

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

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

EDITORIAL BOARD

V. J. JEROME, *Editor*

ABNER W. BERRY, ALEXANDER BITTELMAN, JACK STACHEL, MAX WEISS

VOLUME XXVII, NO. 4

Contents

APRIL, 1948

The People's Victory in Czechoslovakia	<i>An Editorial</i>	291
Background of the Struggle Against Reaction In Czechoslovakia	<i>B. Vlatausky-Geminder</i>	298
The Communist Position on the Marshall Plan	<i>C.P.U.S.A.</i>	304
Bail Granted!	<i>Marion Bachrach</i>	315
On the Theoretical Work of the Party	<i>William Z. Foster</i>	319
Puerto Rico: 50 Years under American Imperialism	<i>Cesar Andreu</i>	327
American Labor and the German Working Class	<i>Joseph Clark</i>	337
On the History of Philosophy	<i>A. A. Zhdanov</i>	344
Notes on Keynes' Concepts of Saving and Investment	<i>Albert Prago</i>	367
One Year's Application of Truman's Program in Greece	<i>The Free Greece Radio</i>	376
COMMUNICATIONS:		
The Cultural Struggle in Argentina	<i>Rodolfo Ghioldi</i>	379
FROM THE TREASURY OF MARXISM:		
The Revolution of 1848 and the Proletariat	<i>Karl Marx</i>	383

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

PRINTED IN U.S.A.



602

RECENT PAMPHLETS

• • •

- | | |
|--|--------|
| THE THIRD PARTY AND THE 1948 ELECTIONS
<i>by Eugene Dennis</i> | \$.15 |
| N. Y. HERALD TRIBUNE'S 23 QUESTIONS ABOUT
THE COMMUNIST PARTY ANSWERED
<i>by William Z. Foster</i> | .10 |
| THE INGRAMS SHALL NOT DIE!
<i>by Harry Raymond</i> | .02 |
| JEWISH CULTURE IN AMERICA
<i>by Nathan Ausubel</i> | .15 |
| LABOR AND THE MARSHALL PLAN
<i>by William Z. Foster</i> | .05 |
| WHY I AM A COMMUNIST
<i>by Benjamin J. Davis</i> | .05 |
| THE RED-BAITING RACKET AND HOW IT WORKS
<i>by George Morris</i> | .10 |
| THE PALMER RAIDS
<i>Prepared by Labor Research Association</i> | .30 |
| THE THUNDER OF THE GRASS
<i>by Aaron Kramer</i> | .50 |
| ON THE THEORY OF MARXISM, Little Lenin Library
Vol. 31, <i>by Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin</i> | .15 |

•

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

THE
VIC
CZE

AN

THE M
slovak
throug
that th
most
"cold
Bohem
forme
"bastic
have a
in the
of Pr
Hitler
egy o
inheri
— the
fough
on th
and h
One
two r
battles
capital
of 184
lating
be rel
and f
years
crucia
of C

THE PEOPLE'S VICTORY IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

AN EDITORIAL

THE MID-FEBRUARY EVENTS in Czechoslovakia and their repercussions throughout the world have shown that that country has been one of the most sensitive battle-points in the "cold war." The ancient plains of Bohemia, Moravia, and Slovakia formed what Bismarck called the "bastion of Central Europe"; they have always occupied a special place in the calculations of medieval kings, of Prussian chancellors and their Hitlerian successors, and in the strategy of the Munichers. Now the inheritors of the Hitlerian ambitions — the Marshall Planners — have fought out an important engagement on this same traditional battlefield, and have suffered a severe defeat.

One hundred years ago, the first two months of 1848 opened social battles which spread to the major capitals of Europe. The epic events of 1848 showed how little the vacillating bourgeoisie of that time could be relied upon to crush aristocratic and feudal reaction. One hundred years later, at the opening of the crucial year 1948, the working class of Czechoslovakia shows how to

proceed resolutely to defeat the plot for restoring reaction and surrendering the nation to imperialism, and to press forward toward Socialism.

The imperialists of Washington and Wall Street are so haunted by images from their own past, that they insist upon recalling Munich. They try to persuade the world that another Munich has eclipsed the independence of Prague and set the stage for a third world war. This exploitation of the Munich symbol is not only grotesque when applied to the consolidation of Czechoslovak democracy—the exact opposite of the extinction of the first Republic—but, when its real content is examined, it boomerangs on those who try to use it.

At Munich, ten years ago this September, the Western powers sacrificed Czechoslovakia as a downpayment in the bargain with the fascist Axis which was to be allowed to dominate all of Eastern Europe in order to strike at the Soviet Union. By distorted reference to "Munich," the guilty men betray their own calculations and reveal their frustrations. Indeed, they expected Czechoslovakia might be used again—by them, the successors of the Axis—to break apart the fraternity of the new peoples' democracies, to subjugate all of Eastern Europe to the Marshall Plan, and thus undo the results of the anti-Hitler war and consolidate strategic war bases against the Soviet Union.

How unlike Munich are the real events of the past month in Czecho-

slovakia! This time, far from allowing themselves to be betrayed, the Czechoslovak people, under Communist leadership, took up the challenge of the pro-Munichers and won the battle decisively.

Far from allowing their country to become the bridge for the subjugation of Eastern Europe, the Czechoslovak people have strengthened the security of the new democracies.

Whereas the betrayal of Czechoslovakia in 1938-39 coincided with the collapse of the French People's Front, the fall of the Spanish Republic, and the resulting setback to the progressive forces in Western Europe, this time the victory of Czechoslovakia has the opposite effect: it throws panic into the imperialists, while stimulating and encouraging the advance of the democratic and Socialist forces in Italy and France.

By exhuming the Munich memory, which we might have expected the guilty men to leave in its Lazarene grave, the imperialists, pointing to the fact that Hitler's seizure of Czechoslovakia precipitated the Second World War, seek to make the world believe that Czechoslovakia has again been "occupied" and hence is a threat to world peace today. Of course, they prefer to keep silent about the fact that what happened in 1938 was not "seizure" pure and simple, but cold-blooded *surrender* of Czechoslovakia by the self-same imperialists of the Western "democ-

racies"—a surrender perpetrated in the name of "peace in our time."

A remembering world rejects the analogy presented by imperialism. For it is well known that the war could have been prevented, even as late as the spring of 1939, had the Western capitalist powers wished to reach an understanding with the Soviet Union and had they wished to forge a firm peace front. The Czechoslovak people certainly remember the public admission made by Benes in Chicago to the effect that the Soviet Union offered to come to the aid of Czechoslovakia, even without France, which had treacherously denounced the tripartite Mutual Assistance Pact.

The democratic forces, taking this Munich image and hurling it back at those who have exhumed it from the ugly past, draw a valuable conclusion from the experience of a decade ago. There *is* time today to mobilize the peoples into a firm peace front, to compel an American-Soviet understanding by defeating the Russia-haters in Washington, London, and Paris. There is time to organize on a much broader basis than ever before a front that can prevent the imperialists from inflicting a new edition of Munich and its aftermath on the whole world. Just as the contemporary events in Czechoslovakia represent the exact opposite of Munich, so the aftermath can and must be the exact opposite of what followed the Munich events ten years ago.

DEVE
TO

It is
of wha
to reca
postwa
ticular
democ
postwa
oslova
forma
workin
popula
the C
the or
in-exil
the ot

The
Kosice
coaliti
the na
state
agrari
of fri
Soviet
front
menta
were
ences
nation
to our

In
took
sembl
count
woul
nists,
of 37
Bohe
—we
new

DEVELOPMENTS LEADING
TO THE CRISIS

It is useful, for an understanding of what happened in Czechoslovakia, to recall some specific features of its postwar development and the particular form which the new people's democracy took in that country. The postwar reconstruction of the Czechoslovak state was undertaken by a formal united front between the working class and its allies in the popular resistance movement led by the Communists and Socialists, on the one hand, and the government-in-exile led by President Benes, on the other.

The agreement was reached at Kosice in May, 1945, outlining a coalition of all the anti-Hitler forces, the nationalization of basic industry, state planning of the economy, agrarian reform, and a foreign policy of friendship and alliance with the Soviet Union. The Kosice national front conference agreed on a parliamentary system in which all parties were pledged to settle their differences within the framework of the national front, and not by attempts to outvote one another.

In May, 1946, the first elections took place for the Constituent Assembly, charged with governing the country while the new Constitution would be prepared. The Communists, gaining a nation-wide plurality of 37 per cent—about 43 per cent in Bohemia and 30 per cent in Slovakia—were charged with forming the new government, a coalition which

included the National Socialists (Benes' party), the Social-Democrats, the Catholic People's Party, and the Slovak Democrats, as well as various non-party figures.

This coalition worked reasonably well to restore Czechoslovak production and extend democracy until last summer, when certain trends which culminated in the February crisis began to make themselves felt.

First, new problems arose in the process of realizing the Two-Year Plan. The failure to nationalize certain light industries, such as the building trades, and the continued private grip on wholesale and retail trade, when combined with the severe drought of last summer, created serious problems for the nationalized sector and the economy as a whole.

The big capitalists, who had been driven out of the nationalized sectors, concentrated on the private sectors. A black market developed which was undermining, not only the nationalization plan, but the living standards of the people. Large sums were being lost by the state through speculation abroad. This struggle of the capitalist elements against the national economy found of necessity its political expression within the coalition.

Secondly, the Marshall-Plan bribery and corruption of the Right-wing Social-Democrats in Western Europe and the emergence of the self-styled "third force" were finding their expression also among the Czech Social-Democrats, some of whom hankered to follow the ruinous example

of the Blum and Saragat Socialists. The danger sign was the victory of the Rightist and Centrist Social-Democrats at the Czech Social-Democratic Congress last autumn, which threatened the unity of the Czechoslovak trade-union movement, as well as the Socialist-Communist unity in the Parliament. In actuality, this was to be the Czechoslovak counterpart of the general Wall Street strategy in one European country after another of ordering the exclusion of Communists and Left Socialists from the Government—a strategy designed to open wide the gates for American imperialist intervention and domination.

Closely connected with this was the discovery of serious plots against the state in Slovakia, where the Slovak Democrats became the hope, not only of Right-wing forces, but of all the former quisling elements, in close contact with the Slovak fascist circles having their main center in the United States.

When the Communists proposed, for example, to speed agrarian reform or to subsidize the peasants in order to overcome the effects of the drought, they met resistance in the cabinet. For the first time there was evidence of a ganging-up by the Right-wing, monopoly, pro-fascist, and Vatican circles against Premier Gottwald and his leadership.

Gottwald himself was fully aware of the implications of this threatened paralysis of the Czechoslovak democracy. In his report to the Communist

Central Committee on November 27, 1947, he declared:

Although it is said that nobody in this country dreams of reversing our nationalized economy, we know that reaction is attempting to bring this about and to return to pre-Munich conditions. It hopes to misuse the food difficulties, and in co-operation with foreign reaction to undermine the people's democratic regime. Reactionaries on all sides will try to paralyze the activities of the Government, Parliament, and other institutions to an even greater extent than hitherto, in order to render both the Government and Parliament completely incapable of action at a given moment. Reaction is aiming at creating a government crisis at some suitable moment, in order to set up a "government of officials and experts." Politically, such a step would mean an attempt at a reactionary putsch, an attempt at a reactionary counterrevolution. Such an attempt would have to be met with an appropriate and shattering answer.

In form, the crisis was precipitated by the resignation of 12 ministers—of the National Socialist, Social-Democratic, and People's parties—over the immediate issue of a transfer of some nine police officials in the Prague area by the Minister of the Interior, Gustav Nosek.

In substance, these resignations were intended to force President Benes to dissolve the government, which no longer had a technical majority in the Parliament in view of the Right Social-Democrats' willingness to side with the other Right-

wing
ing to
also
uled
in an
much
Ho
a mat
Gottw
of the
from
Presi
clear
ment
a gov
the l
Com
holdi
ignat
popu
of th
who
Com
and
In th
the l
quic
TI
Com
tion
men
crati
head
took
pres
deep
spir
be
refu
intr
ters

wing forces. Such a dissolution, leading to a caretaker government, was also intended to move up the scheduled May elections and hold them, in an anti-Communist atmosphere, much earlier than scheduled.

How the crisis was resolved is now a matter of historical record. Premier Gottwald demanded the replacement of the political gamblers by new men from a reconstituted national front. President Benes made it immediately clear that the only legitimate government for Czechoslovakia had to be a government headed by Gottwald as the leader of the largest party, the Communist Party. While initially holding up the acceptance of the resignations, Benes realized quickly the popular will for a government rid of the quisling-minded secessionists who had plotted to force out the Communists from the government, and he acted upon that recognition. In the Social-Democratic Party, both the Left-wing and the Center united quickly against the Right-wingers.

The resolute steps taken by the Communists for the favorable solution of the crisis, were entirely parliamentary, constitutional, and democratic. The Ministry of the Interior, headed by a Communist since 1945, took elementary security measures to preserve order and investigate the deeper aspects of the reactionary conspiracy. The Army showed itself to be an army of the people; firmly refusing to become involved in the intrigues of the Right-wing ministers, it gave its loyal support to the

state. The Czechoslovak masses themselves acted with decision—through the trade-union councils which were meeting at that very moment and through their preparation for the impending peasant congress. It was the combined force of all these actions that nipped the plot in the bud.

The action committees were the specific popular instruments through which the democratic will of the broad masses expressed itself directly. These committees arose, not only in the factories, but in all public institutions and in the parties whose ministers had resigned.

The action committees expressed not only the vigilance of the people, but their desire to resolve the accumulated problems weighing down Czechoslovak democracy and make a leap forward. The action committees, assisting the security organs of the state, helped to bring about a change within the bourgeois parties—isolating the Ring-wingers and forcing a reconstitution of the national front on a new basis.

A BASIC LESSON WELL LEARNED

Taken as a whole, the Czechoslovak experience underscores one of the basic axioms which Marxism-Leninism has drawn from its scientific analysis of past history and applies to history in the making. To defend and extend the economic and political bases of the people's democracy, a people's republic must move

forward to consolidate itself, and its working class and Communist vanguard must act decisively. Wherever this is not done, the reactionary forces will gain the upper hand, and by isolating the working class and its Communist vanguard, strike at the very foundation of the people's democracy. This fundamental lesson is taught us again by the history unrolling before our eyes.

In the prewar 'thirties, the French People's Front, and particularly the Spanish People's Front, gave costly examples of the need for resolute action in defense of democracy, as the alternative to defeat by reaction and fascism.

The events in Republican Spain made a special impression in our country. Americans, remembering them, ought to be able to understand the Czechoslovak developments, despite the many differences in the internal situation and international setting.

The Spanish *Frente Popular*, which came to power by legal, constitutional means in February, 1936, was a coalition of the workers, peasants, and considerable segments of the capitalist class. It set itself the popular-democratic objectives of agrarian reform and of industrial revival by partial nationalization. But it failed to clean out the armed forces. It was all too insufficiently vigilant against the traitors within, and the working class failed to replace the vacillating elements at the helm of the republic. This was the

key factor which allowed the Franco plot to develop.

Profiting from the lessons of the past, the Czechoslovak workers and their vanguard Communist Party spared their people civil war and chaos. They gave to all peoples a fundamental lesson in how to struggle successfully today for preservation of their national integrity and sovereignty and for defeat of the imperialists who seek to dominate their country, and of the native quislings who would betray it. Their victory is therefore a victory for the democratic camp all over the world.

Henry Wallace's categorical accusation that U.S. Ambassador Steinhardt was involved in the reactionary plot against Czechoslovak democracy is borne out by the rage and fury with which the State Department and a venal press have greeted the victory of the Czechoslovak people. The cries of frustration in the capitalist press, the shameless attempt to panic the American people, and the open efforts to use the Czechoslovak developments to alibi the aggressive schemes of the bipartisan Marshall Planners in Western Europe, all testify to the interventionist role played by American imperialism in Czechoslovakia.

The arrests of important Czechoslovak figures charged with conspiring with foreign reaction will undoubtedly throw further light on the extent to which U.S. finance capital has been implicated in this conspiracy.

The
given
"car
situa
be ch
with
of U
Th
the s
Czec
of th
ing o
the c
is to
nom
keep
tries
terla
on
vaki
trial
Eur

The Marshall Planners have never given up the hope that by their "carrot and club" policy the internal situation in Czechoslovakia would be changed, and that country—along with Poland—brought into the orbit of U.S. domination.

The U.S. monopolies well realize the strategic economic importance of Czechoslovakia. The economic heart of the Marshall Plan is the rebuilding of German heavy industry under the control of Wall Street. Germany is to act as the lever for U.S. economic domination of Europe by keeping the Eastern European countries in the position of agrarian hinterlands dependent, as in the past, on German industry. Czechoslovakia is the most advanced industrial country in Central and Eastern Europe, apart from the U.S.S.R. The

peaceful industrial development of Czechoslovakia will be an important factor in dooming the Marshall Plan and the Wall Street ambitions in Europe.

This is the basis of the arrogant interference of the State Department in Czechoslovakian affairs. This is the true background of the frenzied cries of "Soviet expansionism" and the baseless, miserable charges leveled against the U.S.S.R. in the United Nations, cooked up by the hirelings and stooges of Wall Street. But no provocations, no saber-rattling will stop the onward march of the People's Democracies. And no Truman-manufactured crisis or hysterical militarization, no beating of war-drums will drown out the demand of the American people for peace and friendship among nations.

IF ONE CHOSE TO BE AN OX . . .

"If one chose to be an ox one could of course turn one's back on the agonies of mankind and look after one's own skin."

Karl Marx to S. Meyer, April 30, 1867.

BACKGROUND OF THE STRUGGLE AGAINST REACTION IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA*

BY B. VLATAVSKY-GEMINDER

LAST YEAR Czechoslovakia, like many many other European countries, experienced a drought which ruined the country's crop. The damage caused our economy amounted to 15,000 million kron, the equivalent of nearly one-fourth of our budget.

The crop failure, naturally, affected the standard of living.

International reaction and its Czechoslovak agents, who in pursuit of their anti-popular and anti-state plans, take advantage of every difficulty encountered by the people's democratic state, were in their element. The drought and its consequences offered excellent opportunities for their activities.

During the two and a half years of the people's democratic Czechoslovakia, reaction waged an offensive struggle in the course of which it suffered constant defeat. Dealt devastating blows, the economic and political base of reaction steadily narrowed.

The explanation of this successful struggle of the people's democratic regime against the forces of reaction lies in the increased output of industry, which has reached the pre-

war level, and in the fulfillment of the Two-Year Plan. Goals were exceeded during the first year of the Plan, an achievement which made it possible to raise the standard of living. The new democratic regime had demonstrated that it could run the country better than the capitalists.

Reaction in Czechoslovakia placed high hopes on the drought. Reaction calculated that by skilful maneuvering it could switch to the offensive, bring about a favorable change in the relation of forces in the Republic, and restore Czechoslovakia to the old pre-Munich capitalist order.

In his New Year's message Comrade Gottwald, summing up the policy of reaction, quoted reaction's own slogan: "The worse for the people, the better for us, that is, for reaction." In practice this policy reflected itself in efforts to sabotage grain deliveries by the peasants and to divert the maximum amount of agricultural products and manufactured goods to the black market. In this way reaction hoped to see a breakdown in the food supply system.

At the same time reaction calculated that the crop failure would

* Reprinted from *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy*, organ of the Communist Information Bureau, Belgrade, No. 6, February 1, 1948.

seriously affect the entire economic life of the country. Typical of its methods was the policy of undermining the favorable development of the currency system by making demagogic demands on the government. Such, for instance, was the purpose of the demand made at the end of last year by the leadership of the National Socialist Party that civil servants be given a retroactive thirty per cent wage increase, to date from January 1, 1947. The National-Socialist leadership refused to recognize the fact that twice in the course of the year civil servants had received special bonuses. Such, too, was the purpose of reaction's attempts to get the government to cover the emergency expenditure of 6,500 million kronas for the purchase of grain and relief for the peasants who were hit hardest by the drought. The reactionaries opposed the Communist Party's proposal to tax property and the profits of millionaires, a proposal which was later adopted by the government.

By throwing the supply system and finances out of gear, and by undermining the country's economy, the reactionaries hoped to arouse the dissatisfaction of the people and to use this to set one section of the people against the other, mainly the workers against the peasants, with the aim of weakening and disrupting the firm alliance of workers, peasants, handicraftsmen, small shopkeepers, and intelligentsia.

Reaction likewise aimed at utilizing the difficulties caused by the

drought to secure a change in foreign policy and tried to get Czechoslovakia to adhere to the Marshall Plan. This, had it succeeded, would have spelt the end of our country's freedom and national independence, and would have seriously undermined the foundations of its security.

The underlying principle of reaction's whole policy was to discredit the people's democratic regime and the government of the National Front, headed by the Communist Party—the Party which shoulders the main responsibility for the consolidation of the Republic—and, by staging a reactionary coup d'état, to restore capitalism.

REACTION'S OPPOSITION TO THE NATIONAL FRONT

Both foreign and domestic reactionary circles relied on certain parties in the National Front. At first the Czechoslovak reactionaries tried to form their own party, which would oppose the National Front. However, after some vacillation the reactionary forces in the country took the line of infiltrating into the parties of the National Front, of occupying executive positions in these parties, and in this way exercising a decisive influence on their policy.

In this respect the National Socialist and People's (Catholic) Parties in Czechia and in Slovakia the Democratic Party, proved to be the least steadfast.

It will be appreciated that infil-

tration by reactionary elements into some of the parties of the National Front had negative consequences, affected the activity of the Front and hampered its endeavor to surmount the difficulties caused by the drought and the crop failure.

"For many months now," stated the Executive Committee of the Communist Party in a message to the membership, published on January 3, "the state of growing tension in the National Front threatens to break out into a crisis when major problems are tackled. The reason for this is that the reactionary elements, who have penetrated into the parties of the National Front, are, to an ever greater extent, influencing the policy of these parties, and are intensifying their undermining activities in accord with, and on the orders of, foreign reaction."

Exposing the plans of domestic and foreign reaction, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia is rallying the democratic forces for the further consolidation of the people's democratic regime and its political foundation in the National Front.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Party held in November, Comrade Gottwald pointed out that reaction was trying to bring about a government crisis so as afterwards to form a government of officials, that is, a government without Communists. Gottwald described this policy as "a desire to organize a reactionary putsch, to effect a coup d'état." He declared unequivocally that any attempt of this kind would

meet with a fitting rebuff and that it would spell a "dangerous risk" for reaction.

Subsequent developments in Czechoslovakia showed that Comrade Gottwald's words were properly appreciated.

At the same time, the Communist Party advanced a concrete program for surmounting the economic difficulties and for ensuring the further development of the national economy and the Republic.

The Party insisted that the task was to supply the people with provisions, which must be secured primarily at the expense of internal resources. The Party has mobilized all its organizations to carry out this important task, and, with the help of the national committees and emergency commissions, completed the task in the main. By the end of the year the plan for grain deliveries in Czechia had been three-quarters realized, while in Slovakia, of the goal of 7,000 carloads of grain, fixed by the government, 6,300 were delivered to the state.

Of enormous significance in regulating the question of supplies was the help given by the Soviet Union in the form of grain and fodder. Last November, Prime Minister Gottwald submitted a request to Generalissimo Stalin that the grain promised by the Soviet Government be increased by another 150,000 tons. Five days later came the reply. Generalissimo Stalin, on behalf of the Soviet Government, responded by saying that Czechoslovakia would receive an-

other 200,000 tons of grain, that is, 50,000 tons more than was asked for by the Czechoslovak Government. This generous act of the Soviet Government made it possible fully to meet the needs of the population.

The people of Czechoslovakia are well aware of the difference between Soviet aid and the "aid" of the American imperialists. Soviet aid is based on mutual economic co-operation and on sincere friendship. "Had there been another government foreign policy," stated Comrade Gottwald, "the bread, which we would have been forced to buy somewhere abroad, and for which we would have had to pay body and soul, would have tasted very bitter."

EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF GOODS

The crop failure was followed by a shortage of manufactured goods. In view of this the Executive Committee of the Communist Party advanced the important task of bringing order into the system of distribution and of preventing goods, intended for general consumption, from being diverted to the black market. The Executive Committee likewise outlined the main principles for reorganizing the system of distribution.

The proper distribution of textiles, of which there was a particularly acute shortage, was most important. The suggestions made by the Executive Committee in this connection called for the creation of a central

board which would justly and systematically distribute textile goods among the regional distributors, under the control of the national committees. There were 1,100 private wholesale dealers in textiles in Czechia and it was suggested that their number be reduced by at least a thousand through the medium of regional distributors.

Despite the bitter opposition offered by reaction and its agents in some of the parties in the National Front, the Communist proposals were accepted by the Government. Thanks to these measures, the distribution of textile goods is all but completely out of the hands of the private merchants. This represents a big victory, which has further restricted the economic base of reaction.

The disastrous drought and the struggle to surmount its consequences were a serious trial for the people. It can be said that the new democratic order, the Gottwald government, and the Communist Party have come through with flying colors. The plans of reaction were reduced to nought; the measures taken to remedy the consequences of the drought brought no discredit to the people's democracy. On the contrary, these measures increased the confidence of the people in the Government which, under the leadership of the Communist Party and with the active support of the people, was able to cope with the critical situation better than any other regime which formerly existed in Czechoslovakia.

STRENGTHENING THE NATIONAL FRONT

In the political sphere the further development of the people's democratic order depends on consolidating the alliance between the workers and peasants, on the unity of all the working people, as reflected in the National Front. The Communist Party is conducting a resolute struggle to cleanse the National Front of reactionary elements and to promote its further progress.

The anti-State conspiracy discovered in Slovakia last summer showed that reaction still wields considerable influence in some of the parties belonging to the National Front. The conspirators were defended, not only by the leadership of the Slovak Democratic Party, which had collaborated with them, and which made it possible for them to penetrate into the State apparatus, into political life, and even into Parliament. They were also defended by the leaders of the National Socialist Party and the People's (Catholic) Party, who feared that a defeat for the conspirators in Slovakia would weaken the anti-Communist front throughout the country.

Reactionary influences among certain parties of the National Front are also evidenced by the following fact. At a meeting of the agricultural department of the Executive Committee of the National Socialist Party, one of its leaders, formerly a leader of the Agrarian Party, which has been banned, called for "skilful ma-

neuvering in the matter of poor crops." The essence of this "skilful maneuvering" was made clear afterwards, not only by many active members of this party, but also by some of its Parliamentary deputies who had called upon the peasants to sabotage the delivery of agricultural supplies to the state.

In these circumstances there is a special danger in the fact that the leadership of certain parties betrays a tendency to transform the National Front into a bargaining coalition of Party leaders. They would like to see expelled from the Front such popular organizations as the United Trade Unions, numbering 2,500,000 members, the United Peasant Union, the Union of Co-operative organizations, etc.

In view of the fact that such tendencies endanger the very existence of the Front, the Executive Committee of the Communist Party at its meeting in November called upon all honest Czechs and Slovaks, irrespective of party affiliation, to fight for the elimination of reactionary influences in the National Front, influences which cause disintegration and undermine the Front.

At the moment, a bitter struggle is being waged against reaction in Czechoslovakia. If, in the Government and in Parliament, reaction sometimes succeeds in retarding the work, quite a different picture is presented by the genuine National Front—the alliance of workers, peasants, intelligentsia, handicraftsmen, small merchants, and all genuine

democrats and patriots who are fighting for the Plan, for supplying the people with necessities, for the development of the people's democracy, and for the honor and independence of their country. It is precisely this Front that demonstrated its strength and might in the tax-the-millionaires struggle and that secured order in the system of distribution. Relying on the masses, united in the National Front, the Communist Party put through these measures, despite the fact that in the beginning the majority of Government members opposed the Communist Party proposals.

Alas for the hopes that both foreign and home-bred reaction reposed in the consequences of the unprecedented crop failure! Reaction had imagined that all that was necessary was a skilful maneuver, sabotage of Government measures, and the fomenting of discord and economic chaos, in order to make the crop failure an insurmountable obstacle for the popular democratic regime,

and to bring about its downfall and pave the way for the return of the capitalist system.

But the popular democratic regime, under the leadership of the Czechoslovakian Communist Party, not only succeeded in overcoming the main difficulties; it utilized the struggle to overcome these difficulties in order to deliver new blows at reaction, to expose its agents among the parties belonging to the Front, and to increase the faith of the working people in the Communist Party.

Proof of this is the fact that the membership of the Communist Party has increased. The membership of the Party in Czechia is now over 1,300,000. In the month of November alone, nearly 62,000 new members joined the ranks of the Communist Party.

The successes achieved by the popular democratic regime in the struggle to eliminate the aftermath of the drought provide a base for further victorious struggle against reaction, for its final and complete elimination.

COMMUNIST POSITION ON THE MARSHALL PLAN

STATEMENT OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A., TO THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON THE PROPOSED EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM*

THE COMMUNIST PARTY of the United States of America opposes enactment of the Bill known as the "European Recovery Program." This legislation is not intended to bring about the economic recovery of Europe. On the contrary, it is an extension of the notorious Truman Doctrine, a vital part of our Government's reactionary "cold war" against the Soviet Union, the new democracies of Eastern Europe, and the peoples' movements all over the world, including the United States. Its principal objective is to rebuild western Germany's industrial war potential and to convert the Ruhr into an arsenal for World War III. It is designed to prop up the tottering capitalist system in Europe, halt the march of the peoples of Western Europe toward Socialism, and underwrite the dividends of American and West-European monopolists. It is designed to subvert the national sovereignty of the countries of Western Europe and place them under the domination of Wall Street. It is aimed at building up an anti-Soviet Western bloc in order to facilitate Wall Street's drive to world

domination and its preparations for a new world war.

The Marshall Plan will likewise have the most devastating effect upon the American people. It is directly opposed to the people's demand for peace, democracy, and security. It is accompanied on the home front by a staggering military budget, in contrast to the pitiful sums meted out for fulfillment of the pressing social needs of the people for all forms of social security, health and educational facilities, and child welfare. It will expand the already swollen war economy of the United States and cut deeply into the living standards of the people by drastically increasing the unprecedented inflation which already exists because of the unbridled profiteering of the trusts and the complete absence of all democratic price controls. It is inseparable from the program of the employers, as voiced before this committee by various spokesmen, for wage freezes, longer hours, and speedup. As a result, it will accelerate the outbreak of a new economic crisis in the United States with all its misery and suffering for the people.

Enactment of the Marshall Plan,

* Submitted February 17, 1948.

the war program of Wall Street, will result in a still more rapid militarization of the civilian life of our country. Universal military training, appointment of army and navy officers to important government posts, military supervision of factories and introduction of a blacklist under the smokescreen of war orders and government contracts, are leading in the direction of the complete militarization of our country as part of the drive against all democratic and civil liberties. Hence, it will accelerate the drive toward the establishment of a full-fledged police state in the United States.

E.R.P. NOT CONCERNED WITH EUROPEAN RECOVERY

That the present bill is not concerned with the economic recovery of Europe is shown by the following:

1) The Truman Administration and the bipartisan coalition in Congress have worked consistently since the end of the war to prevent the recovery of Europe. They abruptly terminated lend-lease before the countries of Europe could begin to make the transition from war to peace. They torpedoed U.N.R.R.A. shortly after the end of the war, despite the fact that the Director of U.N.R.R.A., the late Fiorello LaGuardia, insisted upon the absolute need for its continuance. They did this to prolong hunger and misery, hoping that the suffering peoples of Europe and Asia would thereby become more amenable to proposals that they abandon their programs for new social advance—agrarian reform,

nationalization, progress to Socialism—and barter their birthright of independence for a mess of Wall Street pottage. They have done everything in their power to split Europe by pitting Western against Eastern Europe, thereby creating the major obstacle to the economic recovery of Europe.

2) The Truman Administration and the bipartisan coalition in Congress have consistently used loans, not for purposes of economic recovery, but as a political weapon. American loans have been used to extort economic and political concessions from various countries and to spur attacks upon the democratic and peoples' movements of these countries. This is clearly seen in the refusal to grant loans to the Soviet Union and the new peoples' democracies of Eastern Europe, at the same time that lavish loans have been granted to the reactionary Chiang Kai-shek and the fascist Greek governments for their civil wars against the peoples of China and Greece. It is seen in the loan extended to the police state, Turkey, which assisted Hitler during the war, in order to strengthen it as a military outpost for a projected war against the Soviet Union. It is seen in the political conditions and economic concessions demanded and received from Britain, France, Belgium, Italy, and other West-European countries in return for loans extended to them. It is seen in the ouster of Communists from the Cabinets of France and Italy at the dictates of the State Department in return for loans to these countries.

3) The Truman Administration and the reactionary bipartisan coalition in Congress have been carrying on a "cold war" against the countries that have made the greatest strides toward economic recovery in Europe, namely, the Soviet Union and the new peoples' democracies of Eastern Europe. They have been carrying on political warfare against the Communist parties of Western Europe, despite the fact that these parties have advanced the only programs capable of bringing about economic recovery—agrarian reform, nationalization of key industries, and national economic planning.

4) The Truman Administration and Congress have deliberately by-passed the machinery that was set up by the United Nations for collective efforts to achieve economic recovery in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The present bill, like its progenitor, the Truman Doctrine, is a unilateral action by the United States. When the Truman Doctrine was made public, it was stated that "economic aid" to Greece and Turkey (in reality, military aid) could not be sponsored through the United Nations because, allegedly, the U.N. could not act swiftly enough. Even at that time this was a lame and hypocritical excuse. Today, nobody even dares to advance that explanation for by-passing the U.N. Today, it is asserted that the U.N. has been by-passed because some U.N. members are not part of the E.R.P. and because some nations participating in the E.R.P. are not members of the U.N.

But this is a specious and hypocritical excuse. This consideration has never before prevented our government from using the machinery of the United Nations. At this very moment, the State Department is attempting to push through a World Trade Charter at the United Nations-sponsored conference in Havana, despite the fact that some members of the U.N. are not part of the conference, while other countries which are part of the conference are not members of the U.N. Clearly, the U.N. is not being by-passed for the reason publicly advanced, but because the State Department considers that the U.N. acts as something of an obstacle to the swift realization of its plans for establishing its imperialist domination over the world.

DESIGNED TO REBUILD GERMANY'S WAR POTENTIAL

That the present bill is designed to rebuild the industrial war potential of Western Germany, specifically the Ruhr, under the domination of American trusts and banks, is shown by the following:

1) Despite verbal disclaimers, it is an actual fact that Western Germany is being restored along its pre-war pattern as the keystone of European economy. The new levels of industry, set by Anglo-American authorities in violation of the Potsdam agreement, aim to restore German industry to the levels existing in 1936, a year when Hitler's armament program was already in full blast.

2) The report of the Harriman Committee established priority for aid to Germany as one of its most fundamental principles. It stated:

In addition, the program written at Paris may have to be modified by a shift in the amounts going to the separate countries. As this shift is made, we believe that the amount of aid allotted to Germany may have to be higher than was set at Paris.

3) This principle of priority to Western Germany has been incorporated in the present bill. It would, in its over-all operation, taking into account supplementary appropriations indirectly funnelled into Germany through American occupation forces, allocate the largest sum of money to Western Germany.

This is clear from an examination of the E.R.P. as it will operate during the first 15-month period.

During the first 15 months, the following sums will be distributed to the three top recipients, according to the *United States News-World Report* for January 23, 1948:

Britain	\$1,132,200,000
France	1,261,000,000
Western Germany	764,700,000

In addition to the above sum for Germany, the U.S. will also finance a deficit of \$230,200,000 which western Germany will have with countries other than the U.S. On top of that, there is also being requested an Army appropriation of \$822,000,000 for "the prevention of disease and unrest" in Germany. This makes a grand total for Germany for the first

15 months of \$1,816,900,000—by far the largest sum allotted to any country under the Marshall Plan.

A STRAIT-JACKET ON RECIPIENT COUNTRIES' ECONOMY

That the present bill is designed to strait-jacket the economic development of the participating countries, thus undermining the basis for their national sovereignty, is shown by the following:

1) The bill insists that recipient countries must, in effect, restrict themselves to the use of *existing* facilities. But these facilities were created prior to the war when most of Europe was dependent upon German industry. Hence, the bill would perpetuate the economic dependence of these countries, with this important difference: today, the industries of Western Germany are controlled by American capital, and the dependence of these countries (including Western Germany) would be upon the United States.

2) By limiting the countries of Western Europe to the use of existing facilities, the bill would effectively prevent the planned development of new industries needed by them to assure the economic basis for their national sovereignty. France, for example, would be prevented from breaking with its prewar, and present, dependence on the German steel industry in the Ruhr.

As to the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe, the bill is diametrically opposed to their policy of overcoming the economic

limitations imposed by existing facilities through rapid and increasing capital investment in new industries. These countries could participate in the Marshall Plan only at the price of an agreement to act as the agrarian hinterland of Western Europe, an agreement which they naturally and rightfully reject.

3) Limitation of Marshall Plan countries to existing facilities is enforced by prohibition of any large-scale new capital investments. The Marshall Plan countries are criticized because of what are alleged to be "too ambitious" plans for "housing, industrial equipment and expansion, development of utilities and reconstruction." New capital investment is called "inflationary" and said to be in "conflict" with production for consumer needs and exports. In the same vein, the listing of needs by the sixteen Marshall Plan countries is criticized because the proposed rate of capital formation is "excessive."

In line with this criticism, the present bill revises downward even the limited proposals for capital development originally advanced at the Paris Conference. It states flatly that the United States will not send any equipment requested for hydroelectric development or steel mill expansion; that it will give low priority to capital expenditure for housing or for mechanization of agriculture. The only capital expenditures that will be given any priority will be those for coal, fertilizer, inland freight, transport, steel, and mining machinery—none of which can be

utilized to expand industrial capacity or to construct new industries. In quantity and kind, steel shipments—mostly finished items—will be such as to prevent expansion of the steel industries of these countries. And the price of receiving American ships is the curtailment of the scale of operation of the ship-building industries of Europe.

In their totality, these limitations upon capital expenditures effectively prohibit the countries participating in the Marshall Plan from undertaking national industrial development plans based on their national needs and requisite for defense of their national sovereignty. Furthermore, they effectively prevent the development of those industries that are competitive with American industries, thus directly benefiting American trusts and monopolies.

UNDERMINING THE NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY OF THE PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES

That the present bill is designed to undermine the national sovereignty of the participating countries by compelling them to sign bilateral agreements which convert them into helpless dependencies of the United States, is shown by the following:

1) The participating countries must agree to make "efficient use" of the commodities made available and to take "necessary measures" to achieve a self-sustaining economy. Since the interpretation of what constitutes "efficiency" and "necessity" will be made by the United States, the countries receiving such com-

modities must surrender the freedom to make their own decisions concerning utilization of materials received.

2) The participating countries must make a deposit of local currency equal to grants received in a special account to be used only for purposes agreed to by the U.S. Obviously this creates an enormous currency pool in each participating country which can be manipulated by the United States to obtain any advantage desired by American trusts and monopolies.

3) The participating countries agree to undertake financial and monetary measures "to stabilize currencies and rates of exchange" and monetary and fiscal measures to stabilize "price and cost structures." Since these measures will in the final analysis be determined by the United States, the agreements actually provide for American supervision of government economic policies in a manner in no wise different from the supervision exercised in a colony or dependency.

4) The participating countries must agree to reduce tariff barriers and abolish import quotas in accord with the Charter now being discussed at the Havana conference on International Trade and Employment. As a result, they must agree to render themselves helpless before the competition of products manufactured by the giant industries of the United States.

5) The participating countries must sell to the United States such raw and strategic materials as the United States requests for stockpiling

purposes. Such an agreement throws open the natural resources of these countries and their colonies to whatever demands this country may see fit to make. It becomes another lever to determine the direction of economic development of these countries at the same time that it speeds up Wall Street's preparations for a new war.

6) The participating countries must permit representatives of our government and Congressional committees "to observe and advise and report" on the distribution of commodities. This, taken together with their obligation to permit representatives of the American press and radio to "observe and report," constitutes an agreement by them to open their doors to a flood of American pro-consuls roaming their countries as though they were colonies or dependencies.

7) Finally, the participating countries may be disqualified by the United States, if in its opinion the agreement is not being adhered to. This condition is obviously a club constantly held over the heads of the participating countries to ensure compliance with any demands which the United States government may make upon the participating country.

The nature of the demands which will be made are obvious from those that have already been made. In France and Italy, the State Department has demanded changes in the composition of the governments of these countries, as was seen in the ouster of Communists from the Cabinets of those countries. In France

and Italy, as well as in England, the State Department has demanded and secured a halt to the original plans for nationalization of key industries.

Now, Secretary of Defense Forrestal, in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, states openly that "beneficiary" nations will be asked to make military and naval bases available to the U.S. in return for loans extended under the Marshall Plan, while Dulles and Baruch have openly voiced demands for a military alliance with the United States.

E.R.P. AIMS TO FORGE REACTIONARY WESTERN BLOC

That the present bill is designed to weld the participating countries into a Western bloc, under the domination of Wall Street, directed against the Soviet Union and the new peoples' democracies of Eastern Europe, is shown by the following:

1) The obvious intention of the bill is to exclude the Soviet Union and the East-European democracies from receiving any loans. The conditions of the bill are such as to make it impossible for these countries to participate, except on condition of surrendering their right to advance along the new social, economic, and political paths they have charted for themselves.

2) The economic strait-jacket which has been placed on the participating countries in respect to capital development narrows the basis for large-scale economic intercourse between the countries of Western

Europe and the countries of Eastern Europe. The bill speaks about the resumption of the prewar "normal pattern" of east-west commercial relations. This prewar "normal pattern," however, was based on the exploitation of the countries of Eastern Europe—except for the Soviet Union—by German, English, French, Italian, and American capital. As a result, they were compelled to act as an agrarian hinterland for Western Europe. Today, these countries are interested in exporting their raw materials and agricultural products in return for machinery and other capital equipment. The present bill makes it practically impossible for the countries of Western Europe to export large volumes of capital goods. Hence, the basis for any large-scale east-west trade is undermined by the present bill, which sets Western Europe against Eastern Europe.

3) The public statements of the Administration have made it clear that, far from envisaging any unity between the countries of Western Europe and those of Eastern Europe, the present bill is part and parcel of the "cold war" against the Soviet Union and the new peoples' democracies. President Truman, in his message of transmittal of this bill, declared that the Marshall Plan is a "vital part of our foreign policy." The whole world knows that this foreign policy is a policy aimed to promote war against the Soviet Union and the new peoples' democracies.

Secretary of Defense Forrestal further underlined the war aims of the

present legislation when he asserted in his testimony before the Senate Committee that if this bill were not enacted an equivalent sum would have to be spent for increased armaments. Now it is ridiculous to assert that any country is threatening the U.S. with war. It is, on the contrary, the American trusts and monopolies which are threatening the rest of the world with war. Nor will anyone in his right mind believe that military expenditures for war preparations by the United States have been in any way limited by the prospects of enacting this or any other legislation. The eleven billion dollar direct military appropriation asked for in President Truman's budget message is sufficient testimony to that. The significance of Secretary Forrestal's testimony is that it reveals the Marshall Plan to be part of the preparations of the government for war. The appropriation asked by President Truman for direct military preparations and the appropriation asked by him for the Marshall Plan are two sides of the same coin.

EFFECT OF MARSHALL PLAN ON U. S. ECONOMY

The effects of the Marshall Plan upon the American people will be as disastrous as its effects upon the peoples of the world. Economically, it will act as a powerful stimulus to the unprecedented inflation which already exists. The inflationary character of the Marshall Plan does not, as has been alleged, stem from the mere fact that large-scale loans will be made to other countries. Under

conditions which the Communist Party has already advocated, such large-scale loans can be made without inflationary effects.

The Marshall Plan will have a direct inflationary effect because it is part of, and is based upon, the already swollen war economy of the United States. This war economy diverts necessary materials into industries producing for the gigantic military establishment of our country as well as for the shipment of vast military supplies to reactionary forces all over the world. As a result, even within the framework of the shortages deliberately created by the policies of the trusts in restricting production (as in the steel industry), additional shortages are created in relation to the demand for various products. In the absence of necessary democratic price controls, and as a direct result of the limitless profiteering of the trusts and the speculation in foodstuffs by the wealthy, prices are continuing to soar, cutting into the pay envelopes and living standards of the mass of American people.

On the other hand, the great banks, trusts, and monopolies stand to make enormous profits as a result of the Marshall Plan. In fact, one of the essential functions of the Marshall Plan is to act as a government subsidy for the export trade of the United States. This export trade has been declining very seriously in the past months because of the so-called "dollar shortage" of other countries. But behind this "dollar shortage" stands the one-way character of American capitalism's foreign trade

—exports without imports. The Marshall Plan is intended to take up the slack in exports, at the expense of the people, in order to maintain the high level of capitalist profits.

No matter to what degree the Marshall Plan lessens in the immediate future the decline in exports, it will not be able to prevent or seriously retard the outbreak of a cyclical economic crisis in the near future which will bring untold suffering to the masses of the people. In fact, by the very limitations which it places upon the export of capital goods, the Marshall Plan prevents the expansion of the market for those industries which are decisive in precipitating an economic crisis of over-production—the heavy capital goods industries such as steel, machinery, chemicals, etc. Furthermore, whatever the form of administration finally decided upon, the Marshall Plan is designed to give the giant monopolies new and greater powers in the economic life of our country. But it is the policies of these trusts which are accelerating the rush to a new economic crisis. Hence, it is a cruel fraud and a callous deception of the American people to assert that the Marshall Plan will prevent or delay the outbreak of an economic crisis. On the contrary, it will accelerate the outbreak of the crisis.

MARSHALL PLAN INTENSIFIES REACTIONARY OFFENSIVE HERE

The Marshall Plan will result in an intensification of the drive at

home toward reaction and fascism. For the Marshall Plan is part and parcel of the reactionary drive which is transforming the United States into a typical police state. The militarization of our country is already at a very advanced stage. Witness the constant placement of Army and Navy officers in the State Department and other important civilian posts, the vesting of unprecedentedly broad powers over the civilian life of our country in the new Department of National Defense, the direct intervention of the military in the supervision of factories and plants with a resultant reintroduction of the "blacklist" under the smokescreen of "security regulations," military subsidization and control of scientific research, etc. The proposal of the Administration for the enactment of Universal Military Training is part of this general pattern.

This militarization of our country's civilian life corresponds to the general assault upon the democratic rights and liberties of the American people now being carried on through the Taft-Hartley Law; the President's witch-hunting loyalty oath; the fascist persecution of all progressives by the Thomas-Rankin Un-American Committee; the lynchings and terrorization of the Negro people; the deportation drive against the foreign-born; and the persecution of Eugene Dennis, General Secretary of the Communist Party, as well as of Alexander Bittelman, Claudia Jones, and John Williamson, members of the National Committee of the Communist Party.

THE STRUGGLES OF THE COMMUNISTS EVERYWHERE FOR GENUINE ECONOMIC RECONSTRUCTION

The Communist Party of the United States reaffirms its conviction that our country must use its great wealth and resources to help the peoples of the world in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America to recover from the ravages of war and to reconstruct their economies in their own freely determined direction. This is a moral obligation of the United States; it is in the best national interests of our country.

It is a malicious and deliberate lie to assert that the Communists either in the United States or abroad oppose measures for the economic recovery of Europe because they want chaos in order to advance their aims.

