with the workers' income and living standards. This is all the more critical where a family has only one breadwinner.

The argument has been made, particularly by the "America firsters" and "isolationists," that shipment of food supplies abroad is the basis of high prices. The facts are that food grain production has increased. This is a bumper year for wheat, although short for corn.

Food grain production has risen from 143 in 1944 to 202 in 1947. At the same time, in 1943 we exported 10 per cent of our food supplies and this year the figure for food export is 8 per cent, including the food for occupied countries. The argument against export is not being made so vigorously now because 40 per cent of the U.S. grain export goes to Germany, Japan, Korea, and Austria, that is to the U.S. occupied zones of our former enemy countries. At the same time, the allocation to France and Italy is less than 11 per cent of the total.

The most recent campaigns have been directed against consumers, with demands by Taft and Truman that the people "eat less" or "waste less." Herbert Hoover initiated this line in the spring of 1946. The "relief program" was then used to smash price control. Artificial shortages of soap and meat were used to black-jack the people in the 1946 elections. Now the consumer, including the worker, farmer, and professional, is charged with creating shortages by wasting food when in actuality he is forced to eat less because of high prices. This campaign has become so brazen that Mr. Luckman can advocate cutting down on the size of a loaf of bread and within two days, the price of bread goes up again. There is not even a slight effort made to cover up the conspiracy in high places for profit-making.

THE POWER AND RESPONSIBILITY OF MONOPOLY

While the people are made the targets by a slanderous press and calumnious politicians, the fact remains that the greedy monopolies have been making profit hand over fist—both at the point of production and the point of sale. These same monopolies, which raked in big wartime profits and which have tremendously increased their postwar profits, are also trying to dictate to the world how people shall live, what they shall eat, and the form of the economy and the government of various other countries.

The open campaign of the economic royalists against the people started immediately after the war, although they pursued this policy even during the war. The line of certain forces of Big Business in the war years was made clear when Mr. Frederick Crawford of Cleveland, former head of the National Association of Manufacturers, went to Europe in 1945, during the war, and upon his return declared: "France and Belgium prospered under Nazi rule and . . . their people would have been content to live with the swastika if they hadn't been liberated by underground scum." Mr. Crawford was President of the N.A.M. and an early admirer of fascism, an advocate of war against the Soviet Union, and notorious as an open-shop industrialist. In the course of the war, Crawford was not alone. For ex-

ample, Lamot DuPont was among those charged with trading with the enemy during the war, with having ties with I. G. Farben of Germany and Mitsui of Japan.

The growth of monopoly's control of the United States, and hence of its control over prices, was well exposed in the Senate Sub-committee report on *Economic Concentration in World War II* (1946).

This report shows that the most powerful finance capitalist group is J. P. Morgan-First National, which controls over 30 billion dollars in holdings. The Rockefeller family controls 6½ billion dollars in oil and banking. Kuhn-Loeb controls holdings of 11 billion dollars. The Mellon family controls over 3 billion dollars and the DuPont family over 2½ billion. The Chicago group controls holdings of over 4 billion, the Cleveland group, 1½ billion, and the Boston group over 1½ billion. These are the main groups of the financial oligarchy in the U.S.

The growth of these eight groups and other powerful monopolists did not stop with the ending of the war. These forces seek more control at home and abroad. They have powerful agencies and spokesmen. They control the press and other means of propaganda. They have their spokesmen in government and in the Republican and Democratic Parties, and Social-Democrat, Trotskyite and Socialist lackeys. They have "expert witnesses at all kinds of hearings

They
varyi
MON
AT

At
monc
slash
labor
its all
lation
New
gram

The
back,
1946
the li
and s
was d
N.A.M.
advert
150 d
papers
tional
propag
radio
another
was th
public
Patters
chains
oily P
spread
geance
Farmer
—reach
rural a
in the
The
the N.
dollars.

They establish front organizations of varying shades.

MONOPOLY'S OFFENSIVE AT HOME

At the end of the war, big monopoly launched a program to slash living standards, destroy the labor movement, isolate labor from its allies, pit one section of the population against the other, uproot the New Deal—and move on to a program of world domination.

The trade union movement fought back, and in the wage struggles of 1946 preserved in a marked degree the living standards of the people and strengthened its unions. This was done in spite of the fact that the N.A.M. in 1945 had conducted an advertising campaign in more than 150 daily and 2,000 weekly newspapers. It claimed that an additional 5,000 newspapers used N.A.M. propaganda. It used practically every radio in the country in one way or another. In addition to this there was the regular propaganda in such publications as those of the Hearst, Patterson, McCormick, and Howard chains and the big city dailies. The oily Pew family of Pennsylvania spreads the same line with a vengeance in its *Farm Journal*, the *Farmer's Wife*, and in the *Pathfinder*—reaching especially the farmers and rural areas. The same line is carried in the press of the fascist outfits.

The 1946 propaganda expenses of the N.A.M. were over three million dollars. Its biggest target and prize

was the scuttling of O.P.A. and the election of the 80th Congress. The 1947 budget of the N.A.M. (with 16,000 members) for propaganda is \$4,700,000. The money that this outfit spent in scrapping O.P.A. is now being returned in heavy profits. The 1946 net profits of 12½ billion dollars after payment of all taxes represents in part the payoff to Big Business. The estimated profit of over 17 billion in 1947 is now being pushed upward with the recent price increases and demands for greater production.

The 80th Congress did the bidding of the N.A.M. in the passage of the Taft-Hartley Law. While monopoly capital failed to smash labor in the old way through strikebreaking and stool-pigeons, it has proceeded to try to accomplish the same end through Congress. While it could not smash living standards by direct wage cuts because of the resistance of labor, it has proceeded to do this by high prices. Certainly, Big Business, with its campaign for greater productivity and its whole attack against the unions, is also preparing for a campaign to cut wages.

MONOPOLY'S OFFENSIVE ABROAD

The N.A.M., as the agency of big capital, does not stop at the borders of the United States in its attacks on the people. Thus, Mr. Robert Wason, Chairman of the N.A.M. board, declared:

On April 23, the board voted its support of the proposed government aid to Greece and Turkey. The board also voted fiscal assistance to the economies of other friendly private-enterprise nations. We recognize that such assistance means the export of goods, shortening of American supply and driving up prices at home.

The program of monopoly capital for profits and more profits, is that of dictating domestic and foreign policy. Greece and Turkey become the model nations. Aid is not to be given to nations on the basis of the needs of the people but on the basis of whether such nations are "friendly private-enterprise nations." Then the proposed "aid" for such nations is to be charged up to the American people in the form of high prices. The aid program of the N.A.M. was put in more scholastic language by Secretary Marshall at Harvard University in June. The American representatives in Europe have, however, been carrying out this N.A.M. program to the letter in concretizing the Marshall phase of the Truman Doctrine by dictating the kind of governments that qualify as "friendly private-enterprise nations."

Herbert Hoover established the formula some 27 years ago. According to the U. S. State Department papers on the Peace Conference following World War I, Georges Clemenceau endorsed the Hoover policy in these words: "The offer of food in return for good behavior would be a very effective weapon."

Mr. Hoover at that time was saving the world from Communism. President Truman welcomed Hoover back to the White House—as a demonstration and guarantee that the Hoover-N.A.M. policy on hunger and food would prevail.

A COUNTER-OFFENSIVE NEEDED

The forces of reaction and monopoly capital aggressively and unitedly try to put over their program against the people. Differences exist among them on details of timing and tactics, yet the essential factor that labor and the mass of American people must recognize in the fight for the people's interests is that the fight must be made against the expression of the monopoly program on all fronts. To support the Truman-Marshall foreign policy is to weaken the fight in defense of labor and living standards at home. To use the tactic of Red-baiting and food as a political weapon is to weaken progressive forces and open wider the gates for the profiteering food trusts and munitions makers. Those who Red-bait soon find themselves giving aid and comfort to the war-mongering propagandists and become diverted from all struggle in the interests of the people. These facts must be made ever more clear to the forces of labor in America.

The forces of reaction can be defeated only by a united peoples' coalition. While carefully estimating the methods and strength of monopoly

capital
more tr
the mo
ple. T
of their
the org
cal mat
other h
of rep
capital
evident
the bou
masses
facts. T
brings t
high pri
and thr
and U
investigati
Unions a
lynching
em of J
anti-Sem
family li
ause of
ng goes
encour
Such a
to the p
treet w
s busin
pells di
eople.

ORGANI
AGAIN

The st
of deci
e peopl
ct that
ention a

capital in America, it remains even more true that the main strength and the most powerful forces are the people. This is true, not only because of their numbers but also because of the organization and growing political maturity of the people. On the other hand the political bankruptcy of representatives of monopoly capital is becoming more and more evident daily. The propaganda of the bourgeoisie does confuse large masses but it does not change the facts. The program of Big Business brings to the masses insecurity, fear, high prices, "eat less and waste less," and threats of war. Loyalty oaths and Un-American Committee investigations destroy civil rights. Unions are harassed and curbed. The lynching of Negroes, the whole system of Jim Crow and an increase in anti-Semitism continues. Normal family living is denied to people because of lack of housing. Profiteering goes forward. Warmongering is encouraged.

Such a program only demonstrates to the people that reactionary Wall Street with its N.A.M. agency and its business agents in government spells disaster for the American people.

ORGANIZE THE FIGHT AGAINST THE H. C. OF L.!

The struggle against high prices of decisive importance for uniting the people against the trusts. The fact that the C.I.O. National Convention advanced a broad program

gave labor and other forces a new outlook. In the many legislative conferences and hearings held throughout the country, many organizations have participated, particularly such groups as labor unions, the Progressive Citizens of America, consumers' organizations, the League of Women Voters, tenants' organizations, and a host of others. This has demonstrated that the people want a fuller answer to the problem. People are demanding a rollback in prices, control of food products, taxation according to ability to pay, extension of social security, a health program, and F.E.P.C., a farm program to guarantee living standards to farmers, a Missouri Valley Authority, and more and more control over the food and meat processing industries. A growing demand also developed for a special session of Congress to act against high prices and those who are responsible.

The Communist Party advanced a 16 point program at the December, 1946, meeting of its National Committee. In the course of the struggle much of this program is now being discussed. It is helping to unite the people. In Alexander Bittelman's articles,* special emphasis has been given to the need to end speculation in grains and livestock; the need for price control and rationing of grain and grain products, dairy and dairy products, meat and meat products.

* See *Political Affairs*, for May and September, 1947.

—based on a rollback to the prices of June, 1946; and the declaration of the steel industry as a public utility and the regulation of its production and prices in the interests of the people.

The program that our Party has advanced is, in the main, a program for immediate application. It is not enough that it is being discussed and that broad sections of the population are expressing general agreement. The achievement of this program requires many forms of mass struggles. Only as the representatives of the bourgeoisie see ever broader sections of the population in mass actions working for this program, will they be forced to grant the demands of the people. The very fact that President Truman could callously and stupidly declare that price control is an expression of a "police state," should remind us that the movement for price control is not yet effective in scope or militancy.

Let us remember that one of the lessons in the fight against the Taft-Hartley Bill was that it was too limited in forces and not aggressive enough in action. In this fight now, there must be an even more intensive campaign to establish the united action of labor and the broader sections of the population.

Within the past two months, the demand to make the meat and food industries public utilities has increased. The brazen profiteering of the food trusts and the fact that public institutions and the health of the

people have been jeopardized has brought forward more concrete demands for action on these industries as well as on the steel industry. The regulation of industries as public utilities, with commissions to regulate rates and prices, is a long established system in American life and deserves much more emphasis.

Housing and rent control need continued attention. Unless this is done there is the danger that the crude and belligerent attitude of reactionary forces will prevail against the people. Already there is the example of Louisville, Kentucky, where rents were increased.

The National Association of Real Estate Boards has already started the campaign to abolish rent control. The fact that the law expires on February 29, 1948, means that new legislation must be passed in order to continue rent control. And the fight for rent control will be strengthened by also making it a fight for large scale federal housing projects and federal aid to private building.

Much more must also be done in guaranteeing that the alliance of labor, the consumers, and the farmers is strengthened. The attack of reactionary elements, including Congressional Committees, against the cooperatives has aroused the anger of many farmers, 60 per cent of whom are members of cooperatives. Around this issue labor and consumers should come to the support of the farmers. Labor should not

camp
guar
in rel
pay f
whole
existe
less r
The
farme
stand
In
any
metho
clear
of a g
same
unite
The o
people
to hea
tion o
of peo
for a
ment
tire b
Hoove
The
the N
that th
politica
monop
new ac
ment o
providi
coalitio
It is
labor l
foreign
is a bet
and ma
royalist

campaign for price support that guarantees farmers a floor in prices in relation to what the farmers must pay for the goods they need. This whole parity program will go out of existence on December 31, 1948, unless new legislation is enacted.

The program for unity with the farmers must be consciously and constantly fought for by labor.

In the course of this fight and in any analysis of the propaganda methods of Big Business, it becomes clear that much more must be done of a grass roots character and at the same time on a national scale to unite people on program at all levels. The continued mass attendance of people in every community to pay to hear Henry Wallace is an indication of the deep concern and desire of people from every walk of life for a new leadership, a new movement which will challenge the entire bi-partisan program of the Hoover-Truman-Taft combine.

The experience of the people with the N.A.M. onslaught has meant that the people have become more politically alert against the rule of monopoly in America. This is a new advance in the political development of the people. Experience is providing the base for a new people's coalition.

It is not a full development. Many labor leaders boastfully support the foreign policy of Big Business. This is a betrayal of the workers' interests, and makes it easier for the economic royalists to proceed with their pro-

gram of high prices. At the same time, what is new in the ranks of labor is the ever-increasing attack developing on its part against monopoly. Thus, the major theme of the recent C.I.O. Convention was the exposure of the role of Big Business. The reports emphasize and condemn the power and the profits of the monopolists.

Thus, President Philip Murray's report states:

The increase in monopoly control and the increase in the concentration of economic power places in the hands of a very limited number of people control over the lives and destiny of everyone. This tight grip held by monopoly power must be broken. This power not only is exercised over employment and production but has been the main spearhead to push prices to their present fantastically high levels.

It is obvious that much more must be done to bring out the facts demonstrating the truth of this statement. At the same time, we must recognize that the people cannot compete on a propaganda basis with the big monopolies and profiteers. The radio, the newspapers, the movies and other propaganda instruments are completely at the disposal of Big Business. While using those media as far as their resources permit, the people must use other means to mobilize public resentment. That is why there must be demonstrative mass forms of action. That is also why such actions must be organized on a national scale to

dramatize the needs and demands of the people.

Many forms of struggle must be developed to serve immediate purposes. There must be no let-up in the demand for Congressional action to roll back prices and to re-establish price control, especially on food products. A fight must be waged for the establishment of the meat, dairy and steel industries as public utilities. Rent control must be continued and strengthened and a housing program must be instituted. Such are the steps that must be taken, and taken quickly, while continuing the fight for a people's tax program, farm legislation, and other demands.

The forms of struggle should include every type of petition and resolution. Conferences and mass meetings are on the agenda. Posters, leaflets, the radio and other forms of mass propaganda must be used. Demonstrations need to be organized on a community-wide basis—such as closing all stores in protest—or a week in which meat will not be bought if it is more than 50 cents a pound, as was organized in Detroit. Many activities are being organized today. All such actions must lead to greater organization and greater demonstrative activity.

The living standards and health of the people are at stake. Immediate action is urgent. Such actions will

be decisive in determining future line-ups for other battles ahead.

* * *

Congress has been called into special session on November 17. Hence, more than ever, the fight against the high cost of living is to the forefront and cannot be ignored. The demand of the people has placed this issue on the agenda of Congress. Much more vigorous demands must now be made for a roll-back and control of prices and for rationing. These are the immediate essentials. Such demands must be made while Congressmen are at home and then repeated again and again during the special session. At the same time, the Congress must be told that the American people want to help wipe out starvation in Europe and to guarantee the reconstruction of the countries that gave so much in the fight against fascism. This calls for a revival of the program of U.N. R.R.A.—of relief and rehabilitation without political strings, and with priority to those who fought fascism. Such a program could be carried out through an agency of the United Nations. This means struggle against the Truman-Marshall policy. It means a more determined fight by the people against the whole policy of Wall Street. Congress must hear the ever stronger demand for a people's program.

ONE
WA
"PE
RO

THE
in the
the b
mono
a pro
astour
the ex
ple, a
the
Amer
in ge
the p
proce
of the
ception
hopes
mocr
to pl
AME
TR
Ph
Doct
says:
Th
fully
in all

ONCE MORE ON WALL STREET'S "PROGRESSIVE" ROLE

By ALEXANDER BITTELMAN

THE ESSENCE OF Philip Jaffe's article in the final issue of *Amerasia* is that the basic forces of the Wall Street monopolies are capable of fulfilling a progressive role. This may sound astounding, especially in the light of the experiences of the American people, and of the rest of the world, with the Truman Doctrine and with American imperialist warmongering in general. But facts are facts, and the plain fact is that Philip Jaffe, proceeding from the fundamentals of the bankrupt and discredited conceptions of Browderism, places his hopes for progress, peace, and democracy upon Wall Street's ability to play a progressive role.

AMERICAN CENTURY AND TRUMAN DOCTRINE

Philip Jaffe discusses the Truman Doctrine at considerable length. He says:

The people of Europe and Asia are fully aware that the Truman Doctrine, in all its manifestations, is the logical

offspring of the American Century ideology (*Amerasia*, July, 1947, p. 201).

And what is the goal of this ideology?

The first step in the realization of this goal would be to establish political and economic control over a sufficiently large part of the world so that there could be no effective opposition to whatever plans the American Century theorists might evolve (*ibid.*).

At first glance this would appear to mean that the American Century forces seek imperialist world domination and that the Truman Doctrine embodies and pursues this objective. But this is so only at first glance. A further reading discloses the following, according to Jaffe: First, that the American Century forces are just "a group of industrial and financial interests whose most articulate spokesman and publisher is Henry Luce, the publisher of *Life*, *Time*, and *Fortune*"; and, secondly, that the American Century group proposes to solve its problems "by exporting the 'industrial revolution,' under direct American supervision, in order to expand the frontiers of American trade and raise purchasing power abroad" (*ibid.*).

This puts an entirely different complexion on the matter. It seems to present the nature and goals of the American Century forces in a sort of idealized and beautified form.

First, what is the real nature of these forces? Jaffe says, it is "a group of industrial and financial interests." Very well. But what is

its scope, power, and position in the economy and politics of the United States? The answer is: this so-called group embraces nothing more nor less than the decisive sections of American monopoly capital, the dominant power in the economy and politics of the United States.

In fact, the very publications of Henry Luce, with whom the American Century slogan originated, are controlled by the Morgan group of the monopolies. This means that the originators of the slogan and its most articulate champions are themselves part of, and directly controlled, by one of the most powerful groups of American monopolies and one of the pillars of Wall Street's imperialism.

Second, is it true that the American Century group wants to export the "industrial revolution," to expand American foreign trade "and raise purchasing power abroad"? There are some grains of truth in this statement, but in its entirety it is false.

American imperialism needs and looks for opportunities for the export of capital, for foreign investments, for control of sources of raw materials, for markets. This is, in fact, the motive power behind Wall Street's drive for world domination. This drive receives particular impulse from the approaching economic crisis in the United States. But does this mean that the Wall Street monopolies are willing to help Europe regain and expand its industrial strength? Does this mean that the

American monopolies are willing to industrialize the colonial and backward countries and make them economically independent? Since it does not and cannot mean that, then what truth is there in Jaffe's assertion that Wall Street is willing to export the "industrial revolution"? No truth at all, but a dangerous and misleading untruth.

The plain truth is that the American monopolies do not want a strong and independent industrial Europe because they seek to retain their present predominant position in world capitalist economy. The American monopolies seek to gain dominance over the economic life of Europe and to make it dependent upon the capitalist economy of the United States. For this purpose, the American monopolies are willing to export capital to Europe, to make large scale investments there, to develop various branches of European economy, but only for *this* purpose—to make European economy dependent upon the monopolies in the United States, and not to enable the countries of Europe to regain and enlarge their industrial strength as economically independent countries.

What is the main objective of the Marshall Plan with regard to Germany? It is to gain for American imperialism dominance over western Germany and to rebuild it as a base for the Wall Street monopolies in Europe. This base will be used to hamstring and gain dominance over the industrial and economic life of

the na
destry
as to
mocrac
of the
and of
Phil
things
unwill
others
a theo
dustria
and hi
nature
world
This
assertio
lies wid
abroad
and in
(*ibid.*)
truth h
the stat
What
profits,
limited
the sul
dile of
and po
monop
the W
been do
cades.
ning to
wherev
Jaffe
gether
imperia
is that
seeks co
ward a

the nations of western Europe, to destroy their independence, as well as to combat the growth of democracy, Socialism, and the influence of the new European democracies and of the Soviet Union.

Philip Jaffe must know all these things himself, but apparently he is unwilling to face them and to let others see them. Hence, he develops a theory about "exporting the 'industrial revolution'" that obscures and hides the aggressive imperialist nature of Wall Street's drive for world domination.

This is even more evident in his assertion that the American monopolies wish to "raise purchasing power abroad" and "to stimulate enterprise and industries in backward areas" (*ibid.*). Again, there is a grain of truth here. But taken as a whole, the statement is entirely misleading. What the monopolies are after are profits, domination and power, limited production at high prices, the subordination of the economic life of other countries to the profit and power needs of the Wall Street monopolies. This is exactly what the Wall Street monopolies have been doing in Latin America for decades. This is what they are planning to do to the rest of the world wherever they get the chance.