The public record of the Communists in Western Europe shows that they took the lead, immediately upon the end of the war, in mobilizing the people of their countries to rebuild industry and agriculture in their respective countries. It was only to the degree that the policies advanced by their Communist Parties were adopted that the countries of Western Europe succeeded in making headway in the work to overcome the ravages and devastation of the war. These policies are based on making new social advances through breaking the power of the monopolists and landlords, by carrying out measures of agrarian reform and nationalization of the key industries.

The obstacles to economic recovery

in Western Europe have come from the big trusts and monopolies and their agents, the Right-wing Social-Democratic leaders. They deliberately sabotaged production in industry and agriculture in order to utilize the economic hardships of the people in their struggle against nationalization of industries, against agrarian reform, against all the new steps of social advance demanded by the people and fought for by the Communists. In this, they were guided and stimulated by Wall Street and its puppet Truman Administration which threw untold obstacles in the way of economic recovery in Europe by abruptly terminating Lend-Lease, scuttling U.N.R.R.A., and attempting to prop up the tottering capitalist system which breeds economic chaos.

The agents of chaos in the United States are likewise the big trusts and monopolies. Their policies are accelerating the mad rush of our country to the cyclical crisis which is inevitable under capitalism.

In contrast to the policies of the trusts and their political representatives in the government and Congress, the Communist Party of the United States fights for a foreign and domestic policy which will maintain peace, speed economic recovery in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America, protect the American people from the dire effects of inflation as well as from the worst ravages of the inevitable economic crisis in the U.S., advance democracy, and hasten the day when the American people will by their own free decision abolish capitalism—the fundamental

cause of war and economic chaos—and establish Socialism in the United States.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY PROPOSES

In the immediate situation, the C.P.U.S.A. is of the firm opinion that the economic recovery of Europe as well as the general interests of the American people, can be served only by defeating the Marshall Plan, now presented in legislative form, and substituting for it new legislative proposals. These have been outlined in their major aspects in the letter sent to all members of Congress during the previous Special Session of Congress.

This letter demanded that:

1) Congress should restore rationing and price control of essential foods, steel, fuel, and all building materials, and roll prices back to the level of June, 1946. It should prohibit speculation in grains and livestock. It should adopt tax reforms that will exempt low income groups, restore the excess profits tax, and abolish all withholding and sales taxes.

2) Congress should declare its support for the restoration of the United

Nations administration of economic relief and rehabilitation to foreign nations. For this specific purpose Congress should now appropriate an adequate fund and place it at the exclusive disposal of the appropriate United Nations agencies for use in 1948. Administration of this economic aid should give priority to those nations which made the greatest contribution to victory and suffered the worst devastation in the anti-Axis war. The aid should be non-military and should be administered by the United Nations under conditions that will fully protect the national sovereignty of all the recipient countries and speed their rehabilitation.

3) Congress should defeat all proposed measures for implementing any aspect of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan—no matter in what guise this reactionary imperialist program is presented by the Administration or the Republican-dominated Congressional Committees.

These are the elements of a program which corresponds to the interests of the American people. The Communist Party fights for the enactment of such a program.

"In politics utopia is a wish that can never come true, neither now nor hereafter—a wish that is not based on social forces and that derives no strength from the growth and the development of political, class forces."

V. I. Lenin, "Two Utopias" (Article written in 1912).

BAIL GRANTED!

By MARION BACHRACH

UNABLE TO RIDE FORTH like modern Paul Reveres, five political prisoners in Tom Clark's Ellis Island concentration camp last month found other means to arouse the American people to the new dangers of fascism that threaten.

On March 1, the five began a courageous hunger strike, determined to defend the Bill of Rights by winning their release on bail, and winning it quickly.

Through the six days of their self-imposed fast, the men on the Island grew wan and weak. But outside, the mass movement against the Truman Administration's deportation delirium was gaining strength, nourished by their indomitable spirit.

In a race with time, the five staked their lives on the ability of the gathering people's counter-offensive to set back the bipartisan drive to a police state. On March 6, their faith was proved justified.

These hunger strikers are working-class leaders. Their prison cell held a microcosm of the world camp of peace and progress. Everywhere it is the unity of Communists and non-Communists that generates political initiative and gives effective challenge to the forces of reaction, fascism, and war.

So it was on the Island. Ferdinand Smith, Irving Potash, and Charles Doyle are progressive trade union

leaders. Potash and John Williamson are members of the National Board of the Communist Party. Smith is a national leader of the Negro people. These four have spent their lives in the service of the American working class and people. Their battle posts are here. And here they mean to stay, fighting with their trade union brothers for peace, economic security, and social progress.

When Hitler came to power, the German Communist Gerhart Eisler was forced to carry on in exile his long struggle against Nazism. Himself innocent of his people's war guilt, Eisler seeks to participate in its expiation through the building of a democratic Germany. Eisler's battle post is in his own country; he is fighting Hitler's American disciples who would keep him from it.

These five are among the more than thirty Communist and non-Communist progressives already arrested on trumped-up deportation charges, while Tom Clark prepares to tick off some thirty-eight more, marked for early victimization.

Today's bipartisan political persecution of the foreign-born is but the prelude to intensified political persecution of American citizens. That is why it was so imperative to prevent the Attorney General from achieving his immediate objective in the case of the five hunger strikers.

That immediate objective was to establish a precedent for suspending the right to habeas corpus and release on bail pending trial. The Constitution guarantees these basic rights to *all persons*, without distinction be-

tween native and foreign-born. Acting as the agent of a sinister bipartisan conspiracy, the Attorney General thought to breach the Bill of Rights by denying its protection to Communists and alleged Communists, non-citizens and alleged non-citizens.

The hunger strikers, and the mass movement that rallied to them, blocked this criminal attempt. The courts have still to accept this people's victory and declare the right to bail a fixed policy in all political cases—an inalienable right beyond the reach of any government agency. But more than temporary bail was won in the six-day hunger strike. The people won a strong position, from which they can advance the fight for civil liberties.

Of course, the architects of an American form of fascism pursue other objectives of longer range. The whole deportation hysteria is a calculated effort to disarm the democratic vigilance of the American people by painting as "un-American" and "alien" the Communists, Left-progressives, and all militant opponents of the Truman-Hoover Doctrine and Marshall-Vandenberg Plan.

This is the softening-up stage, preparatory to larger-scale reactionary offensives on many fronts. Monopoly aims to outlaw the Communist Party, head off the new people's party, strangle the trade unions with the chains of the Taft-Hartley Law, militarize the youth through Universal Military Training, give the Un-American Committee a free hand, intensify the national oppression of the Negro people, and silence

every voice that would speak against the bipartisan foreign and domestic policies of Wall Street. These goals are way-stations on the road to world domination, fascism and war.

But the men of the trusts must constantly revise their timetable. Even as they speed it up, conscious that their time grows short, each day puts new obstacles in their path.

Reflecting the deepened general crisis of world capitalism, the crisis in American monopoly's two-party system grows more acute. The Democratic Party disintegrates, while the new party of the people grows in numbers and in strength.

The developing round of wage struggles gives warning that a powerful labor movement will resist monopoly's efforts to make the people bear the full burden of the maturing economic crisis.

The 1948 secessionist conspiracy of the Southern Bourbons can no more stop the rising movement for the full liberation of the Negro people than the secessionists of 1861 could save their system of chattel slavery.

The Marshall Planners meet increasingly effective resistance everywhere to their schemes of world domination. Their only victories are pyrrhic and add to the certainty of their defeat.

In desperation they whipped up a new fury of warmongering when their interventionist plot was thwarted by the people of Czechoslovakia. This hysteria is designed to condition the American people for more open imperialist intervention, first in the Italian elections and

then in France. But it has domestic uses, too. Those driving toward more drastic police state measures at home invent the Big Lie that Czechoslovakia is now a "police state."

Not only the imperialist warmongers and reactionary Social-Democrats wept for the "death" of Czechoslovak democracy in the hour of its new birth. Many self-styled "liberals" joined them at the wailing wall, and thus inevitably became their accomplices in the dirty work afoot in the Justice Department.

For those who say "aye" to the American imperialists abroad cannot say them "nay" at home. Those who take fright when a European people advances toward genuine democracy, cannot lead the people in the fight for democracy at home. They can only aid the people's enemies.

But, fortunately for our country, other forces came forward to save the Bill of Rights from the Truman Administration's March sneak attack. It is no accident that these forces saw American imperialism, and not the Communists, as the instigator of force and violence—whether in Czechoslovakia or the United States. And while they hailed the Czechoslovak people's peaceful advance toward Socialism, they acted to keep open the democratic road to progress at home.

These forces were the Americans who, by helping to win the freedom of the valiant five, defended the democratic rights of 140,000,000.

We are proud that our Communist Party spearheaded this mass movement which won the release on bail

of the hunger strikers. We are doubly proud that among those five were two veteran leaders of our Party—Williamson and Potash.

It was the militant mass action of the Communist Party that first broke through reaction's conspiracy of silence, and all over the country set broader forces in motion.

In those six stirring March days, the most progressive sections of the labor movement gave a good account of themselves. The new people's party showed that it is developing as a party which struggles, not only on election day, but in the daily battles of the people around concrete issues. Wallace himself roundly condemned the deportation delirium, while many local and state Wallace-for-President Committees also acted. Among the Negro people, the wide support earlier rallied around Claudia Jones was reinforced by new forces that came to the defense of Ferdinand Smith as well as the other hunger strikers.

As a broad mass movement began to unfold, it became impossible for such organs as the *New York Post*, *PM*, and the *Nation* to remain silent. However belatedly, they added their influential voices to the swelling chorus of protest.

Pressed by the anger rising in labor's ranks, Philip Murray joined in the demand for bail for Smith, Doyle, and Potash. And this, in spite of the fact that Murray had in effect encouraged the Justice Department to step up its persecution of trade union progressives by his own action against Harry Bridges, his support

to Curran's Red-baiting in the N.M.U., and his tacit support of Truman's policies and candidacy.

* * *

It was a great hunger strike, and for many young Communist Party members it was a baptism in mass struggle. Detroit's 'round the clock vigil in sleet and snow, kept by workers coming and going to the factories; the five thousand New Yorkers who claimed Broadway at the rush hour as a people's forum—these and many other mass actions will long be remembered by those who participated in them.

It was a great victory, for it points the way to other and greater victories.

On the calendars of the courts a host of civil rights cases, brought against native and foreign-born, Communists and non-Communists, await decision. In the court docket they appear as the case of the U.S. vs. Eugene Dennis—or Alexander Bittelman, Claudia Jones, Beatrice Johnson; or as U.S. vs. John Santo, Harold Christoffel, Michael Obermeier—and Philip Murray.

But in reality all these are but one case—the case of the American people against the un-American men of the trusts.

And all can be won, as the people won in the case of the five hunger strikers. In all, united mass action is the key to victory.

The vigorous prosecution of the people's case against the pro-fascist monopolists on the civil rights front is an integral part of their struggle to make the new people's party the party of victory.

The new third party will speed the people's break-away from the two old parties as it joins in united actions to defend the foreign-born, including their right to become citizens without political discrimination; as it takes up the cudgels for all trade unionists persecuted by the Taft-Hartley Law or the Justice Department; and as it comes to the defense of the Communist Party's democratic rights and fights for the freedom of Eugene Dennis and all victims of the House Un-American Committee.

Our Communist Party, too, will grow through struggle and sacrifice—and above all through the fulfillment of its vanguard responsibility to the broader people's movements. The great hunger strike proved again that the workers, the common people, can be won, if given clear-sighted and firm leadership. And so, as we now face the battle to keep our general secretary, Eugene Dennis, out of jail and to defeat the Un-American Committee's drive to outlaw our Party by forcing its "registration," we can appeal to the American people with renewed confidence.

We may be confident not only of their support on these concrete issues, not only of their democratic will to defend the Bill of Rights. We may be confident also that those who fight against fascism will be receptive to the science that teaches them how to win. We Communists possess that science, and now more than ever before we must make it available to all Americans who strive to check and defeat the imperialist architects of an American police state.

ON THE THEORETICAL WORK OF THE PARTY

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

I.

THE NEED FOR SYSTEMATICALLY organizing the theoretical work of the Communist Party has now become pressingly urgent. Ever since its foundation in 1919 our Party has been weak in the vital matter of Marxist-Leninist theory. This is partly a reflection of the general underestimation of theory characteristic of American political life, and we have added to this by special neglects of our own. The general result has been the weakening of the vanguard role of our Party in the fields both of ideological and practical struggle.

Our neglect of Marxist-Leninist theory manifests itself in a variety of ways. We do not read our classics enough; we do not effectively instruct our membership in the principles of Marxism-Leninism; nor do we effectively carry these principles to the broad masses. We do not adequately tie in theory with practice; we do not always clearly work out the relationship between our day-to-day policies and our fundamental principles. We do not methodically cultivate our best Marxists, nor do we direct their activities. If we had paid

more attention, over the years, to raising the theoretical level of our membership and leadership, Browder would have found it much more difficult to foist his revisionism on our Party.

Especially is our Party weak, from the standpoint of Marxist-Leninist theory, in its altogether inadequate projection of constructive, original analyses of specific features of present-day American and world capitalism. Marxism-Leninism is, of course, much more than the mere memorizing of pat quotations with which to pepper our articles and speeches. It is far more, too, than the simple absorption of a general knowledge of our basic principles to serve as a groundwork for the working out of daily political policies, important though this is. A mastery of Marxism-Leninism implies, above all, the ability to tackle all economic, political, and social problems, to unmask their true meaning and to translate our answers into practical policies. It is in this creative use of theory that we are weakest. For that reason the main attention of this article is directed to this special aspect of Marxism-Leninism. Its aim is to emphasize our burning need for more and better works of constructive Marxist-Leninist analysis.

As the world capitalist system sinks ever deeper into its general crisis, it generates a host of new theoretical and political problems in every field of human activity. Because of the key role of the United States in world economy and also because of the many specific characteristics of American capitalism,

these various new problems present themselves with particular acuteness and urgency in our country. Unfortunately, however, we are lacking in initiative in signalizing these problems, in grappling theoretically with them, in boldly challenging the bourgeois apologists on every field as Marxists should, and in bringing our Marxist-Leninist answers home to our Party and the broad masses.

While our best Marxists are undoubtedly doing much creative analysis in various fields, this work is nevertheless being carried on in a scattered, disorganized, and altogether inadequate fashion. We are not making proper use of such competent forces as we have, nor are we skilfully training new forces. In consequence, we often entirely ignore many vital problems, or at best, make only hasty, superficial analyses of them. The general result is to weaken our work on the whole theoretical and political front, to reduce our policy-making to a semi-empirical basis, and to expose us in many instances to the insidious danger of trailing after Left petty-bourgeois intellectuals. For this chronic theoretical weakness our Party constantly pays dearly in many ways.

The Browder revisionist period vastly emphasized and intensified our Party's grave theoretical weaknesses. Increasingly, Browder, sinking deeper and deeper into opportunism, deliberately played down the study and application of Marxism-Leninism by our Party. The sale and reading of Marxist classics declined drastically, and our schools more and

more became infected with crass opportunism. During this period, when Browder revisionism gained supremacy in the Party, the atmosphere was such as to discourage the development of new Marxist writers. Browder, conceitedly posing as a super-Marxist theoretician, tried to arrogate the Party's theoretical work to himself. He failed to analyze the many problems cast up by capitalism in those years, glibly accepting the Roosevelt (Keynesian) answers to them. He finally even boldly urged the Party to throw aside its "old [Marxian] books and doctrines" and to base itself upon his intellectual trash. He insolently tried to rewrite Marx and Lenin on the basis of his bourgeois reformism. He wound up by landing us in the swamp of his "notorious revisionist" Teheran thesis. Then the Party woke up.

What Browder tried to do was to liquidate the Party's theoretical line by abandoning Socialism and the principles of Marxism-Leninism, to liquidate its political program by making it into an adjunct of American imperialism, and finally to liquidate the Party itself by transforming it into an amorphous "political association." What the Party has been doing since the Emergency Convention of 1945, at which Browderism was repudiated and after which Browder was expelled, is to reverse this whole Browder liquidatory course. We have reorganized the Party; we have re-established for it a correct Marxist-Leninist political program; and now we are turning our

attention to improving the theoretical work of the Party. The long period of Browder revisionism has left our Party still entangled theoretically at many points, particularly in the field of economics, with the Keynesian liberals. To disentangle it is proving to be a complex and difficult task.

Since the repudiation of Browder's revisionism our Party has made a sharp improvement in its attitude toward Marxist-Leninist theory. It has learned from bitter experience to value the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin more highly than ever before. A real "going back to the books" is taking place; a genuine appreciation of Marxist theory is now developing in the Party. Obviously, the impulse of our membership and leaders is to correct, not only the vulgar opportunist errors of the Browder period, but, even more significantly, to begin to overcome the underestimation of Marxist theory that has existed in our Party for so long a time. A kind of renaissance, so far as theoretical work is concerned, is beginning to develop in our ranks—that is, it can be a renaissance if we understand how to cultivate this valuable development.

These are many signs of the new interest in Marxist-Leninist theory that is developing in our Party. In the recent period, *Political Affairs* has markedly improved in its theoretical quality. On the basis of a recent discussion by the National Board, our theoretical organ has adopted an elaborate program of theoretical work. *Political Affairs* has

the task of ever improving its role and work as the leading journal of Marxist-Leninist theory in this country.

Our students and writers, our magazines and schools, are ever more intensely devoting themselves to the working out of Marxist-Leninist analyses and to raising the general theoretical level of our Party. One of the most ambitious of these many theoretical endeavors is the Party's present intensive analysis of the so-called New Economics, or Keynesism. But it is not the purpose of this article to evaluate the various important books, pamphlets, and articles that have been recently produced in our Party on various aspects of Marxism-Leninism. Much of this material is good, and much requires basic criticism. To estimate it properly is the task of a special study. Here the purpose is rather to indicate the existence of the new theoretical work being developed in our Party, and to point out some of the more urgent tasks confronting it.

This renewed interest in Marxist theory is a manifestation of the health of the Party. It shows that our Party is striving to meet its responsibilities as the vanguard of the working class in the fierce ideological struggle now going on between the forces of democracy and those of reaction. Even though the Party is now under violent attack by Red-baiters and warmongers, it is able to begin to develop a counter-offensive of its own on the theoretical front, as well as in its other political activities. This fact is eloquent

testimony to the basic strength of the Party.

II

In the present article it is possible to give only an indication of some of the theoretical tasks confronting our Party. The list given below is by no means complete. It will be noted that a number of the subjects mentioned have to do with immediately sharpening up our daily political policies, while others are more of a long range character. It will also be realized that in regard to some of these problems much work has already been done, while others have as yet been barely touched upon by our writers, if treated at all.

1) Much work needs to be done to define clearly the new position of the United States in the world economy. Urgently needed studies along this line include: America's relation to the world crisis of capitalism; the special features of American imperialism (to refute those who claim that American imperialism is progressive); the economic foundations of American imperialism; the fallacies of "American exceptionalism" (the theory that American capitalism has unique economic laws of its own and is capable of regenerating decadent world capitalism); etc., etc.

2) In the field of economics there are also many problems to be dealt with. In the main these add up to an analysis of the so-called New Economics (Keynesism) and a systematic refutation of the many illusions it creates. Under this general heading special subjects requiring intensive analysis include: a further

treatment of the extent and role of American monopoly; a definitive study of the present role of finance capital (to refute those who claim that the banks are no longer a decisive economic and political factor); further discussion of the question of the national debt; an analysis of the new features of Federal taxation; an analysis of the specific features of capital accumulation in the United States (with special regard to the Keynesian illusions about the savings of the workers and the middle class); a survey of the distribution of wealth in the United States; a treatment, from the economic standpoint, of the relation of the Marshall Plan to the approaching cyclical economic crisis in the United States; a detailed analysis of the specific American types of Keynesism; an examination of the course of the real wages of American workers during recent decades; a documented repudiation of the various current "full employment under capitalism" panaceas; a refutation of the Keynesian "multiplier," or pump-priming theory; an outline of the economic basis for Socialism in the United States; the specific characteristics of American wartime economy; etc., etc.

3) In practical politics there are also many questions that need further theoretical clarification. Among many others, studies are needed which will: elaborate the political conditions under which programs of nationalization of basic industries may be projected; state the limits of economic planning under capitalism; further elaborate the forms of self-

determination for the Negro people; expand further the analysis we have begun of the relation of religion to American politics, and the role of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States and of the Vatican in world affairs; correct theoretically the Browder revisionist errors in our work among women and youth; re-examine our theoretical position regarding national minority groups in the United States, with special attention to the "melting pot" theories; deal with the whole question of Communist Party united-front relations with its political allies; outline the specific features of American fascism; etc., etc.

4) In the arts and sciences and in the field of philosophy Marxists also have many tasks of analysis and exposition. Most important is a thoroughgoing treatment and refutation of Dewey's pragmatism. It is also necessary further to elucidate the particularly intensive corruption in the U.S.—because of the vast extent of monopoly domination—of literature and the arts, the motion pictures, the radio, and culture generally in its various forms and expressions. As never before, we Communists must expand our many activities in exposing the decadence, nihilism, and fascist dehumanization of "Western" bourgeois culture. There are innumerable other tasks also in the fight against the manifold trends of idealism and obscurantism now being cultivated by reactionary capitalist agents in every field of science. In this regard, special attention must be paid to the prostitu-

tion of the biological sciences to reactionary political ends, such as the fascist theories of racial superiority, élite-ism, and the like. Our Party must display an interest and activity in all these intellectual fields comparable to the work now being carried on by the Communist Parties in Europe. We have many good writers in these fields who can lock horns with the bourgeois theoreticians and confusionists on every theoretical front. Our Party should be the leader in the United States in every intellectual field, which is very far from being the case today in the United States.

5) In the field of American history, there is likewise vast work to be done by Marxist historians and theoreticians. American democratic and revolutionary traditions must be far more actively utilized as a powerful weapon in the class struggle. There is, therefore, a great need for a Marxist general history of the United States. Another vital need is a thoroughgoing historical treatment of the trade union movement in all its phases. An amplification of our Marxist histories of the Negro people, and original work regarding the much-neglected Indian peoples, are also very much in order. All this historical work should be done with the thought definitely in mind of correcting the crass bourgeois reformism that Browder injected, during a dozen years, into the studies made, in that period, of American history.

6) Our Party also faces many theoretical tasks requiring an intensive

application of Marxist-Leninist analytical principles to specific general American conditions and developments. A few of these are: a thoroughgoing reevaluation of the political character of the Roosevelt regime; an analysis of the roots and development of Browder's revisionism; a well-rounded analysis of the effect of the various bourgeois ideological trends on the American working class; an analysis of the specific American type of Social-Democracy; a convincing exposition of the superiority of Socialist democracy over bourgeois democracy; a presentation of the conditions requisite for the transition to Socialism; a summary of the development of Marxian theory in the United States; and the development of a general political and economic perspective for the United States. Finally, it is high time to begin writing an authoritative history of the Communist Party of the United States.

7) In connection with thus improving the creative theoretical work of the Party it is indispensable that we also develop a much sounder manner of applying Marxist-Leninist criticism than we now have. It is essential, of course, that we follow very closely the output of bourgeois writers in all the fields of economics, politics, art, philosophy, literature, and science, and subject these writings to a much more incisive criticism and Marxist evaluation. It is no less necessary that we apply searching criticism to our own theoretical writings, always in a constructive, comradesly spirit.

In our Party and in the ranks of progressive writers generally, there are many authors who are turning out a considerable volume of Marxist-Leninist writings, of varying levels of competency. Generally, we give our writers insufficient pre-printing criticism, and even less after they appear in print. Too often our analyses of articles, pamphlets, and books are hardly more than either "puffs" and "blurbs" or indiscriminate condemnation, with little or no regard to their intrinsic merit. We must correct this harmful, un-Marxian, petty-bourgeois practice. A penetrating and frank evaluation is a fundamental necessity, and is the only way by which we can establish satisfactory standards of quality in our Marxist-Leninist theoretical output.