Jaffe has apparently missed altogether the new features of American imperialist policy. The central fact is that American imperialism now seeks control, not merely of the backward and undeveloped parts of the

world, *but of the whole world.* It seeks to promote this objective by securing economic and political (also military) controls in the most developed capitalist countries, *i. e.*, in western Europe. It aims to transform these countries, which themselves own colonies and oppress colonial peoples, into virtual colonies of the United States. The insane ambition of American imperialism is to turn the whole world into a colony of Wall Street. Yet Jaffe finds it possible to insist that American imperialism is anti-colonial and, in this sense, progressive.

Following Browder's discredited theory of the "anti-colonialism" of the American monopolies, Jaffe tries to prove that American imperialism does not *need* colonies, from an economic standpoint, because the United States has nearly all the raw materials it needs for its industries. To this the answer is that there are many raw materials that the United States do not possess. This refers especially to so-called strategic raw materials, which are indispensable for the production of armaments, including uranium for the production of atom bombs. And the military value of such raw materials is also economic, just as economic imperialist conquests are turned also to military uses.

But more important is the fact that the American monopolies are concerned with raw materials not from the standpoint of the economic needs of American economy. Our trusts

and cartels seek monopolistic control of all sources of raw materials. This is the nature of monopoly and imperialism in their drive for super-profits and power. Hence, whether American capitalist economy needs or does not need a particular raw material, the Wall Street monopolies have been seeking and continue to seek, *now more than ever before*, exclusive control, not only of certain raw materials, but of the very sources of all raw materials.

Jaffe says that America's need for raw materials "becomes important only to the extent that we feel compelled to create large 'stockpiles' for military purposes" (*ibid.*, page 211). But does he not know that the American government and the Wall Street monopolies have been feverishly building up such stockpiles, especially since the end of the war, not only for military purposes, *but also for strategic economic purposes, i. e.*, as a weapon in the drive for economic domination? And does he not know, furthermore, that stockpiles of raw materials created for military purposes can also be used for economic purposes—to fix and dictate prices on the home and world markets, to deny these materials to competitors, to build on this basis new industrial monopolies? Or has Browderism completely blinded him to the most elementary facts of imperialism?

Apparently it has, for further on he writes the following:

Those leftist theorists that contend that anti-colonialism is incompatible

with American capitalism and at the same time call for a return to the Roosevelt approach, would do well to recognize that they are contradicting themselves (*ibid.*, p. 212).

In plainer words, this would seem to mean that it is impossible to deny Wall Street's "progressive anti-colonialism" and at the same time fight for a return to Roosevelt's policies of international cooperation. Why? The truth is the exact contrary, namely: it is impossible now to fight for a return to the Roosevelt policies of international cooperation, especially the policy of Soviet-American friendship, without a genuine struggle against each and every illusion or misconception about the "progressive anti-colonialism" of the Wall Street monopolies. For the greatest enemy of and obstacle to international cooperation and Soviet-American friendship are the Wall Street monopolies.

Jaffe's charge of inconsistency against "those leftist theorists" arises from two false and dangerous assumptions. One is that Wall Street's present drive for world domination is compatible, can go hand in hand, with the Roosevelt policy of world cooperation and Soviet-American friendship. The other assumption is that the narrow and selfish clique and group interests of the American monopolies (Morgan, Rockefeller, Kuhn Loeb, Du Pont, Mellon, and the midwestern financial oligarchy) are the same as the national interests

of Am
two
Roo
tional
based
nation
peace,
cial sy
ing fo
betwe
Union
for th
The A
ways
propo
II, the
part o
build
fascism
militar
Union
monop
tain
man
masses
defeat
tels-w
opposi
front,
bled
to sav
destruc
War I
have b
into a
for wo
the n
soverei
rebuild
world
gerous

of America. Let us consider these two assumptions.

Roosevelt's policies of international cooperation arose from and are based upon the proposition that the national interests of the U. S. require peace, that nations with various social systems are capable of cooperating for peace, and that cooperation between the U. S. and the Soviet Union is a fundamental condition for the promotion of world peace. The American monopolies have always been bitterly opposed to these propositions. Prior to World War II, the Wall Street monopolies, as part of world reaction, sought to build up fascism, especially Hitler fascism, and to direct Germany's military might against the Soviet Union. During the war, these same monopolies—some of which even retained their contacts with the German cartels while the American masses were shedding their blood to defeat the conspiracies of these cartels—were hampering the war effort, opposing and sabotaging the second front, and desperately seeking to bleed the Soviet Union white and to save fascism from complete destruction. Since the end of World War II, the Wall Street monopolies have been driving the United States into a reckless and insane offensive for world rule, for the destruction of the national independence and sovereignty of other peoples, for the rebuilding of fascism, for a new world war. The source of the dangerous warmongering and war pro-

vocations in which reaction in the United States now engages so freely and recklessly—the chief source of all of this criminal business is *the monopolies*, who are once more reaching out after the immense profits of war and war preparations.

Is this the same as the Roosevelt policy of international cooperation? Obviously not. But Jaffe seems to think it is. He still has not found out that a return to the Roosevelt policy of peace, world cooperation, and Soviet-American friendship, calls for a people's anti-imperialist struggle in the United States of such dimensions and scope as will be able to slow down, to check and eventually defeat Wall Street's drive for world rule. This means, since it can mean nothing else, a struggle by the American people, headed by its working class, against the Truman Doctrine, against the Marshall Plan, against the whole reactionary and war-making course of American imperialism.

Thus and only thus can we fight effectively for the return to the Roosevelt policies of international cooperation, for Big Three unity, for Soviet-American friendship, for saving the United Nations as an organ of world cooperation.

Jaffe's other wrong assumption is that the selfish clique interests of the Wall Street monopolies are identical with the national interests of America. From this, two wrong conclusions are being made. One is that Wall Street must be in favor of international cooperation "because" it

is in the national interests of America. The other is that the national interests of America demand that Wall Street rule the world and that a new world war must come to bring this about "because" this is in the narrow and selfish group interests of the American financial oligarchy. Proceeding from a wrong assumption, both of these conclusions are wrong and dangerous.

It is not true that the immediate clique and group interests of the Morgans, Kuhn Loeb, the Rockefellers, and of the midwestern monopolists are the same as the national interests of America. For example, the economic and political interests of the Wall Street monopolies dictate their drive for world domination and for a new world war. American capitalist economy, the dominant part of the world system of capitalism, develops in the surroundings of an advanced stage of the general crisis of capitalism. It is approaching a cyclical economic crisis of serious dimensions. Hence, the problem of markets for the export of goods and capital and the problem of raw materials are confronting the monopolies in a very acute form. The monopolies are pressing for a solution of their own—world rule for American imperialism and preparations for a new world war.

But from this it does not and cannot follow that the national interests of the United States require that Wall Street rule the world and that we wage another world war to bring

it about. When it is argued that since American capitalist economy at the present time is in great need of markets, it "therefore" becomes America's national interest to follow Wall Street's drive for world rule and another war, the answer is as follows:

Other countries—capitalist, the Soviet Union, the new democracies, the colonial and undeveloped lands—need and want American goods and American loans. To obtain them they are willing to enter into bona fide business agreements with this country on the manner and ways of *repayment* of the loans and credits. But they are unwilling to let the Wall Street monopolies penetrate and subordinate their national economies. Thus, foreign countries, too, make a distinction between normal business dealings with the United States, on the one hand, and Wall Street's attempt to rule the world carried forward by the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, on the other hand.

Marshal Tito made this plain once again in an interview with Ella Winter. He said:

We want trade with America. We want good relations. But we consider we should run our own country (*Daily Worker*, Oct. 3, 1947).

Another consideration reinforcing this position is that Wall Street's drive for world rule is not a matter of life and death to American capitalist economy at the present historical moment. Of greater

med
econ
the
desir
press
peop
talis
Socia
coloni
mono
gener
restric
contra
the r
needs
kets.
Thi
of mo
founda
This i
nopoly
talis
ment o
tion ar
perman
to this
ialism,
169-170
emphas
And
At th
has gro
not abo
and alo
rise to a
antagon
(*ibid.*, p
This
between
tion th

mediate urgency to American economy now are trade relations with the rest of the world of a character desired by Tito who has given expression to the desires of nearly all peoples, whether living under capitalism, Socialism, in transition to Socialism, or in countries of a colonial type. In fact, Wall Street's monopolistic economic policies in general—high prices, high tariffs, restricted production, etc.—are in contradiction with and harmful to the realization of the present acute needs of American economy for markets.

This follows from the very nature of monopoly. Says Lenin:

... the most deep-rooted economic foundation of imperialism is monopoly. This is capitalist monopoly, *i.e.*, monopoly which has grown out of capitalism and exists in the general environment of capitalism, commodity production and competition, and remains in permanent and insoluble contradiction to this general environment" ("Imperialism," *Collected Works*, Vol. XIX, pp. 169-170, International Publishers. My emphasis. A. B.).

And further:

At the same time, monopoly, which has grown out of free competition, does not abolish the latter, but exists over it and alongside of it, and thereby gives rise to a number of very acute, intense antagonisms, friction and conflicts (*ibid.*, p. 159).

This includes "the contradictions between monopoly and free competition that exists side by side with it,

between the gigantic 'operations' (and gigantic profits) of finance capital and 'honest' trade in the free market, the contradictions between cartels and trusts, on the one hand, and non-cartelised industry, on the other, etc." (*Ibid.*, page 186.)

At the same time, Lenin has demonstrated another important truth, namely, "the wholesale transition of the possessing classes to the side of imperialism" (*ibid.*, page 179). He has shown that finance capital is able to influence, pressure, and subordinate large sections of the bourgeoisie—medium, small, and smallest—and that imperialist ideology also penetrates the working class. In other words, we have an imperialist bourgeoisie, that seeks to corrupt and confuse sections of the middle classes and of labor, and is doing it mainly with the help of reactionary labor leaders and Right-wing Socialists, such as Matthew Woll, Dubinsky, Rieve, Reuther, etc.

The political conclusion from the fact that monopoly "remains in permanent contradiction" to the general capitalist environment, while the bourgeoisie as a class is imperialist, is two-fold. First, the chief motive force and leader of the anti-imperialist struggle is the working class, headed by its vanguard party, allied with the farmers, Negroes, middle classes, progressive intellectuals and professionals. Secondly, the contradictions and frictions within the bourgeoisie, if correctly utilized, offer an important source of strategic re-

serve strength to the camp of anti-imperialism and democracy.

Lenin's analysis of monopoly's permanent and insoluble contradiction to the general environment of capitalism makes it amply clear that the selfish clique interests of the Wall Street monopolies are not identical with American national interests. It also makes clear the basic opportunist fallacy and danger of the old Kautskian conception "that imperialism must not be regarded as a 'phase' or stage of economy, but as a policy; a definite policy 'preferred' by finance capital; that imperialism cannot be 'identified' with 'contemporary capitalism'" (*ibid.*, page 161). Imperialism is not a policy but a special—the last—stage of capitalism; and the monopolies—the economic base of imperialism—are *capitalist* monopolies, which have grown out of capitalism, and remain in permanent and insoluble contradiction to this general environment.

On the basis of the foregoing we are justified in saying that it is possible to have the peaceful co-existence and cooperation for peace of nations having different social systems. "What is necessary," as Stalin said in his interview with Stassen in April, 1947, "is to respect the systems approved by the people. Only on this condition is cooperation possible." We must say further, on the basis of our analysis, that a third world war is not inevitable; that the people have it in their power to check Wall

Street's drive toward a new war; that the major issue of the central struggle now is not Socialism versus capitalism, but anti-imperialism, democracy, and peace versus imperialism, reaction, fascism, and war. Finally, our analysis has shown that it is possible and necessary to fight for a return to the Roosevelt policies of collaboration for world peace between the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, France, China—and especially for friendship between the United States and the Soviet Union—in the building of the United Nations.

We have thus demonstrated the following three things:

1. The greatest menace at the present time to world peace, democracy, and national independence comes from the American monopolies, from the imperialists of the United States, from American imperialism. Jaffe's Browder-like talk of Wall Street's progressive anti-colonialism is misleading, dangerous, and harmful to the struggle for peace.

2. Wall Street's drive for world rule, its warmongering, and the war preparations of American imperialism are incompatible with, and a great threat to, the national interests of the American people. The narrow and selfish group interests of the American monopolies are not identical with America's national interests.

3. The struggle for a return to the Roosevelt policy of international co-

operati
based s
al inter
of the
This s
the mo
drive f
prepara
bated
ALTER
TRU
From
underst
Jaffe's.
tion th
though
the Tru
Plan i
conclud
"interna
ism," th
is betw
progress
because
"interna
He w
Aggre
present
affairs, it
can part
global s
And f
If a
against th
ast the v
result we
pattern
which th
foreign P
p. 22

operation and Big Three unity is based solidly upon American national interests and upon the opposition of the American people to a new war. This struggle will succeed only in the measure in which Wall Street's drive for world rule and for war preparations are effectively combated and checked.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE

From the foregoing we can better understand another serious error of Jaffe's. It is, namely, his assumption that the only practical, even though undesirable, alternative to the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan is "isolationism." From this he concludes that the real issue today is "internationalism" versus "isolationism," that the choice for progressives is between these two, and that the progressives must support Truman because he is on the side of the "internationalists."

He writes:

Aggressive and blundering as the present Administration is in foreign affairs, it is at least committed to American participation in foreign affairs on a global scale.

And further:

If a narrowly conceived campaign against the Truman Doctrine should assist the victory of reaction in 1948, one result would be the destruction of a pattern of internationalism within which the struggle for a Rooseveltian foreign policy can be carried on (*op. cit.*, p. 227).

Here we begin to perceive the menacing *political* consequences of Jaffe's blundering and Browder-based analysis. Just think of it: because the Truman Administration is driving to establish the world rule of the American monopolies and is preparing to wage a new world war to attain this objective, Jaffe calls it "internationalism" ("participation in world affairs on a global scale") and wants the American people to support it. The defeat of the Truman Doctrine, he says, "would be the destruction of a pattern of internationalism." We wonder whether Jaffe is familiar with the fact that the Wall Street monopolies and their press are now attacking the Soviet Union's insistence upon respect for national sovereignty and independence as "outdated" for "the atomic age" and "nationalistic." The Wall Street monopolies want it to be known that they are "internationalist" and hence more modern and up-to-date than the "nationalist" Soviet Union and the Communists. But is it not evident that this so-called "internationalism" of Wall Street and of the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan is *only a mask* to hide Wall Street's drive to destroy the national independence of all other peoples, to establish its own rule over them, to turn the United Nations into an instrument of American imperialist policy, and to realize a Wall Street monopoly over atomic energy? Yet Jaffe is willing to accept all this brazen imperialist propaganda as "a

pattern of internationalism" and as a real alternative to "isolationism."

His justification for this position is:

... that the isolationist ideology propounded by the Tafts, the Brickers, the McCormicks, the Langers, the Hoovers, and the U. S. Steel Corporation, actually leads more directly and more certainly to war than does the Truman Doctrine, even though that doctrine at the moment appears to be symbolic of militant American expansionism (*ibid.*, p. 225).

And further:

For no matter how much one may believe that the Truman Doctrine is leading America into an economic and political wilderness, the isolationist alternative would be immeasurably worse (*ibid.*, p. 230).

To begin with, "isolationism" is not an "alternative" to the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan. "Isolationism" is a more extreme, more reckless, more violent expression of American imperialism, but it is an expression of American imperialism in the same way as the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. The difference between the Truman Doctrine and "isolationism" is not, as Jaffe says (in accord with Browderism), the difference between "internationalism" and "isolationism." Not at all. To make this assumption the basis of policy is to capitulate to Wall Street. The difference between the Truman Doctrine and "isolationism" is the difference be-

tween two forms or expressions of American imperialist policy—the isolationist expression being more extreme, more reckless, more violent. That is why the "isolationist" wing of American imperialism is as a rule also more reactionary in domestic affairs, more aggressively hostile to labor and all democratic forces, more ready to destroy constitutional liberties. In short, that is why the "isolationist" wing of imperialism, which stems from certain Wall Street monopoly forces and from a number of midwestern centers of finance capital, is the main source of fascism in the United States.

But that is not all by far. There is a *very close relationship*, as well as differences, between the two wings of imperialism. We shall show later that Hoover, Dulles, Taft, etc., are the expression of the connections and relationships of the two wings of imperialism. At this point, it suffices to say that the "internationalist" wing of imperialism is in effect working for the "isolationists." In foreign affairs, the Truman Doctrine seeks to realize the main objectives of "isolationism." The Truman Administration is rebuilding German fascist imperialism, preparing for war, attacking the national sovereignty and independence of other nations, inciting to war against the Soviet Union and the new democracies of Europe, rebuilding Japanese military imperialism, combating the realization of China's national independence, fattening Wall Street's stranglehold

upon Latin America, building up reaction and fascism in many parts of the world, undermining the United Nations, destroying international cooperation, etc.

Are these not the main objectives of the "isolationist" wing of American imperialism? Of course they are. But they have also become the main objectives of the "internationalist" wing. All that needs to be said, in addition, is that Truman's and Vandenberg's tempo, timing, and certain methods are not the same as those favored by the "isolationists." But what is equally, if not more, important is the fact that the power of government is now in the hands of the "internationalist" wing of American imperialism; that this wing comprises the decisive sections of the Wall Street monopolies that are dominant in both major parties; and that *the "bipartisan" foreign policy of the "internationalists" is at present the mailed fist of American imperialism in action.* It is therefore this policy that the anti-imperialist and democratic coalition has to combat, check, and defeat. It is therefore the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan that the people have to combat, check, and defeat because the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan are the major policy instruments of Wall Street's drive for world rule and war preparations. *In this way, and only in this way, will the American people succeed in preventing the "isolationist" wing of imperialism—its more violent, more re-*

actionary, and more reckless wing—from assuming full power. And in this struggle, the people's coalition will have to make full use of the differences, contradictions, and frictions within the imperialist camp and between its two wings.

What about domestic policy? Here the true situation is somewhat obscured by the following facts. The Truman Administration continues to maneuver very intensively with domestic issues in order to gain the support of labor and the pro-Roosevelt forces of the middle classes for 1948. This creates the false impression that in domestic affairs the Truman Administration is not as bad as in foreign affairs.

But what is the actual situation? Essentially, the Truman Administration is hostile to labor and all democratic forces. Truman's strike-breaking actions against the miners and railroad workers were no accident. His veto of the Taft-Hartley bill has already been sufficiently exposed as a partisan maneuver and not a concession to labor. His entire reactionary drive (loyalty tests, etc.) seeks to undermine the labor movement and all progressive movements. Truman is against the Negro people. His maneuvers on the vital questions of wages and prices are directed toward satisfying the demands of the monopolies while giving labor nice promises and empty gestures. His latest declaration that price controls and rationing are the methods of "a police state" is a most

brazen attempt to back up the monopolies and speculators against labor, the farmers, and the middle classes.

Thus, we see that in domestic affairs, too, the Truman Administration is carrying out a reactionary line—a line basically hostile to labor and all democratic forces—while continuing to maneuver for support of the masses in 1948. Here, too, the Truman Administration is realizing the main objectives of Wall Street, common to both major parties, though its tempo, timing, and methods are not the same as those favored by the more extreme and violent reactionaries.

From a political standpoint this means that, in domestic as in foreign affairs, the Truman Administration is making room, paving the way, preparing the ground, for the more extreme, more violent, more openly pro-fascist and fascist forces of American imperialism.

This in no way ignores the serious divisions and frictions in the camp of the monopolists and imperialists, seen more in domestic than in foreign affairs. Nor does it ignore the fact that in domestic affairs the divisions in the camp of the monopolists do not generally run along the lines of "internationalism" and "isolationism," and that the partisan rivalries within and between the two major parties can be utilized by the people's coalition in the struggle for peace, democracy, equal rights and economic security. But it does mean

that, to prevent the rise of fascism, we must resist and defeat reaction; to prevent the more extreme and violent sections of American imperialism from assuming full power, we must resist, combat, and defeat the reactionary, imperialist, and war-breeding course of the Truman Administration. This course is now backed by the decisive sections of the Wall Street monopolies that control and dominate the Republican Party and the Democratic Party, even though the latter party continues to maneuver for mass support.

From the foregoing it should be clear that it is an unmitigated slander to say, as Jaffe does, that "There exists on the left a defeatist view that a reversion to American isolationism would be the lesser of two evils" (*ibid.*, p. 230). No! What exists on the true Left is a determination to help the American people win the fight for peace and democracy, and to expose all capitulators to Wall Street, whether they do capitulate openly or under cover of a fraudulent theory on the "progressive anti-colonialism" of Morgan, Rockefeller, Kuhn Loeb, Du Pont, etc., etc.

In his discussion of "isolationism," Jaffe is making still another mistake. He puts into the camp of the "isolationists" a number of monopolies that are the very backbone of the Truman Doctrine and its real instigators, for example, the U.S. Steel Corporation, which is the main base of the Morgan group of finance capital. Who does not know that the

Morg
backe
Morec
Taft
tionist
nopoly
nectin
two w
—betw
and it
wonder
the "I
another
tween

Is it
the ba
trine
Hoove
the rel
Street
as an
ting E

The
mistak
at one
from
Trum
and th
for an
of the
arising
the T
as for
the pr
ist" ca
and T
tionist
that t
tween
imper
the m

Morgan group is one of the main backers of the Truman Doctrine? Moreover, Jaffe also puts Hoover and Taft unqualifiedly into the "isolationist" camp, whereas these two monopoly spokesmen are typical connecting links or bridges between the two wings of American imperialism—between its "internationalist" wing and its "isolationist" wing. It is a wonder Jaffe did not put Dulles into the "isolationist" camp, for he is another basic connecting link between the two imperialist wings.

Is it a secret to Jaffe that some of the basic policies in the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan stem from Hoover and Dulles? For example, the rebuilding of Germany as a Wall Street base, the rebuilding of Japan as another base, the policy of splitting Europe, etc., etc.