III

To improve our Marxist-Leninist work of creative analysis the major task before us is, of course, to raise the general theoretical level of our Party membership and leadership. We must engender a genuine love for, and interest in, Communist theory in our Party. This will require real attention to this question in all our schools, journals, and other means of education.

It would require a special article to detail our tasks in this basic work of raising the Party's theoretical level. Such is not the purpose of this article, the aim of which is to indicate how we can make better use of the trained Marxist forces that the Party now has at its disposal. We

have many such forces. The trouble is that they are not cultivated and organized. Our theoretical work goes ahead on a haphazard, desultory, hit-or-miss basis. We have no planned theoretical program and we are making no organized analysis of the many theoretical problems confronting us. The Party gives no systematic leadership on the vital theoretical front.

This impossible situation must be corrected. All of us must understand that work on the theoretical front, as on the political front, must be conducted on a systematic basis. Under the Browder regime Marxist-Leninist theory was stifled in our Party; today it must be methodically cultivated and developed, both in the sense of a general education of our Party in Marxist-Leninist principles and in the organized application of these principles to the solution of the urgent and important theoretical problems facing us.

To these general ends the Party needs to set up a standing commission on the theoretical work of the Party, to be made up of leading Party workers and writers. Indeed, the National Board is already taking steps in this direction. The functions of this commission on theoretical work should be, in addition to stimulating theoretical education generally in the Party, especially to turn the Party's attention to constructive Marxist-Leninist analysis. The commission should clearly outline the Party's most important theoretical tasks and then proceed to assign them to specific comrades for analy-

sis. The commission should also carefully evaluate all our Marxist-Leninist theoretical writings, *before they are printed*, and it should likewise strive to maintain at the highest level the quality of the theoretical teaching in our schools and journals. The commission should, particularly, keep sharp watch on the latest outpourings of capitalist thinkers and propagandists and carefully organize our Party's ideological counteroffensive against them.

One of the many major tasks of the commission on theoretical work should be to bridge the gap between theoretical and practical work in our Party. As things now stand, those comrades who specialize in theory do little or no practical day-to-day political work, while our Party's political leaders rarely do any theoretical writing. This situation is bad all around and must be remedied. Our specialized theoretical writers must be helped to get rid of any "ivory tower" tendencies on their part and integrated into Party work, while our political leaders (no matter how busy they may be) should be required to write specific theoretical articles.

Another task of the commission on theoretical work should be to develop among our comrades an inner sense of the urgency of maintaining continuous individual study and application of Marxism-Leninism. At present, in too many cases, our political leaders have the habit of neglecting to do serious Marxist reading or analyses for long periods, with the idea in mind of later "pol-

ishing" themselves up in some school course or other. But Marxism-Leninism is not something that can be taken periodically in doses in this fashion. Schools and study courses for leading cadres are very good and should be greatly extended, but they are no substitute for daily individual study and application of Marxism-Leninism. We must learn to combine theory with our daily work. No leader is so busy that he can afford to neglect theory.

A major means by which the study and application of Marxist-Leninist theory in our Party can be stimulated would be by the organization of periodic open conferences on theoretical problems. Such conferences could be held about once a year. They should be two-day, weekend gatherings, with regular agendas. These conferences on Marxist-Leninist theory could take up the most urgent problems confronting us on the theoretical front; specific papers could be read, followed by general discussion. Such broadly attended conferences would have highly beneficial results. We hold conferences on Negro work, on

women's work, on trade union work, and on many other activities; why not, then, conferences on theoretical work? Some years ago, *The Communist* held such a conference, with very good results. The national conference of Marxist cultural workers, held in mid-1947 under the auspices of *New Masses* and *Mainstream*, was an event to be hailed. One of the first tasks of the commission on theoretical work, therefore, should be to organize a conference on Marxist-Leninist theory, to take place in the near future.

The improvement of our Party's Marxist-Leninist theoretical work along the lines suggested above will strengthen the Party in every respect—in its numbers, its mass contacts, its political work, its ideological fiber. The whole question of better theoretical analysis, already too long delayed, should receive the earnest attention of our Party. Our Communist Party is becoming more mature politically and it is facing ever more complex problems. To advance to a higher theoretical level in its work has therefore become imperative for it.

"It is in particular the duty of the leaders to gain an ever clearer insight into all theoretical questions, to free themselves more and more from the influence of traditional phrases inherited from the old world outlook, and constantly to keep in mind that socialism, since it has become a science, must be pursued as a science, *i.e.*, it must be studied."

Frederick Engels, *The Peasant War in Germany*.

PUERTO RICO: 50 YEARS UNDER AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

By CESAR ANDREU

President, Communist Party of Puerto Rico

THERE IS AN AMERICAN MYTH, the story told in the official history books. It contrasts the development of the United States with that of the other world powers, who have grown great by the use of violence and aggression. But the United States, so the story goes, has always been guided by high principles of peace and justice, in a tradition worthy of the Pilgrim Fathers who landed on Plymouth Rock.

So goes the story. Puerto Rico, more than any other nation, has been a victim of the American Myth.

When American troops landed on the shores of Puerto Rico, their commander, Major General Nelson A. Miles, proclaimed:

The people of the United States in the cause of liberty, justice and humanity . . . come bearing the banner of freedom . . . to promote your prosperity . . . to give to all . . . the advantages and blessings of enlightened civilization.

But these high-sounding phrases could not mask the historic reality of the conquest, and on July 25, 1898, a new colonial chapter was begun for Puerto Rico. That chapter has not yet been closed. A half

century has passed since the American invasion. The purpose of this article is to examine briefly that half century of colonial rule and to evaluate it from the point of view of the interest of the Puerto Rican people.

I

Three hundred and ninety years before the American invasion, Juan Ponce de Leon began the conquest of the island of Puerto Rico. In the course of the four centuries that followed, the Puerto Rican nationality began to take shape until, at the beginning of the 19th century, Puerto Rico had acquired its own distinct national characteristics, a product of the fusion of Indian culture with that of the great majority of the population, which was of Spanish descent, and to which was added the contribution of the African Negro.

From 1810 on, the history of Puerto Rico was one of constant struggle for national liberation. Puerto Rico demanded representation in the Spanish Cortes, and during the periods when Spanish liberal forces won gains on the continent, those demands were granted, and Puerto Rican delegates sat in

the Spanish parliament. A continual struggle was carried on to make the government more democratic and to free the slaves.

On September 23, 1868, seventeen days before the Yara insurrection in Cuba, the Republic of Puerto Rico was proclaimed in Lares, only to be crushed in a few days by the arms of the Spanish monarchy. In spite of persecution and official terrorism, the bourgeoisie, with the support of the people, continued the struggle. Although from that time a reformist character was imposed on the movement, the most progressive elements of the liberal bourgeoisie contributed to the Antillean revolution. Betances, Ruiz Belvis, and Hostos, in exile, traveled widely throughout Europe and America organizing the struggle for the independence of Puerto Rico and Cuba. In the Cuban *maniguas* (brush) nearly two thousand Puerto Ricans fought the Spanish monarchy, producing heroes of freedom such as Pachin Marin and General Rius Rivera. In the meantime Spain made concessions.

In November, 1897, a Royal Decree proclaimed the autonomy of Puerto Rico, and on February 9 of the following year the new autonomous government was inaugurated. Six days later the battleship "Maine" was blown up in Havana harbor, and on April 25 President McKinley signed the declaration of war with Spain. At dawn on May 12 the United States fleet bombarded San Juan, the capital of Puerto Rico, and on July 25 infantry landed near Guanica on the other side of the

island. Hostilities were suspended after less than three weeks, and by October 18 the American flag floated over La Fortaleza, the governor's palace at San Juan.

Dr. Tomas Blanco says in his *Prontuario Historico*:

At the very moment that that people [Puerto Rico] was ready to enter a new period of maturity in harmony with its history, it suffered the violence of an abrupt change, the result of a war in whose declaration we had no part, by the severity of a defeat to which we did not contribute, by the terms of a treaty in whose negotiation we had neither voice nor vote. By the force of arms and the exaggerated demands of the victor, our personality as a people—an autonomous province—was subjugated, and as war booty we became a colony of a powerful foreign nation with whom we had no score of any kind to settle. As an immediate result, we ceased the exercise of our autonomy and over us was imposed an "absolute and supreme" military government.

II

The Spanish-American War marks the entrance of the United States in the imperialist struggle to divide up the world. As a result of that war, the United States took possession of the Philippines and accelerated its military, economic, and political expansion in the Pacific toward China. At the same time, the United States assured its supremacy in the Caribbean, taking outright possession of Puerto Rico and strengthening its domination of Cuba, Santo Domingo, Haiti, Panama, Nicaragua,

and most of the rest of Latin America. In the 20th century the Caribbean has become what is sometimes called a "Yankee swimming pool." The other colonial empires—English, Dutch, and French—are merely Wall Street's junior partners in the Caribbean.

The Caribbean is one of the world's richest regions. It is one of the most important producers of petroleum, a source of raw materials and tropical products, and at the same time an extensive market.

The United States has taken full advantage of the strategic location of Puerto Rico as a base from which to assure its control over the Caribbean region. Because of this, it is not difficult to understand the desire of Washington to keep the case of Puerto Rico hidden from the world. With the same curtain of silence, the U.S. has tried to muffle the demands of other Latin American countries for Puerto Rico's independence.

In its struggle for national liberation, Puerto Rico has always had the warm support of the republics to the South, because the peoples of Latin America can never forget that the United States is the only nation of the Western hemisphere that has subjugated a nationality of Spanish cultural heritage.

In 1936 the Argentine Senate sent a message to the United States urging Puerto Rican independence. Similar messages were sent in 1941 by the Chilean House of Representatives, in 1942 by the Second Constituent Convention of Cuba, in 1943 by the Cuban House of Representa-

tives, and in 1945 by the Guatemalan Congress. Other resolutions were approved by the Pan-American Congress in 1936, by the World Congress P.E.N. in 1939, by various conventions of the Confederation of Latin American Workers (C.T.A.L.), and by other international gatherings. The case of Puerto Rico is a vital issue in the world struggle against American imperialism.

III

As a result of the U.S. military occupation, a rapid economic transformation occurred in Puerto Rico. Apologists of "progressive imperialism" wonder why Puerto Ricans are so ungrateful for the change. These gentlemen complain that in denouncing the colonial regime we overlook the positive accomplishments of the United States in Puerto Rico. These complaints are often echoed by apologists of another stripe—the pseudo-progressives and yellow socialists.

Mythology is the name that R. Palme Dutt, in his book *India Today*, gives to the window dressing with which the agents of imperialism attempt to disguise their colonial spoils: ". . . the real driving force which impels the capitalist invaders to subjugate foreign peoples . . . is neither love of the peoples nor abstract missions of civilization, but very concrete aims of the drive of capitalism for extra profits."

The development of transportation, communications, and so on, in India, concludes Dutt, "has been

done, not to meet the needs of the given stage of development of the people, but to meet the needs of commercial and financial penetration."

These concepts are as applicable to Puerto Rico as to India and all other colonial areas. Dutt's conclusions on India are also applicable: capitalism, in its last stage, imperialism, has long since abandoned its progressive role and has become the bulwark of reaction.

On their arrival, the representatives of American imperialism found in Puerto Rico a nation with close to a million inhabitants on a mountainous island of 3,400 square miles. The census taken by the military government in 1899 compared the patterns of land tenure in Cuba and Puerto Rico:

While in Cuba the proportion of farm owners to the whole number of farms is but 28 per cent, in Puerto Rico it is 93 per cent. On the other hand, the proportion of the cultivated area owned by occupants is but 43.5 per cent in Cuba, while in Puerto Rico it is 91 per cent.

Thus, the principal economic base of the colony, the land, was widely divided among a large sector of the Puerto Rican population. Naturally, the result was an almost pre-capitalist economy, but it is important to stress, not its relative backwardness at that time, but rather in whose interest changes were made. Undoubtedly, in the course of that economic transformation Puerto Rico has advanced, but it has suffered the dis-

advantages, while the United States has reaped the benefits. What progress Puerto Rico has made in the transformation of its economy has been incidental to the change and not its motive force.

The first economic blow was struck when U.S. currency was exchanged for Spanish pesos at a 40 per cent discount. "This change," says Diffie in his book *Puerto Rico: A Broken Pledge*, "placed incalculable hardships on the people of all classes and specially the very poor who found their wages cut to suit the change in currency, and their food priced at the same number of dollars as it had been pesos."

With the extension to Puerto Rico of U.S. tariff and coastwise shipping laws, the island was cut off from the rest of the world. The ships of many nations which had engaged in trade with the island no longer called at our ports. In the decade before the American invasion, less than 30 per cent of our trade was with Spain, and 20 per cent was with the United States, 16 per cent with England and its possessions, 13 per cent with Cuba, 9 per cent with Germany, and 7 per cent with France. But by 1901 we were sending 65 per cent of our exports to the United States and were buying 78 per cent of our imports there. Today, from 95 to 98 per cent of our trade is with the U.S. and is carried in American ships.

The principal product at the time of the American invasion was coffee, which was in great demand in the European market. Not less than 500,000 hundredweight were ex-

ported annually. Attempts have been made to lay the decline of coffee production to hurricanes, but tropical storms had often before hit the island and production had always recovered. The real reason lies, not with hurricanes, but rather in the loss of the European market. Production dropped to 170,000 hundredweight by 1905 and to 53,500 by 1930. It has rallied slightly since then, but production in 1946 was not over 138,000 hundredweight.

At the same time, the decline of coffee weakened the principal sector of the national bourgeoisie, the coffee farmers. Thus the political domination of American capital was assured by the destruction of the economic base of the only class in a position at that time to lead a decisive anti-imperialist struggle.

Although American capital was not interested in coffee, it *was* interested in the profits to be gotten from sugar. American investors began immediately to grab for land. From 1899 to 1910 the area in sugar cane doubled, drawing into production the rich alluvial lands that rim the coast.

The increase in absentee corporate land holdings was accomplished fairly easily. In 1888 there were 446 small sugar mills, of which about a third used steam power and the rest animal power. By 1910 the number of mills had dropped to 146, of which 41 were large mechanized mills.

The small farmer could not long hold out against the pressures of big capital. He was forced to sell his crop to the mill at a price fixed by

the mill. Swallowed up in debt, his land mortgaged to the hilt, he had no choice but to sell out to his creditors, the mill, or what amounted to the same, the Federal Land Bank.

The sugar industry increased its scope and power steadily until 1930. Before 1899 sugar production varied from 50,000 to 100,000 tons. By the middle 30's it had risen to well over a million tons. Three of the largest absentee-owned corporations admitted to having made a total profit of more than \$80 million from 1920 to 1935. The 41 mills controlling the industry have in recent years been consolidated into 37, and a publication of the Social Science Research Center of the University of Puerto Rico comments that "a definite trend is indicated, with the economies of large-scale production leading to an increasing concentration of sugar processing in a relatively small number of large, modern mills."

But the imperialists do not appear interested in exploiting all the potentialities of sugar in Puerto Rico. To protect the production of sugar in the United States, a system of quotas was set up in 1934. Sugar producers in Louisiana, Colorado, and other states have quotas proportionately higher than Puerto Rico's, which, with the ability to produce 1,500,000 tons a year, is limited to only 910,000 tons. The four sugar refineries in Puerto Rico are limited by a quota on refined sugar. With an export potential of 500,000 tons of refined sugar, we must send most of our crop to the U.S. in raw form.

In the early period of U.S. rule,

tobacco developed rapidly as an important crop, but since the '20's the production of cigars and cigarettes has dropped sharply, and Puerto Rico has become an exporter of unmanufactured tobacco to the United States. We import annually more than seven million dollars' worth of cigarettes from the U.S.

The last 50 years have witnessed a steady growth of unemployment. In 1899 about 17 per cent of the labor force was unemployed. In 1926 it was 30 per cent, and since 1930 it has fluctuated around 40 per cent. A government report in 1941 stated that 86 per cent of our population of two million had family incomes averaging \$341, while the minimum requirement was calculated at \$1,240 in 1942 prices.

In spite of its low standard of living, Puerto Rico is an important export market for the United States. In 1932 the island ranked ninth among all countries and first in Latin America. Since then there has been little change in its position.

Because of the emphasis on sugar and other cash crops, Puerto Rico must import, not only industrial goods, but also a third by weight and a half by value of the food it consumes. Although in 1945 the value of imports was 198 per cent higher than in 1935, import prices had increased 86 per cent, and the true volume of imports after eliminating price changes is only 58 per cent above 1935. Because of population growth, there is little increase in per capita imports since 1921, and the consumer is not getting much

more goods than he did a generation ago.

In summary, the economy of Puerto Rico is based on a single export crop, sugar, with the best lands in the hands of absentee corporations. The people must import most of what they consume from the high price U.S. market, because while U.S. tariff laws protect sugar, they also cut off trade with other countries. Together with the coastwise shipping laws, they insure a monopoly market for U.S. shippers and exporters.

Our national wealth has been steadily drawn off as return on American investments, and the credit system is in the hands of imperialist finance capital. In "normal" times, more than 100,000 workers are idle while living costs rise and living standards drop.

Such is the economic situation in Puerto Rico after 50 years of U.S. imperialist rule.

IV

The exploitation of Puerto Rico has not been accomplished by the free action of economic forces alone. These forces have been guided by a conscious colonial policy which has imposed definite forms of government.

For two years after the invasion, the island was ruled by a military government. In 1900, Congress established a civil government, with a governor sent from Washington and a legislature with one elected and one appointed chamber. The latter

consisted of 11 members, of whom six were required to be Americans, and also acted as the governor's cabinet. A policy of concessions to American capital was naturally followed. Despite the continued struggle of the people, expressed by the protests of its elected representatives, the land, public services, and the exploitation of natural resources was handed over to U.S. investors.

An "Americanization" campaign was launched to weaken the national revolutionary spirit of our people. Hundreds of Americans were brought down as teachers for the new school system, conducted in the English language and paid out of local taxes. On the eve of the entry of the United States into the First World War, Puerto Ricans were made U.S. citizens in an endeavor to gain their loyalty and to justify the extension of the draft to the island. We were not consulted. The law simply declared that those who did not wish to be U.S. citizens would lose all civil rights.

At the same time, the government was reformed. The legislature was made entirely elective; but the governor, the commissioner of education, the attorney general, the auditor, and the justices of the supreme court were still appointed. All legislation was subject to a four-fold veto: by the governor, the President, the Congress, and the Supreme Court of the United States.

This system of government still operates, except for reforms made to appease public opinion in 1947. Under this reform, the governor will

be elected from 1948 on, and he may appoint his cabinet. However, Congress was very cautious in making even this small concession. Not only are the auditor—whose signature is required on all government checks—and the supreme court still appointed, but a new post has been created, a super-governor known as the Federal Co-ordinator, to be filled by an American sent down from Washington.

V

The *Popular Democratic* party is the government party of Puerto Rico. In 1940, when it obtained a legislative majority, a broad social and economic reform program was initiated under the slogan, *Bread, Land, and Liberty*.

Under the program the production of electric power has come under government ownership and is administered by the Water Resources Authority. Other public corporations run part of the island's transport and communications. The Land Authority is carrying out a land reform program in enforcement of the legal limit of 500 acres on corporate holdings. The Development Bank, Agricultural Company and Industrial Development Company were created.

This program has been under constant fire by Puerto Rican sugar interests and their fellow-reactionaries in Washington. Many measures have been denounced as "Communist" to the point where reactionaries such as Taft, Ellender, and Crawford have threatened Congressional action

to annul the basic legislation passed in recent years by the Puerto Rican legislature. In the face of growing imperialist opposition to their program, Popular Democratic party leaders have moved toward a policy of appeasement. Their most significant concession has been to postpone the struggle for the independence of Puerto Rico.

The basic need of Puerto Rican people, as of any colonial or semi-colonial people, is to industrialize. Any far-reaching program of economic development, however, is at all times threatened with defeat unless Puerto Rico obtains the political sovereignty to permit the protection of its economy against competition from American big industry.

In the last few years the thinking of the top leadership of the Popular Democratic party has been dominated by the concept that the principal problem of Puerto Rico is economic rather than political in character, and that without destroying the political restrictions of the colonial regime, effective economic measures can be successful. This is, naturally, a fallacy. Economic and social liberation is impossible unless a struggle for national liberation is carried on at the same time.

We must, however, reject the opposite thesis, advanced by certain representatives of the national bourgeoisie through the *Nacionalista* and *Independentista* parties. Both view the colonial problem as merely a legalistic one. They show no interest in facing the economic problems that affect the people. The *Inde-*

pendentista party has partly overcome the utopian sectarianism of the *Nacionalistas* by rejecting the electoral boycott which the latter advocates and by preparing to participate in the 1948 elections. But its only program is that if the party wins the elections it will negotiate the immediate recognition of Puerto Rican independence by the U.S.

The old-line pro-American parties—*Republicano, Socialista, and Liberal*—have slowly disintegrated. As a sign of the great changes that have occurred in Puerto Rico in the last 10 years, these parties have only four of the 58 seats in the legislature.

Under the inspiration of the small but militant *Partido Comunista*, the working class in 1940 rejected the discredited Socialist labor leadership and organized the General Confederation of Workers (C.G.T.). This labor center was an important factor in the electoral triumph of the Popular Democratic party in 1940 and 1944, but in 1945, fearful of the growing strength of the labor movement, and giving way to imperialist pressure, the leadership of that party succeeded in splitting the C.G.T. The split was inevitable because the working class had lost its organized vanguard, the Communist Party, which, following Browder's liquidationist policy, had dissolved.

On March 10, 1946, the Communist Party was reconstituted and immediately began a struggle to unify the labor movement. In September, 1947, a convention was held in which the General Workers Union was founded to continue the fight for

labor unity. The old A. F. of L. affiliate in Puerto Rico has taken advantage of the split in the C.G.T. to strengthen its position. Leaders of this A. F. of L. agency are being used by the top A. F. of L. leadership as its fifth column in Latin America. Two Puerto Rican leaders represented this Puerto Rican A. F. of L. agency at the anti-C.T.A.L. labor convention in Lima and are now traveling through Latin America.

The growing militancy of the working class is revealed in the annual report of the Commissioner of Labor for 1946-47. In that year the Conciliation Service handled 309 disputes affecting a total of 307,000 workers, or nearly half the total labor force. This indicates that the objective conditions in Puerto Rico are favorable for building a strong class-conscious labor movement. But this achievement will only be possible to the degree that a strong Communist Party is also built, capable of giving leadership to the working class.

The immediate objectives of the Communist Party are:

- 1) Contribute to the best of its ability to the unity of the working class in a single trade-union center.
- 2) Stimulate the formation of a broad national patriotic front for the independence of Puerto Rico.
- 3) Work to transform the representative bodies of the government into real organs of struggle for the welfare of the people, and help elect men who have proved themselves consistent fighters in the ranks of

the national liberation movement.

4) Fight to defend popular gains, for the development of the industrialization program, and for all political, economic, or social measures which contribute to the class consciousness of the working class and to the national consciousness of the people.

All sectors of opinion in Puerto Rico condemn the colonial regime, and the legislature in a unanimous declaration has made this known to the United States government. The only point on which agreement has not been reached is how to end the colonial regime. American imperialism has tried and tries to sow confusion with alleged solutions to the colonial problem. The so-called formulas of "dominion status," "associated state," "self-government," etc., have only one aim—to prolong the colonial regime under another name.

The imperialists, says Stalin, "while mendaciously prating of self-determination, are endeavoring to keep the non-sovereign peoples and colonies in subjection and to retain them within their imperialist state." He ends by saying that

... the vague slogan of the right of nations to self-determination has been replaced by the clear revolutionary slogan of the right of nations and colonies to political secession and the formation of independent states. (Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, p. 112.)

On these principles the Communist Party bases its fight for the na-

tional liberation of Puerto Rico. The Communist Party, the working class, the entire Puerto Rican people cannot fight this battle alone. Their natural ally, without doubt, is the people of the imperialist oppressor country, the working class and its most advanced sector, the Communist Party of the U.S.

Two bills to grant independence to Puerto Rico have on several occasions been presented in Congress, one by Sen. Millard E. Tydings and the other by Rep. Vito Marcantonio. It is the duty of the progressive movement in the United States to demand the ending of the colonial regime in Puerto Rico and to insure that any legislation for that purpose be based on the following principles:

1) Guarantee the political separation of Puerto Rico from the United States, full sovereignty and the right to make trade agreements with other countries.

2) Recognize the duty of the United States to grant Puerto Rico economic concessions favorable to the development of an economy which will guarantee a higher standard of living for the people.

3) Provide for the strict fulfillment of the obligations of the United States government to those who have served in the armed forces.

4) Provide that the commercial relations between Puerto Rico and the United States will be determined by

a bilateral reciprocal trade agreement.

5) Acknowledge the sovereignty of Puerto Rico over its entire national territory, with the concession of military and naval bases to be determined by mutual agreement.

The Marcantonio independence bill covers all these points, and therefore should be supported.

In the recent war 70,000 Puerto Ricans served in the United States armed forces on all fronts, in defense of the freedom of the peoples of the world. Despite the promises made, a half century after the American invasion of our country Puerto Rico remains bound by a colonial regime that the people unanimously reject. At the same time, Truman and Marshall, the spokesmen of atomic imperialism, proclaim their love for democracy and the freedom of all peoples. There is no better proof than the case of Puerto Rico that those fine phrases are used only to hide the plans of American imperialism for world domination.

We must destroy the American Myth. For half a century the United States has kept Puerto Rico behind an iron curtain for fear that the world will learn the true story of its rule in Puerto Rico. And that is because the case of Puerto Rico so forcefully contradicts the hypocritical and demagogic propaganda of American imperialism.

AMERICAN LABOR AND THE GERMAN WORKING CLASS

BY JOSEPH CLARK

The key role assigned to Germany by the Marshall Plan indicates its importance to American imperialism as it attempts to build up a broad anti-Soviet front decisive in the drive to world domination. The American labor movement must therefore advance and press for the realization of a progressive, democratic, unified Germany. Should it fail to do so, the American people will surrender to the policy of the Wall Street cartelists for restoring the powers of the German Junkers and industrialists, which will thus repeat the history of 1918-1933 and its consequence, the bloodiest war of all time.

With such a danger threatening, can American labor afford to be passive with respect to the German working class and other democratic forces whose resurgence the Anglo-American imperialists are striving to prevent? Indeed, such passivity is justified by some who argue, in effect, that there are no progressive forces in Germany, in other words, as though class differences and class struggle no longer pertain to Germany.

Marxists never forget that no matter how backward temporarily a working class may have become, it still remains the most progressive force in a capitalist society—and this holds true also for Germany. Such a relapse of a working class is contrary to its fundamental progressive and revolutionary character, which must finally emerge ascendant. This does not mean that weaknesses, faults, or crimes of a particular working class should be glossed over or forgotten. To say that the whole German people bears collective responsibility for the crimes of Hitlerism does not exclude the obligation to help create the conditions that make it possible for the German working class to lead the regeneration of a peaceful and democratic Germany. The German working class must ruthlessly condemn what was done in the name of Germany, and be the foremost in accepting the duty to make good at least in part the irreparable damage to humanity. This the German Marxists and other progressive forces in the German labor movement have done and are doing. And as they consolidate their strength to accomplish this important task, the working-class movement here must ask itself what special responsibilities devolve upon it in view of the role of American imperialism in Germany.

REVIVAL OF THE GERMAN WORKING CLASS

Despite twelve years of the sever-

est terror any working class ever faced, over two million Germans today are members of Marxist parties. This achievement is all the more phenomenal in view of the rapidity of this mass enrollment.

Because of the four-zone setup, there are four Marxist parties in Germany. The Socialist Unity Party (S.E.D.) in the Soviet zone, which resulted from the merger of the Communist and Socialist parties in the spring of 1946, has a membership of 1,800,000. This party proclaims as its immediate aim the establishment of a united democratic parliamentary Republic for the whole of Germany. It emphasizes the necessity of removing from all positions of influence and power in public and private life all Nazis, militarists, Junkers, and big industrialists. It stands for land reform and the nationalization of big industry. The S.E.D. openly proclaims its ultimate goal of Socialism and is committed to a program of militantly defending democracy.

In the French, British, and U.S. zones, the three Communist parties have a combined strength of 324,000. This is more than the highest total membership of the Communist Party of Germany before Hitler came to power. The occupying powers have to date forbidden the organization of the S.E.D. in the western zones. As against the encouragement provided by the Soviet Military Government to the anti-fascist forces, the American Military Government (A.M.G.) has discrimi-

nated against, harassed, and held back the anti-fascists in every way. Nevertheless, A.M.G. admits that the German Communist Party "is the best organized party" in western Germany. Even with the rigged elections rushed through early in 1946 before the anti-fascists could become organized, the Communist Party polled over 10 per cent of the vote in western Germany.

The revival in the western zones of the old Social-Democratic Party (S.P.D.) under the leadership of Kurt Schumacher, the "new Noske," represents the organization of sections of the German working class that are still under the demoralizing influence of present and traditional Social-Democratism. Its leadership consists of pro-imperialist and Soviet-hating forces which split the working class before 1933 and facilitated the catastrophe of Hitlerism. Saturated with reactionary tendencies, the S.P.D. fights against the unity of the Left and forms coalitions with the clerical fascists of the Christian Social Union Party. Thus, it again plays today its role as a lackey of imperialism. The S.P.D., because of the still strong hold of tradition on many German workers, succeeded in polling over 30 per cent of the vote in the western zone. However, in the present political and economic crisis it becomes ever more difficult for the Schumachers to keep the workers tied to American imperialism. Already there is a growing rank-and-file resentment against the S.P.D. leadership, as well

as a developing split within the leadership itself.

The Christian Democratic Party (or the Christian Social Union Party, as it is called in Bavaria) is *the* party of reaction in Germany today. It is strongest in Bavaria, where it polled almost 50 per cent of the urban vote and about 70 per cent of the rural vote. It is weakest in the Soviet zone, where it received an over-all vote of about 23 per cent.

This party is the gathering ground and front for the Nazis, industrialists, and Junkers. The only other party of importance is the bourgeois Liberal Democratic Party, which has to date remained small in numbers and influence.

A somewhat different situation prevails in the trade unions. In contrast to the situation before 1933, when the workers were divided among Social-Democratic, Christian, and Communist trade unions, the German trade unions of today have learned the importance of establishing a united trade-union movement. There is such a trade-union movement in each zone; and if it is not yet a country-wide movement, the responsibility rests with the American Military Government. Jack Raymond, in the *New York Times* of December 22, 1947, wrote:

In keeping with its policies of federalism in Germany, the United States Military Government has been reluctant in the past to permit even a zone-wide organization of trade unions, to say nothing of inter-zonal unions. . . . Last October representatives of the

unions of all four zones adopted a resolution favoring the creation of a Germany-wide union, but the realization of this appears to be very far in the future.

Despite the obstacles placed in their way by A.M.G. (ably assisted by A. F. of L. advisers), there are three million trade union members in the three western zones which contain two-thirds of the population of Germany. On the other hand, in the Soviet zone, where every opportunity is given to further the trade-union movement, there are about 4,500,000 organized workers.

American policy has also restricted trade-union development in several other ways. First, the great wealth of the old trade unions—buildings, co-operatives, and equipment—was confiscated by the Nazis. The A.M.G. seized all Nazi organizational property; much of this has not been returned to the trade unions. Secondly, A.M.G. blocked formation of a central trade union body by demagogically insisting on a "grass roots" development by stages, *i.e.*, from the smallest community, to the city, to the region, and to the zone.

But most crippling of all restraints of trade unionism in the West is the A.M.G.-established regulations which in effect *do not permit workers to strike or even to discuss hours and wages*, thereby devaluing the unions. All strikes considered by A.M.G. "harmful to the military occupation" or dangerous to "public health or public safety" are *verboten*. The reason given for forbidding dis-

cussion of hours and wages is that prices and wages are frozen. When one considers that wages are frozen at the level of 1932, a crisis year in Germany, one can see why the German workers are chafing at these restraints.

The recent 24-hour protest strike, embracing close to three million workers in the British and U.S. zones, assumes a special significance in the light of the military restraints on the labor movement. Also noteworthy is the fact that this mass strike was more than an economic protest. It had a definite political character. This can be seen in the slogans and placards carried in the strike demonstrations. For example, in Munich 100,000 workers demonstrated with such slogans as: "Away with Bizonia—For a United Germany," and "We are German Workers, not Colonials." It must be remembered that all demonstrations, marches and parades are forbidden under the military occupation. Even in Bavaria where the working class is weakest, 800,000 unionists downed tools and were joined by 200,000 non-unionists on the 24-hour protest strike. And all this was carried through in the face of attempts by General Clay to whip up an anti-Communist campaign, which culminated in the infamous forgery and provocation, the so-called "Protocol M," an F.B.I. man's dream of a "Communist plot," ranking in infamy with the Zinoviev Letter forgery during the British General Strike in 1926.

Recent events thus evidence that the forces making for a powerful, united, and progressive trade-union movement are maturing in Germany. Such a labor movement is essential to a future democratic Germany. Yet very few American trade unions have to date condemned the anti-labor practices of A.M.G. in Germany. The basic interests of American labor require that it defend the rights of the German workers. American monopolists have already acquired substantial interests in German heavy industry. Their plans call for using cheap German (colonial) labor, which must inevitably result in depressing the living standards of the American working class, and in contributing to unemployment in the United States. Hence, support of the German workers' struggle by American labor is not only a general question of proletarian solidarity, *but is a matter of practical self-interest and self-defense to our labor movement.*

PROGRESS IN THE SOVIET ZONE

The S.E.D. is showing the way to a progressive solution of the German question. It is working for the creation of a united Germany within the framework of a single, unified, democratic State. What has taken place in the eastern third of Germany prepares the ground for development in the direction of the new democracies of Eastern Europe. Already the big monopolies have been liquidated and the banks na-

tionalized. The confiscation of the big landed estates and their distribution among the small peasants under the democratic agrarian reform represent a social advance of decisive importance, since these eastern areas were the chief centers of Junker power. The peasantry, long an ally and reserve of the Junkers, has received the land through the leadership of the working class, with whom it is linked in alliance. Millions of Germans expelled from the areas now part of Poland, have received land, thereby being prevented from becoming "lumpen" allies of German reaction.

The other decisive transformation under the leadership of the S.E.D. has been the expropriation and nationalization of the banks and large industries. In addition, the S.E.D. is demonstrating how the separation of Church and State can be carried through without depriving anyone of full freedom of worship. Furthermore, by building the trade unions and by involving large masses of people—the youth, the women, the peasantry—in democratic people's organizations, the S.E.D. is contributing daily to the regeneration of a democratic Germany.

REACTION IN THE WESTERN ZONES

These developments in eastern Germany present a contrast to the situation in the western zones. Here no land reform has taken place. In fact, Junkers like H. von Schlange-Schoeningen, who lost their estates

in the east, have gained extensive lands in the west. (The Junker in question was even put in charge of the Food Ministry of the British zone.) The decisive industrial monopolies have not been expropriated, despite the fact that they were part and parcel of the Nazi regime. In the name of "free enterprise," American imperialism has refused to put these industries in the hands of the people even when, as in the province of Hesse (U.S. zone), a referendum vote favored nationalization. In the west we find that the unholy alliance of the old Social-Democratic leaders, the Catholic Church, and Anglo-American imperialism, supported by the Schumann-Blum camp, is desperately trying to preserve the base of German reaction.

THE NATIONAL QUESTION IN POSTWAR GERMANY

The problem of the unification of Germany on a democratic basis has been completely misrepresented by the Anglo-American press, which, to confuse the issues, deliberately poses the problem in an abstract way, *i.e.*, as centralization vs. federalization.

The S.E.D. in the eastern zone and the Communist Parties in the three western zones demand a unified, *centralized* Germany under democratic control and based on thoroughgoing de-nazification and elimination of the power of the Junkers and industrialists.

On the other hand, the Western powers are trying to establish a federalized Germany so that the three

western zones may become small and weak dependencies, or virtual colonies of the United States. Like the slave-holders of pre-Civil War days in the U.S., our modern British and American imperialist rulers seek to preserve the status quo by talking about "States' Rights." And just as Great Britain supported slavery in the South to gain a foothold on the American continent, so today American imperialism seeks, through a federated Germany, to preserve German reaction from destruction and, through it, gain an imperialist stronghold in the heart of Europe. After buying out Britain and achieving the dominant role in the rich Ruhr region, American imperialism needs the state form of federalism for domination of Europe and the world.

To split Germany; to attain full control of the Ruhr; to restore the political and economic power of German reaction, under American domination; to turn Germany into an anti-Soviet base as after World War I—all of this lies at the heart of the Marshall Plan.

The Anglo-American drive for the federalization and partitioning of Germany serves a further purpose. It serves as a pretext for breaking the Potsdam agreement on reparations, for sabotaging the restoration by Germany of even a small part of the damage she caused the other nations.

As Molotov clearly demonstrated at the London Conference of Foreign Ministers last November, Ger-

many can pay the \$10,000,000,000 in reparations agreed upon at Yalta and Potsdam without hampering the development of its consumers' goods industry. Reparations have been taken from the eastern zone and, nevertheless, industry has risen there to 52 per cent of the 1938 production level as against 35 per cent in the west. Molotov proposed the increase of production in the west to 70 per cent of the prewar level, out of which Germany could afford to pay reparations and still improve its economic position.

But U.S. foreign policy has other aims. It seeks to make Germany permanently dependent on American imperialism. This is the essence of the new colonialism Wall Street is practicing in Germany. Wall Street's aim is to maintain its former competitor, German imperialism, in continuing dependence on the U.S. It lays the basis for the utilization of Germany as a vassal for new imperialist adventures directed at the Soviet Union and the new peoples' democracies.

During the London Conference all the parties and mass organizations of the Soviet zone issued a call for a People's Congress to formulate plans to unify the democratic forces in their struggle for a united Germany. Hundreds of delegates attended from western Germany, even though it was difficult to obtain inter-zonal passes from A.M.G. About 100 delegates came from the Social-Democratic Party, despite threats of expulsion by Schumacher.

More
has o
Germ
and
ment
ings
the g
Ame
man
unity
force
and
tov
ence
resto
out
dem
peop
T
strat
exist
exist
mill
they
and
N
wor
Ger
clas
cre
and
U.S
wo

More recently, the People's Congress has organized meetings in western Germany, even though the British and American Military Governments have forbidden some meetings and have tried to prevent the growth of the Congress. Anglo-American imperialism and its German reactionary stooges fear this unity movement of the democratic forces in Germany, whose influence and strength are growing. As Molotov stated after the London Conference: "Germany's unity cannot be restored on a democratic basis without the active participation of the democratic forces of the German people."

The facts presented above demonstrate that real democratic forces exist in Germany. Not only do they exist, but, as the recent strike of millions of German workers showed, they are daily growing in numbers and militancy.

Now is the time for the American workers to turn to action as far as Germany and the German working class is concerned. This means, concretely, struggle against the policies and methods being employed by U.S. imperialism to split the German working class; to prevent the estab-

lishment of a united trade-union organization; to prevent the growth of the Socialist Unity Party in the western zones; to transform "bizonia" into a puppet state; to establish a reactionary federalized Germany; to develop the Ruhr's industrial potential for an anti-Soviet war; and to deliver Germany once again into the hands of the cartelists and Junkers.

American trade unionists must repudiate the anti-working class, pro-imperialist activities of the Browns and Careys. Their role as purveyors of Marshall Plan enslavement is all the more pernicious since they speak in the name of labor.

It is precisely the growing enlightenment, pressure for unification, and mood for struggle of the German working class that U.S. imperialism fears and combats in Germany. It is precisely the forward, democratic forces within the German working class that the American workers must support.

The fight for a progressive, democratic, unified Germany is of vital concern to the living standards, security, and freedom of the American people!

ON THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

By A. A. ZHDANOV

[In 1946, there appeared in the Soviet Union a textbook on *The History of Western European Philosophy* by Georgi Alexandrov. Although originally awarded a Stalin prize, the book evoked widespread criticism in the U.S.S.R. As a consequence the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union organized in June, 1947, a conference of philosophical workers from all parts of the country to discuss, not only the book and problems of the history of philosophy, but also shortcomings and tasks on the philosophical front. Eighty-three contributions were made to the discussion at the conference, which was summarized in the brilliant speech by A. A. Zhdanov, Secretary of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. Zhdanov's speech originally appeared in the first issue of the new Soviet journal, *Questions of Philosophy*, and subsequently in the *Bolshevik* of August 30, 1947, from which this translation has been made for *Political Affairs*.—Ed.]

COMRADES, THE DISCUSSION of the book by Comrade Alexandrov has not been confined to the subject under debate. It has transcended it in breadth and depth, posing also more general questions of the situation on the philosophical front. The discussion has been transformed into a kind of all-Union conference on the status of our scientific work in philosophy. This, of course, is quite natural and legitimate. The creation of a textbook on the history of philosophy, the first Marxian textbook in this sphere, represents a task of enormous scientific and political significance. It is therefore not accidental that the Central Committee has given so much attention to this question and has organized the present discussion.

To write a good textbook on the history of philosophy means to equip our intellectuals, our cadres, our youth with a new, powerful ideological weapon and at the same time to take a great step forward in the development of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. Hence, the high level of the requirements for such a textbook was expressed in the discussion. The extension of the range of the discussion has, therefore, been profitable. Its results will, without doubt, be great, the more so since we dealt not only with questions connected with the evaluation of the textbook, but also with the more general problems of our philosophical work.

I shall permit myself to discuss both themes. It is far from my thought to summarize the discussion

—this is the task of the author. I speak as a participant in the debate.

I ask in advance to be excused if I have recourse to citations, although Comrade Baskin has repeatedly warned all of us against this procedure. Of course, it is easy for him, an old salt on the sea of philosophy, to plow through philosophical seas and oceans without navigation instruments. But you will have to permit me, a novice, treading for the first time the unsteady deck of the philosophical ship in a time of terrible storm, to use quotations as a sort of compass which will enable me to maintain the correct course.

I now pass to the remarks on the textbook.

I

THE WEAKNESSES OF COMRADE ALEXANDROV'S BOOK

I believe that from a textbook on the history of philosophy we have a right to demand the fulfillment of the following conditions, which, in my opinion, are elementary.

First, it is necessary that the subject—the history of philosophy as a science—be precisely defined.

Second, the textbook should be scientific—*i. e.*, based on present-day achievements of dialectical and historical materialism.

Third, it is essential that the exposition of the history of philosophy be a creative and not a scholastic work; it should be directly linked with the

tasks of the present, should lead to their elucidation, and should give the perspectives for the further development of philosophy.

Fourth, the facts adduced should be fully verified.

Fifth, the style should be clear, precise, and convincing.

I consider that this textbook does not meet these demands.

Let us begin with the subject of science.

Comrade Kivenko has pointed out that Comrade Alexandrov does not present a clear idea of the subject of science, and that although the book contains a large number of definitions having individual importance, in that they illuminate only individual aspects of the question, one does not find in the work an exhaustive general definition. That observation is entirely correct. Neither is the subject of the history of philosophy as a science defined. The definition given on page 14 is not complete. The definition on page 22, italicized, apparently as a basic definition, is essentially incorrect. Should one agree with the author that "the history of philosophy is the history of progressive, ascending development of man's knowledge of the surrounding world," it would mean that the subject of the history of philosophy coincides with that of the history of science in general, and in which case philosophy itself would appear as the science of sciences. This conception was long ago rejected by Marxism.

MATERIALISM VERSUS IDEALISM

The author's assertion that the history of philosophy is also the history of the rise and development of many contemporary ideas is likewise incorrect because the concept "contemporary" is here identified with the concept "scientific," which, naturally, is erroneous. In defining the subject of the history of philosophy it is necessary to proceed from the definition of philosophical science, given by Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin.

This revolutionary side of Hegel's philosophy was adopted and developed by Marx. Dialectical materialism "no longer needs any philosophy standing above the other sciences." Of former philosophy there remains "the science of thought and its laws—formal logic and dialectics." And dialectics, as understood by Marx, and in conformity with Hegel, includes what is now called the theory of knowledge, or epistemology, which, too, must regard its subject matter historically, studying and generalizing the origin and development of knowledge, the transition from *non-knowledge* to knowledge.*

Consequently the scientific history of philosophy is the history of the origin, rise, and development of the scientific materialist world outlook and its laws. Inasmuch as materialism grew and developed in the struggle with idealist currents, the history of philosophy is simultaneously the history of the struggle of materialism with idealism.

* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. XI, p. 17.

As to the scientific character of the book from the standpoint of its utilizing contemporary attainments of dialectical and historical materialism, in this respect, too, it suffers from many serious inadequacies.

A REVOLUTION IN PHILOSOPHY

The author describes the history of philosophy and the development of philosophical ideas and systems as a smooth, evolutionary process through the accumulation of quantitative changes. The impression is created that Marxism arose simply as the successor to preceding progressive teachings—primarily the teachings of the French materialists, of English political economy, and the idealist school of Hegel.

On page 475 the author states that the philosophical theories formulated before Marx and Engels, although occasionally containing great discoveries, were not fully consistent and scientific in all their conclusions. Such a definition distinguishes Marxism from pre-Marxist philosophical systems only as a theory fully consistent and scientific in all its conclusions. Consequently, the difference between Marxism and pre-Marxist philosophical teachings consists only in that the latter were not fully consistent and scientific; the old philosophers merely "erred."

As you see, it is a question here only of quantitative changes. But that is metaphysics. The rise of Marxism was a genuine discovery,

a revolution in philosophy. Like every discovery, like every leap, like every break in gradualness, like every transition into a new condition, the rise of Marxism could not have occurred without the previous accumulation of quantitative changes—in this instance, the development of philosophy prior to Marx and Engels. But the author evidently does not understand that Marx and Engels created a new philosophy, differing qualitatively from all antecedent philosophies, however progressive they were. The relation of Marxist philosophy to all preceding philosophies and the basic change which Marxism effected in philosophy, transforming it into a science, is well known to all. All the more strange, therefore, is the fact that the author focuses his attention, not on that which is new and revolutionary in Marxism but on that which unites it with the development of pre-Marxist philosophy. This, notwithstanding the statement of Marx and Engels that their discovery meant the end of the old philosophy.

MARXISM AND THE END OF THE OLD PHILOSOPHY

Evidently the author does not understand the concrete historical process of the development of philosophy.

One of the essential shortcomings of the book, if not the principal one, is its ignoring of the fact that in the course of history, not only do views on this or that philosophical question

undergo change, but the very range of these questions, the very subject of philosophy, undergoes a constant change, which is in complete conformity with the dialectical nature of human cognition and should be clear to all real dialecticians.

On page 24 of his book, expounding on the philosophy of the ancient Greeks, Comrade Alexandrov writes: "Philosophy as an independent sphere of knowledge arose in the slave society of ancient Greece." And further, "Philosophy, arising in the sixth century [B.C.] as a special sphere of knowledge, attained wide dissemination."