The political consequences of these mistakes in analysis become manifest at once. By arbitrarily removing from the camp of supporters of the Truman Doctrine the Morgan group and the Hoovers, Jaffe lays the basis for an extraordinary underestimation of the danger to peace and democracy arising from that doctrine and from the Truman Administration, as well as for a similar overestimation of the *present strength* of the "isolationist" camp. Also, by placing Hoover and Taft unreservedly in the "isolationist" camp, Jaffe obscures the fact that there is no Chinese Wall between the two wings of American imperialism, that both stem from the monopolies and finance capital,

and that the "isolationist" wing greatly influences the "internationalist" wing, and precisely through such forces as Hoover, Taft, Dulles, etc.

To minimize the dangers arising from the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, Jaffe brings forth another misleading statement. He writes:

... the most vigorous and consistent opposition to the Truman Doctrine and its variants *à la* Stassen, Acheson, and Marshall, comes from the most reactionary sections of American big business and finance, and their representatives in Congress (*ibid.*, p. 217).

Jaffe deliberately keeps silent on the class nature and political character of this reactionary opposition and distorts the nature and importance of the *progressive* opposition. Certainly, the "isolationist" wing of American imperialism carries on a *certain kind* of opposition to the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan. It is the kind that does not oppose the imperialist objectives of Wall Street to rule the world. For this objective, common to both imperialist wings, the "isolationists" would be willing to go to war quicker and sooner than the "internationalists." And this opposition was quite successful in speeding up the unfolding of the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan along the lines of policy advocated by the "isolationists" and by such connecting links as Hoover, Taft and Dulles. At the same time, it must not be forgotten that the Truman

Doctrine is backed and carried forward by the decisive sections of American finance capital (Morgan, Rockefeller, etc.), that the Truman Administration is carrying out the will of these reactionary and imperialist forces, and, hence, that its policies, especially in foreign relations, lead to war and fascism. But Jaffe, proceeding from Browderism, seeks to obscure these facts and to lay the basis for a virtual capitulation by the progressives to the Truman Doctrine and Administration.

What about the progressive, the democratic, the people's alternative to the war-breeding policies of American imperialism—to the policies of both its wings: the "internationalist" (Truman Doctrine) and "isolationist"? Already fighting such an alternative are all those forces that demand a return to the Roosevelt policies of international cooperation and Big Three unity, and a progressive program to fight the approaching crisis. Fighting for such an alternative are the more advanced sections of the labor movement. This is the alternative for which Wallace, the rising Wallace movement, and the pro-Roosevelt forces in the Democratic Party are fighting. And the Communist Party, as part of this crystallizing broad people's coalition, supports this alternative—a return to the Roosevelt policies of international cooperation and Big Three unity—and projects a complete program for an anti-imperialist and democratic durable world peace, for curbing the

war-mongers, reducing armaments, and saving the United Nations as an instrument of world cooperation.

Does Jaffe accept this alternative? Obviously not, even though he speaks of an alternative program to the Truman Doctrine and the "isolationists." To accept a progressive alternative to the imperialist and war-mongering course of the monopolies—to accept it in deeds and not just in words—means to accept a line of struggle against Wall Street, against monopoly domination of the government, against the source of reaction, imperialism, the war danger, and fascism. But Jaffe argues that these monopolies have "progressive" capabilities. How, then, can he fight for a peace policy? He cannot and he does not.

The political conclusions he draws from his own analysis spell virtual capitulation to the imperialist offensive of the monopolies. Jaffe advocates unconditional surrender to Truman. He demands the acceptance, if not the active support, of the Truman Doctrine at all costs. He opposes the third-party movement. He is against an independent people's Presidential ticket in 1948 under all conditions and circumstances. In other words, no matter how far Truman goes in his imperialist and war-provoking course; regardless of how close the Truman policies and actions come to those advocated by the "isolationists"; notwithstanding the increasing probability that with such a course Truman will almost certainly

be d
disre
peopl
dent
dema
Trum
aban
Trum
1948.
S
Jaffe'
lican
most
victor
the n
such
there
and
and f
anti-i
coalit
an in
tial t
can t
to ex
Trum
fluenc
cratic
meas
be a
in thi

be defeated; and, above all, in total disregard of the rising and growing people's movement for an independent Presidential peace ticket—Jaffe demands unconditional acceptance of Truman for 1948 and the virtual abandonment of the fight against the Truman Doctrine in preparation for 1948.

Such a course, regardless of Jaffe's professions to see the Republicans defeated in 1948 "at all costs," most certainly insures a Republican victory and—most important—leaves the masses helpless to face and meet such a victory. The American people therefore face the task of fighting and opposing both major parties; and for this purpose the forces of the anti-imperialist and democratic peace coalition face the task of organizing an independent—a third—Presidential ticket for 1948. Only in this way, can the progressive coalition expect to exert effective pressure upon the Truman Administration, and to influence the outcome of the Democratic national convention in any measure whatever, should there still be a possibility for doing so. Only in this way will the American people

have a choice in 1948; for, as things stand now, there will be nothing to choose from on the Presidential tickets of the Republican and Democratic Parties. Only in this way will the American people be able to consolidate their progressive coalition in such a way as to meet effectively the tasks that will face them after the 1948 elections.

He who speaks seriously and honestly for a consistent progressive alternative to the Truman Doctrine and to the "isolationists," must support the fight for independent political action of the people, headed by labor. He must support the promotion of the third-party movement. He must help create the conditions necessary for the setting up of an independent people's Presidential ticket. He must fight for the broadest united front of labor and all progressives inside and outside the Democratic Party. Finally, he must fight for a common and united policy to elect a progressive, a pro-Roosevelt Congress in 1948 and for daily resistance to the reactionary, imperialist, and war-breeding offensive of the trusts and monopolies.

BUILD THE UNITED NEGRO PEOPLE'S MOVEMENT*

By BENJAMIN J. DAVIS

SINCE V-J DAY the status of the Negro people, on a national scale, has grown sharply and rapidly worse. The fate of the Negro people is a fundamental test of American democracy, of the political, economic, and social health of the nation, and of the direction in which the country is moving on all fronts. Therefore, the present anti-Negro offensive is not a matter of concern to the Negro people alone. It is a matter of national and international importance. Every toiling American is adversely affected in his daily life by the constantly increasing oppression of the Negro. Consequently, the organized labor movement and its allies cannot hope successfully to raise mass living standards and extend democratic liberties without taking the forefront in the struggle for Negro rights. The Negro people are a decisive ally of the American working class, and their militant struggles against Jim-Crow reaction and for national liberation constitute an

* Based on report made to a national conference of the Communist Party on the problems of the Negro people, held September 19-20, 1947.

anti-imperialist potential that labor has not yet fully seen in all its dynamic magnitude.

Uppermost today in the minds of the Negroes—as a people—is the desire for unity in their own ranks around a militant program to defeat the present anti-Negro campaign, and to move to the counter-offensive for full citizenship. This article is primarily concerned with this urgent task of building a united Negro people's movement.

* * *

Almost on the very day the fascist axis surrendered, big capital in this country opened up a well-organized offensive to halt the forward march of the Negro people and to wipe out the limited gains they had made during the Roosevelt and war periods. This was part of a plan executed under the cynical slogan of "return the country to normalcy"—a euphemism for handing the nation over to the trusts.

This drive against the Negro people is just as reactionary and "bipartisan" as the Administration's foreign policy. In fact, it is a domestic aspect of that policy. Moreover, it is taking place at the moment when Truman and Marshall on the one hand, and Dulles, Hoover, and Dewey on the other, are prating hypocritically about this bipartisan foreign policy "defending democracy and preserving freedom throughout the world."

Let us see how the Wall Street policies of these gentlemen are "defend-

ing democracy and preserving freedom" in America.

More than 50 lynchings have taken place since V-J Day, in open defiance of the United States Constitution, without a single conviction. There is no way of ascertaining how many concealed lynchings have taken place. In the North, unprovoked police brutality against Negroes, women as well as men, has reached alarming proportions; and it is directed against the fraternal association that is incident to Negro-white labor unity. Efforts of the Negro people in the South to vote are invariably met by K.K.K. cross burnings, floggings, and outright murder. A special, organized campaign of poll-tax officials has sought to intimidate Negro veterans, depriving them even of the right to apply for terminal leave pay. The civil liberties of the Negro people are under attack all over the country, and these attacks receive immunity from, if they are not incited by, federal and state authorities.

On the economic front, where the living standards of the entire American people are under assault, the Negro workers are receiving the heaviest blows. A recent U.S. Census Bureau study of key labor markets in five metropolitan centers shows that unemployment is growing among the Negro people four to five times as fast as among whites. In New York, where comparative wartime prosperity prevailed, more than 1,000 of the 6,000 monthly additions to the relief rolls are Negroes. The special question of jobs for Ne-

groes, within the framework of overall growing unemployment, is already on the order of the day. Job discrimination is rife even in states like New York, where the State F.E.P.C. is but a political football in the hands of Governor Dewey.

The approaching winter can be expected to intensify the disproportionately large unemployment among Negro workers, thus aggravating all the other ills from which the Negro people suffer. The big employers aim to build up a sizable army of unemployed to use as a club against wage standards. They hope to induce suicidal competition for jobs between Negro and white workers, hoping that this will lead to "race riots" that will weaken the trade unions and general Negro-white unity.

The lynch drive in the deep South is clearly intended to reduce the Negroes—as well as poor whites—to greater debt, poverty, and peonage; to smash the organizing drives of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L.; to reduce the wages of Negro farm workers and the income of sharecroppers and to drive them off the land to starvation.

The already scandalous housing conditions in the Negro ghettos of New York, Chicago, Detroit and other centers, are steadily growing worse. Thousands of Negro war workers who migrated to these centers are caught between unemployment in the North and lynch terror in the South and have nowhere to turn. They remain victims of congestion, abominable housing accom-

odations, and the super-high rentals that the landlords extort for the uninhabitable slums of the gold-producing ghettos. Mounting unemployment among the Negro bread-winners will confront their families with a wave of cold-blooded mass evictions.

The limited number of Negro women who entered industry during the war are being driven back into domestic drudgery at slave wages. Negro youth without jobs, job training, or educational opportunities are being shoved toward despair, demoralization, and delinquency. Tuberculosis and other decimating diseases, forced on the Negro people by unhealthy slum environments, are on the rise again.

Jim Crowism, discrimination, and segregation are increasing in all walks of life. Paralleling this is the increase in anti-Semitism, which is accompanied by a furious attempt by pro-fascist elements to incite conflict between the Negro and Jewish people, and, on the basis of "white supremacy," to turn all minorities against the intended Negro scapegoat.

In addition to the direct attacks upon their citizenship rights, the Negro people bear the heaviest burden of the sky-rocketing living costs that are plundering consumers of every race, creed, and color. Moreover, the Taft-Hartley law directly affects Negro trade unionists; and, what is more, it is aimed at the very C.I.O. and progressive A. F. of L. unions

that have been the mainstay of the fight for Negro rights.

Such is a bird's-eye view of how the Wall Street-Southern Bourbon combine ruthlessly pursues the Negro people. While lynch terror and violent repression is the main characteristic of its campaign, reaction does not hesitate to use bribery, demagoguery, cajolery, and empty, cheap gestures to accomplish its evil ends.

* * *

From this desolate picture, it is clear that some of the most important anti-Negro objectives of reaction are:

1. To smash the developing liberation struggles of the Negro people, struggles given impetus by the victorious war against fascism.
2. To reduce the Negro people in the deep South to a worse state of economic serfdom in order to guarantee the super-profits that Wall Street extorts from the Southern semi-feudal landed economy.
3. To impose disproportionate mass unemployment upon the Negro workers, aimed at straining Negro-white unity in the industrial centers; and to use the metropolitan ghettos as a source of super-profits for the banking, Big Business, and realty lords.
4. To make the Negro a "scapegoat," to freeze his status as a so-called "inferior race," and thus help to condition the political and social atmosphere for easy establishment of

some
try.

To
is re
tactic

1.
twec
ized
unity
sacrif
point
Roos

2.
datio
peopl
tion
porta
ment

3.
the M
ideolo
baitin
slick
action
hiera
sinist

4.
peopl
states
sive-
along
indep
in ele
and C

A
and i
of th
back
it wil
entire
Amer

some sort of fascist rule in the country.

To attain these objectives, reaction is relying upon at least four main tactical courses.

1. It seeks to disrupt the unity between the Negro people and organized labor and white progressives, a unity that was built with enormous sacrifice and that reached a high point during the existence of the Roosevelt-labor-progressive coalition.

2. It seeks to forestall the consolidation of the unity of the Negro people and to splinter the united action already achieved on such important issues as the oust-Bilbo movement.

3. It seeks to confuse and divide the Negro people through a fierce ideological campaign involving Red-baiting, high-pressure tactics, and slick demagoguery—in all of which reactionary sections of the Catholic hierarchy are playing an evermore sinister and prominent role.

4. It seeks to prevent the Negro people—particularly in the eight states where the Negro vote is decisive—from playing their full role, along with other components of the independent, labor-progressive forces, in electing a pro-Roosevelt President and Congress in 1948.

A successful blitz by Wall Street and its political flunkies along any of these lines, will not merely set back the struggle for Negro rights; it will also deal a heavy blow to the entire anti-fascist camp, and to the American people as a whole, the

effect of which will last for years to come. This is why reaction is working overtime in pursuit of all these objectives.

For example, collaboration between the Negro people and organized labor was the basis on which the limited gains made in Negro rights during the Roosevelt-New Deal period were won. It is the very cornerstone of the Negro liberation struggle and must be fortified against every storm of reaction. In recent years the Negro people have developed a firm grasp of this fact. Therefore, the anti-labor financiers are sometimes hesitant about making an open, violent attack upon Negro-labor unity: they also use guile.

Thus, under the guise of philanthropy, the big capitalists, in today's new conditions, are using dollars as gifts to influence Negro educational institutions and to poison Negro youth into believing that the Negro people's best interests lie with the Wall Street rich rather than with their natural allies, labor and the common people.

There is heightened activity by big capital to bribe its way into the top circles of the Negro people for the purpose of spreading its anti-labor, anti-progressive nostrums. For example, Henry Luce—the notorious millionaire publisher of *Time*, *Life*, and *Fortune*—now heads the fund-raising campaign of one of the strategic service organizations among the Negro people, the National Urban League. And it is quite clear

that, when the Negro Publishers Association recently took the shocking step of officially approving the Taft-Hartley law, some of the Wall Street-G.O.P. politicians had their fingers in the pie.

The House Un-American Committee has unleashed an intensive ideological campaign of Red-baiting against the Negro people. It is utilizing such contemptible traitors as Manning Johnson, William Nowell, and Tim Holmes, Negro renegades, whose haste to do Rankin's bidding is an unspeakable betrayal of their own oppressed people. The attempt of the Committee to silence even the mighty voices of Paul Robeson and Henry Wallace, is a demonstration of the scale of this attempt to suppress the struggle for Negro rights.

The gutter pens of George S. Schuyler and his kind are today even more servilely at the disposal of the reactionaries and Red-baiters. The renewed and insidious campaign of the Catholic hierarchy among the Negro people aims not so much to win religious converts as to serve the cause of political reaction. Certain of the Catholic officialdom in Negro communities, by peddling their "Red-fascist" slanders against Communists and other labor-progressive forces among the Negro people, rival the despised Goebbels.

* * *

The capitalist-Bourbon combine has had successes — some of them serious—in its anti-Negro offensive, but it has by no means attained its

major goals. There are a number of reasons for this.

1. Reaction's offensive has been met, in the first place, by the militant resistance of the Negro people themselves. The mass voting and registration campaigns of the Negro people in the poll-tax states have been heroic. Never before has there been such an effective, fighting "right to vote" spirit among the Negro people in the South; and never before have they received such support from white workers and poor farmers. The struggle of the tobacco workers in Winston-Salem, and the election of a Negro Councilman there, indicate the determination of the Negro people to resist the lynch drive to the bitter end. Everywhere the Negro people, supported by their allies, are counter-attacking, are building their people's organizations, are pressing to the assault on the citadels of Jim Crow.

2. A vastly different relationship of forces exists in the country today as compared with the period immediately following World War I. Then there were only 4 million workers organized in the trade unions, and from those unions the Negroes were excluded. Today there are 14 million workers organized—and one million of these are Negro—a powerful force for Negro rights. The significance of this achievement was shown in the first round of strike struggles following V-J Day, when Negro and white solidarity on the picket line stymied the efforts of the

trusts to use the Negro workers against the white.

3. The democratic sentiment of the American people, strengthened in the fire of the war against Nazism, has brought a new potential to the struggle for Negro rights. It has, for example, already broken through the seemingly impenetrable barriers to Negroes playing in big league baseball.

4. Red-baiting, Soviet-baiting, and labor-baiting have had certain effects among the Negro people—particularly among their upper strata. For the most part, however, it has fallen flat among the Negro people and their organizations. The Negro people recognize Red-baiting as a Hitlerite weapon intended to divide and smash the militant struggle for Negro rights. The Negro people have an instinctive distrust of Red-baiters, labor-baiters, and Soviet-baiters. No section of the population has a more profound and justified admiration of the Soviet Union. Not only do the Negro workers join our Party in large numbers because of its great contributions to their struggle for equal rights and complete liberation; but their recognition and support of Eugene Dennis' challenge to Rankin's seat in Congress, again reveals them as maturely conscious of the danger to all minorities that is inherent in the Nazi-like persecution of the Communists.

Reaction is nevertheless continuing its daily, many-sided attacks against the Negro people, orienting

its entire strategy on the 1948 elections, in which it seeks to achieve a major and decisive victory. Such a victory would be a disaster, especially for Negro Americans. Hence, the broadest unity of the Negro people with labor and white progressives must be consciously and rapidly developed now, for 1948 and beyond.

* * *

For this reason it is vital to stress that nowhere has the decadent two-party system demonstrated its utter bankruptcy more completely than on the issue of Negro rights. It is the shame of America that, despite repeated election promises by the major parties in recent years, including 1944, the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments are still unenforced, and F.E.P.C., anti-poll tax, and anti-lynching legislation are cynically suppressed.

The Negro people are overwhelmingly disillusioned with the Truman Administration. But it is little more than an insult to the Negro's intelligence for the G.O.P. to attempt to make hay out of the situation. Nevertheless, the Republican general staff, flushed with money and demagogy, is seeking to establish a beach-head among the Negro voters—particularly in the eight Northern states where the Negro vote has the balance of power. But for the Negro people to turn from Truman to Dewey, Taft, or any other Republican presidential candidate, would be

like jumping from the frying pan into the fire.

Since 1946 the 80th Congress has been officially under the domination of the Republican Party. Its record has been the most reactionary of any Congress in 50 years. Its adoption of the Taft-Hartley law (over the half-hearted Truman veto), its killing of O.P.A. and rent control, were some of the body blows that Negroes feel more keenly than any other section of the population.

The 80th Congress has done nothing to protect the citizenship rights of Negro Americans in the face of anti-Negro lynching bees that have shocked the civilized world.

Meanwhile, the Truman Democrats have maintained a discreet and partisan silence in the face of this betrayal of the Negro people. Only the courageous voice of Representative Vito Marcantonio, assisted by Adam Powell (handicapped by illness), Helen Gahagan Douglas, Senator Glen Taylor, and several others, defended the Negro people.

Any attempt to line up the Negro people for either the Democratic or Republican national machine can only result in division and disunity, in a betrayal of the Negro people's best interests and an undermining of their effectiveness in the fight for a people's victory in 1948.

The path of independent political action, the establishment of a national third party, culminating in a third pro-Roosevelt Presidential ticket, is the only path of unity for

the overwhelming majority of the Negro people. This course offers the basis for collaboration of the Negro people with labor and white progressives around a Roosevelt program and candidates for Congress that will advance the full citizenship of the Negro and peace, security, democracy, and progress for labor and the American people as a whole.

Such a party and ticket provides the only way that an anti-monopoly, anti-imperialist, anti-war democratic coalition can be developed that can stave off fascism at home and check the bipartisan war policy of Wall Street abroad. A third, pro-Roosevelt Presidential ticket in '48 would receive wider support among the grass-roots section of the justly-aggrieved Negro people than perhaps any other part of the population; and important and representative Negro leaders have indicated that this is the trend of their thinking. The Negroes, as a people, are indispensable for the success of the movement for a third party and a third, pro-Roosevelt Presidential ticket in 1948.

To win the Negro people to the third-party movement requires a two-pronged struggle.

1. Labor and progressives must carry on a much more forceful day-to-day struggle for Negro rights, around such issues as jobs, housing, discrimination, and around F.E.P.C., poll-tax, and anti-lynch legislation. They must also integrate the Negro people and their organizations more fully into positions of equality and

lead
P.C.
Part
muc
crim
desir
ple t
and
2.
amon
for t
peop
and
must
of fo
deper
gro-l
1948.

Car
move
15 mi
—but
broad
peopl
the c
The
role o
fight
explo
ple, n
the ec
as a w
Her
Negro
organi
and n
the N
a mil
also or

leadership in such organizations as P.C.A., P.A.C., the American Labor Party, etc. They must recognize much more keenly the special discrimination against Negroes, and the desire and right of the Negro people to representation in federal, state, and local governmental bodies.

2. Labor and progressive forces among the Negro people must work for the broadest unity of the Negro people from below around issues—and on a non-partisan basis—and must seek to promote a realignment of forces among them based upon independent political action and Negro-labor-progressive collaboration in 1948.

* * *

Can an effective united people's movement be developed among the 15 million Negro Americans? It can—but only by gathering together the broadest forces among the Negro people, from top to bottom, and from the conservative to the Left wing. The key to this urgent task is the role of Negro labor, which, while fighting for the interests of the most exploited sections of the Negro people, must simultaneously fight for the equal rights of the Negro people as a whole.

Here it must be noted that the Negro people are a progressive and organized people. Their principal and most influential organization is the N.A.A.C.P., which has over half a million members. But they are also organized in their churches, busi-

ness associations, lodges, women's organizations, college fraternities and professional societies, in trade unions and youth groups, and in many other ways. In every Negro community various people's organizations exist, most of them concerned with the struggle against discrimination.

But while the Negro people are organized they are not functionally united, nor do they move in unison—thus making it impossible for them to wield their full political, social, and economic strength—although this is their main desire. The main potential basis for establishing such unity on a national scale lies in the common thinking of the Negro people around such unifying issues as F.E.P.C. and jobs, and anti-poll tax and anti-lynch legislation.

Often, however, the efforts of the Negro people to bring their tremendous progressive strength to bear against reaction, are endangered by conscious anti-unity forces among them.

These disruptive forces express themselves in many ways and forms, but all of them stem from, or play into the hands of, the trusts and their Southern poll-tax allies.

By far, the most insidious and dangerous of these disruptive forces is Right-wing Social-Democracy, which is assuming increasing influence among the Negro people, although its conscious adherents are small in numbers.

These Social-Democrats tail after and support the reactionary bipar-

tisan foreign policy and subserviently spread among Negroes the war-mongering, anti-Soviet, anti-democratic demagoguery that aims to build support for Wall Street's drive to dominate the world. They strive to poison the Negro people with Red-baiting, and thus influence them to give objective support to the Truman loyalty oath and the witch-hunting of the Thomas-Rankin Committee.

Their main link is such professional Red-baiters and splitters as David Dubinsky, of the I.L.G.W.U. and the A. F. of L. Executive Council, and James Carey, Secretary-Treasurer of the C.I.O. They try to keep the Negro people tied to the two-party system, and seek to prevent their alliance with labor and progressive forces for independent political action around a third pro-Roosevelt Presidential ticket in 1948. Their policy, however they try to conceal it, leads to a betrayal of the Negro people, and they seek to throw Negro movements and organizations into strife and discord by their incessant Red-baiting, as shown by the disintegration of the so-called March-on-Washington movement. Among the spokesmen of these policies are A. Phillip Randolph, George Weaver, Willard Townsend, and others. Unfortunately, many progressive leaders and organizations among the Negro people are influenced at various times by the Red-baiting, splitting policies of Right-wing Social-Democracy.

All these reactionary policies are put forward by Right-wing Social-Democracy under a barrage of "super-militancy," of radical-sounding and "socialist" phraseology. Sometimes these fakers give the impression of "defending" Marxism from the Marxists. They have become a veritable magnet for the disruptive Trotzkyists and Norman Thomas Socialists. At other times, like Randolph, they mix mysticism and confusion with reactionary bourgeois Negro nationalism, which leads to separation of Negro from white. The most reactionary policies of the imperialists are thus made more "palatable."

These elements can further these policies in Negro life much better than the old-fashioned "Uncle Toms"—the avowed and, in the main, discredited apologists for the big capitalists. As a passport among the pro-labor Negro people, these Right-wing Social-Democrats use their official identification or association with the trade unions or other progressive organizations; or they attempt, among the politically inexperienced, to rely solely upon past glory.

Right-wing Social Democracy is a conscious force for disunity among the Negro people. It is the main force to be isolated and defeated in order to establish a Negro people's unity movement capable of securing major victories in the struggle for Negro rights.

* * *

The biggest factor in the present

situation so far as the Negro people themselves are concerned is that they are essentially anti-imperialist, pro-labor, anti-Jim Crow, and politically progressive, and that they desire united, non-partisan struggle against reaction on all issues facing them and the nation. The whole problem of building the Negro people's movement—and advancing the cause of Negro rights—depends upon the transformation of that desire into effective reality.

To achieve this, prime attention must be given to a few decisive tasks.

1. Organized labor and white progressives must take bold initiative against the main imperialist ideology of white chauvinism in the fight to defend and extend the democratic liberties of the Negro people. Failure to wage unrelenting, open battle on this score feeds reactionary, nationalist trends among Negroes.

2. The advanced labor and progressive forces among the Negro people must make their paramount objective unity and collaboration with the labor-progressive movement on the basis of issues. This is particularly true as regards the N.A.A.C.P., the main Negro people's organization.

3. Decisive for bringing about the unity of the Negro people must be the emergence of Negro labor, through its own organizational forms in the Negro communities, as the leader of the whole Negro liberation struggle. This will guarantee the collaboration of the Negro people

with the trade union and progressive movement. Organized Negro workers are the best guarantee of the unification of all sections of the Negro communities.

4. Work should be focused on a minimum number of issues—such as F.E.P.C. and jobs, anti-poll tax and anti-lynch legislation—on which the broadest area of agreement exists among all strata of the Negro people. This will intensify the cohesion of the Negro people on a national scale.

5. The single most important way to promote the struggle for Negro rights is to make 1948 the year of the big push of the Negro people and their allies to secure substantial victories from the next session of the 80th Congress. Next year—election year—is the time when the greatest concessions can be wrung from a Congress whose fate rests in the voters' hands. Pressure brought to bear on Congress in the most insistent and dramatic fashion by a united Negro people, and supported by the trade unions and white progressives, can compel the enactment of progressive legislation that would be a great victory, not only for Negroes but for the people generally, over the whole present program of reaction.

The free and equal citizenship of the Negro people will be won only through bitter, unceasing struggle. The reservoir of good-will among the Negro people toward the Communists was created through the self-sacrificing contributions made to the

cause of Negro rights over the years by our Party. The fierce anti-Communist campaign that reaction is conducting, is putting strains upon that good-will, which can be maintained and extended only through the most vigorous and courageous daily struggle on our part against the system of national oppression in its every manifestation.

We Communists must point out to the Negro people that their just aspirations can be fulfilled only in joint struggle with the working class on issues of progress and democracy, on a national and international scale. But the warning we must raise for ourselves is that, while avoiding the danger of Right opportunism, any tendency on our part toward a go-it-alone sectarianism—a hesitancy to plunge boldly into the main stream of the Negro people's movement—must be tenaciously combated.

The common enemy is powerful. But he should no more be overesti-

mated than underestimated. No section of the Negro people is capable of achieving success by itself. Success requires the combined action of the overwhelming majority of Negro Americans and their organizations in collaboration with their natural labor-progressive allies.

The Communists must raise high the banner of the struggle for Negro rights and imbue it with their militant, crusading spirit and boldness. They must constantly, and in a way that will further the present struggle, point to socialism as the only permanent and complete answer to national oppression.

There can be no possible realization of the Negro people's national aspirations except through the path of struggle for the equal citizenship of the Negro people in the current struggles of the day. In building the unity of the Negro people for full liberation, the Communists must be in the vanguard.

THE
AND
WO

It is
to int
ward-
demo
into b
of the
for th
trade
union
Du
labor
ward
and a
in th
rights
tion
practi
Among
the ra
A. F.
road
tional
retain
tices t
of the
unity

* Based
ference
of the
1947.

THE TRADE UNIONS AND THE NEGRO WORKERS*

By JOHN WILLIAMSON

IT IS CLEAR that it is necessary today to intensify the struggles of all forward-looking Americans for Negro democratic rights, and to help bring into being a broad progressive unity of the Negro people in preparation for the 1948 elections. In this the trade unions and the Negro trade unionists have a special role to play.

During recent years the entire labor movement has registered forward steps in both understanding and action as regards its participation in the general struggle for Negro rights, for an F.E.P.C., and in relation to elimination of Jim-Crow practices within the trade unions. Among the three main groupings in the ranks of organized labor, many A. F. of L. unions, some of the Railroad Brotherhoods, and the International Association of Machinists still retain constitutional clauses and practices that are harmful to the interests of their own unions as well as to the unity of the labor movement. This

is further complicated by labor leaders, such as A. F. Whitney, who adopt a generally progressive and anti-fascist position on many questions, but who are reactionary on the Negro question.

Over the past decade, the C.I.O. in particular has established a place for itself in the hearts of the Negro people and has played a great educational role in relation to many sections of the white working class. At a certain time the initials, C.I.O., had an almost magnetic attraction among the broadest sections of the Negro people, both North and South, irrespective of whether they were workers or not.

These sentiments developed because:

1. The C.I.O., under President Lewis and President Murray, spoke out boldly on the general question of Negro democratic rights. It threw its weight behind such legislation as that against lynching, for abolition of the poll tax, for elimination of white primaries, for national and state F.E.P.C.'s, and similar bills. The C.I.O. also established its own Anti-Discrimination Committee.

2. In a number of C.I.O. unions, including many that were identified with Left-progressive forces, real struggles were developed—in opposition to reactionary influences still prevalent among sections of their white membership—for the right of Negro workers to jobs along with white workers, for upgrading of Negro workers, for equal pay for equal

* Based on a report made to a national conference of the Communist Party on the problems of the Negro people, held on September 19-20, 1947.

work, for the right to hold trade union office. In some cases, C.I.O. union officers had to enforce union discipline to achieve the operation of their democratic constitutions and convention resolutions. Numerous examples of this are known. Among the outstanding are undoubtedly the U.A.W. (Packard case and Ford), the N.M.U., the T.W.U. (bus companies in New York). A landmark was established when N.M.U.'s Fred (Blackie) Myers declined renomination to the C.I.O. Executive Board in order to make room for the first Negro, Ferdinand Smith, to sit on this highest C.I.O. governing body.

These and many other experiences established a new page in American trade union history. They coincided with, and gave impetus to, the developing loose coalition of labor and the Negro people that was a part of the Roosevelt-New Deal camp. The Negro people became a real, powerful ally in the struggle against fascism at home and abroad.

The Communist Party, which had unfurled the banner of struggle for full political, economic, and social equality for the Negro people as far back as 1924, was in the forefront of all these progressive developments.

NEW PROBLEMS

Today, in the present postwar period, the economic royalists are on the offensive against the people of America and the world. American capitalism is returning to "normalcy"

with its accompanying threat of economic crisis, monopoly extortion through high prices, attacks upon the trade unions, adoption of the Taft-Hartley Act, and a general development of fascist trends. With Herbert Hoover brought back into government councils, with government posts crowded with Wall Street bankers and with generals, with the Southern Bourbons given free reign within the Democratic Party, it is no accident that the Truman Administration has deserted even those minimum democratic reforms that were achieved during the war. It is no accident that President Truman can callously state, as he did to a delegation headed by Paul Robeson, on September 23, 1946, that as far as the problem of lynching was concerned he was aware of the "problem" and was thinking about it.

Clearly, these developments create a whole series of new problems affecting the Negro people and the united struggle for Negro democratic rights and citizenship within our country. Despite the desertion by Truman of the popular F.D.R. progressive program of democratic reform, there are nevertheless developments among important strata of the common people, including those in the South, that can be brought into play as decisive factors in this developing struggle.

Key to success, however, is the continued and closer-knit unity of the labor movement and the Negro people's movement. Big Business reac-

tion
ing
sible
tion
This
upon
reco
mill
to s
from
mov
conf
the
mari

UNI
NI

TI
mov
mov
caus

1.
first
C.I.O.
have
a sa
in th
econ
peop

2.
is to
ques
mem
leade

3.
trans
equa
tion
prob
cover

tion understands this, and is working overtime to weaken, and if possible destroy, the existing loose coalition of labor and the Negro people. This places a special responsibility upon the C.I.O., which has been the recognized trade union leader to the millions of the Negro people. It is to some of the new problems confronting the section of the labor movement that has already won the confidence of the Negro people that the balance of this article will primarily address itself.

UNITY OF LABOR AND NEGRO PEOPLE JEOPARDIZED

This loose coalition of the labor movement and the Negro people's movement is jeopardized today because:

1. The trade unions—and in the first place the generally progressive C.I.O., in which the Negro people have had confidence—are not waging a satisfactory or consistent struggle in the postwar period to retain the economic gains won by the Negro people in industry during the war.

2. Within the trade unions, there is too often a formal approach to the question of equality of the Negro member in the actual operative leadership of the trade unions.

3. Not enough is being done to translate the good resolutions on equal rights for the Negro into action in connection with the burning problems of housing and restrictive covenants, equal opportunities for

educational facilities, the continued denial of the franchise to millions of Southern Negroes, Jim-Crow discrimination in restaurants, movies, railroads, hotels, etc.

An examination of the first point made above will show that while over-all employment remains at a high level, there has been a decline in the employment of Negroes in some industries as well as in government employment. In the very center of this particular question are two issues:

1. The need for the opening up, by the trade unions, of all industries, and all shops within industries, to employment of Negro workers, and the abolition of lily-white plants; and the fight for equal privileges in jobs for the Negro workers without their being ousted from industries, as is the objective of many employers today.

2. The need for a fight by the trade unions to secure upgrading of the Negro workers and the general opening up of skilled jobs and trades to them, as well as firm resistance to any attempted denial of equality of jobs and security won during wartime.

A policy to meet these issues and a struggle to realize such a policy can no longer have a single uniform pattern. Each industry must be examined and dealt with separately. In such industries as railroad, electrical equipment, and machine-building, the problem is one of opening them up to employment of Negroes. In

the railroad and machine building industries, however, an obstacle continues to be the anti-Negro attitude of some of the trade union leaders. Even the U.E.R.M.W.A., although its progressive program and forthright progressive leadership are in sharp contrast to such anti-Negro attitudes, has nevertheless not waged a successful struggle to overcome the lily-white policies of the big trusts in the electrical equipment field. The fact that no more than 25,000 to 30,000 of its 600,000 members are Negroes, dramatizes the problem.

THE SITUATION IN THE AUTO INDUSTRY

In the auto industry, a different and complex problem exists. A recently completed union survey shows that, while there has been an absolute decline in employment of both Negro and white workers, in 1947 there are 10.6 per cent Negro workers as compared with 8 per cent in 1943.

A more specific breakdown of this survey, as it relates to a more limited number of plants, shows the following:

<i>Auto Industry General</i>	1943	1947
Total plants surveyed	153	153
Total employment	509,341	359,124
Total Negro employment	49,799 (9.7%)	47,302 (13.1%)
<i>General Motors Co.</i>		
Total plants surveyed	26	26
Total employment	118,306	86,379
Total Negro employment	6,461 (5.5%)	8,825 (10.2%)
<i>Ford Motor Co.</i>		
Total plants surveyed	15	15
Total employment	98,293	79,265
Total Negro employment	16,688 (17%)	16,042 (20.5%)
<i>Chrysler Motor Co.</i>		
Total plants surveyed	9	9
Total employment	49,916	52,350
Total Negro employment	4,368 (8.7%)	7,990 (15%)

A broader survey of some 382 auto plants today, without benefit of 1943 comparison, shows approximately the same trend for Ford and Chrysler as indicated above, but in G.M. the percentage of Negro workers employed drops to 9 per cent. This is because there are a greater number of lily-

white G.M. plants than is true of the other big corporations. Of real concern is the fact that, of the 382 plants surveyed, 169 or 44 per cent employed no Negroes at all.

These statistics indicate the need for varied conclusions. In one group of shops, especially Ford, Chrysler,

Pack
the
cham
the
Negr
ing
ploys
In
a lar
speci
is to
again
This
trade
their
crim
in en
W
have
main
level,
to b
tiona
will
plant
THE
An
Whil
able,
90,00
Steel
the s
typic
Negr
Gary
Gary
Shen
Big C
Sparr

Packard, etc., the primary tasks for the trade unions are for them to champion the right of upgrading and the opening of skilled jobs to the Negro worker, as well as guaranteeing no discrimination in future employment or layoffs.

In the lily-white plants, including a large number of G.M. plants, the special problem of the trade unions is to break down this discrimination against the hiring of Negro workers. This emphasizes the importance for trade unions to include clauses in their contracts that guarantee no discrimination against Negro workers in employment.

While the trade unions concerned have a responsibility on all levels, the main fight today is on a local union level, for that, basically, is the way to bring pressure on the Internationals, and to ensure that each local will set an example within its own plant.

THE STEEL INDUSTRY

Another case is the steel industry. While exact statistics are not available, it is estimated that there are 90,000 Negro workers in "Basic Steel" and from 120,000 to 130,000 in the steel industry as a whole. Some typical examples of the percentage of Negroes employed in big mills are:

Gary Big Mill	30 per cent
Gary Sheet-Tube	25 per cent
Shenango Valley (Youngstown)	20 per cent
Big Crucible (Pittsburgh)	30 per cent
Sparrows Point (Baltimore)	40 per cent

There are certain types of jobs in the steel mill that are the hottest, hardest, dirtiest, and most dangerous. Among these are the blast furnaces, ore trestles, coke ovens, Bessemer hot floor, etc. Prior to the first world war, these jobs were set aside to be performed by the latest immigrants from central Europe. In the last decade these same jobs have been earmarked for the Negro worker. The natural tendency is for the worker to get away from these jobs, and thus there is a potentially big turnover. To prevent this, the companies try to earmark these jobs primarily for the Negro worker and thus, not only set him apart from the other workers and prevent his upgrading, but ensure a permanent flow of labor power to these jobs without the natural turnover, which ordinarily could only be influenced by a radical improvement of conditions and wage rates.

The key special question in "Basic Steel" as far as the Negro worker is concerned, is for his trade union to concern itself with a real fighting program of upgrading for the Negro worker. Unfortunately this is not yet the case in most places.

What is needed is:

1. Strict enforcement of seniority in upgrading—with consideration of seniority on a plant-wide, and not merely on a departmental basis. This is a fight that must be made against the companies and that must be accompanied by a real educational campaign among the white workers.

2. Establishment of anti-discrimination committees in each local union. The work of such committees has to do with both the community and the plant. In some mills where a functioning committee exists, a procedure has been established of upgrading all workers without discrimination from the labor department (or labor pool as it is sometimes called) where most Negro workers are found.

3. Establishment of functioning Safety Committees in dangerous departments, such as those mentioned above, to safeguard both white and Negro workers.

While the situation varies, the trade unions have a big responsibility in the fight for jobs for the Negro worker. In some places, it is a fight to win the right of Negroes to be employed, in others it is a fight for the right to be upgraded, and in still others it is a struggle for equal pay for equal work and no discrimination in layoffs, and even adjustments in seniority procedures. But whatever the form their struggle takes, the trade unions, if they fight, will help to reinforce the necessary unity of the labor movement and the Negro people in the common fight against the employer and the forces of reaction in general.

THE NEGRO TRADE UNIONIST AND UNION LEADERSHIP

The second main reason, already mentioned, for the coalition of labor and the Negro people being jeopard-

ized today, is the growing discontent among Negro trade unionists as to the lack of equality in the operative leadership of the trade unions.

The average Negro workers knows that in many A. F. of L. unions his fight to attain equality is tied up with the general struggle for progressive policies and leadership. However, in the C.I.O., which the Negro people have correctly hailed because of its correct general declarations and limited struggles previously referred to, they are particularly dissatisfied. Ten years have elapsed and still the election of Negroes to top posts proceeds at a snail's pace, although on lower levels substantial headway has been made in many C.I.O. unions.

A survey of twenty-three well-known C.I.O. Internationals shows that 12 have not a single Negro among their International officers or on their International Executive Boards. These unions include the three largest C.I.O. unions—steel, auto, and electrical—as well as the unions in the following fields: men's clothing, office and professional, furniture, textile, communications, chemical, shoe, smelter, and newspaper. The unions that have elected Negro members to top posts of leadership (either as officers or as members of executive boards) are in the following fields: maritime, transport, food and tobacco, longshore, public workers, fur and leather, cooks and stewards, shipyard, farm equipment, and rubber. This line-up cuts

across
often

Rec

(i.e.

interv

and

of the

questi

ple on

take

of thi

weake

betwe

Some

interv

unwit

such

clear

the N

union.

The

Negro

Unite

distric

respec

"We

among

he's a

do the

low

"You'

equali

pick

cause

vides

various

zation.

"Num

ing a

trade

contra

across the Left-Right relationships often referred to in the C.I.O.

Recently, the *Pittsburgh Courier* (i.e. its issue of August 16, 1947) interviewed President Philip Murray and Secretary-Treasurer McDonald of the steel workers union on this question. Undoubtedly certain people on the *Courier* had it in mind to take advantage of this shortcoming of this key union in order further to weaken the loose coalition existing between labor and the Negro people.

Some of the answers given in this interview by the steel union leaders unwittingly play into the hands of such divisive forces and reflect unclear thinking on the relationship of the Negro member and his trade union.

The reporter asked: "How many Negroes are on the payroll of the United Steelworkers of America at district and international levels, respectively?" Murray answered: "We have substantial representation among the Negro elements. . . . If he's a good trade union guy and can do the job . . . then you select a fellow like that." He continued: "You've got to give these guys equality of treatment, you don't pick a man for the job because he's a Negro. That provides a bar to good feeling among various elements within the organization." Still further, he answered: "Number one requisite for hiring a man is that he is a good trade union man, understands the contract and his union. On the basis

of this and his qualification, he should be entitled to a job." Secretary McDonald added: "He also should be respected for his ability, and not for his color."

In general, the Negro steel worker will agree with these answers, but he will suspect—and correctly so—that behind these general statements about being "respected for his ability, and not for his color," he continues to be excluded from high union office. The Negro trade unionist in this case, after he examines the facts, becomes enraged, because he feels that the generality that "you don't pick a man for the job because he's a Negro," conceals an insult. If the steel union has at least 100,000 Negro members, is it lack of "good trade union guys" or lack of "understanding the contract" that results in there not being a single Negro among the national officers, and not a single Negro on the International Executive Board? In fact, it is said that there are some 636 people on the steel union payroll, of whom less than 20 are Negro staff members, plus some "Negro girls working in some of the offices" (McDonald in *Pittsburgh Courier*).

Too often, the correct general statement that "we don't elect someone just because he is a Negro," is actually used to underestimate, and prevent the recognition of, the role of the Negro trade unionist and the importance of electing him to office. It is the role of enlightened trade union leadership to win united sup-

port to the promotion and election of Negroes to the operative trade union leadership on all levels, including the highest.