But can we speak of the philosophy of the ancient Greeks as a special, differentiated sphere of knowledge? On no account. The philosophical views of the Greeks were so closely interwoven with their natural science and with their political views that we should not, and have no right to, transfer to Greek science our division of the sciences, the classification of the sciences which came later. Essentially, the Greeks knew only one, undifferentiated science, into which there entered also their philosophical conceptions. Whether we take Democritus, Epicurus, or Aristotle—all of them in equal degree confirm the thought of Engels that "the oldest Greek philosophers were at the same time investigators of nature."*

The unique character of the development of philosophy resides in the fact that from it, as the scientific

* Frederick Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*, p. 245.

knowledge of nature and society developed, the positive sciences branched off one after another. Consequently, the domain of philosophy was continually reduced on account of the development of the positive sciences. (It should be noted that this process has not ended even up to the present time.) This emancipation of the natural and social sciences from the aegis of philosophy constitutes a progressive process, for the natural and social sciences, as well as for philosophy itself.

The creators of the philosophical systems of the past, who laid claim to the knowledge of absolute truth in the ultimate sense, were unable to further the development of the natural sciences, since aspiring to stand above science, they swaddled them with their schemes, imposing on living human understanding conclusions dictated, not by real life, but by the requirements of their philosophic system. And so philosophy was transformed into a museum in which were piled the most diverse facts, conclusions, hypotheses, and outright fantasies. If philosophy was nonetheless able to serve as a means of surveying phenomena, of contemplation, it still was not suitable as an instrument for practical action on the world, as an instrument for understanding the world.

The last system of this kind was the system of Hegel, who attempted to erect a philosophical structure, subordinating all other sciences, pressing them into the Procrustean bed of its own categories. Hegel counted

on solving all contradictions, but fell into a hopeless contradiction with the dialectical method which he himself had divined but not understood, and hence applied incorrectly.

But:

. . . As soon as we have once realized . . . that the task of philosophy thus stated means nothing but the task that a single philosopher should accomplish that which can only be accomplished by the entire human race in its progressive development—as soon as we realize that, there is an end of all philosophy in the hitherto accepted sense of the word. One leaves alone “absolute truth,” which is unattainable along this path or by any single individual; instead, one pursues attainable, relative truths along the path of the positive sciences, and the summation of their results by means of dialectical thinking.*

The discovery of Marx and Engels represents the end of the old philosophy, *i.e.*, the end of that philosophy which claimed to give a universal explanation of the world.

Comrade Alexandrov's vague formulations blur the great revolutionary significance of the philosophical discovery of Marx and Engels, since he emphasizes that which connected Marx with the antecedent philosophers, but fails to show that with Marx there begins a completely new period in the history of philosophy—philosophy which for the first time has become science.

A SCIENTIFIC PHILOSOPHY OF THE PROLETARIAT

In close connection with this error,

* Frederick Engels, *Ludwig Feuerbach*, p. 25.

we find in Alexandrov's book a non-Marxist treatment of the history of philosophy as the gradual change from one philosophical school to another. With the appearance of Marxism as the scientific world outlook of the proletariat ends the old period in the history of philosophy, when philosophy was the occupation of isolated individuals, the possession of philosophical schools consisting of a small number of philosophers and their disciples, detached from life and the people, and alien to the people.

Marxism is not that kind of philosophical school. On the contrary, it supersedes the old philosophy—philosophy that was the property of a small élite, the aristocracy of the intellect. It marked the beginning of a completely new period in the history of philosophy, when it became the scientific weapon in the hands of the proletarian masses in their struggle for emancipation from capitalism.

Marxist philosophy, as distinguished from preceding philosophical systems, is not a science dominating the other sciences; rather, it is an instrument of scientific investigation, a method, penetrating all natural and social sciences, enriching itself with their attainments in the course of their development. In this sense Marxist philosophy is the most complete and decisive negation of all preceding philosophy. But to negate, as Engels emphasized, does not mean merely to say "no." Negation includes continuity, signifies absorption, the critical reforming and unification in a new and higher synthesis

of everything advanced and progressive that has been achieved in the history of human thought.

Hence, it follows that the history of philosophy, inasmuch as there exists the Marxist dialectical method, must include the history of the preparatory development of that method, showing that which conditioned its rise. Alexandrov's book does not give the history of logic and dialectics, does not show the development of the logical categories as the reflection of human practice; because of this the quotation from Lenin in the introduction to the book, to the effect that every category of dialectical logic should be considered a nodal point in the history of human thought, hangs in the air.

Entirely indefensible is the fact that the book brings the history of philosophy only up to the rise of Marxist philosophy, that is, to 1848. Without presenting the history of philosophy during the last hundred years, the work naturally cannot be considered a textbook. Why the author has so pitilessly wronged this period remains a mystery, and no explanation is to be found either in the preface or in the introduction.

Nor is the reason indicated for the failure to include the history of the development of Russian philosophy. It is not necessary to emphasize that this omission involves principle. Whatever the author's motives for excluding the history of Russian philosophy from a general history of philosophy, its omission objectively means belittlement of the role of Rus-

sian philosophy; it artificially divides the history of philosophy into the history of Western European and of Russian philosophy. The author makes no attempt to explain the necessity for such a division. This separation perpetuates the bourgeois division of "Western" and "Eastern" culture and presents Marxism as a regional Western current. On page 6 of the introduction, the author ardently argues the reverse position:

Without studying diligently and utilizing the profound criticism of the philosophical systems of the past given by the classics of Russian philosophy, it is impossible to achieve a scientific understanding of the development of philosophic thought in Western European countries.

Why then did the author fail to adhere to this correct position in his book? This remains absolutely incomprehensible and, taken together with the arbitrary termination at 1848, it produces a vexing impression.

The comrades who spoke in the discussion have also pointed out the gaps in the presentation of the history of the philosophy of the Orient.

It is clear that for this reason as well the book requires radical revision.

THE PARTY-CHARACTER OF PHILOSOPHY

Some comrades have indicated that the introduction to the book, which obviously should present the author's credo, correctly defines the tasks and methods of the investigation of the subject, but that the author somehow

has not fulfilled his promises. I believe that this criticism is inadequate; for the introduction itself is faulty and cannot stand up against criticism.

I have already mentioned the inexact definition of the subject of the history of philosophy. But that is not all. The introduction contains other theoretical errors. Some comrades have pointed out the strained manner in which the author, dealing with the foundations of the Marxist-Leninist history of philosophy, refers to Chernishevsky, Dobroliubov, and Lomonosov, who, of course, have no direct relation to the question under discussion. The question, however, involves more than this. The questions from the works of these great Russian scientists and philosophers were badly selected. The theoretical propositions which they contain are from the Marxist point of view incorrect and, I would add, even dangerous. And I do not in the slightest intend to cast any aspersion on the quoted authors, since the quotations were selected arbitrarily and are related to questions that have nothing in common with the subject with which the author is dealing. The point is that the author refers to Chernishevsky in order to show that the founders of different, although contradictory, philosophic systems must be tolerantly related one to another.

Allow me to cite the quotation from Chernishevsky:

The continuers of scientific work rise against their predecessors whose work served as the point of departure for

their c
a host
thorou
whose
times
this.
when
stand
judg
cessor
selves
the i
pred
clear
cont
own.
in th
To t
scien
upon
and
kno
geni
teac
gen
His
7.)

I
qu
vio
of
all
pri
ph
Lo
wi
M
du
al
st
th
A
a

their own labors. Thus, Aristotle took a hostile view of Plato, thus Socrates thoroughly humiliated the sophists, whose continuer he was. In modern times there are also many examples of this. But there are happy instances when founders of a new system understand clearly the connection of their judgments with the ideas of their predecessors and modestly consider themselves their disciples; when in disclosing the inadequacy in the ideas of their predecessors, they at the same time clearly manifest how much those ideas contributed to the development of their own. Such was the case, for instance, in the relation of Spinoza to Descartes. To the honor of the founders of modern science, it must be said that they look upon their predecessors with respect and almost filial affection, fully acknowledging the greatness of their genius and the noble character of their teaching, in which they indicate the germs of their own views. (Alexandrov: *History of Western Philosophy*, pp. 6-7.)

Inasmuch as the author offers this quotation without reservation, it obviously appears to be his own point of view. If that is so, the author actually takes the position of denying the principle of the Party-character of philosophy, inherent in Marxism-Leninism. It is well known with what passion and irreconcilability Marxism-Leninism has always conducted the sharpest struggle against all enemies of materialism. In this struggle Marxist-Leninists subject their opponents to ruthless criticism. An example of Bolshevik struggle against the opponents of materialism

is Lenin's book, *Materialism and Empirio-criticism*, in which every word is like a piercing sword, annihilating the opponent. Lenin wrote:

The genius of Marx and Engels consisted in the very fact that in the course of a long period, *nearly half a century*, they developed materialism, that they further advanced one fundamental trend in philosophy, that they did not confine themselves to reiterating epistemological problems that had already been solved, but consistently applied—and showed *how* to apply—*this same* materialism in the sphere of the social sciences, mercilessly brushing aside as litter and rubbish the pretentious rigmarole, the innumerable attempts to “discover” a “new” line in philosophy, to invent a “new” trend and so forth. . . .

And finally, take the various philosophical utterances by Marx in *Capital* and other works, and you will find an *invariable* basic motif, *viz.*, insistence upon *materialism* and contemptuous derision of all obscurantism, of all confusion and all deviations towards *idealism*. All Marx's philosophical utterances revolve within these fundamental opposites, and, in the eyes of professorial philosophy, their defect lies in this “narrowness” and “one-sidedness.”*

Lenin, we know, did not spare his opponents. In all attempts to blur and reconcile the contradictions between philosophical tendencies, Lenin always saw the maneuver of reactionary professorial philosophy. How then after that could Comrade Alexandrov appear in his book like

* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. XI, pp. 386-7.

a preacher of toothless vegetarianism in relation to philosophical opponents, presenting unqualified tribute to professorial quasi-objectivism, when Marxism arose, developed, and triumphed in a merciless struggle against all representatives of the idealist tendency?

Comrade Alexandrov does not confine himself to this. He constantly applies his objectivist ideas throughout the book. It is not accidental, therefore, that Comrade Alexandrov, before criticizing some bourgeois philosopher, pays "tribute" to his merits and burns incense to him. Let us take, for example, the teaching of Fourier on the four phases in the development of mankind.

The great achievement of the social philosophy of Fourier, says Comrade Alexandrov,

... is his theory of the development of mankind. In its development society passes, according to Fourier, through four phases: 1) ascending disintegration; 2) ascending harmony; 3) descending harmony; 4) descending disintegration. In the last stage mankind experiences a period of senility, after which all life on earth comes to an end. Inasmuch as the development of society proceeds independently of human will, a higher stage of development arises just as unfailingly as the change of seasons. From this Fourier drew the conclusion of the inevitable transformation of the bourgeois system into a society in which free and collective labor would prevail. True, Fourier's theory of development of society was limited by the conception of the four phases, but for that period it rep-

resented a great step forward. (Alexandrov, *History of Western Philosophy*, pp. 353-354.)

There is not a trace of Marxist analysis in this. By comparison with what does the theory of Fourier represent a step forward? If its limitation consisted in that it spoke of four phases of the development of mankind, with the fourth phase constituting descending disintegration, as a result of which all life on earth comes to an end, then how shall we understand the author's criticism of Fourier that his theory of social development is limited within the confines of the four phases, when the fifth phase for mankind could consist only of life in the hereafter?

Comrade Alexandrov finds it possible to say something good about almost every philosopher of the past. The more eminent the bourgeois philosopher, the greater the flattery that is offered him. All of this shows that Comrade Alexandrov, perhaps without being aware of it, is himself a captive of bourgeois historians, who proceed from the assumption that every philosopher is first of all an associate in the profession, and only secondarily an opponent. Such conceptions, if they should take hold among us, inevitably would lead to objectivism, to subservience to bourgeois philosophers and exaggeration of their services, toward depriving our philosophy of its militant offensive spirit. And that would signify the departure from the basic principle of materialism—its principle of direction, its partisanship. Well did

Lenin teach us that "materialism includes, so to speak, partisanship, *i.e.*, the obligation when estimating any event to adopt directly and frankly the viewpoint of a definite social group."*

The exposition of philosophical views in Alexandrov's book is abstract, objectivist, neutral. Philosophical schools are placed one after another or one near the other in the book, but are not shown in struggle against one another. That, too, is a "tribute" to the academic professorial "tendency." In this connection, it is apparently not accidental that the author's exposition of the principle of partisanship in philosophy is not satisfactory. The author refers to the philosophy of Hegel as an example of partisanship in philosophy; and the struggle of antagonistic philosophies has for him its illustration in the struggle of the reactionary and progressive principles within Hegel himself. Such a method of demonstration is not only objectivist eclecticism, but it clearly embellishes Hegel, inasmuch as in this way one wants to show that in Hegel's philosophy there is as much progressive as there is reactionary content.

To conclude on this point, I may add that Comrade Alexandrov's method of evaluating various philosophical systems—"along with merits, there are also shortcomings," or "the following theory is also of importance"—is marked by extreme vague-

ness, is metaphysical, and can only confuse. It is incomprehensible why Comrade Alexandrov chose to pay tribute to the academic scientific traditions of the old bourgeois schools, forgetting the fundamental principle of materialism which demands irreconcilability in the struggle against one's opponents.

A further remark. A critical study of philosophical systems must have an orientation. Philosophical views and ideas long slain and buried should not attract much attention. On the other hand, philosophical systems and ideas still current, which, notwithstanding their reactionary character, are being utilized today by the enemies of Marxism, demand especially sharp criticism. This includes particularly neo-Kantianism, theology, old and new editions of agnosticism, the attempts to smuggle God into modern natural science, and every other cookery that has for its aim the freshening up of stale idealist merchandise for the market. That is the arsenal which the philosopher lackeys of imperialism make use of at the present time in order to bolster their frightened masters.

ON THE METHOD OF DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM

The introduction to the book also contains an incorrect treatment of the notions of reactionary and progressive ideas and philosophical systems. The author states that the question of the reactionary or progressive character of one or another idea or philosophical system should be determined on

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 276 (Russian).

the basis of historical conditions. But, time and again he ignores the established position of Marxism that the very same idea can be reactionary or progressive under different concrete historical conditions. The author, by obscuring this point, opens a fissure for the smuggling in of the idealist conception of ideas as independent of history.

While the author correctly notes that the development of philosophical thought in the final analysis is determined by the material conditions of social life and that the development of philosophical thought has only relative independence, he repeatedly violates that basic position of scientific materialism. Time and again he presents the various philosophical systems without relating them to their actual historical environment, and without showing the social-class roots of this or that philosopher. That is the case, for instance, with his exposition of the philosophical views of Socrates, Democritus, Spinoza, Leibnitz, Feuerbach, and others. Such a method is, clearly, not scientific; it justifies the assumption that the author has slipped into the course of treating the development of philosophical ideas as independent of history, a distinguishing characteristic of idealist philosophy.

The failure to show the organic connection of this or that philosophical system with its historical environment is evident even where the author attempts to give an analysis of that environment. What we have

in those instances is a purely mechanical, formal, and not a living organic connection. The divisions and chapters dealing with the philosophical views of a particular epoch, and those discussing the historical circumstances, revolve upon parallel planes, while the presentation of the historical data—the link of causation between the basis and superstructure—is given as a rule unscientifically, slipshod-wise. It does not provide material for analysis but rather presents an inadequate frame of reference. Such, for example, is the introduction to Chapter VI, entitled "Eighteenth Century France," which is utterly irrelevant and which in no way elucidates the sources of the ideas of French philosophy in the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries. Consequently, the ideas of the French philosophers lose their connection with the epoch and begin to appear as some independent phenomena. Allow me to quote this part:

Beginning with the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, France following behind England gradually takes the road to bourgeois development, experiencing radical changes for a hundred years in its economy, politics, and ideology. The country, although it was still backward, began to free itself from its feudal inertia. Like many other European states of that time, France entered the period of primary capitalist accumulation.

The new bourgeois social structure was rapidly taking shape in all spheres of social life, quickly giving rise to a new ideology, a new culture. About

that tim
ginnin
as Par
and of
chant
panies
militar
which
Trade
1788
reache
than f
The g
the T
(1748)
Especi
books.
turnov
reache
land
frances
found
Europ
remain
overw
tion v
315-31

Tha
is me
ber of
to on
positi
data a
chara
the d
detach
tions
Let
the d
man
writes
Gen
half

that time we witness in France the beginning of a rapid growth of such cities as Paris, Lyons, Marseilles, and Havre, and of the development of a strong merchant fleet. International trading companies arose one after another, and military expeditions were organized which conquered a number of colonies. Trade grew rapidly. In the years 1784-1788 the turnover of external trade reached 1,011,600 livres, exceeding more than four times the trade of 1716-1720. The growth of trade was facilitated by the Treaty of Aachen [Aix-la-Chapelle] (1748) and the Treaty of Paris (1763). Especially significant was the trade in books. Thus, for instance, in 1774 the turnover in the book trade in France reached 45 million francs, while in England it stood only at 12-13 million francs. In the hands of France was found nearly half the gold supply of Europe. At the same time France still remained an agrarian country. The overwhelming majority of the population was agrarian. (Alexandrov, pp. 315-316.)

That, of course, is no analysis; it is merely an enumeration of a number of facts set forth without relation to one another, but simply in juxtaposition. It is obvious that from these data as "basis" one cannot derive any characteristic of French philosophy, the development of which appears detached from the historical conditions of the France of that period.

Let us take as a further example the description of the rise of German idealist philosophy. Alexandrov writes:

Germany in the eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth century was a

backward country with a reactionary political regime. Feudal-serf and artisan-guild relations prevailed in it. At the end of the eighteenth century the urban population was less than 25 per cent of the total, while the artisans constituted only 4 per cent. Corvée, quitrent, serfdom, and guild restrictions hindered the development of the embryonic capitalist relations. Moreover, the country was split up into numerous political segments.

Comrade Alexandrov cites the percentage of urban population in Germany to illustrate the backwardness of that country and the reactionary character of its state and social-political structure. But in that same period the urban population of France was less than 10 per cent of the whole; nevertheless, France was not a backward feudal land, as was Germany, but the center of the bourgeois revolutionary movement in Europe. Consequently, the percentage of urban population itself does not explain anything. More than that, the fact itself must be explained by the concrete historical conditions. This, too, is an example of the inept use of historical material to explain the rise and development of one or another form of ideology.

Alexandrov writes further:

The most prominent ideologists of the German bourgeoisie of that period—Kant, and later Fichte and Hegel—expressed through their idealist philosophies, in an abstract form, conditioned by the narrowness of German reality, the ideology of the German bourgeoisie of that epoch.

Let us compare this cold, indifferent, objectivist statement of facts, from which it is impossible to understand the causes for the rise of German idealism, with the Marxist analysis of the conditions of that time in Germany, presented in a living, militant style, which stirs and convinces the reader. Here is how Engels characterizes the situation in Germany:

... It was all over one living mass of putrefaction and repulsive decay. Nobody felt himself at ease. The trade, commerce, industry and agriculture of the country were reduced to almost nothing; peasantry, tradesmen and manufacturers felt the double pressure of a blood-sucking government and bad trade; the nobility and princes found that their incomes, in spite of the squeezing of their inferiors, could not be made to keep pace with their increasing expenditures; everything was wrong, and a general uneasiness prevailed throughout the country. No education, no means of operating upon the minds of the masses, no free press, no public spirit, not even an extended commerce with other countries—nothing but meanness and selfishness—a mean, sneaking, miserable shopkeeping spirit pervading the whole people. Everything worn out, crumbling down, going fast to ruin, and not even the slightest hope of a beneficial change, not even so much strength in the nation as might have sufficed for carrying away the putrid corpses of dead institutions.*

* Frederick Engels, "The State of Germany," *The Northern Star*, October 25, 1845; Marx-Engels, *Gesamtausgabe*, Erste Abteilung, Band IV, p. 482.

Compare this clear, sharp, exact, profoundly scientific characterization given by Engels with that which Alexandrov gives and you will see how badly Comrade Alexandrov utilizes the material at hand in the inexhaustible wealth left us by the founders of Marxism.

The author has failed to apply the materialist method to the exposition of the history of philosophy. This deprives the book of scientific character, making of it, to a considerable extent, an account of the biographies of the philosophers and their philosophic systems, unrelated to the historical conditions. This violates the principle of historical materialism:

All history must be studied afresh, the conditions of existence of the different formations of society must be individually examined before the attempt is made to deduce from them the political, civil-legal, aesthetic, philosophic, religious, etc., notions corresponding to them.*

The author, further, sets forth unclearly and inadequately the purposes of the study of the history of philosophy. Nowhere does he emphasize that one of the fundamental tasks of philosophy and its history is to continue the development of philosophy as a science, to deduce new laws, to verify its propositions in practice, to replace old theses with new ones. The author proceeds chiefly from the pedagogical aspects of the history of philosophy, from the cultural-educational task. And so he gives to the

* Engels to Conrad Schmidt, August 5, 1890. *Marx-Engels, Selected Correspondence*, p. 473.

whole study of the history of philosophy a passive, contemplative, academic character. That, of course, does not correspond to the Marxist-Leninist definition of philosophical science, which, like every science, must continuously be developed, perfected, enriched by new propositions, while it discards the obsolete.

The author concentrates on the pedagogical aspects, thus placing limitations on the development of the science, as though Marxism-Leninism had already reached its apex and as though the task of developing our theory were no longer a main task. Such reasoning is inconsistent with the spirit of Marxism-Leninism inasmuch as it introduces the metaphysical idea of Marxism as a completed and perfected theory; it can lead only to the drying up of living and inquiring philosophical thought.

PHILOSOPHY AND THE NATURAL SCIENCES

Likewise unsatisfactory is the author's treatment of the development of the natural sciences in that period when the history of philosophy could not be separated from the progress of the natural sciences. Thus, Comrade Alexandrov fails to clarify the conditions for the rise and development of scientific materialism on the granite foundation of the achievements of modern natural science.

In expounding the history of philosophy, Alexandrov managed to sever it from the history of the natural sciences. It is characteristic that the introduction, which sets forth the

main premises of the book, fails to mention the interrelation of philosophy and the natural sciences. The author does not refer to the natural sciences even when such silence would seem impossible. Thus, on page 9, he writes: "Lenin in his works, particularly in *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, studied the Marxist theory of society in all its aspects and further developed it." In speaking of *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Comrade Alexandrov managed to say nothing about the problems of natural science and its connection with philosophy.

One is struck by the extremely poor and abstract characterization of the level of natural science at various periods. Thus, with regard to the natural science of the ancient Greeks, we read that there took place "the nascence of the sciences of nature" (p. 26). With regard to the epoch of the later scholasticism (XII-XIII centuries) we read that "there appeared many inventions and technical improvements" (p. 120).

Where the author attempts to clarify such vague formulations, we get only an inadequately connected enumeration of the discoveries. Moreover, the book contains flagrant errors, disclosing an amazing ignorance of the questions of natural science. Of what value, for instance, is the description of the development of science in the epoch of the Renaissance:

The learned Goerika constructed his famous pneumatic pump, and the existence of atmospheric pressure which

replaced the notion of vacuum, was demonstrated practically, at first through the experiment with hemispheres at Magdeburg. In the course of centuries people argued about the location of the "center of the world," and whether our planet was to be considered that center. But then Copernicus made his entrance into science, and later Galileo. The latter proved the existence of spots on the sun and their change of position. He saw in this, and other discoveries, confirmation of the teaching of Copernicus on the heliocentric structure of our solar system. The barometer taught people to forecast the weather. The microscope replaced the system of conjectures regarding the life of the minutest organisms and played a large part in the development of biology. The compass helped Columbus to prove by experience the spherical structure of our planet. (p. 135.)

Nearly every one of these sentences is absurd. How could atmospheric pressure replace the notion of vacuum? Does the existence of atmosphere negate the existence of vacuum? In what way did the movement of the sun spots confirm the teaching of Copernicus?

The idea that the barometer forecasts weather is in the same unscientific vein. Unfortunately, even today people have not yet fully learned how to forecast the weather, as is well known to all of you from the practices of our own Weather Bureau.

Further, can the microscope replace the system of conjecture? And, finally, what is this "spherical structure of our planet"? Until now it

has seemed that *spherical* could refer only to shape.

Alexandrov's book is full of such pearls.

But the author is guilty of even more essential errors, touching on principle. He states (page 357) that the way was prepared for the dialectical method by the advances of natural science "as early as the second half of the eighteenth century." This basically contradicts Engels' well-known statement that the dialectical method was prepared for by the discovery of the cellular structure of organisms, by the theory of the conservation and transformation of energy, by the theory of Darwin. All these discoveries date from the nineteenth century. On this false assumption, the author proceeds to enumerate the discoveries of the eighteenth century and speaks extensively of Galvani, Laplace, and Lyell, but as regards the three great discoveries indicated by Engels he limits himself to the following:

Thus, for instance, already during the life of Feuerbach, there was established the cellular theory, the theory of the transformation of energy, and there appeared the theory of Darwin on the origin of the species through natural selection. (p. 427.)

Such are the basic weaknesses of the book. I shall not digress upon incidental and secondary weaknesses; neither will I repeat the highly valuable remarks of criticism, from the theoretical and the practical stand-

point,
the d
T
book
revis
first
confu
ifest
pher
pass
tion
soph
-
TH
PH
T
drov
the
soph
sent
was
rece
sho
ers
Co
a
our
T
ev
it
Ce
Co
qu
vel
cri
TH
cri
bu
sci
kn
er

point, which have been made during the discussion.

The conclusion is that the textbook is bad, that it must be basically revised. But such revision means first of all overcoming the false and confused conceptions which are manifestly current among our philosophers, including leading ones. I now pass to the second question, the question of the situation on our philosophical front.

II

THE SITUATION ON THE PHILOSOPHICAL FRONT

The fact that Comrade Alexandrov's book received recognition by the majority of our leading philosophical workers, that it was presented for the Stalin prize, that it was recommended as a textbook and received many laudatory reviews, shows that other philosophical workers obviously share the mistakes of Comrade Alexandrov. This bespeaks a most unsatisfactory situation on our theoretical front.

The fact that the book did not evoke any considerable protest, that it required the intervention of the Central Committee, and particularly Comrade Stalin, to expose its inadequacies, shows the absence of developed Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism on the philosophical front. The lack of creative discussions, of criticism and self-criticism, could not but have a harmful effect upon our scientific work in philosophy. It is known that philosophical works are entirely insufficient in quantity and

weak in quality. Monographs and articles on philosophy are a rare occurrence.

Many have spoken here of the need for a philosophical journal. The need for such a journal is questionable. We have not yet forgotten the sad experience with the periodical *Under the Banner of Marxism*. It seems to me that the present possibilities for publishing original monographs and articles are not utilized adequately.

Comrade Svetlov stated here that the reading public of *The Bolshevik* is not the public for theoretical works of a special character. I think that this is entirely incorrect and proceeds from an obvious underestimation of the high level of our readers and their demands. Such an opinion, it seems to me, comes from a failure to understand that our philosophy is not the property merely of a group of professional philosophers, but belongs to our entire Soviet intelligentsia. There was decidedly nothing bad in the tradition of the advanced Russian magazines of the pre-revolutionary epoch, which published, along with articles on literature and art, scientific works, including philosophical studies. Our magazine *The Bolshevik* speaks to a far larger audience than any philosophical journal, and to enclose the creative work of our philosophers in a specialized philosophical journal, it seems to me, would create the danger of narrowing the basis of our philosophical work. Please do not take me for an opponent of a journal. It seems to me that the paucity of philosophical

studies in our magazines and in *The Bolshevik* invites us to begin to overcome this weakness in their pages first, especially in the magazines which from time to time even now publish philosophical articles having a scientific and social interest.

Our leading philosophical institute—the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences—in my opinion, presents a rather unsatisfactory picture, too. It does not gather to itself the workers in the periphery, and, having no connection with them, is therefore not in reality an institution of an all-Union character. Philosophers in the provinces are left on their own, although they represent a great force which unfortunately is not utilized. Philosophical studies, including works submitted for university degrees, turn for their themes toward the past, toward quiet and less responsible historical subjects of the type of: “The Copernican Heresy—Past and Present.” This leads toward a certain revival of scholasticism. From this point of view the dispute about Hegel which took place here appears strange. The participants in that dispute forced an open door. The question of Hegel was settled long ago. There is no reason whatsoever to pose it anew. No material was presented here beyond that which had already been analyzed and evaluated. The discussion itself was irritating in its scholasticism and as unproductive as the probings at one time in certain circles into such questions as whether one should cross oneself with two or with three

fingers, or whether God can create a stone which he cannot lift, or whether the mother of God was a virgin. Problems of present-day actuality are hardly dealt with at all. All this taken together is pregnant with great dangers, much greater than you imagine. The gravest danger is the fact that some of you have already fallen into the habit of accepting these weaknesses.

ADVANCING OUR PHILOSOPHICAL FRONT

Our philosophical work does not manifest either a militant spirit or a Bolshevik tempo. Considered in that light, some of the erroneous theses of Alexandrov's textbook reflect the lag on the entire philosophical front, thus constituting, not an isolated accidental factor, but a phenomenon that is general. We have often used in our discussion the term “philosophical front.” But where, in actuality, is this front? When we speak of the philosophical front, it immediately suggests an organized detachment of militant philosophers, perfectly equipped with Marxist theory, waging a determined offensive against hostile ideology abroad and against the survivals of bourgeois ideology in the consciousness of Soviet people within our country—a detachment ceaselessly advancing our science, arming the toilers of our Socialist society with the consciousness of the correctness of our path, and with confidence, scientifically grounded, in the ultimate victory of our cause.

But does our philosophical front resemble a real front? It resembles rather a stagnant creek, or a bivouac at some distance from the battlefield. The field has not yet been conquered, for the most part contact has not been established with the enemy, there is no reconnaissance, the weapons are rusting, the soldiers are fighting at their own risk and peril; while the commanders are either intoxicated with past victories, or are debating whether they have sufficient forces for an offensive or should ask for aid from the outside, or are discussing to what extent consciousness can lag behind without appearing to lag too far.

This, at a time when our Party urgently needs an upswing of philosophical work. The rapid changes which every new day brings into our Socialist life are not generalized by our philosophers, not illuminated from the viewpoint of Marxist dialectics. This only renders more difficult the conditions for the further development of philosophical science. As a result, the development of philosophical thought proceeds to a considerable extent apart from our professional philosophers. This is entirely inadmissible.

Obviously, the cause for the lag on the philosophical front is not connected with any objective conditions. The objective conditions are more favorable than ever. The material awaiting scientific analysis and generalization is unlimited. The causes for the lag on the philosophical front must be sought in the subjective

sphere. These causes are basically the same as those disclosed by the Central Committee in analyzing the lag in other sectors of the ideological front.

As you will remember, the decisions of the Central Committee on ideological problems were directed against formalist and apolitical attitudes in literature and art, against the ignoring of present-day themes and withdrawal into the past, against bowing before foreign influences and for the militant Bolshevik Party-character of literature and art. It is known that many groups of workers on our ideological front have already drawn proper conclusions from the decisions of the Central Committee and have made considerable advance on this path.

But our philosophers have lagged behind. Apparently they have not taken note of the absence of principle and idea-content in philosophical work, of the neglect of present-day themes, the existence of servility and fawning before bourgeois philosophy. Apparently they believe that a turn on the ideological front does not concern them. It is clear now that the turn is necessary.

A considerable share of responsibility for the fact that the philosophical front does not stand in the first ranks of our ideological work rests unfortunately upon Comrade Alexandrov. Regrettably, he does not possess the ability for sharply critical disclosure of the weaknesses of his work. He evidently overestimates his powers and does not rely on the ex-

perience and knowledge of the collective body of philosophers. Moreover, he relies too much in his work on a narrow circle of intimate collaborators and admirers. Philosophical activity has somehow been monopolized by a small group of philosophers, while a larger number, especially in the provinces, have not been brought into leading work.

This cannot be considered a proper relationship among philosophers.

It is clear that the creation of such a work as a textbook on the history of philosophy is beyond the capacity of one man and that Comrade Alexandrov from the very beginning should have drawn upon a wide circle of authors—dialectical materialists, historical materialists, historians, natural scientists, and economists. In thus failing to rely upon a large group of competent people, Comrade Alexandrov chose an incorrect method of preparing his book.

This fault must be corrected. Philosophical knowledge, naturally, is the property of the collective of Soviet philosophers. The method of drawing in a large number of authors is now being applied to the editing of the textbook on political economy which should be ready in the near future. Into this work there have been drawn wide circles, not only of economists, but also of historians and philosophers. Such a method of creative work is the most reliable. This implies also another idea—that of uniting the efforts of ideological workers in various fields, who at present have insufficient contact with

each other, for the solution of large problems of general scientific significance. Thus we secure reciprocal activity among the workers in various branches of ideology and are assured that we will advance, not helter-skelter, but in an organized and unified manner, and consequently with the greatest guarantee of success.

CRITICISM AND SELF-CRITICISM —THE SPECIAL FORM OF STRUGGLE BETWEEN THE OLD AND THE NEW

What are the roots of the subjective errors of a number of leading workers on the philosophical front? Why did the representatives of the older generation of philosophers in the course of the discussion justly reproach some of the young philosophers for their premature senility, for their lack of militant tone, of combativeness? Obviously, there can be only one answer to this question—insufficient knowledge of the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism and the presence of remnants of the influence of bourgeois ideology. This expresses itself also in the fact that many of our workers still do not understand that Marxism-Leninism is a living, creative theory, continuously developing, continuously enriching itself on the basis of the experience of Socialist construction and the achievements of contemporary natural science. Such underestimation of this living revolutionary aspect of our theory cannot but lead to the abasement of philosophy and its role.

Precisely in this lack of militancy

and fighting spirit must we look for the reasons that some of our philosophers fear to apply themselves to new problems—to present-day questions, to the solution of problems which are daily posed by practice, and for which philosophy is obligated to provide an answer. It is time to advance more courageously the theory of Soviet society, of the Soviet state, of contemporary natural science, of ethics and aesthetics. It is necessary to put an end to a cowardice alien to Bolshevism. To permit a standstill in the development of theory means to dry up our philosophy, to deprive it of its most valuable feature—its capacity for development, and to transform it into a dead, barren dogma.

The question of Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism is for our philosophers not only a practical but a profoundly theoretical matter.

Since, as dialectics teaches us, the inner content of the process of development is the struggle of opposites, the struggle between the old and the new, between the dying and the rising, between the decaying and the developing, our Soviet philosophy must show how that law of dialectics operates in Socialist society and what are the specific characteristics of its operation. We know that in a society divided into classes that law operates differently than in our Soviet society. Here there is a broad field for scientific investigation, and none of our philosophers has cultivated that field. This, notwithstanding the fact that our Party long ago discovered and placed at the service of

Socialism that particular form of revealing and overcoming the contradictions of Socialist society (such contradictions exist and philosophy cannot avoid dealing with them)—that particular form of struggle between the old and the new, between the dying and the rising, in our Soviet society, which is known as criticism and self-criticism.

In our Soviet society, where antagonistic classes have been liquidated, the struggle between the old and the new, and consequently the development from the lower to the higher, proceeds not in the form of struggle between antagonistic classes and of cataclysms, as is the case under capitalism, but in the form of criticism and self-criticism, which is the real motive force of our development, a powerful instrument in the hands of the Party. This, is, incontestably, a new aspect of movement, a new type of development, a new dialectical law.

Marx stated that earlier philosophers only explained the world, while the task today is to change the world. We have changed the old world and built a new one, but our philosophers, unfortunately, do not adequately explain this new world, nor do they adequately participate in transforming it. In the discussion there were several attempts, as it were, "theoretically" to explain the causes of that lag. It was stated, for instance, that the philosophers worked too long as commentators, and for this reason did not pass in due time to original monographs.

This explanation may be well-sounding, but it is not convincing. Of course, the philosophers must now place creative work in the forefront, but that does not mean that the work of commentary, or rather of popularization, should be given up. Our people need this equally as much.

THE DEPRAVED IDEOLOGY OF THE BOURGEOISIE

We must now quickly make up for lost time. The problems do not wait. The brilliant victory of Socialism achieved in the Great Patriotic War, which was at the same time a brilliant victory for Marxism, is like a bone in the throat of the imperialists. Today the center of the struggle against Marxism has shifted to America and England. All the forces of obscurantism and reaction have today been placed at the service of the struggle against Marxism. Brought out anew and placed at the service of bourgeois philosophy are the instruments of atom-dollar democracy, the outworn armor of obscurantism and clericalism: the Vatican and the racist theory, rabid nationalism and decayed idealist philosophy, the mercenary yellow press and depraved bourgeois art. But apparently all these do not suffice. Today under the banner of "ideological" struggle against Marxism large reserves are being mobilized. Gangsters, pimps, spies, and criminal elements are recruited. Let me take at random a recent example. As was reported a few days ago in *Izvestia*, the journal *Les Temps Mod-*

ernes, edited by the existentialist Sartre, lauds as some new revelation a book by the writer Jean Genêt *The Diary of a Thief*, which opens with the words: "Treason, theft, and homosexuality—these will be my key topics. There exists an organic connection between my taste for treason, the occupation of the thief, and my amorous adventures." The author manifestly knows his business. The plays of this Jean Genêt are presented with much glitter on the Parisian stage and Jean Genêt himself is showered with invitations to visit America. Such is the "last word" of bourgeois philosophy.

We know from the experience of our victory over fascism into what a blind alley the idealist philosophy has led whole nations. Now it appears in its new, repulsively ugly character which reflects the whole depth, baseness, and loathsomeness of the decay of the bourgeoisie. Pimps and depraved criminals as philosophers—this is indeed the limit of decay and ruin. Nevertheless, these forces still have life, are still capable of poisoning the mass consciousness.

Contemporary bourgeois science supplies clericalism, supplies fideism, with new arguments which must be mercilessly exposed. We can take as an example the English astronomer Eddington's theory of the physical constants of the world, which leads directly to the Pythagorean mysticism of numbers and, from mathematical formulae, deduces such "essential constants" of the world as

the apocalyptic number 666, etc. Many followers of Einstein, in their failure to understand the dialectical process of knowledge, the relationship of absolute and relative truth, transpose the results of the study of the laws of motion of the finite, limited sphere of the universe to the whole infinite universe and arrive at the idea of the finite nature of the world, its limitedness in time and space. The astronomer Milne has even "calculated" that the world was created two billion years ago. It would probably be correct to apply to these English scientists the words of their great countryman, the philosopher Bacon, about those who turn the impotence of their science into a libel against nature.

In like measure, the Kantian subterfuges of latter-day bourgeois atomic physicists lead them to deductions of the "free will" of the electron and to attempts to represent matter as only some combination of waves and other such nonsense.

Here is a colossal field of activity for our philosophers, who should analyze and generalize the results of contemporary natural science, remembering the advice of Engels that materialism "With each epoch-making discovery even in the sphere of natural science . . . has to change its form. . . ."*

Upon whom, if not upon us—the land of victorious Marxism and its philosophers—devolves the task of heading the struggle against corrupt and base bourgeois ideology? Who

if not we should strike crushing blows against it?

THE TRIUMPH OF MARXISM

From the ashes of the war have arisen the new democracies and the national liberation movement of the colonial peoples. Socialism is on the order of the day in the life of the peoples. Who if not we—the land of victorious Socialism and its philosophers—should help our friends and brothers beyond our borders to illuminate their struggle for a new society with the light of scientific Socialist understanding? Who if not we should enlighten them and arm them with the ideological weapon of Marxism?

In our country we have the vast expansion of Socialist economy and culture. The steadfast growth of the Socialist understanding of the masses presents ever greater demands upon our ideological work. What is taking place is a broad assault upon the vestiges of capitalism in the consciousness of people. Who but our philosophers should head the ranks of the workers on the ideological front, applying in full measure the Marxian theory of knowledge in generalizing the vast experience of Socialist construction and in solving the new tasks of Socialism!

In the face of these great tasks one might ask: Are our philosophers capable of undertaking these new obligations? Is there enough powder in our philosophical powder-horns? Has not our philosophical power

* Frederick Engels, *Ludwig Feuerbach*, p. 36.

weakened? Are our scientific philosophical cadres capable, with their own inner strength, of overcoming the defects of their development and reconstructing their work anew? There can be but one answer to this question. The philosophical discussion has shown that we have these forces, that they are by no means small, that they are capable of exposing their errors in order to overcome them. We need only more confidence in our forces, more testing of our forces in active battles, in posing and solving the burning present-day problems. It is time to put an end to the non-militant tempo of our work, to shake off the old Adam and to begin to work as Marx, Engels, Lenin worked, as Stalin works.

Comrades, as you may remember, Engels, in his time, greeted the appearance of a Marxian pamphlet in 2,000 or 3,000 copies and characterized this as a great political event of

vast significance. From such a fact, insignificant by our standards, Engels drew the conclusion that Marxist philosophy had deeply taken root in the working class. What are we to say of the penetration of Marxian philosophy into broad layers of our people; what would Marx and Engels have said if they knew that in our country philosophical works are distributed among the people in tens of millions of copies? This is a real triumph of Marxism, and it is a living testimony of the fact that the great teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin have become in our land the teaching of the entire people.

On this foundation, which has no equal in the world, our philosophy should flourish. May you be worthy of our epoch, the epoch of Lenin and Stalin, the epoch of our people, our victorious people!

“The strength and vitality of Marxism-Leninism are derived from the fact that it relies upon an advanced theory which correctly reflects the needs of development of the material life of society, that it elevates theory to a proper level, and that it deems it its duty to utilize every ounce of the mobilizing, organizing and transforming power of this theory.”

Joseph Stalin, *Dialectical and Historical Materialism*.

NOTES ON KEYNES' CONCEPTS OF SAVING AND INVESTMENT

By ALBERT PRAGO

JOHN MAYNARD KEYNES' theory of saving and investment can be summed up as follows: Consumption increases along with increasing income, but not in the same proportion. Hence, an increasing portion of income is saved. The lack of consumption is a reflection of insufficient employment because of insufficient investment. A stimulus for increasing investment is needed, to be supplied by a *deus ex machina*—the State. By initiating various monetary reforms to secure a fall in the rate of interest, the State would encourage new investment; and, secondly, by engaging in public works, the State would overcome the unwillingness of private capital to invest. Such an increase in investment would, according to Keynes, increase employment and therefore raise the level of consumption. Consumption would accordingly develop in proper proportion to the rising income, as well as allow an adequate residue for new investment. For such an equilibrium to be established, the

State would have to intervene. In this wise, there would be an end to the contradictions of capitalism—to unemployment, economic dislocations, and crises.

KEYNESIAN CATEGORIES

To understand Keynes' concepts of saving and investment, we must briefly examine his categories of income, consumption, and prime cost.

The Keynesian category of income entails the factor of total sales to entrepreneurs and to consumers, designated by symbol A. The symbol for total sales to entrepreneurs is A_1 . Consequently, $A - A_1$ equals Consumption (C). The amount available for national consumption is determined by national income. National income is variously interpreted by Keynes as being equal to: 1) "value of output"* (actually, total sales prices; for to Keynes value and price are synonymous); or 2) the difference between A (total sales to entrepreneurs and to consumers) and "user cost" (U).

What is user cost? It is one part of Keynes' prime cost; the second part of prime cost consists of factor cost, which is the "amount paid out by the entrepreneur to the other factors of production in return for their services, which from their point of view is their income."** Presumably, "other factors of production" com-

* John Maynard Keynes, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money*, New York, p. 65. (Referred to hereafter as *General Theory*.)

** *Ibid.*, p. 53.

prise the trinitarian formula of land, capital, and labor—the “expenses” for which are rent, interest, and wages. Exactly what Keynesian user cost consists of is left unclear! Keynes defines U (user cost) as “equal to $A_1 - I$ where A_1 is what he [the entrepreneur] has bought from other entrepreneurs and I is what he has currently invested in his own equipment.”* Keynes includes in this I an unascertainable variable involving the so-called psychological “sacrifice” entailed by the capitalist in utilizing the means of production instead of leaving them unused.

R. G. Hawtrey considers that “‘User Cost’ is composed of his [the entrepreneur’s] payments to other entrepreneurs for their output, *minus* the net increment of his capital.”** In other words, during a given period of production, Hawtrey figures, there is an increase of working capital and of new equipment, from which, by subtracting the depreciation costs, he arrives at an estimate of the *net* additional capital equipment. This definition throws light on Keynes’ description of user cost as that “which measures the sacrifice of value involved in the production of A .”*** In any case, user cost is a category dreamed up by Keynes; it is not a scientific reflection of the productive process. In the world of reality costs of production are equivalent to the value of constant capital used up during the process of production plus

wages. In relation to the value of capital, the descriptive categories reflecting this process are: wear and tear, depreciation of fixed capital plus raw materials, fuel, etc., and wages. The entrepreneur engages in no “sacrifice” other than sitting in his office instead of on a Florida beach. And even for sitting in his office, he receives compensation in his capacity as “director.”

Now, to proceed with the Keynesian equations relative to income, consumption, and investment.

If Income equals $A - U$ and Consumption equals $A - A_1$ it follows that saving—the difference between income and consumption—is equal to $A_1 - U$ (or total sales to entrepreneurs) minus the unascertainable, mystical user cost.*

KEYNESIAN EQUATIONS

Now we are ready to consider the following set of equations evolved by Keynes:

Income = value of output = consumption + investment.

Saving = income — consumption.

Therefore saving = investment.**

1. We shall see that what Keynes calls “savings” is fundamentally accumulation, which arises out of the surplus value appropriated by the capitalist class. Keynes’ “saving” can only constitute the difference between the realized total surplus value and the amount spent by the capitalists for individual consumption.

* *The General Theory*, p. 66.

** R. G. Hawtrey, *Capital and Employment*, New York, 1937, p. 170.

*** *General Theory*, p. 53.

* *Ibid.*, p. 62.

** *Ibid.*, p. 63.

KEY

Sav

equal

basic

almo

Keyn

Abba

eral

that

any

(or

But

that

sav

impl

ing

In

asser

ment

cient

sour

fund

the p

disag

on i

lack

the e

the

inve

peop

quer

no s

Fu

ting

pora

loan

to c

three

• T

autho

Harris

•••

Emph

KEYNESIAN SAVING

Saving is defined by Keynes as equal to investment. This equation, basic to the Keynesian system, has almost as many interpretations as Keynes has followers. For example, Abba P. Lerner—apparently in general agreement with Keynes—asserts that “there cannot for the society be any excess of saving over investment (or of investment over saving).”^{*} But H. Gordon Hayes, in asserting that “Failure to invest all that is saved is the basic difficulty,”^{**} clearly implies that there *are* excesses of saving over investment.

In the first case, where Keynesians assert that saving must equal investment, if the difficulty lies in insufficient investment, what is to be the source of the additional capital funds? In the second case, if we take the position of those Keynesians who disagree with the master's emphasis on insufficient investment and stress lack of consumption as the cause of the economic system's ills, would not the original difficulty of insufficient investment ensue? For, clearly, if people consumed more and consequently saved less, there would be no source of additional investment.

Furthermore, Keynes fails to distinguish between individual and corporate “saving.” It is a fact that loanable capital flows to banks and to other investment institutions in three principal ways: 1) industry's

reserve funds; 2) deposits by all non-industrial capitalists and deposits of savings of all classes, including temporarily unemployed (uninvested) money; and 3) gradually consumed income. Thus, not all of the savings of individuals are real savings; for a portion (generally an appreciable portion) constitutes only deferred consumption, *i.e.*, money that is temporarily being saved for purposes of individual consumption at some future date.