The sentiment of the members in the steel workers union was shown in the 57,000 votes cast for Joseph Cook, a Negro local union president who ran for the relatively unimportant national post of "teller." Irrespective of who Cook is—although it is reported that he is a long-time member of the union and many times delegate to national conventions and a president of a local union with a majority of white members—one would think that there would be enough understanding to support such a candidacy.

NEGRO TRADE UNION CAUCUSES

As a result of the shortcomings of many C.I.O. unions on these two questions—an inadequate fight for improving the economic position of the Negro workers under postwar conditions, and a formal approach to equality of the Negro in trade union leadership—there is a development of discontent among Negro trade unionists. This discontent is genuine and does not reflect an anti-union attitude. It can be taken advantage of by employers and by certain forces among the Negro people to divide the Negro worker from the trade union movement and to break the loose coalition of the Negro people with the organized labor movement.

The symptoms of this grave danger are reflected in:

1. The fact that some Negro newspapers hailed the Taft-Hartley Act as of benefit to the Negro worker.

2. The fact that a campaign is being developed by dubious forces to the effect that now is the time for the Negro to drop out of the trade union movement.

3. The slogan of "no taxation without representation," which is being raised in different parts of the country among the Negro union members.

4. The stay-at-home tendency of large sections of the Negroes in the 1946 elections, and the accelerated demagogic wooing today of the Negro people by the Republican Party.

Basically, the Negro workers are among the best and most devoted trade unionists. Their role in the C.I.O. organizing drives, in the many strike struggles, in the defense of their local unions against scabs and informers, in mobilizing the community in support of labor, is well known, and has been demonstrated by hundreds of splendid examples from coast to coast. The Negro people are an ally of labor in the camp of progress and anti-fascism, and against imperialist Wall Street.

Wherever unionization work is developed, the Negro worker has responded splendidly. In the Southern organizing drive—a step of major importance to the entire progressive

cause—
enroll
the tr
quate
proach

A re
of the
Negro
in D
tradit
was c

Cash
the be
panies
the fir
the N

in the
missio
Charl
Counc
locals
nent

munit
despit
Negro
public

the th
came
and M
second
big b
coaliti
on.

A f
contes
develo
withi
tain a
is a l
and a
will e

cause—the Negro workers have been enrolled in substantial numbers in the trade unions, despite an inadequate and sometimes *wrong* approach.

A recent example of the vital power of the unity of the trade union and Negro people's movement was shown in Dayton, Ohio. This city was traditionally open-shop as far as G.M. was concerned, and the National Cash Register Company was one of the better-known paternalistic companies. In August of this year, for the first time, the trade unions and the Negro people united their forces in the primary election for City Commissioners. A ticket consisting of Charles Sims (President of the C.I.O. Council and business agent of U.E. locals) and Joseph McLin (prominent Negro leader in the community) scored a smashing victory despite Big Business Red-baiting and Negro-baiting sponsored by the Republican and Democratic Parties and the three daily newspapers. Sims came out highest in a field of seven; and McLin came in third, missing second place by a mere 87 votes. The big battle to elect this labor-Negro coalition slate in November is now on.

A further consequence of this discontent of the Negro worker is the development of Negro caucuses within some trade unions, and in certain areas. So far, this development is a limited one, but failure to face and answer adequately this problem, will encourage them to spread out.

Clearly, such Negro caucuses have many potential dangers, but the answer cannot be a rush to condemn their organization. The answer is not condemnation, but rather a recognition by the Left-Progressive forces of the conditions that provoke the formation of such Negro caucuses, and proper activity to change conditions. Meanwhile, participation in such existing Negro caucuses to prevent them from being turned against the trade unions or being transformed into factional pawns, is an equally important task.

MICHIGAN ADVANCES

The entire labor movement has learned much from the recent experiences in the C.I.O. convention of Detroit and that of the state of Michigan. In both, the progressive camp was finally persuaded (with some defections on this issue) as to the urgency and correctness of championing a Negro as one of the top full-time officers. Within the state convention, the Reuther-Scholl forces defeated this proposal, but in the Detroit county convention even the Reuther forces were compelled to recognize the problem and also nominated a Negro for the new full-time post of organizational director with the progressive-backed candidate being elected.

If the trade unions—and in the first place the C.I.O., because of its progressive attitude on this question—is to overcome this present threat

of disunity and heal the breach that threatens the coalition of labor and the Negro people, it is not enough merely to reassert generalities, however good, in resolutions. These are necessary, but such resolutions must be seen by the Negro in very concrete terms. They must answer the three questions dealt with at the very beginning of this article, with the following concrete steps:

1. A struggle by the trade unions to retain the economic gains won by the Negroes in industry and government employment during the war.

2. A joint fight for equality of the Negro people in all fields of life and citizenship.

3. Real inclusion of the Negro trade unionists in the operative leadership of the trade unions.

The C.I.O. National Convention that just concluded its sessions, adopted a far-reaching resolution on "Protection of Democracy." In its handling of the struggle for Negro rights, it went far beyond anything previously adopted. In part, it declared:

We Demand:

(1) The enactment of effective Federal, State and municipal legislation providing for fair employment practices. The issuance by the President of an Executive Order establishing a Fair Employment Practices Committee covering all employees whose pay is derived in whole or in part from monies appropriated by Congress to end discrimination in hiring, promotion and tenure.

(2) The enactment of a Federal anti-lynching bill.

(3) The enactment of Federal legislation for the District of Columbia and of State legislation outlawing discrimination and segregation.

(4) The enactment of Federal and State legislation invalidating restrictive covenants based on race, color, creed, or national origin.

(5) That provision be made for adequate safeguards against racial discrimination in Federal appropriations for State aid.

(6) The amendment of the Interstate Commerce Act to prohibit racial segregation in buses, trains and airplanes.

(7) The enactment of effective Federal, State and municipal civil rights laws and of laws guaranteeing the right of suffrage and abolishing the infamous poll tax.

Nevertheless the real feeling of the Negro C.I.O. rank and file was expressed by a Negro woman delegate of the F.T.A. in supporting the resolution. She stated in part:

Too long have the Negro people of the South and other workers in America heard a lot of words read to them. It is time for action, and I am now wondering if the C.I.O. is going to stop and do some of the things by action. You talk about political action and you talk about politics. How can there be any action when the Negroes in the South are not allowed to vote? Too long have the workers in the South stopped and looked to Congress for protection. We no longer look to the government in Washington for protection. It has failed. Today we are looking for an organization that says they

are organized to fight for the freedom of all men regardless of race, creed or color, and that is the C.I.O.

... Our forefathers fought and bled and died for this country and we are proud to be a part of it just as you are. When the civil liberties of Negroes in the South are interfered with and you do nothing about it I say to you you are untrue to the traditions of America. You have got to get up and do something in action, as I have said before, and not by mere words.

* * *

The Communist Party historically has waged the struggle for clarity of understanding among the white workers on these questions affecting the Negro people. The Communist Party has demonstrated in action how it fights for full political, economic, and social equality for the Negro people. Today there are forces abroad in the trade union movement, forces that mouth "radical" phrases on the problems of

the Negro people, but actually lead them to division and confusion on program. These are the forces of Reuther and Dubinsky and their allies, Randolph and Crosswaith. Combating these forces, the Communists, especially the Communist trade unionists, must be in the forefront in creating the understanding of today's new problems and especially in helping to provide the "Know-How" to solve these problems.

The Negro working class is an integral part of the organized labor movement. It is also the bridge between the labor movement and the Negro people. In common struggle against Wall Street's drive at home and abroad, the Negro working class will help to hammer out on the anvil of struggle, and forge in the fire of experience, the steel-like unity of the labor movement and the Negro people.

THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION

By ROB F. HALL

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON Trade and Employment, which will convene in Havana, Cuba, on November 21, represents more than two years of work by the State Department to establish an International Trade Organization (I.T.O.) that will facilitate Wall Street's capture of world trade. Although dedicated in words to the expansion of world trade, the removal of trade barriers, and the encouragement of full employment everywhere, the Geneva Draft Charter, which will come before the conference for ratification, sets forth rules and regulations that favor the highly industrialized capitalist nations in general and the United States in particular.

The clearest view of Washington's objectives in Havana can be obtained by observing the development of the I.T.O. from its birth as an idea in 1942 through its successive stages down to the present. At each step, as each new draft was compiled, the imperialist aims of the U.S. expressed themselves more clearly. It is doubtful whether the 50 to 60 nations expected to attend the Havana Confer-

ence would ratify this Geneva Charter if they were not seeking loans and credits from the powerful U.S.

The present draft is the work of 18 nations* whose delegates met at Geneva from May to August, 1947, as a Preparatory Committee named by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations in February, 1946. The Soviet Union, although appointed to this committee, did not send delegates, undoubtedly because it perceived early what the outcome of these Washington-dominated conferences would be.

The idea of the International Trade Organization was born back in the heyday of the New Deal when the Rooseveltian concept of world trade dominated the thinking of most government officials and even some business men. It was fashionable, even in 1942-43, to identify American interests with expanding world trade and high employment everywhere. A global organization that would promote multilateral trade and the freer convertibility of currencies seemed a good thing. These aims were in obvious contrast to the prewar trade policies of Hitler's Third Reich, under which Germany's manufactured products were dumped on the markets of protesting but helpless South American and eastern European countries, forced to accept barter if they wished to sell

* The eighteen nations were Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Lebanon, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Union of South Africa, the United Kingdom and the United States.

their raw products to the German people. These aims also appeared to be in harmony with the postwar perspectives of the democracies for a peaceful and prosperous world.

There were, of course, certain peculiar advantages that would accrue to the United States, advantages that did not escape the notice of William L. Clayton, Under Secretary of State, at that time Assistant Secretary of Commerce. While a completely operative Open Door policy throughout the world was not to be expected, the larger the opening in the tariff walls of any nation, the better it would serve American interests. U.S. industry would emerge, as it was already anticipated, in a better position to compete with world industry than the industry of any other power.

A second aim was the weakening of Britain's hold on the markets of the empire through its system of imperial preferences and the sterling bloc. In 1938, the United Kingdom exported 12 per cent of the world's total exports, compared to 14 per cent for the U.S., a disproportionate share for the British in the opinion of such gentlemen as Mr. Clayton. But it should also be observed that, in the early 40's, this attitude was shared by many American progressives for whom the British empire and the evils of ruthless imperialism had become synonymous. Thus, a cloak of liberal and unselfish aims tended to conceal America's own imperialist struggle against the British.

THE ORIGINAL PROPOSALS

The program for a world trade organization, as conceived by Washington, emerged in the autumn of 1945 in a document entitled *Proposals for Expansion of World Trade and Employment*, issued by the State Department. The United Nations had been formed in San Francisco in July of the same year. Discussions were proceeding toward the organization of the Bretton Woods institutions, the International Bank, and the International Monetary Fund. The outlook for Big Three unity and world cooperation was bright, creating an atmosphere favorable for acceptance of international cooperation in the field of trade.

The language of the *Proposals* was attuned to this atmosphere. Its subtitle was: "Developed by a Technical Staff within the Government of the United States in preparation for an International Conference on Trade and Employment and Presented for Consideration by the Peoples of the World."

In his letter of transmittal, Mr. Clayton said that the *Proposals* were "intended to suggest a way in which the United States and other countries may concert their policy and action in the field of international trade so that the enormous productive powers which lie all about us may be released to operate fully for the general benefit."

The *Proposals* begin on a lofty level:

The main prize of the victory of the United Nations is a limited and temporary power to establish the kind of world we want to live in.

The fundamental choice, the *Proposals* stated, was "whether countries will struggle against each other for wealth and power, or work together for security and mutual advantage." The goal of world-wide full employment was iterated and reiterated. World trade was described as the only certain path to this goal. But world trade would expand only if the nations removed restrictions, *viz*:

1. Restrictions imposed by governments;
2. Restrictions imposed by private combines and cartels;
3. Fear of disorder in the markets for certain primary commodities;
4. Irregularity, and fear of irregularity, in production and employment.

The U.S. proposed:

An International Trade Organization . . . to stand beside the existing international agencies dealing with currency, investment, agriculture, labor and civil aviation. It should have a constitution much like those of the other agencies set up by the United Nations, with enough internal specialization to enable it to perform the tasks assigned to it in dealing with trade barriers, restrictive business practices, and international commodity arrangements.

Among its governing principles should be the recognition that:

(a) In all countries high and stable employment is a main condition for the attainment of satisfactory levels of living;

(b) The attainment of approximately full employment by the major industrial and trading nations, and its maintenance on a reasonably assured basis, are essential to the expansion of international trade on which the full prosperity of these and other nations depend. . . .

The *Proposals* contained the first of a series of draft charters for the organization. In Chapter I, it reached back into the Atlantic Charter for one of its four purposes: "to facilitate access by all members, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity."

Chapter III laid down a general commercial policy that provided, in the first place, that products imported from a member nation should receive treatment no less favorable than that accorded domestic products. Steps would be taken to prevent dumping. "Excessive requirements" as to marks of origin (such as "Made in U.S.A.") should be eliminated.

Members should enter arrangements for the substantial reduction of their own tariffs and the elimination of tariff preferences, with an eye toward ending the "most-favored-nation" status for certain powers.

One of the most important sections, however, from the American point of view was that which called for the general elimination of quantita-

tive
port
has
form
reas
agai
still
our
quot
vide
num
ing
New
biles
quot
velop
of a
preci
duce
meth
Th
natio
balan
titled
limi
must
count
when
ment
Th
subsi
doubt
since
agric
trols
Chart
tain r
in us
Th
tackle
subje

tive restrictions or quotas on imports. Import quotas, Mr. Clayton has said, are "the most serious of all forms of trade restrictions." The reason, of course, is that if tariffs against U.S. exports are high, it may still be possible to scale the wall with our low-cost products. But import quotas established by a nation provide that it will accept only a certain number of a given commodity during the year, as, for instance, the New Zealand quota of 1,000 automobiles from the U.S. in 1947. Such quotas are usually designed to develop the infant or defense industries of a nation and are therefore directed precisely against the low-cost producer, *i.e.*, the U.S. There is no easy method of scaling that kind of wall.

The Draft Charter provided that nations confronted with an adverse balance of payments would be entitled to use import quotas in a limited manner, but where used they must apply equally to all exporting countries and should be abandoned when a favorable balance of payments is reached.

The Charter frowned on export subsidies. But in deference, no doubt, to the fact that the U.S. has since 1933 granted export subsidies to agriculture and exercised import controls on farm products, the Draft Charter provided that, subject to certain regulations, they might continue in use.

The next section of the Charter tackled what was, in 1945, a delicate subject—state trading as practiced

by the Socialist Soviet Union and in various forms by the new European democracies. It suggested that member countries engaged in state trading should treat the commodities of all other members equally. They should be guided only by price, quality, marketability, transportation, and terms. The language of the Draft Charter implied that any nation that would stoop to state trading would not hesitate to enter trade agreements for political reasons.

In Chapter IV, dealing with restrictive business practices, the Draft Charter urged "individual and concerted efforts by members . . . to curb those restrictive business practices in international trade" that interfere with the expansion of production and trade, access to markets and raw materials, and "the maintenance in all countries of high levels of employment and real income." It listed the practices of the classic cartel—combinations to fix prices and terms of sale, limit production or exports, suppression of invention, exclusion of enterprises from certain fields, and discrimination against certain firms. But it was noted, even in 1945, that the *Proposals* did not suggest international action against cartels but left the matter of punishment to the individual nations.

FURTHER STEPS

Despite the noble sentiments of the *Proposals*, there were no signs of a mass movement of the nations of the world into the projected I.T.O.

The first to accept the principles of the document was Great Britain, which did so, it must be acknowledged, under that particular form of duress which the State Department has become most adept in applying—the need for dollars.

When the British, in December, 1945, signed the Anglo-American Financial and Commercial Agreement, that document included the following paragraph:

The Secretary of State of the United States has made public today a document setting forth certain "Proposals for Consideration by an International Conference on Trade and Employment" . . . the Government of the United Kingdom is in full agreement on all important points in these proposals and accepts them as a basis for international discussion; and it will, in common with the U.S. Government, use its best endeavors to bring such discussions to a successful conclusion.*

In May, 1946, when the French government secured a loan from the U. S., it signed an agreement that expressed approval of the *Proposals* and the intention to cooperate in building the I.T.O. From Autumn, 1945 to December, 1946, eight nations secured American loans only after signing commitments to enter the I.T.O. They were, besides those named, Belgium, Greece, Poland, Turkey, Czechoslovakia, and the Netherlands.

This led to a significant colloquy last March when Mr. Clayton ap-

peared before the Senate Finance Committee, at that time conducting hearings on the I.T.O.

The Chairman. Mr. Secretary, there has been a lot of talk around that we are the sole nation that has any real interest in this International Trade Organization; that we are the inventors of it; that we are the enthusiastic promoters of it, and that whatever interest there is in other countries is a sort of "oats bag" interest. . . . I noticed . . . that the charter was discussed and proposed at the time the British loan was pending . . . and at a time our other loans were pending with other countries.

Mr. Clayton. As I say, we discussed this thing. . . . The British loan started in September and we discussed this document in connection with the negotiations and we got substantial agreement from the British on practically everything in the document. We negotiated the loan to France following that, in the spring of 1946.

The Chairman. France got its loan after this subject had been raised with France?

Mr. Clayton. This subject was raised with them in connection with the negotiations for settlement of lend-lease, and the loan and everything else. . . .

The Chairman. Let me put it this way: What countries other than the United States are really as enthusiastic about this as we are?

Mr. Clayton. I think perhaps Belgium and Norway and countries of that character. . . .*

* Anglo-American Trade and Financial Negotiations, *Federal Reserve Bulletin*, January, 1946.

* Hearings before the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, on Trade Agreements System and Proposed International Trade Organization Charter, March 20 to April 3, 1947. Part 1, pages 32-35.

By February, 1946, the State Department had enlisted enough support to secure from the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, holding its first session in London, a resolution favoring the creation of an International Trade Organization.

The Department issued in September, 1946, a booklet entitled *Suggested Charter for an International Trade Organization* and the American delegation took this document with it to London the following October for the meeting of the Preparatory Committee set up by the Economic and Security Council of the U. N.

The Preparatory Committee apparently rejected none of the American proposals point-blank, but it failed to reach decisions on a number of sections, pleading lack of time for full discussions. As a result, the State Department issued in December 1946 a *Draft Charter for the I.T.O. of the United Nations*, usually described as the London Draft, which contained in brackets the material that the committee had failed to approve.

During the late winter (February to March, 1947), this London Draft was widely distributed, and the State Department held hearings in seven American cities. Testifying before the Department panels were 109 business and professional organizations, 24 representatives of individual business establishments, 41 civic organizations, 11 religious groups and 17 trade unions. A few trade organi-

zations suggested changes and 16, all business interests, expressed opposition. But the vast majority of witnesses endorsed the London Draft.

Meanwhile, a drafting commission of the Preparatory Committee, at work in New York from January 20 to February 25, 1947, had concluded a new draft, hereafter known as the New York Draft. For some reason, this draft was not printed by the State Department. It was not submitted to the various organizations whose opinion on the I.T.O. the State Department sought during the panel hearings in March, 1947, although copies could easily have been made available. Eventually, it saw the light of day in the appendix of the published Senate Finance Committee hearings, where only the most diligent research workers would find it.

However, the New York Draft was circulated among six organizations: the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Foreign Trade Council, the U. S. Chamber of Commerce, the International Chamber of Commerce, and the U. S. Associates of the I. C. of C.

Many suggestions made by these organizations were incorporated into the Geneva Draft, drawn up by representatives of the U. S. and 17 other nations meeting in Switzerland from April to July, 1947. It is this document, considered the final draft, that will be used for the actual establish-

ment of the International Trade Organization at Havana.

The Geneva Draft, while it still uses much of the language of international cooperation noted in the original *Proposals*, has sharpened its approach to all the questions related to expansion of American exports and protection of American investments abroad. Most of these changes are highly significant as revealing, not only the unblushing boldness of American imperialism, but also the power of the U. S. delegation in determining the outcome of the Geneva deliberations.

Chapter I, on purposes, was rewritten. The statement of purpose—"to avoid fluctuations in world trade"—was eliminated, probably as a result of criticism of it by Senator Millikin, Republican of Colorado, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. Written into the section on purposes was the suggestion of the N.A.M.: "to encourage the international flow of capital for productive investment."

The chapter on Employment and Activity (Chapter II in the Geneva Draft) underwent some subtle rewriting with the result, as a State Department statement explained, that the "emphasis is now placed on the importance of production as well as the maintenance of employment." This was suggested by the N.A.M., the International Chamber of Commerce, and the U. S. Associates of the I. C. of C., it said. The stated objective of "high and stable levels of effective demand" became, in the

rewriting, "large and steadily growing demand."

The original draft confined itself to an exhortation to nations to maintain full employment of, in the language of the U. S. "full employment" act, all those "willing and able to work." But this disturbed both the N.A.M. and Senator Albert J. Hawkes, Republican of New Jersey, a member of the Senate Finance Committee. Obliging, the State Department inserted a formulation that made clear that the powers of the Economic and Social Council of the U.N. with respect to employment do not go beyond an advisory capacity.

The new version of the article on balance of payments is likewise revealing. Virtually every nation in the world has balance of payment difficulties with the U.S., arising in the first instance because they must receive large exports from the U.S. but are unable to sell within the American market in sufficiently large quantities to pay for what they buy. Their feeling is that if the U.S. would lower the high tariffs adopted by Congress in 1930 in the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act, and remove certain import restrictions, especially on farm products, a substantial part of their balance of payment troubles would disappear. The New York Draft contained language that would have required the U.S. to "make its full contribution to action designed to correct the maladjustment." Several business organizations protested hotly against "the implication

tha
are
anoth
fore,
...
contri
shall
conce
tion.
A
ever,
shoul
backv
The
time
partu
Frank
useful
velopi
positi
ATTN
IN
CO
The
of the
colony
economi
used b
and of
hibit
manuf
shippm
to the
exploit
necessa
metrop
popula
marke
the im
This

that balance of payment difficulties are inflicted upon one country by another." The new version, therefore, reads:

... the Member shall make its full contribution, while appropriate action shall be taken by the other Members concerned, towards correcting the situation.

A far more basic question, however, was the attitude the I.T.O. should have toward the economy of backward, semi-colonial countries. The changes in the U.S. position, as time passed, revealed further departures from the foreign policy of Franklin D. Roosevelt. It will be useful to examine in detail the development of the present American position.

ATTITUDE TOWARD INDUSTRIALLY BACKWARD COUNTRIES

The traditional and classic attitude of the imperialist power toward the colony or semi-colony is to keep it economically dependent. The method used by Britain, the U.S., Germany, and others, was to discourage or prohibit the development of native manufacturers by hampering the shipment of the necessary machinery to the colonies. Native labor was exploited to produce raw materials necessary to the industry of the metropolitan power. The native population thus became a natural market for the finished products of the imperialists.

This relationship has not always

been confined to imperialist powers and colonies. It was characteristic of the trade between Hitler Germany and the countries of eastern Europe within Hitler's prewar orbit, of the trade between the United Kingdom and most of the Empire, in fact, of the market relations between the four or five most highly industrialized nations and the rest of the world until World War II. Since V-E Day it has characterized the relations between the U.S. and most of the world, with the exception of the U.S.S.R. and the new democracies of eastern Europe, which are determined to rehabilitate themselves on the basis of a balanced industrial and agricultural economy.

During the latter days of World War II, many voices were raised in the interest of a fresh approach to this question. New Deal foreign trade experts pointed out that American prosperity would expand as productivity abroad expanded. Industrialized nations, it was pointed out, make the best customers for American exports.

This idea received a vague, generalized expression in the first Draft Charter, which gave as one purpose the need "to encourage and assist the industrial and general economic development of Member countries, particularly of those still in the early stages of industrial development."

This formulation, however, did not satisfy several countries represented at the London meeting of the Preparatory Committee. They observed that provisions of the Draft

Charter were inadequate to meet the needs of under-developed countries, and asked revision of the agenda to permit full discussion of this subject. They further contended, as an unpublished State Department memorandum reveals, that the provisions of the Charter that limited the freedom of Members to restrict imports were designed to "maintain the economic dominance of the developed countries and to keep the undeveloped countries economically subservient." As a result, a new chapter (III in the Geneva Draft; IV in the London and New York drafts) on economic development was included.

The first and keynoting article of the new chapter read:

Members recognize that the industrial and general economic development of all countries and in particular of those countries whose resources are as yet relatively undeveloped will improve opportunities for employment, enhance the productivity of labor, increase the demand for goods and services, contribute to economic stability, expand international trade, and raise the level of real income, thus strengthening the ties of international understanding and accord.

But State Department officials who consented to the insertion of this chapter later revealed their lack of enthusiasm for it. The hopes of the under-developed countries to achieve this industrialization through the instrumentality of the I.T.O. were, of course, doomed to failure from the start, despite these pious phrases,

which the U.S. had reluctantly approved. In fact, the I.T.O. has emerged as one of the chief instruments to prevent their industrialization, and to keep them as dependencies of the developed industrial nations.

Clayton made some significant revelations when he described the chapter on economic development to the Senate Finance Committee. After explaining, like Wilcox, that it had been added at the insistence of other nations, Clayton said:

The chapter provides for relaxation of commitments with respect to tariffs and restrictions on imports. . . . The procedure is such that there cannot be any general and widespread application of restrictions on trade to protect industries in under-developed countries which have no prospect of developing and which would only be a burden on consumers and work injury to foreign exporters.

You will understand at once, Mr. Chairman, what is meant by that. It is intended there shall be no encouragement in the way of protection of industries not properly suited to the countries where they are expected to be established.

Further questioning of Wilcox by the Committee revealed that the decision as to what industry is "not properly suited" to the under-developed country is made by the industrial nations from which it has hitherto purchased that commodity. The technique is complicated. But the under-developed nation joining I.T.O. binds itself to shun import quotas, and to lower its tariffs by

agreements with other nations.

It can secure release from these agreements for the purpose of developing its own industries only with the consent of the contracting parties. In certain cases, the industrially backward nation can employ some restrictive devices otherwise prohibited in the charter, provided it receives permission from the I.T.O. in advance. This was authorized on the basis of a simple majority vote under the New York Draft. But the Geneva Draft, as a result of U.S. pressure, changed the requirement to a two-thirds vote.

Two articles, 13 and 14, permitting the undeveloped nations some slight latitude in this field, were adopted at Geneva over intense opposition by the U.S. The State Department finally consented, with poor grace, and filed a statement declaring that, although it did not regard these modifications as "justifiable or necessary," it accepted them "because other countries attached importance to them."

The statement then referred to the American demand that undeveloped nations should employ no restrictive quotas on imports without prior approval of the I.T.O. This provision had been adopted at Geneva by a scant majority, with India, China, Chile, and Lebanon voting in the negative. Unless these nations changed their vote on this issue, the U.S. would withdraw its acceptance of Articles 13 and 14, the statement warned.

Delegations representing India

and China subsequently notified the Conference they would recommend to their governments acceptance of this provision. But Chile and Lebanon have so far held out.

In summarizing the deliberations of the Geneva conference, the U.S. delegation said in a State Department memorandum:

It would be unfortunate if this issue were to be re-opened at Havana in such a way as to precipitate an open conflict between developed and undeveloped countries. Such a conflict might well wreck the conference, the charter and the I.T.O.

If this issue wrecks the I.T.O., it will be because the industrially backward nations recognize that the new International Trade Organization is simply an attempt to streamline the drive of the United States for complete control of world trade. For, just as the chapter on economic development in the Geneva Charter favors the position of the dominant industrial U.S. vis-à-vis the primary producing countries, so do other provisions of the Charter strengthen the American position.

From the first publication of the *Proposals* to the Geneva Draft, American foreign trade policies have emerged sharper and clearer. The State Department speaks of the provisions of the Geneva draft as "more concrete, tougher and more workable." While a lot of the window dressing is still there, the imperialist aims of Washington appear more naked.

U.S. IMPERIALIST OBJECTIVES

To summarize, the I.T.O., operating under the Geneva Charter, would achieve the following objectives of American business:

1. Member nations would in general reduce tariffs on imports that would favor, in the first place, the U.S.

2. They would be virtually compelled to abandon quota restrictions on imports, the chief sufferers from which have been U.S. exporters.

3. Industrially backward nations that seek industrial development would be hampered in establishing restrictions designed to build up their own industries.

4. Members would be discouraged from state control of exports and imports and from certain trade monopolies that go under the general heading of "state trading." This would facilitate penetration by foreign (*i. e.*, U.S.) capitalists.

5. Protection for foreign (*i. e.*, U.S.) investments would be expanded and guarantees would be enforced by the international organization.

Moreover, the I.T.O. cannot be viewed apart from the trade agreements that the U.S. has been negotiating with the 18 participating nations during the conferences. Undertaken under the authority of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Acts of 1934 and 1945, these agreements grant some reductions in our own high tariff wall, erected by the

Smoot-Hawley Act, in return for sweeping concessions to American exporters.

Mr. Clayton stated recently that 108 negotiations had been opened by the U.S. with nations represented at Geneva and that about 80 had been completed.

Although one of the primary goals of the I.T.O. is multilateral trade, it is significant that these agreements are all bilateral. The relationship between these agreements and the I.T.O., however, is that the organization will provide a means of enforcing these agreements. A Member who has entered such an agreement with the U.S. obligates itself to continue it or suffer retaliation, not only from the U.S., but from the entire organization.

As for the U.S., the escape clause that has been written into every one of its trade agreements since the Mexican agreement of 1945 provides that the U.S. may cancel the accord if it results in injury to American industry.

At his latest press conference, on the day of his departure from the State Department, Mr. Clayton emphasized that the prospect of the "Marshall Plan" did not eliminate the need for the I.T.O. The "Plan" was for the present emergency, he said. The I.T.O. was for the long pull ahead.

It was a candid admission. In the final analysis, the I.T.O. and the "Marshall Plan" have the same objective.

A PROGRAM FOR COAL

By GABE KISH

THE INDISPENSABILITY OF COAL to public health, public safety, and the national economic and military security has been stressed time and again. Despite the inroads of competing sources of energy, coal still supplies the fuel to heat more than half of all the homes and apartments throughout the nation. It drives 9 out of 10 railroad locomotives. It is the source of energy for more than half the electric power produced. It is the source of chemicals essential to the manufacture of many paints, drugs, plastics, insecticides, perfumes, rubber goods, explosives, and other chemical compounds and products. It comprises more than one quarter of all the freight carried by American railroads and pays more than 10 per cent of their gross revenue. Coal mining provides a livelihood for hundreds of thousands of individuals who, with their dependents, constitute a large segment of the American population.*

These facts make it quite clear that coal plays, and will continue to play, a decisive role as a basic industry, upon whose continuous operation depends, not only the well-being of those directly connected with the industry, but also the economic well-being of the nation as a whole.

The indispensability of this basic

natural resource to the well-being of the people is clear. But with the exception of the struggles put up by the mine workers union little attention is paid to the problems of this industry by the labor and people's movement. The greedy coal operators, disregarding the people's needs, have had a practically free hand in plundering and exploiting, for their own selfish interest, the nation's coal deposits and the American coal miner.

This has resulted in an annual average of 1250 lives lost and over 50,000 maimed and injured. It has resulted in keeping the mining communities in a backward status and isolated from the higher living and cultural standards of other American industrial communities. It has resulted in wastage and pillage of the rich coal deposits. It has resulted in constant industrial strife. Last, but not least, it has resulted in callous disregard of the economic welfare of the nation.

Hence, if coal is to play its rightful role as a product indispensable to the economic well-being of the people, then the American people, together with the coal miners, must fight for an immediate as well as a long-range program that will give them a say in the functions of this industry, for a program that will place the welfare of the coal miner and the people above all else.

To obtain a better perspective of the character that an immediate and a long-range program must have, we must note the trends and developments in this industry.

* *Medical Survey of the Bituminous-Coal Industry*, Report of the Coal Miners Administration, Washington, 1947.

PRODUCTION, PRODUCTIVITY, AND EMPLOYMENT

Employment in the bituminous-coal industry reached its peak in 1923 when 704,793 men were employed, and has since shown a steady decline. In 1945, employment dropped to 383,100. Although the return of the veterans has resulted in a slight increase in employment in 1946-47, the general trend nevertheless remains one of a general decrease in the number of men employed.

Total production increased from 564,564,662 tons in 1923 to 577,617,327 tons in 1945, even though 300,000 fewer men were employed in 1945. These figures, of course, do not give a complete picture because the average number of days worked was 179 in 1923 as compared with 261 in 1945. But while this is true, productivity increased during this same period from 4.47 tons to 5.78 tons per man per day. It is important to note that, while average over-all productivity is now 5.78 tons per man, the mechanized mines produce over 8 tons per man, some of them reaching averages as high as 12 and 15 tons, while the productivity of the handloading mines still remains at the level of 4.5 tons per man.

Thus, we are today witnessing a rapid increase in the mechanization of the coal mines. In 1923 only 0.3 per cent of the mines were mechanized and 2.1 per cent of the total production was strip-mined. In 1945, however, 56.1 per cent of production was mechanized and 19.0 per cent was strip-mined.

While in the past it was a simple matter for anyone with very little capital to enter the coal business and compete on the basis of the average productivity level of 4.5 tons per man, today it is not so simple to compete for long with the higher productivity of the mechanized mines.

Mechanization, with its higher productivity, is not only here to stay; it is increasing its tempo of growth. It is only a matter of time before an average of 10 tons per man per day will be reached.

It is clear that in the coming period it will be mainly the large corporations that can engage in extensive mechanization. This will, no doubt, have an important effect upon the thousands of smaller producers, particularly when demand for coal begins to fall and competition becomes sharper.

What can be expected in the coming period, but on a much larger scale, can be illustrated by what took place in the period leading up to 1932, the deepest point of the crisis.

The coal industry reached a peak of 9,331 mines in operation in 1923. After that, as competition sharpened, a steady decline developed in the number of mines in operation until there were only 5,642 mines in operation in 1931 and 5,427 in 1932. But during this same period, while mechanically loaded coal was only 0.3 per cent of total production in 1923, in 1931 it amounted to 13.1 per cent. With the elimination of the less productive mines, with the mass layoffs (mainly of older men), and

with increased speedup, the highest productivity in the history of mining to that time, 5.3 tons per man, was reached in 1931. It is interesting to note that, since 1931, that figure was never again reached until 1943, during the war, when almost 50 per cent of the total production was mechanically loaded. As a matter of fact, productivity sank as low as 4.4 tons per man in 1934, a figure that is even lower than that for 1923.

There were, of course, a number of factors that accounted for this development. First of all, mechanization was practically in its experimental stage, with a downward trend actually taking place from 1931 to 1935. Secondly, the union, taking advantage of Roosevelt's program, reorganized the union, negotiated contracts, and fought back the speedup attempts. Thirdly, the adoption of the Guffey coal stabilization act resulted in the fixing of minimum prices, enabling even less productive mines to compete. Finally, following the Guffey act, the war years with their unlimited demand for coal production brought many more less productive mines into operation. (In 1945, 7,033 mines were in operation. This does not include the 1,499 "father and son" country pits, which produce less than 1,000 tons annually per mine.)

But beginning in 1935, when mechanization began to develop at a much more rapid pace, and despite the lower productivity of the handloading mines, over-all productivity has steadily increased.

This development has also tended to concentrate into increasingly fewer hands the main bulk of the total coal production of the nation. While some may argue, by pointing to the increased number of mines and operators in this industry, that concentration of production has not taken place to any appreciable degree, the fact remains that 45 per cent of the mines produce only 2 per cent of total production; while only 10 per cent of the mines, with an annual capacity of 200,000 tons each, produce over 75 per cent of the total. When we also take into account that about 20 per cent of total production is by captive mines (closed markets), it will be clear, not only that the less productive commercial mines have higher productivity to compete with, but also that the open market is limited. Even the competition for this limited open market is becoming narrowed down by monopoly control, as evidenced, for example, in the formation of the largest commercial producer in the world through the combination of the Pittsburgh Coal Company with the Pittsburgh Consolidated Company.

TOWARD A PROGRAM FOR COAL

With the signing of the recent contract in the coal industry, the predominance of the mechanized mining contract over the handloading contract was established. All previous contracts were based, more or

less, upon the handloading mines. It was no accident that, when the union originally signed with the big-wigs of the captive and commercial mines, these producers were not so much concerned with handloading provisions as they were with mechanical loading provisions in the contract. Thus, it was not until these big operators agreed upon a base rate for the mechanical mines that the smaller producers, most of whom are handloading producers, signed on the dotted line, agreeing to that base rate for the handloading mines too.

But with the signing of the most recent contract, Representative Hartley (of slave labor law fame) raised a howl that the union "monopoly" had ganged up with the industrialist monopolists to force the smaller producers into line. (As if Hartley were concerned about the welfare of the smaller producers!)

There is no doubt that the smaller producers, particularly those that operate handloading mines, will find it more difficult to remain in business under such conditions. But it is also clear that Hartley does not provide the solution when he suggests that contracts be signed on the basis of these small producers. Under such circumstances it would be the mine workers who would get it in the neck and the big producers who would benefit most.

A LONG RANGE PROGRAM

The mine workers union had no other alternative than to fight for a

contract that served the best interests of its membership under existing conditions. The mine workers, however, along with the rest of the American people and the small producers, have the responsibility of uniting around a common program against the grip of the trusts in the mining industry, as well as against their hold upon the economic life of the people.

Such a common program providing for a real and basic improvement in the working and living conditions of the mine workers, and providing relief for the smaller producers, can best be served by nationalization of the coal industry.

The Federal Government, for the past decade or so, has in one way or another, been called upon to intervene in this industry. While the pretext used for government intervention was "the welfare of the nation," the actual results left a very bad taste, especially as far as the mine workers were concerned, because it was not the American people and the mine workers but the coal operators who benefited from that type of government intervention.

It is quite clear that government control serving, instead of curbing, the interests of monopoly, does not offer any solution to the problems of the industry. Such "control" is, of course, to be expected of such a servant of monopoly as the Truman Administration.

Therefore, if a genuine program of nationalization is to be realized, it must be part and parcel of the program of a people's movement that

will
repre

as ag

But

velop

uncon

living

small

of a

maini

of the

of the

"free

indus

FOR

OF

How

contin

der a

not m

at the

indust

limita

govern

trary,

the pr

monop

done

lems f

The

find t

Devel

show

produ

upon

profit

of the

Wh

tract t

with

This

will place into office candidates who represent the interests of the people as against those of the trusts.

But such a program will not develop if the people generally remain unconcerned over the working and living conditions of the miners, if small business heeds the suggestions of a Hartley and insists upon remaining in business at the expense of the miners, and if the leadership of the U.M.W.A. continues with its "free enterprise" policy for the coal industry.

FOR THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE CONTRACT

However, while the fight must continue for a people's program under a people's government, this does not mean that nothing can be done at the present time as far as the coal industry is concerned, under the limitations of the present reactionary governmental set-up. On the contrary, the successful realization of the program to curb the powers of monopoly will depend upon what is done now on the immediate problems facing the mine workers.

The union should and must defend the interest of its membership. Developments in the coal industry show that both the large and small producers have already embarked upon a program to sweat as much profit as they can out of the hides of the coal miners.

Wholesale violations of the contract took place even before the ink with which it was signed was dry. This was particularly true in the

handloading mines, which tried to swindle the handloaders out of the base pay that was agreed upon. In their efforts to increase productivity and to lower production costs, the operators have stepped up their speedup program, to which they are more and more subordinating safety.

As the economic crisis matures and as the demand falls and competition sharpens, the mine workers can expect a further stepping up of the operator's program to force the greatest amount of work and profit out of them under this contract.

Therefore, one of the biggest tasks facing the miners in this coming period, if they are to check the offensive of the operators, is to fight stubbornly for the *enforcement of the contract*.

This contract was signed under relatively good conditions, and is therefore one of the best in the history of the U.M.W.A., but if its provisions are to be realized, the mine workers must know what it provides for, and fight to enforce those provisions.

OTHER PROBLEMS

While an advance was made by the union in the signing of a more definite contract for mechanized mining, there are many problems that still remain unsolved, and many of these press for immediate solution. There is, for example, the problem of job classification, *i. e.*, the attempt of the operators to have higher skilled work done for lower skilled wages.

There is the question of seniority for job protection and job advancement as well as for protection of union leadership.

This last point is very important. With the adoption of the Taft-Hartley Act, the workers are compelled more and more to rely on the strength of their unions. But if contracts do not contain clauses protecting local union leadership, the companies, with the aid of the anti-labor bills, can center their attack upon this leadership and get rid of it. Hence, locals will have a very difficult time in getting members to accept leading union posts. Under such conditions we can speak all we want about the need to enforce the contract, but which workers will take the leadership to fight for enforcement?

While other unions have long ago adopted clauses even for super-seniority for their leadership, the U.M.W.A. has not yet succeeded in writing into its contract any seniority clauses at all for job protection. This question is a *must*, not only to protect the local union leadership, and thus the union, but also to maintain conditions of employment, to guard against discriminatory layoffs, to protect the Negro workers and the older workers, to guard against discriminatory job advancement, etc.

In addition to these main ways in which the contract must be strengthened, a fight must be waged to guarantee that all mine workers receive the base pay agreed upon in the contract. This is especially important

as far as the handloaders are concerned, for already attempts have been made to deny them the base pay of \$13.05.

Furthermore, the safety provisions must be enforced; and every attempt of the operators to sidetrack the safety code must be fought. This will go a long way toward cutting down speedup and disregard of the miner's safety. The safety code must be studied, particularly by the Safety Committees, as well as by all of the miners.

THE WELFARE FUND

A fight must be put up for the correct operation of the welfare fund, for this fund can help tremendously to alleviate the hardships of the miner and his family.

During the first year of its operation, under the Krug-Lewis agreement for a five cent per ton royalty, the fund piled up, but no apparatus was established for the handling of the funds so far as benefits were concerned. Under the present contract, the royalty has been increased to ten cents per ton, which will amount to about 50 to 55 million dollars a year. While a committee has been agreed upon to handle this vast fund for the benefit solely of the mine workers, a rounded-out program, including all the benefits for which the fund was established, is very slow in shaping up.

In the meantime, however, the funds continue to accumulate, not only without assistance being rendered to the thousands of welfare

cases, but all which arguments by claim is too

It to worker build a for the to real fits, wi the ran

A fig local u

ments upon b and to health

From v fit comm

ment of for dis payer single p person,

We als tingent case fro In othe received

Social fund p from th no pay The me up: fir to incr and sec der the any oth

A fig

cases, as was the original intention, but also creating a huge reserve, which the operators can use as an argument for reducing the royalty by claiming that the existing royalty is too large and has not been used.

It fought a struggle by the mine workers to win royalty payments to build a welfare fund; but the fight for the payment of the benefits, and to realize the fullest possible benefits, will require greater initiative by the rank and file.

A fight must be taken up in the local unions to liberalize the payments that have already been agreed upon by the welfare fund committee and to provide for a number of other health matters not yet agreed upon. From what we can gather, the benefit committee has agreed upon a payment of \$1,000 as a death benefit; and for disability and old age cases, payments monthly of \$50.00 to a single person, and \$65.00 to a married person, plus \$5.00 for each dependent. We also understand that this is contingent upon the amount paid in each case from the Social Security fund. In other words, if a single person received \$50.00 a month from the Social Security fund, his welfare fund payment would be deducted from that, which would leave him no payments from the welfare fund. The membership must fight this set-up: first, to liberalize the payments; to increase the monthly payments; and secondly, to make payments under the fund *not contingent upon any other income*.

A fight must also be undertaken

to expand payments to provide for hospitalization, medical care for the miner and his family, and many other health matters seriously neglected in the mining communities. Committees on a local and sub-district scale must be established to work out these proposals, and conferences of local unions should be called to fight for them. The fund is there, it belongs to the membership, but it will take action by the membership if they are to receive the fullest benefits of the fund.

COMMUNITY PROBLEMS

There are also other problems that the contract, good as it was, failed to provide for, problems that the union leadership failed to project as burning needs of the mine workers.

There is, for example, the question of community problems. Upon negotiating the Krug-Lewis agreement, the government was given an assignment to conduct a medical survey of the bituminous-coal industry. The government completed the survey this year, publishing a report and making many recommendations. It was a quite comprehensive report, which exposed the unhealthy, backward conditions in the mining communities. Now, nothing much is being done about carrying out the recommendations of the report.

As for the government report itself, it obscures the responsibility of the mining companies and their Wall Street directors for the semifeudal conditions existing in the mining communities. It fails to establish

the plain fact that the miners serve the nation as a whole, not only by producing the coal it needs but also by struggling to improve their living and working conditions, to defend their democratic rights, and to throw off the feudal domination of the coal barons, which retards the development of whole regions and the progress of a large segment of the American people.

The least, however, that can be expected is the fulfillment of the recommendations of the Government survey on housing, sanitation and public health, industrial medicine and hygiene, general medical services and hospitalization, and off-the-job living (recreational facilities, etc.).

These recommendations will be realized only if the American people, the miners' union, and the mining communities fight to have them put into effect.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND PART-TIME WORK

The problem of unemployment and part-time work is also a major question now facing the mine workers. Any program for mining must tackle this problem as a major one.

With the increased tempo of mechanization and speedup, layoffs are already taking place. The older miners are the ones most effected by this drive because of the discriminatory practices of the companies, which are not bound by any seniority provisions in the contract. Seniority

for job protection and the reduction of the age limit with adequate old age pensions both as far as social security and the union fund is concerned, are the demands that must be fought for.

Part-time work in the mining industry, at a time when the demand for coal is still high, poses a problem different from that of prewar days. The shortage of railroad cars is given as the main reason for this part-time work. It seems rather peculiar, however, that so soon after the war, during which there were plenty of railroad cars, there should suddenly be a shortage of cars. This cannot be explained away, as some have tried, by saying that those were old cars, which were scrapped before new cars were built to replace them. As in the steel industry, so in the coal industry the question can be raised as to the extent to which the maneuverings of the trusts are responsible for the retardation of production. The shortage of railroad cars for some mines, and the abundant supply of cars for others, is undoubtedly only an excuse for holding down coal production so as to create an artificial shortage of coal, thus keeping coal prices high and blackjacking the people into paying these prices.

The people should demand an investigation that will force the release of coal cars. They should demand that the mines be worked at capacity production—thus providing more work for the mine workers—and that the price of coal be lowered.

POLITICA

The re-
mediate a
for the co
a great e
shown by

This m
economic
but also in
ing comm
other sect
ple's mov

If the
tives of V
teated in
and the p
then it is
united w
movement
action to
ment that
of the R
election o
and a pro
didate in

This, it
lished e
ican Par
monopoly

The el
lates on
will main
to which
with the

ments, m
dependent
and the
Democrat

The mi
and still
of the Ro

POLITICAL ACTION

The realization of both an immediate and a long-range program for the coal industry will depend, to a great extent, upon the initiative shown by the mine workers.

This means initiative, not only in economic struggles by their unions, but also in political action in the mining communities and in unity with other sections of the labor and people's movement.

If the Taft-Hartleyite representatives of Wall Street are to be defeated in the crucial 1948 elections and the people's candidates elected, then it is now that the mine workers, united with the rest of the labor movement, must move into political action to develop a political movement that will guarantee the return of the Roosevelt program and the election of a progressive Congress and a pro-Roosevelt Presidential candidate in 1948.

This, it is clear, cannot be accomplished either through the Republican Party or through the pro-monopoly Truman Democrats.

The election of people's candidates on a pro-Roosevelt program, will mainly depend upon the extent to which the mine workers, along with the rest of the labor movements, move into political action independent of the Republican Party and the pro-monopoly Truman Democrats.

The mine workers have long been, and still remain, staunch supporters of the Roosevelt program. Not only

can they be won to continue this support, but, more important, they can help lead other sections to fight for a pro-Roosevelt program.

This they have already demonstrated in their recent struggles against the Taft-Hartley Bill, by engaging in a strike against such measures. They will undoubtedly continue their struggle for the defeat of all anti-labor bills and those who are responsible for their passage. But it is not enough simply to move for the defeat of those individuals responsible for the passage of the bill. It is not simply a question of defeating, in 1948, these individuals and the reactionary machine they represent. Reaction will not be defeated just by changing the drivers on the reactionary bandwagon. The drivers and their wagon must be kicked out.

This can be accomplished only if there is a people's movement, independent of the regular machine, and if there develops a third party.

One key issue around which such a movement could develop, is the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. The mine workers have already moved into action against this law, but its repeal will depend not only upon what the mine workers do by themselves, but, more important, upon how they organize this fight in unity with other sections of the population in the mining communities, as well as with other sections of the labor and people's movement.

The repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act must be one of the major issues

around which the mine workers and other sections of the labor movement move into political action. But other key issues must be fought on, if the people are to be mobilized for the fight against the Taft-Hartley Act. Among such issues are those concerned with high prices, rent control, and the community problems such as taxation, sanitation, health.

THE ROLE OF LEWIS

The unity, initiative, and will to struggle displayed by the mine workers have always been a source of inspiration to the American labor movement. The miners' militant actions of the past year, including their strike for safe working conditions, and the vigorous fight against the Taft-Hartley Act, carried an honorable tradition to a new and higher level.

The fighting spirit of hundreds of thousands of mine workers influenced the policies of the U.M.W.A. and gave them a progressive direction on some important issues. Even though John L. Lewis pursued a policy that had serious limitations in the latter stages of the negotiations, this policy was in general a sound one. Certainly, Lewis' denunciation in uncompromising terms of the Taft-Hartley Act expressed in words the sentiments the miners were already expressing in militant action. Lewis' insistence that the A. F. of L. Executive Council continue its refusal to comply with the anti-Com-

munist provisions of the slave labor law reflects the position of the membership of the U.M.W.A. and will have the full support of the miners. The same is true of the Lewis call for the defeat of all members of Congress responsible for passage of the Taft-Hartley Act.

But, while Lewis appeals to, and voices, the militant spirit of the miners on certain concrete issues, there is no indication that he is prepared to break his ties with the Republican Party, with the reactionary domestic and imperialist foreign policies of the Truman Administration and its Hoover-Vandenberg advisors, or to strike out on a new and independent path with the broad forces seeking to elect a pro-Roosevelt candidate and progressive Congress on a third ticket.

Lewis' appeal in the A. F. of L. convention was directed to the mass of A. F. of L. members who are moving in a Leftward direction, and his attack on the "fat and stately asses" of the A. F. of L. bureaucracy was designed to win back his old position as champion of the progressive elements in both the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. But this position can not be regained by John L. Lewis if he continues to play ball with Hoover and Dewey, to give aid and comfort to the anti-Communist and anti-Soviet warmongering now sweeping the country, and above all if he fails to make crystal clear his position on the 1948 elections and to associate himself fully with the independent political forces, including those in

the labor movement, who are moving toward the launching of a third party and an anti-war, anti-imperialist Presidential ticket.

INITIATIVE FROM BELOW

This is the direction that the bulk of the mine workers are taking, and that is consistent with their past record. Election after election has proved them staunch supporters of Roosevelt's progressive domestic and foreign policies. Election after election has shown that they are bitterly opposed to any alliance with the monopoly - controlled Republican Party, and that they repudiate any deals made with it in their name. They are no less firmly opposed to the Truman Administration, which has betrayed the Roosevelt program of an Economic Bill of Rights and Big Three unity.

The fight for this program is in the best interests of the membership of the U.M.W.A. and will strengthen the union in every way. But it is clear that there is no basis for assuming that the national leadership of the U.M.W.A. will take the initiative to fight for this all-around program. The initiative must therefore come from the local unions and those forces in the union and in the mining communities who urgently feel

the necessity for this program and will fight for it now. Naturally, one of the objectives of the movement for this program in every mining community has to be to enlist the support of the entire union and the union leadership for the program. The success of the local movements will determine to what extent the national leadership can be won to support this fight. The local movements in the mining communities also have the job of winning general support of the entire labor and people's movement in their communities and states in support of the miners' program for the mining communities.

The Communists in the mining industry, and all Communist organizations in the mining community, must be in the forefront of the fight to realize this vital program for the miners. They should do all in their power, not only to help unite the miners for this program, but also to enlist the support of the entire labor and people's movement in support of the miners. Only in this way can the Communist Party gain new members and influence among the miners and thereby further strengthen the fight of the miners, as well as the fight of all the labor and progressive forces, against the offensive of the monopolies.

TOWARD THE 100th ANNIVERSARY OF MARXISM

INDEPENDENT SELF-STUDY OF MARXISM

By WILLIAM WEINSTONE

I. WHAT TO STUDY

THE IMPORTANCE OF Marxian theory is understood by increasing numbers of our members. Events of recent years have taught the correctness of what is now a maxim—that practice without the light of theory is blind. Yet many comrades engaged in important mass work still underestimate theory; others, admitting its value, have failed to undertake a serious examination of Marxian theory because of past habits of little study. They are also discouraged from independent self-study because they hold the view, in many cases unconsciously, that Marxism can be acquired only by a few, and at that by intellectuals only.

Nothing is farther from the truth. Karl Marx first taught his doctrines to workers' clubs as did Lenin. In his introduction to Volume I of *Capital*, which he wrote with the worker reader in mind, Marx expressed the

view that the volume would be readily grasped by the reader, presupposing, he said, that one is willing to learn and therefore to think for himself. He thought the reader would have difficulty only with the first part, dealing with the nature of value. At the request of the Russian translator he even considered further popularization of this part but never found time for the task.

Stalin has stated that theory is acquirable by all. A resolution of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., stressing the importance of self-study as the best means of mastering Marxism,* stated that, while learning a science is not easy, it can be done by everyone willing to apply persistence and effort. This is a truth that holds for the mastery of any skill, intellectual or manual.

However, even where there is a will, many stand off from tackling

* Independent self-study does not exclude attending schools and classes. In fact, study in schools and classes is extremely helpful in acquiring Marxist knowledge and the habit of theoretical study. However, it is only possible thoroughly to master Marxism by individual reading. In the last analysis, it is only through individual effort in reading, thinking, and working over the material, that one acquires a deep knowledge of the science. Students who have gone through short-time training schools would do well to read or reread the classics that they studied in part before continuing with wider reading.

Marxism
such a n
They t
through
sound
This too
ter Mar
one sho
Marxist
particul
should
heights
only the
best wor
acquires
Marxism
number
derstand
further
acquired
work.

It is t
What
consecu
umes of
gels and
umes o
and so
the best
sider th
student
introduc
vanced.

Before
make a
who are
first stud
No. 1, is
mittee of
the Com
with Ma

Marxism earnestly because there is such a mountain of material to study. They think that only if one goes through all the works can one have a sound knowledge of the science. This too is wrong. Naturally, to master Marxism and apply it effectively, one should know everything that Marxists have written. All students, particularly youth, as Lenin advised, should aspire to reach the luminous heights of the science—studying not only the works of Marxism, but the best works of all humanity. But one acquires a working knowledge of Marxism after reading a reasonable number of works, and fuller understanding and depth comes with further study and application of the acquired knowledge in practical work.

It is therefore necessary to begin.

What to study? Should one go consecutively through the many volumes of the works of Marx and Engels and then follow with the 12 volumes of Lenin's *Selected Works*, and so on? No, that would not be the best way to begin. We can consider three stages for the average student in the study of Marxism: introductory, intermediate, and advanced.

Before discussing these, let me make a recommendation to those who are just beginners, that they first study the Marxist Study Course No. 1, issued by the National Committee on the *Theory and Practice of the Communist Party* and to follow with Marxist Study Course No. II,

now in preparation. It serves as an easy introduction to Marxism. It is suited for study groups. If disputed questions arise, the student can send for an answer to the Educational Department.

For a basic *introductory* study of Marxism-Leninism, a foundation on which to build as one goes along, the student should begin with the following: Marx and Engels' *Communist Manifesto*; Engels' *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific* and "Speech at the Graveside of Karl Marx" (in Karl Marx, *Selected Works*, Vol. IX); Leontiev's *Political Economy*; Lenin's *State and Revolution* and *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*; Marx' *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* and *The Civil War in France*; Stalin's *Foundations of Leninism* (the chapters on theory and the Party); Dimitroff's *The United Front Against Fascism*; and *Marxism-Leninism vs. Revisionism* by Wm. Z. Foster and others.

There are also a number of biographies and commentaries, which can be read simultaneously with the above, that will be of considerable aid, such as Engels' "Karl Marx"; Liebknecht's "From Reminiscences of Marx"; Lenin's "The Three Sources and Component Parts of Marxism"; Lenin's "Karl Marx" (all to be found in Karl Marx, *Selected Works*, Vol. I). Also valuable are Kherzentsev's *Life of Lenin*, and the volume entitled *The Life of Stalin*, a series of essays on his 60th birth-

day. The value of these biographies is that they give the historical setting and the acquaintances of these personalities, thus imparting to the basic works the living reality of the time in which they were written.

For *intermediate* study the following are suggested. For a deeper overall view of Marxism, the student should read Engels' *Anti-Duhring*. For further historical material on the features of capitalism, the student should read *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State; The Peasant War in Germany*, and *The Housing Question*—all by Engels. For Leninism, the student should study Stalin's *Foundations of Leninism; The History of the C.P.S.U.; Lenin's What Is To Be Done; Lenin's Collapse of the Second International* (in Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. V.); Lenin's *Left-Wing Communism*; Stalin's *Leninism* (selected works in a single volume); Stalin's essay entitled "Marxism and the National Question" (in the volume of the same name); James S. Allen's *The Negro Question in the United States* (revised edition in preparation; I shall have more to say about American works later); and Stalin's *The Great Patriotic War*. The student should study *Marxian philosophy* by reading Engels' *Ludwig Feuerbach* and the letters by Marx and Engels on historical materialism, which can be found in Vol. I of the *Selected Works* of Karl Marx. For an understanding of the *economic doctrine*, the stu-

dent should read Marx's *Wage-Labor and Capital* (with Engels' introduction), *Value, Price, and Profit*, and Vol. I of *Capital*.

In this intermediate course, biographies and popularizations can also be read together with the works listed above. Some of these are: N. Krupskaya's *Memories of Lenin*; Plekhanov's *Fundamental Problems of Marxism* and *The Role of the Individual in History*; Foster's *Pages From a Worker's Life and Selected Writings on American Trade Unionism*; Mother Bloor's *We Are Many*; and Mehring's *Karl Marx* (noting the criticism, in the book's appendix, of Mehring's wrong views regarding Marx's estimate of Lasalle and Bakunin).

The lists given above are not complete and indicate only the main writings. In passing from one stage to another, a certain amount of repetition is unavoidable in all study.

It would suffice at present to stop here. Yet many will want to know how to proceed further and will ask if there is a preferred order for advanced study to master the science. I think experience shows there is no blueprint that can be followed schematically. Lenin pointed out that there is a remarkable consistency and unity in Marxism. That is why one can reach the peaks of the science by following a number of paths, one leading into the other, and the order of study is a matter of taste and convenience.

At this advanced stage of study,

it is p
metho
Histor
to reac
Stalin
value o
recom
the his
student
lation t
were w
student
comm
writing

Another
deeply
ence,
(listing
Marxist
in turn
econom
and str
bered,
doctrin
ist-Leni
maste
well an
of gras
a know
student
litical st

What
unionist
Marxist
it neces
maste
science
knowle
one can
subject,

it is possible to follow one of two methods. One method is to use the *History of the C.P.S.U.* as a text and to read all the works of Lenin and Stalin for the period covered. The value of this method, which has been recommended for *advanced study* of the history of the C.P.S.U., is that the student can evaluate the works in relation to the conditions in which they were written. At the same time, the student reads works that are rich in commentary and explanations of the writings of Marx and Engels.

Another way is to study more deeply the main branches of the science, beginning with philosophy (listing all the important works of Marxism and tackling each of them in turn); the same with political economy, the class struggle, tactics and strategy, etc. *It must be remembered, however, that the economic doctrine is the chief content of Marxist-Leninist teaching and must be mastered to understand Marxism well and to use Marxism as a means of grasping class relations.* Without a knowledge of economic theory, the student flounders in deciphering political struggles.

What if one is an active trade unionist and wishes to grasp the Marxist teachings on the subject? Is it necessary to wait until one has mastered all main branches of the science first? No! With a general knowledge of Marxism as a guide, one can make a list of books on the subject, studying such material as

Lozovsky's *Marx and the Trade Unions*; Engels on American and British unions in the Marx-Engels' *Correspondence*; Lenin on the trade unions in *What Is To Be Done* and in *Left-Wing Communism, Lenin on Britain*, and Ralph Fox's *Class Struggles in Britain, 1880-1923*; Stalin on the unions of western Europe and America in his report to the 14th Party Conference of the C.P.S.U., and in his talk with the American Labor Delegation (in his volumes on Leninism); Lenin's debate with Trotsky and Bukharin on the role of unions (*Selected Works*, Volume IX); *Strategy and Tactics* (consisting of excerpts of Marxist writings published by International Publishers); Foster's *Selected Writings on American Trade Unionism*; Foner's *History of the Labor Movement in the U.S.*; etc. A complete study of trade unionism requires also readings on international trade union experiences of the past generation, which can be found in bound volumes of *International Press Correspondence* and also in bourgeois works on American trade unions.

In the same way, one can study the national and colonial question, the state and democracy, the third party question, the question of nationalization, the Party, or other subjects. This is a method that takes counsel with Marx and Lenin on the problems of daily work while continuing with the task of mastering the whole science.

II. HOW TO STUDY

The tendency of many American students is to try to get a condensation of the subject and get at the essence of the matter in double-quick time. There is no objection to summaries and popularizations and some have been indicated. However, popularizations by their very nature tend to simplify questions, creating the danger that the student who relies only on these works will oversimplify, and get a mechanical view of, Marxism. Actually, life is richer than any formula or summary statement of the laws of social development. Fortunately, the best popularizations of the basic views of Marxism-Leninism have been provided by the great teachers themselves. That is why reading the original works is the best, and in the long run the shortest, route to take. There is really no short cut to knowledge. *How should one study?* Here the advice of Krupskaya (Lenin's wife) on how Lenin studied Marx is of great value. Krupskaya wrote that Lenin did not study a Marxist work once but many times and returned to it again and again. She recalls that in advising students to study Engels' *Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*, Lenin counseled the student that: "... you should not be perturbed if on reading this work you do not understand it at once. That hardly happens to anyone." "But," continued Lenin, "returning to it later, when your interest has

been aroused, you will succeed in understanding the greater part of it, if not the whole of it." Similarly, Engels advised Victor Adler, who wanted to take a try at Volume III of *Capital* while in prison, to read the difficult parts once for the sense of it and return later after the whole volume was read to understand these sections.

But Krupskaya tells us that Lenin did not simply read books. As his published notebooks indicate, he worked actively with them, copied important passages, reformulated difficult parts in his own words, and wrote out his own conclusions. He never permitted revolutionary phrases to become a substitute for real thought. "It was characteristic of Lenin," she writes, "to get at the essence of every question . . . to see the vital issues, the living forces and policies behind words and formulas." Krupskaya is here pointing out that Lenin understood Marxism as a guide and not a dogma, that he was concerned with the substance of Marxism and not the mere letter. "We do not regard," Lenin said, "Marxist theory as something completed and inviolable . . . it has only laid the cornerstone of the science which socialists [read Marxists] *must* further advance in all directions if they wish to keep pace with life." That is why Lenin did not hesitate on the basis of new phenomena to develop the doctrines of Marx further. He did not add any new *principles*; he

deve
of the
ism.

propo
and E
becaus
one s
longer

the ne

the th

tory o
countr

Marxis
of the

proleta
pressed

questio
of the

—all c
which

perialis
tion. S

Lenin
still fu

the dea
ing so

Lenin

In t
tactics

Marx's
studied

compar
Marx v
discove
ences,
peculia
count y
the pri
visionis
mechar

developed and made more concrete the doctrines in the new conditions of the class struggle under imperialism. He modified some individual propositions and opinions of Marx and Engels that had been outworn because they were arrived at under one set of circumstances and no longer applied in the same way to the new conditions. He formulated the theory of the possibility of victory of socialism in one or several countries, further developed the Marxist teachings on the dictatorship of the proletariat, on the role of the proletariat as leader of all the oppressed, on the national and colonial question, and the nature of the party of the proletariat under imperialism—all of which make up Leninism, which is Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and the proletarian revolution. Stalin and other followers of Lenin have since advanced Marxism still further in the two decades since the death of Lenin, likewise modifying some individual judgments of Lenin and adding new ones.

In the same way, in matters of tactics and strategy, Lenin studied Marx's teachings dialectically. He studied them in relation to the times, comparing the situation in which Marx wrote with the current period, discovering similarities and differences, and at all times taking the peculiarities of each country into account while resolutely safeguarding the principles of Marxism against revisionism. Lenin rebuked those who mechanically tried to apply the tac-

tics proposed for one country as an absolute guide for another without regard to time or conditions. He wrote of the different approach of Marx and Engels, in the period 1876-1895, to Germany on the one hand and to England and America on the other as examples of how "the creators of the *Communist Manifesto* defined the tasks of the struggling proletariat in application to the different stages of the national labor movement in various countries. As regards Germany, Marx strongly insisted in those years that the party fight against the petty-bourgeois opportunist tendencies of the newly entered intellectuals, who "broaden" the tactics of the party in such a way as to submerge its independent role in the mass movement and give up its revolutionary policies and change it into a bourgeois labor party. On the other hand, with regard to England and America, he criticized sharply the isolation of the party from the labor movement. In these latter countries, the proletariat lacked its independent, mass socialist party and continued to drag behind the bourgeoisie; electoral successes of the revolutionary party were absent and so was a mass press, etc."

That is why Marx and Engels counseled that in these countries everything be done to get the party into the mass movement, to agitate constantly among the masses for the party's immediate policies and for socialism, to respond to every de-

mand of the masses, to take part in every economic and political struggle in order to shake up the proletariat and develop an independent workers' party. They worked for a workers' party that would have Socialist principles, as in Europe, but they conceived the possibility that, while at first its principles would be limited to reforms or would have utopian views, it would nevertheless signify progress because it would be an *independent* mass political organization—a labor party. Needless to say, Marx and Engels did not overlook the fight against the opportunism of the reactionary labor leaders, Fabian reformers, and revisionists, without which no progress was possible. They insisted, however, that this essential fight should be carried on, not in a sectarian way, isolated from the labor movement, but with and among the masses in the manner of a real revolutionary vanguard party.

This example highlights the cardinal point in the study of Marxism that one must know both the general laws of Marxism and the history and development of one's own country. The laws of Marxism are universally applicable and are "general guiding principles which in *detail* must be applied in England in a manner different from that applied in France, in France in a manner different from that applied in

Germany, and in Germany in a manner different from that applied in Russia" (Lenin).

This means that only he can lay claim to the title of Marxist in the U.S. who knows, not only the general writings of Marxism but the history of his own land, and who tries to apply these writings to the solution of the problems of America. This also means that the student must study American economic, social, and political history, the trade union movement, the Socialist and Communist movements, the Negro question, not only in the works of the founders of Marxism, but also in the writings of the early American Socialists and Communists and present-day Marxists, a list of which works is obtainable through International Publishers and New Century Publishers. It is necessary to know well the history of the struggle for Socialism in our land. Moreover, it is essential to study the works of bourgeois writers—of course critically. By studying the peculiarities of American development, we shall apply our science in the spirit of its great founders.

* * *

These proposals on how and what to study are but one man's opinion. It would be good to hear from others, and in that way vastly widen the study of Marxism on its rooth anniversary.

THE
CZEC
YOUN

Young
I exte
you as
Commun
future.

It is l
am con
finest of
and res
promise
like to s
sion of
must be
people o
in the g
fore the
and the

1. Yo
above a
our wor
for the
ment of
particul
generati
should
life of o
a life v

* Speech
at a rally
on April 2

THE MISSION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA'S YOUNG COMMUNISTS

By KLEMENT GOTTWALD

Young Communists:

I extend my warmest greetings to you as the young lifeblood of our Communist Party, the makers of its future.

It is because you should be, as I am convinced that you will be, the finest offshoot of our whole Republic and responsible for fulfilling the promise of the future that I should like to say a few words on the mission of young Communists, for you must be an example to the young people of our country, leading them in the great tasks which are put before them by the Communist Party and the Republic.

1. Young Communists must above all stand in the forefront of our work of construction, in the work for the Two Year Plan. The fulfillment of the Two Year Plan is of particular importance for the young generation. Its implementation should help in making the future life of our young people a happy one, a life without unemployment and

without the hard struggle for the bare necessities of existence. It is for this reason that our young people must do their utmost to make the Plan a reality. Young Communists must set the example. In their work they must show that the act of working is for them not merely a matter of necessity in order to earn a living, but a patriotic duty, a joyful and honorable part of life itself. Young Communists should be pioneers in the creation of a new relationship toward work—above all toward physical work, which must receive the honorable place it rightly deserves. Young Communists should be our chief stakhanovites, the spearhead of the voluntary work brigades that help agriculture and industry.

2. Young Communists must watch over the people's democracy and guard the progressive ideals we have taken as our own. The young people of today have grown up during the struggle against the occupationists, during the national revolution and during the building up of the people's democracy. They must therefore guard and protect our revolutionary achievements as they would their own lives. It is their duty to defend them against all who attempt to revive the old ways, undermining and sabotaging our nationalized economy and attacking the people's political rights as well as the new rights of young men and women.

Young people today hold positions in public life, in the State adminis-

* Speech made by the Premier of Czechoslovakia at a rally of young Communists held in Prague on April 25, 1947.

tration, in the National Committees and in State offices, such as they have never held before. Let young Communists everywhere endeavor to bring the new, progressive, un-bureaucratic spirit of youth into their work.

Young people also form the nucleus of our army. Young Communists should try to set an example here as everywhere, fostering respect for our army and our security forces, and seeing to it that the army develops into a new and truly popular anti-fascist force.

3. Young Communists must strive for the unity of youth and the unity of the entire nation. In our young people a strong desire for unity and an aversion for the former narrow-minded party spirit exists. It is the task of young Communists to support and strengthen this healthy feeling and to unmask all enemies and disrupters of unity. This is the reason why our party has not set up its own youth organization, but calls on its young members to be the best and most devoted members of the Union of Czech Youth, developing the idea of unity among all young people, and spreading the ideals of tolerance and fellowship in the work for the prosperity of the nation and the Republic. In this way the young people's will for unity may become an important factor in securing the cooperation of all people of the National Front, while the comradeship between young workers, students, and peasants will contribute to the

creation of a true brotherhood between workers, peasants, intelligentsia, and all the working sections of our nation.

4. At the same time, young Communists must be the connecting link in our state unity, strengthening the fraternal relations between Czechs and Slovaks in a united Czechoslovak Republic on the basis of the complete equality of both nations. The younger generation, which lived through the cruel German oppression and personally felt the consequences of the lack of unity between our nations, are certainly best of all fitted to be the chief pioneers in establishing truly fraternal relations between Czechs and Slovaks.

5. Finally, young Communists must open up a new chapter of history in the mutual relationship of the Slav people. Only with the help of the Soviet Union and their armies have the young people of today learned the meaning of freedom. Always remember that freedom would again be lost if this alliance were broken. The young people of today have the good fortune to be able to make personal contact with the Russians and Yugoslavs and will soon have the possibility of getting to know the Poles and their other Slav kinsmen. Uphold this friendship with all your heart and soul. It is the guarantee of our freedom, of the independence of our state and the prosperity of our economic and cultural life. Young Communists are given the proud mission of teaching our

young
tion
which
the p
they
coope
are th
cratic
Her
portar
Comm
of the
these
what
ing m
in his
every-
examp
fellow
You
all be
their c
fulfilli
by the
of their
votion
guiding
They s
some o
their e
such sa
meanin
and m
spect f
should
sons. T
deepen
ideas, a
and cu
lastly, t

young people their honorable position in the family of Slav nations, which today are a leading force in the progressive world. Working, as they are, for peace and democratic cooperation between the nations, they are the spearhead of all the democratic forces of the world.

Here, then, are the five most important political tasks of young Communists, and the main purpose of their activities in life. But beyond these tasks I should like to underline what I feel should be the distinguishing mark of the young Communist in his political work and during his every-day life, for by character and example it is his duty to lead his fellows.

Young Communists must first of all be active and ready to sacrifice their own interests or inclination in fulfilling the tasks put before them by the country and the Party. Love of their country and people and devotion to their Party should be the guiding factor in all their actions. They should not be afraid to sacrifice some of their leisure hours, some of their entertainments, for it is just such sacrifices that give life a greater meaning and make existence richer and more satisfying. Then, too, respect for and love of knowledge should be cultivated in young persons. They should constantly try to widen the scope of their interests, deepen their knowledge of Socialist ideas, and learn to know the history and culture of their nation. And, lastly, they should like their profes-

sion and steadily seek to improve their qualifications. This is the duty of young workers, students, peasants, and office employees alike. Remember the words of the great Lenin who told the young Comsomols that a person who does not apply himself to acquiring all the knowledge that mankind has accumulated, cannot be a proper Communist.

Courage and a gallant spirit are other attributes that the young Communist should possess. You must be bold and courageous as befits a young person. Do not be afraid of new ideas and do not be afraid to fight for your opinions if you consider them right; never be afraid of mistakes and of adverse criticism. This pioneering spirit is vitally needed in our public life and also in our Party.

Young Communists must be an example, too, in their personal relationship to other people, an example of solidarity and comradeship. Other young people must be convinced that you are always ready to give help and advice. You should set an example in your good relationship to your parents and endeavor to keep moral cleanliness and sincerity in the relationship between boys and girls. Our young families should be a healthy element in our national life. All this and more belongs to the tasks of the Communists, whose aim it is to build up a new and better society.

I could only enumerate some of the tasks and some of the qualities that

go to make up a good young Communist. It is true that they are exacting and we are indeed asking much from you. We have to do this, if we wish to realize the historic aim that has been formulated by our Party—to gain the majority of the nation for the policy and goal of the Communists; if we want to achieve Socialism quickly and successfully, we need a strong, determined and conscientious nucleus of individuals who will be the keystone of the Party, enthusiastically supporting the defenders and implementers of the Communist policy.

Sometimes when all this seems to be very hard, remember your Soviet comrades. Remember the splendid generation that grew up out of the October Revolution. Remember how they fulfilled their tasks. The building up of a Socialist state and economy, the Stalin Five Year Plan, and

finally the defeat of Hitler Germany—these are some of the many accomplishments of the young people who grew up in the revolution and afterwards. Take them as your example.

Take, too, as your example our own heroes who perished on the battlefield or were executed by the Germans. Study the life and activities of such fine fighters as Sverma, Fucik, Brunclik, Santroch and Konrad. Think of them and follow in the path they trod.

If you choose this way, not only will there be no doubt about the qualities of young people, but you will be recognized as among the finest offshoots of our nation. And for the future you will have gained the glory of having been the generation of gallant and devoted builders of a people's democracy, the architects of Socialism.

RES
THE
MUN

*The
texts of
meeting
leaders
nine Ea
printed
those u
paper,
publishe
country
ferences*

At T
land to
conferen
the foll
Commun
Comrad
van D
Party
Vulko
mov; C
—Comm
Anna F
nist Pa
and Joz
Party—
Minc; A
(Bolshe
Comrad
kov; C

RESOLUTIONS OF THE 9-PARTY COM- MUNIST CONFERENCE

The following are the unofficial texts of the resolutions adopted at a meeting in Poland in September of leaders of the Communist Parties of nine European countries. The texts printed below are translations of those which appeared in the newspaper, Pravda. Translated texts published by newspapers in this country have shown marked differences in wording.

I

AT THE END of September in Poland took place an informational conference with the participation of the following Communist Parties: Communist Party of Yugoslavia — Comrades Edvard Kardelj and Milovan Djilas; Bulgarian Workers' Party (Communist) — Comrades Vulko Chervenkov and V. Poptomov; Communist Party of Romania — Comrades Gheorghiu-Dej and Anna Pauker; Hungarian Communist Party — Comrades M. Farkash and Jozsef Revai; Polish Workers' Party — Comrades Gomulka and H. Minc; All-Union Communist Party (Bolshevik) of the Soviet Union — Comrades A. Zhdanov and Malenkov; Communist Party of France —

Comrades Duclos and Fajan; Communist Party of Czechoslovakia — Comrades R. Slansky and S. Bashtovansky; and the Communist Party of Italy — Comrades Longo and Reale.

Members of the conference heard information reports about the activity of the Central Committees of the Parties represented from Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Poland, the Soviet Union, France, Czechoslovakia, and Italy.

Having exchanged viewpoints on these reports, the members of the conference decided to discuss the question of the international situation and the question of exchange of experience and coordination of activity of Communist Parties represented at the conference.

A report on the international situation was made by Zhdanov. Members of the conference exchanged viewpoints on the report, fully coordinated their views on the present international situation and the tasks issuing from it and unanimously accepted a declaration on the question of the international situation.

A report on the exchange of experience and coordination of activity of Communist Parties was made by Comrade Gomulka.

On this question, the conference, having in view the negative phenomena produced by the absence of contact between Parties represented at the conference and taking into consideration the necessity for mutual exchange and experience, has

decided to create an Information Bureau.

The Information Bureau will consist of the representatives of the Central Committees of the above-mentioned parties.

The tasks of the Information Bureau consist in the organization of an exchange of experience between parties and, in case of necessity, in coordination of their activity on the basis of mutual agreement.

It has been decided that the Information Bureau will publish a printed organ. The city of Belgrade [Yugoslavia] has been decided as the location for the Information Bureau and the editorial board of its organ.

II

The conference states that the absence of connections between Communist Parties who have taken part in this conference is in the present situation a serious shortcoming. Experience has shown that such division between Communist Parties is incorrect and harmful. The requirement for an exchange of experience and voluntary coordination of actions of the separate parties has become particularly necessary now in conditions of the complicated post-war international situation and when the disunity of Communist Parties may lead to damage for the working class.

Because of this, members of the conference agreed on the following:

First, to set up an Information Bureau of representatives of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, the Bulgarian Workers' Party, the Communist Party of Romania, the Hungarian Communist Party, the Polish Workers' Party, the All-Union Communist Party (Bolshevik), the Communist Party of France, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, the Communist Party of Italy.

Second, the task given to the Information Bureau is to organize and exchange experience and, in case of necessity, coordinate the activity of Communist Parties on foundations of mutual agreement.

Third, the Information Bureau will have in it representatives of the Central Committees—two from each Central Committee. Delegations of the Central Committees must be appointed and replaced by the Central Committees.

Fourth, the Information Bureau is to have printed an organ—fortnightly and, later on, weekly. The organ is to be published in French and Russian and, if possible, in other languages.

Fifth, the Information Bureau is to be in Belgrade [Yugoslavia].

III

Representatives of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia—Comrades Edvard Kardelj (Yugoslav Vice-Premier) and Milovan Djilas (Yugoslav Minister without portfolio); Bulgarian Workers' Party (Communist)—

Comrade
V. Popov
Romanian
Gheorghe
Pauker;
Polish—Com
Revai; Fran
Party—
Wladyslaw
All-Union
Union)—
Zhadanov
Kov; Com
Comrade
Etienne
of Cze
Slansky
the Com
ades (L
Reale—h
on the q
situation
ment ab
tion:
Essenti
in the in
ult of th
the postw
While
ed state
many an
formed o
ime, ther
nd also
postwar
The So
untries
of the
strengthen
res in E
ism and

Comrades Vulko Chervenkov and V. Poptomov; Communist Party of Romania — Comrades (Gheorghe) Gheorghiu-Dej and (Mrs. Anna) Pauker; Hungarian Communist Party—Comrades M. Farkash and Jozsef Revai; Polish Workers' (Communist) Party — Comrades (Vice-Premier Wladyslaw) Gomulka and H. Minc; All-Union Communist Party (Soviet Union)—Comrades A. (Andrei) Zhadanov and (Georgi M.) Malenkov; Communist Party of France—Comrades (Jacques) Duclos and (Etienne) Fajon; Communist Party of Czechoslovakia—Comrades R. Klansky and S. Bashtovansky; and the Communist Party of Italy—Comrades (Luigi) Longo and (Eugenio) Keale—having exchanged viewpoints on the question of the international situation, have come to an agreement about the following declaration:

Essential changes have taken place in the international situation as a result of the second world war and in the postwar period.

While the war was going on, Allied states in the war against Germany and Japan joined together and formed one camp. Even during war-time, there existed different war aims and also (differences) of tasks of the postwar organization of peace.

The Soviet Union and democratic countries considered as the main aims of the war the setting up and strengthening of democratic structures in Europe, the liquidation of fascism and the prevention of the pos-

sibility of a new aggression on the part of Germany and the creation of prolonged cooperation among the peoples of Europe on all sides.

The United States and, in agreement with it, England set for themselves another aim—to get rid of competitors in markets (Germany and Japan) and establish their dominating position. This difference in war aims and task of the postwar organization became deeper in the postwar period.

Two opposite political lines formed:

On the one side is the policy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and democratic countries directed toward undermining imperialism and strengthening democracy; on the other side is the policy of the United States and England directed toward strengthening imperialism and strangling democracy.

Since the U.S.S.R. and countries of the new democracy became a hindrance in carrying out imperialistic plans for the struggle for world domination and the smashing of democratic movements, there was proclaimed a campaign against the U.S.S.R. and countries of the new democracy, reinforced also by threats of a new war on the part of most zealous imperialistic politicians in the United States and England.

In such a way, two camps formed—the imperialistic and anti-democratic camp, which has as a main aim the establishment of world domination of American imperialism and

the smashing of democracy, and the anti-imperialistic and democratic camp, which has as a main aim the undermining of imperialism and the strengthening of democracy and the liquidation of the remnants of fascism.

The struggle of the two opposite camps—of imperialist and anti-imperialist—is going on in a situation of further sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism, of the weakening of the forces of capitalism and the strengthening of the forces of socialism and democracy. In this, the imperialistic camp and its leading force, the United States, is displaying especially aggressive activity.

This activity is developing simultaneously along all lines—in the direction of military and strategic measures, of economic expansion and ideological struggle.

The Truman-Marshall plan is only a constituent part, the European section, of the general plan of world expansionist policy carried on by the United States in all parts of the world. The plan of economic and political enslavement of Europe by American imperialism is supplemented by plans for the economic and political enslavement of China, Indonesia and South America.

The aggressors of yesterday—the capitalistic magnates of Germany and Japan—are being prepared by the United States for a new role—to become the instrument of the imperialistic policy of the United States in Europe and Asia.

The arsenal of tactical measures utilized by the imperialistic camp has many forms. Here are combined the direct threat by force, blackmail and extortion, all measures of political economic pressure, or bribery, of utilization of internal contradictions and controversy for the reinforcement of their positions—and all this covered by the liberal-pacific mask designed for deceit and fooling people who are not experienced in politics.

A special place in the tactical arsenal of imperialists is occupied by the utilization of the treacherous policy of Right-wing Socialists of the type of (Leon) Blum (former French Premier and Socialist Party leader) in France, (Prime Minister) Attlee and (Foreign Secretary Ernest) Bevin in England, (Dr. Kurt) Schumacher (Social-Democrat) in Germany, (President Karl) Renner (Socialist) and (Vice-Chancellor Adolf) Schaerf (Socialist) in Austria, (Right-wing Socialist Giuseppe) Saragat in Italy, et cetera, who try to hide the real bandit essence of imperialistic policy under the mask of democracy and Socialist phraseology and who, in reality, in all respects are loyal assistants of imperialists, introducing disintegration into the ranks of the working class and poisoning its conscience.

It is not accidental that the foreign policy of English imperialism has found, in the person of Bevin, its most consistent and zealous executor. In these conditions, the anti-imperialistic, democratic camp must

rally
dinate
out it
of th
Amer
Engis
Right
those

In c
imper
all den
in Eur

Right
in this

those o
where
Sociali
gressiv
of resis
perialis

majority
all Fre
borites

madier
their sl
facilita
ital, are

and are

the roa
United

Hence

falls up

must ta

ner of

dence a

tries.

If the
stand o
not per
ened or
bravely

rally together and work out a coordinated platform of actions to work out its tactics against the main forces of the imperialistic camp, against American imperialism, against its English and French allies, against Right-wing Socialists—first of all those in England and France.

In order to frustrate the plan of imperialistic aggression, the efforts of all democratic anti-imperialistic forces in Europe are necessary.

Right-wing Socialists are traitors in this cause. With the exception of those countries of the new democracy where the bloc of Communists and Socialists, with other democratic progressive parties, forms the foundation of resistance of these countries to imperialistic plans, Socialists in the majority of other countries, and first of all French Socialists and English Laborites—French Premier Paul Ramadier, Blum, Attlee and Bevin, by their slavishness and officiousness are facilitating the task of American capital, are encouraging it to extortions and are pushing their countries along the road of vassal dependency on the United States.

Hence it follows that a special task falls upon Communist Parties. They must take into their hands the banner of defense of national independence and sovereignty of their countries.

If the Communist Parties strongly stand on their positions, if they do not permit themselves to be frightened or blackmailed, if they stand bravely on guard for the democracy,

national sovereignty, freedom and independence of their countries, if they succeed in their struggle against the attempts of economic and political enslavement of their countries and head all forces which are ready to defend the cause of honor and national independence, then no plans for the enslavement of the countries of Europe and Asia can be realized.

At present this is one of the main tasks of Communist Parties.

It is necessary to remember that between the desire of imperialists to develop a new war and the possibility of organizing such a war there is a great gap.

The peoples of the world do not want war. The forces which stand for peace are so considerable and great that if they are firm and solid in the cause and defense of peace, if they will display firmness and solidarity, the plans of the aggressors will suffer complete collapse.

It must not be forgotten that the noise of imperialistic agents over the war danger is designed to frighten weak-nerved and unstable ones and obtain, by means of blackmail, concessions to the aggressor.

The main danger to the working class at present consists in underestimation of its forces and in overestimation of the forces of the imperialist camp.

As the Munich policy in the past unbound the hands of Hitlerite aggression, so concessions to the new course of the United States and the imperialist camp may make its in-

spirers still more insolent and aggressive.

This is why the Communist Parties must head the resistance to plans of imperialistic expansion and aggression along all lines—state, political, economic and ideological; they

must rally together, uniting their efforts on the basis of a common anti-imperialistic and democratic platform and must gather around themselves all democratic forces of the people.

their of
n and
c pla
l them
of the