While Keynes recognizes deferred consumption as a factor, however negligible, he ignores the fact that the bankers indiscriminately utilize as investment capital *all* deposits, including that portion which represents only deferred consumption. This gives rise to a number of complexities, not the least of which is the growing amount of fictitious capital arising out of increasing credit emanating from the growing deposits of individuals in savings accounts, bond purchases, life insurance policies, stocks, etc.

Another major factor completely ignored by Keynes is that investable capital is a sum several times the actual amount of loanable capital, depending on its speed of turnover. This is made clear by Marx, who comments that “Since the same piece of money may perform different purchases, according to the velocity of circulation, it may just as well perform the service of different loans, for the purchases take it from one hand to another, and a loan is but

^{*} *The New Economics*, [essays by various authors] edited with introductions by Seymour E. Harris, New York, 1947, p. 123.

^{**} H. Gordon Hayes, *Spending, Saving and Employment*, New York, 1946, p. 26.

a transfer from one hand to another without the intervention of a purchase.* Thus, the extension of the credit system multiplies the loanable capital.

To return to the question of real saving—whether it is for deferred consumption, for a “rainy day,” or whether it is outright hoarding—Marx effectively attacks the concept that such saving is the result of the “abstinence” of the capitalists and that interest and profits are “rewards” for “saving” instead of consuming. Marx writes:

... the business of actual saving and abstinence (by people forming hoards), to the extent that it furnishes elements of accumulation, is left in the division of labor, which comes with the progress of capitalist production, to those who receive the smallest share of such elements, and who frequently enough lose even their savings, as do the laborers when banks fail. On the one hand the capital of the industrial capitalist is not “saved” by himself, but he has command of the savings of others in proportion to the magnitude of his capital; on the other hand the money-capitalist makes of the savings of others his own capital, and of the credit, which the reproductive capitalists give to one another, and which the public gives to them, a source for enriching himself. *The last illusion of the capitalist system, to the effect that capital is the fruit of one's own labor and saving is thereby destroyed.* Not only does profit consist of the appropriation of other people's labor, but the capital, with which the labor of others is set in motion and

exploited, consists of other people's property, which the money-capitalist places at the disposal of the industrial capitalist, at the same time exploiting the latter in his turn.*

If by “savings” is meant accumulation of potential capital, then it is not savings at all, but principally the action of corporations, not of individuals; and among the corporations the chief “savers” are the monopolies, trusts, holding companies, etc., which, as we saw, operate with other people's property. Lumping the actions of monopolies together with those of small enterprises, and worse of all with the actions of individuals, obscures the issues, hides the real social relationships, and covers up the class antagonisms. It would make of every child and adult who has a few dollars saved, a capitalist! That is right up the absurd propaganda alley of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers and has nothing in common with science or reality.

INCOME, PROFITS, AND SURPLUS VALUE

For Keynes income consists of rent, interest, wages, and entrepreneurs' profits. The Keynesian concept of profits excludes the profits distributed as rent and interest. Keynes defines profits as being the difference between the total sales prices and what he terms “prime cost.” This concept of profits also excludes the unrealized, unutilized surplus value embodied in unsold

* Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, p. 555.

* *Ibid.*, pp. 596-7. Italics mine—A.P.

commodities. The fallacy of excluding the unrealized surplus value is obvious. For, in the first place, the surplus value may be realized at some future date. On the other hand, it may never be realized; if any portion is not realized because the capitalists are unable to market all of their products, then the consequences are disastrous in the long run.

It has been previously noted that Keynes makes the amount available for investment equal to savings. Investment for Keynes means purchases of capital equipment, *i.e.*, purchases of constant capital. He thus omits an important and indispensable category of investment, namely, variable capital. Of course, this omission of labor power does not bother Keynes; for, like all vulgar economists, he conceals the source of surplus value. He considers profit simply as the difference between total sales prices and prime cost. Not to consider the investment in the purchase of labor power is to conceal the value-creating force in production; for only labor creates value and surplus value.

CONTRADICTIONS OF CAPITALISM

The irreconcilable contradictions of capitalism continue to dog Keynes, however he may define income, saving, and investment. He ignores, for instance, the fact that the growth of capitalist accumulation brings with it intensification of the contradiction between production and consump-

tion. It is pertinent to examine this matter of basic importance.

In his analysis of the determinants of the level of employment, Keynes states that "the theory can be summed up by saying that, given the psychology of the public, the level of output and employment as a whole depends on the amount of investment."* Let us assume, with Keynes, that income equals consumption plus investment ($Y = C + I$). Now, the most significant aspect of the problem, for Keynes, is that under-consumption is a result of insufficient investment. Apparently, the way to increase consumption is to increase investment, which will, Keynes asserts, in turn increase employment. The conclusion is that investment can and should be stepped up, so that the much desired full employment equilibrium can be attained and maintained. But, how?

What are the determinants of investment? According to Keynes, there are two: the "marginal efficiency of capital" (*i.e.*, the average rate of profit) and the rate of interest. Alvin Hansen—leading liberal Keynesian in the U.S.A.—believes that Keynes stressed the first factor, namely, marginal efficiency of capital.** Abba P. Lerner believes that Keynes stressed the second factor, namely, the rate of interest.***

All Keynesians, however, agree that an equilibrium level of income,

* J. M. Keynes, "The General Theory," in *The New Economics*, p. 191.

** *The New Economics*, p. 138.

*** *Ibid.*, pp. 124-5.

investment, and consumption may be temporarily reached, but without full employment. The problem is to achieve full employment. How? The Keynesian answer is that full employment can be attained, provided everything "saved" is invested. The amount to be "saved" is determined, say the Keynesians, by the given level of employment and the amount of income, since that will determine the amount to be consumed and, therefore, the amount to be "saved." Hoarding (Keynes' "liquidity preference") will be discouraged by low rates of interest which will stimulate new investment. Keynes and some of his followers, in order further to stimulate investment, advocate guaranteeing a high rate of profit to capitalist investors by having prices rise more rapidly than nominal wages. Other Keynesians—liberals like Alvin Hansen—advocating increased real wages, recommend larger amounts of profit but a lower rate. All agree, nevertheless, that the stimulation of investment is to be accomplished through monetary manipulation by the government and the latter's entrance into a more or less extensive system of public works.

Why do Keynesians stress in this connection lowering the rate of interest? Clearly, because a high interest rate contracts credit and contracting credit discourages new investment, squeezes out marginal producers, makes for a declining production index, and stimulates growing unemployment. Simply

stated, Keynesians regard an increase in the rate of interest as a factor *accelerating* the elements leading to crisis.

Therefore, as viewed by Keynesians, the bankers are mad to be contracting credit now. They should lower the interest rate (through the intervening, forcing actions of the State) and expand credit. But let the bankers be so good as to heed the sane advice of the Keynesians and what would ensue?

At the moment of writing, the economic picture is one in which the pipelines are filling with goods, with inventories mounting precipitously (\$42 billion in January, 1948). But—lead on—encourage new investment produce more, more! Such is the logical conclusion of Keynesianism. Truly, the bankers would still be mad if they followed this advice. Marx long ago established and even today have fully confirmed the inescapable fact that the superabundance of loan capital is but the sign of increasing stagnation of industrial capital. In time of crisis, which is now maturing, Marx makes clear "the demand for loan capital, and with it the rate of interest, reach their maximum; the rate of profit and with it the demand for industrial capital, are almost gone. In such times every one borrows only for the purpose of paying, in order to settle previously contracted obligations."

The encouragement to investment

* Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, p. 602.

the temporary support to marginal producers, would lead to a still more rapidly rising production—an effect that is further heightened if the government, as Keynesians advocate, engages in public works. But such production increases would last only for a while, to be followed by a more devastating crash! Raising or lowering interest rates on the basis of the capitalist anarchy of production, accelerates the conditions leading to crisis.

Let us assume now the conditions advocated by the liberal Keynesians: lowered interest rates, increasing investment, increasing employment, rising real wages, increasing consumption! That would seem to establish the ideal Keynesian "equilibrium" of income, investment, and employment. But see what happens to such "plans" of men; under capitalism they "aft gang agley." The ideal conditions described would lead to a sharply declining rate of profit; for the rate of exploitation would be declining to the degree that real wages were to rise.

Let us then assume the conditions proposed by the orthodox Keynesians: lowered interest rates, increasing investment, increasing employment, declining real wages (for Keynes advocates increasing prices more rapidly than increasing money wages). In that case, a rising production index, accompanied by increased employment but decreasing real wages, is nothing more than the spread of poverty! Such a growth of

mass poverty contrasted to increasing production must also unavoidably hasten the conditions making for a violent economic explosion.

If by any combination of circumstances the rate of profit falls, the capitalists must be constrained to seek measures to restore the rate, or at least to check its further decline. All measures to check a declining rate of profit involve mainly increasing the rate of exploitation by:

- 1) Improved techniques, increased productivity, and intensification of labor;
- 2) Economies in the employment of constant capital;
- 3) Increasing prices;
- 4) Reductions in wages.

Yet all or any of these measures negate, cut the ground from under, the Utopian concepts of Keynesian full employment under capitalism. For any of these measures must tend to widen the gap between production and consumption.

When private capital is unable to apply the above means to check a declining profit-rate, in the face of labor resistance, the State—which is no *deus ex machina* but the executive committee of finance capital—is called in to act in its behalf. One need but witness the current actions of the U.S. Government in reference to the lifting of price control, attempts to freeze wages, stimulation of inflation, enactment of the slave-labor Taft-Hartley Act, etc.

CONTRADICTIONS DOGGING CAPITALIST ACCUMULATION

The tendency of the rate of profit to fall creates barriers to capitalist accumulation. No capitalist state can remove these barriers except temporarily and only at the expense of the working class. Furthermore, such a temporary solution can lead only to an intensification of the contradictions proper to capitalism. Accumulation—expansion of capital—is an essential for capitalism. But capitalist accumulation is replete with internal inconsistencies and contradictions which no amount of Keynesian tinkering can eliminate.

Accumulation is nothing more nor less than the conversion on an ever-extended scale of surplus value into capital; into means of production and labor power. Not all the produced surplus value is thus converted, however; for a portion, an ever declining portion, is consumed by the capitalist as revenue. The capitalist does not produce for use but, in the words of Marx, it is "exchange value and its augmentation, that spur him into action." To continue this passage from *Capital*:

Fanatically bent on making value expand itself, he ruthlessly forces the human race to produce for production's sake; he thus forces the development of the productive powers of society, and creates those material conditions, which alone can form the real basis of a higher form of society, a society in which the full and free development of every

individual forms the ruling principle.*

Accumulation must clearly involve the investment of surplus value in machinery, plant, raw materials—or constant capital—and, in the purchase of the value-creating commodity, labor power—or, variable capital. The compelling drive for profit (not merely for increasing the *amount* of profit, but the drive to preserve the *rate* of profit) inevitably leads to a growing organic composition of capital: constant capital increases in proportion to the total capital more rapidly than variable capital.

This life-giving process of accumulation, peculiar to capitalism, has its own specific concomitants and consequences. Chief among them are: 1) an increasing rate of exploitation; 2) a tendency of the rate of profit to fall; 3) expanding production potential; 4) decreasing consuming power (since variable capital, while increasing with the growth of total capital, does not do so proportionately); 5) growth of relative surplus population arising out of technological development; 6) increasing concentration and centralization of the productive forces; 7) disequilibrium between the producers' goods and consumers' goods departments of production; 8) increasing poverty amidst growing plenty.

Keynes would by a sleight of hand free capitalism of these insoluble contradictions by manipulating the

* *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 649.

currency, especially the rate of interest. But it is in Keynes' recommendation that the rate of interest be lowered—ultimately to the zero level, thus eliminating the class of rentiers—that we see the complete absurdity of the Keynesian recipe for curing capitalism. Keynes would do away with rentiers, only to replace their restrictive rule with the sway of the "entrepreneurs," *i.e.*, industrial capitalists. But this view ignores entirely the all important fact that the rentier class is today the dominant class. Of major significance is the fact that the dominance of the rentiers is not for-

tuitous but the inexorable result of the development from industrial capitalism to monopoly, finance capitalism. Keynes does not at all consider the role of monopoly, in the epoch in which dying capitalism is presided over by a parasitic class of rentiers, who are not a distinctive class, separated from the "entrepreneurs" but represent the fusion between banking and industrial capital. These rentiers, or finance capitalists, cannot be waved away by strokes of Keynesian monetary wands. The sway of the rentiers can and will be abolished only by the abolition of capitalism.

"The real American tradition is a tradition of struggle and political realignment to meet changing conditions. Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, and the democratic forces of their times led in bringing about progressive realignments and in building new parties when reaction had gained control of the old parties. Not the two-party system of Big Business, but the pioneer spirit, the political initiative and organizing ability of the American people, is what is here to stay."

Eugene Dennis, *The Third Party and the 1948 Elections*, p. 31.

ONE YEAR'S APPLICATION OF TRUMAN'S PROGRAM IN GREECE*

BY THE FREE GREECE RADIO

On March 12, a year will have elapsed since Truman proclaimed to the U.S. Congress his famous message for aid to Greece and Turkey, and the open intervention of U.S. imperialism in our country. The complete failure and bankruptcy of British policy in Greece created the problem of the replacement of Great Britain in Greece by U.S. imperialism.

The Americans undertook to continue and intensify the work of the subjugation of our people with more drastic measures. They undertook to continue and intensify civil war in our country and turn Greece, at the earliest possible moment, into a war base to serve their offensive plans against the Balkan Peoples' Democracies and the Soviet Union. Great Britain confined herself to the role of a junior partner, while trying to save as many of her interests in Greece as possible pending better times, and assisting the imperialistic game of the U.S.

Today the Greek people, and all the peoples threatened by U.S. imperialism, are drawing up the balance

sheet of U.S. aid and intervention and are drawing their own conclusions as to the nature and object of this notorious aid. In our country Truman's military and economic aid was given and explained by the slogan of the maintenance of the country's independence, the saving of Greece from the totalitarian regime which allegedly threatened her, of her economic rehabilitation, and, finally, of the retention by the Greek people of their democracy and their threatened freedoms.

U.S. REGIME OF VIOLENCE

The year's balance sheet of the Americans' work in Greece, the events and the state to which the Americans have reduced our country, speak so eloquently, that no falsehood and no excuse can conceal the fact that the more help you get from an American the deeper you sink into the mire.

Under Truman's motto, "Greece must not be subjected to a totalitarian regime," the Americans have established a regime of unprecedented violence, of terror, slaughter, and extermination of the Greek people. They filled our country with

* A commentary broadcast, March 9, 1948, to the Greek people over the Free Greece Radio of the Democratic Provisional Government of Greece, headed by Markos Vafiades.

Hitlerite camps, with jails and graves. More than 10,000 Greek democratic citizens have been murdered by Truman's tools in the most inhuman way during the last 12 months. More than 50,000 Greek patriots are being held in jails and concentration camps under conditions of terror worse than those of the Hitlerite regime. The prisoners are often murdered and are being exterminated by every possible means in the name of Truman's democracy. Five hundred thousand peasants have been displaced and are wandering homeless in the streets in accordance with the plan of Truman's military men in Greece.

SUPPRESSION OF FREEDOM OF OPINION

One year's American intervention has been sufficient to show the people of Greece and of Europe how the U.S. imperialists understand democracy—the famous Western pattern of democracy. They have suppressed all papers opposed to such a type of democracy. They have suppressed the expression of thoughts and opinions. They have suppressed the circulation of all books with progressive content. With their law about the allegiance of employees and workers, which is the exact copy of an American law, they have brought back the days of the dark Middle Ages. They have suppressed the most elementary rights of man and citizen. They

have torn up the Constitution and handed over the authority to the official and unofficial hordes of monarcho-fascism, at whose mercy are the life, honor, and property of all Greek citizens.

Truman proclaimed that his aid aimed at strengthening the allegedly threatened Greek independence and political freedom. Yet within the space of twelve months he has left not a single trace of that independence and political freedom. All Government and political problems are being regulated to the minutest detail by his permanent or special delegates in our country. The Americans dismiss and appoint the so-called Greek Governments, overtly playing the role of supreme sovereign in our country. They retain the pseudo-Parliament for the passing of laws that they dictate. The so-called Greek Ministries are under the complete domination of the Americans and simply carry out the orders that serve U.S. interests in our country. The so-called Greek Army is under the absolute control of the U.S. Military Mission. The Council of National Defense, the General Staff, and the War Ministries are confined to the role of simple executors of American orders.

Truman had also proclaimed that it was necessary to help the Greek people to overcome their poverty. The results of U.S. aid in this field, too, are very eloquent. In 12 months the drachma has lost 50 to 75 per cent of its value. Food prices have

increased by 100 per cent. Salaries and wages have lost 75 per cent of their purchasing power, while 60 per cent of the workers are unemployed today. The manufacturing and agricultural production of the country hardly reaches 50 per cent of the pre-war figure and the produce of our peasants is plundered by the Americans, who offer only ridiculous prices for it.

From these few data of the tragic balance sheet of one year's application of the Truman Doctrine in our country our people draw their conclusions. Either they must vanquish

these foreign invaders, weapon in hand, and expel them from our country, crushing at the same time their local tools, or else cease to exist as a nation. In their choice our people had no hesitation. They are following the road dictated by many years of experience against foreign invaders, the road of armed struggle, for the conquest of the right to live and of the freedom and independence of our country, so crudely threatened by U.S. imperialism. In this struggle our people have proved that they have the strength and will to conquer.

"In order to find one's bearings in the fight among parties, one must not take words at their face value, but study the real history of the parties—study not so much what they say about themselves, but their *deeds*, how they go about solving various political problems, how they *behave* in dealing with matters involving the vital interests of the various classes of society. . . ."

V. I. Lenin, "Political Parties in Russia"
(Article published in 1912).

COMMUNICATIONS

THE CULTURAL STRUGGLE IN ARGENTINA

By RODOLFO GHIOLDI*

Buenos Aires
February 11, 1948

Comrade V. J. Jerome
New York
Esteemed friend,

I thank you very much for having sent me a copy of your *Culture in A Changing World*, a valuable contribution to the study of intellectual life in the period of imperialist decay, and to the analysis of the social function of culture. I have read it with great interest and profit, and I can tell you that we shall use it here, together with other material from Europe, to stimulate the struggle on the cultural front. *Mutatis mutandis*, the features which you note in the North American scene may be observed similarly in our environment. There is an abundance of scientific workers (such as they are) and writers who constantly evade reality, who take refuge in the reactionary Utopia of a science or an art without any social base, and who frequently search in legend for a way to remain

* Editor of *Orientacion*, central organ of the Communist Party of Argentina.

distant from the actual affairs of man.

But there is an Argentine aspect, a special shade we might say, which most particularly interests us—that is, to pose militantly the cultural problem; and on that aspect I wish to say a few words. It is what you call, “Our responsibility to culture, whose very existence is challenged today, is to reassert the positive, progressive values in our heritage—the living past, the rich democratic and proletarian traditions which can inspire the forward movement of our time.” Thus, for several years, particularly since 1943, an energetic struggle was unleashed here against that cultural heritage of the Argentinians, which has been further aggravated in recent times, in that this nihilistic design has the official protection of the Government. The clerical-fascist group, which has been occupying high official posts, and which now has control of university life and of government cultural institutions—like the National Commission of Culture—seeks to decapitate rationalism. It proclaims that Argentina’s misfortune is “the rationalist air that comes to us from the Seine”; it asserts that Argentina’s disgrace is the Revolution of May, 1810 (as was maintained in the Chamber of Depu-

ties by the Peronista leader, *Días de Vivar*); and it appeals to the most absurd and brutal forms of irrationalism. Observe, Comrade Jerome, that those demands have a direct falangist origin: in effect, pre-Franco Spanish reaction, but above all Falangism, has made its struggle against "French influence" the ideological banner of the movement. But the "French influence," the "rationalist air that comes to us from the Seine," are simply rationalism, Encyclopedism, Jacobinism. When the clerical-fascist *Días de Vivar* attacks the May Revolution, it is the consequence of his own falangist position. Fascism and reaction are incompatible with the revolutionary and progressive past. It is understandable that the Falange and its clerical-fascist acolytes in Argentina should direct their fury against that past; for they understand very well that while the lesson of May remains in the minds of Argentinians, fascism cannot triumph. In the same way, Hitler, in his epoch, understood perfectly that while the French people adhered to their Great Revolution, he could not conquer France.

The program of the Spanish Falange says: "We have the will of Empire." For Falangism means to reconstruct the Empire on the basis of the reconstruction of the Indies [Latin America], an aim which the Holy Alliance proposed in vain a century and a quarter ago. A prerequisite of that ambition is the implacable destruction of all the values that are inseparable from the na-

tional independence of the Latin-American peoples gained during the San Martinian and Bolivarian revolutions. The Argentine clerical-fascists, completely subordinated to the Falange, echo that demand. Naturally, reaction on an ideological plane now signifies the extirpation of the progressive and revolutionary cultural heritage. Our May Revolution took place under the acknowledged influence of the French Revolution. The great figures who founded our nation were deeply influenced by the Encyclopedists and by Jacobinism. During a difficult moment of preparation for the Andean campaign, General San Martin, the greatest Argentine hero, longed for a Robespierre or a Cromwell, in exchange for a few leaders less, to assure the happiness of the people. Thus, when the clerical-fascists undertake their anti-rationalist offensive, they pursue a definite objective: to liquidate the May Revolution and the ideological pillars which support it. On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that the convulsion of May, thanks in great part to the Echeverrian generation, conditioned the thought and the legislation of almost all the past century, and the crystallization of what among us is called the "liberal generation of the '80's." Its exponents were the recipients of the successive influences of European thought (Echeverria and his utopian-socialist friends), a fact which explains, for example, that for 70 years we have had a secular law of education and a civil marriage law.

There was also another factor; at that time, the world bourgeoisie, that of the most developed countries, had an expanding, creative capacity. At present, the Falange, clerical-fascism, and ideological reaction in general, are an influence in a direction which inevitably marks the decay of the capitalist world.

I explain these details to you, Comrade Jerome, so that you will see why the cultural front has tremendous, immediate importance for Argentinians. Among other things, it concerns the defense of our heritage, and, primarily, the May Revolution with all its cultural derivations. I do not believe that there can be a higher or nobler task for Argentinians than to consecrate themselves wholly to this mission. What will we be—socially, politically, and culturally—if we permit them to rob us of the May Revolution? What would the Republic of Argentina be without the May Revolution? The problem, I repeat, is very serious because of the official-governmental prestige of the clerical-fascist groups and the Peron-Franco alliance. To refer to one problem only, I wish to explain to you what is happening in the world of books. During the war, the progress of the Argentine publishing industry was accelerated; for years Spanish books published under the regime of Franco did not and could not enter the country. The extensive Argentine publishing industry, like the Mexican, found a vast Latin-American market. Suddenly the process is interrupted. Francoism

wants, first, to conquer Latin America with books, and to this end subsidizes and favors Spanish publishers to the point of "dumping" in the drive against Argentine books. At the same time, Franco closes the Spanish market to Argentine books and magazines. On its part, the Argentine government facilitates the introduction of books from Spain. Result: Argentine publishing houses are being led to their death agonies. (In general, Argentine books were progressive and liberal.) Thanks to this policy, already in 1945, nine million volumes entered Argentina from Spain; and in 1946, twenty million; there are no figures for 1947, but undoubtedly such imports have increased.

There is more to it than that. Present Spanish thought, that of Francoism, bears the German label; in sociology, the geopolitical orientation is accentuated. Moreover, the United States, after the war, inherited geopolitics (Spykman, Percy, etc.), which is an instrument of expansion, and—for Latin America—of disturbances and wars. (For example, a habitual thesis of North American geopolitics is the inevitability of a Brazil-Argentina war, placing Brazil as the first geopolitical power of South America.) Truman supports Francoism. He supports it with Franco today; he could support it without Franco tomorrow. What would happen to us in the cultural realm if the gigantic North American technical apparatus should associate itself with the falangist Spanish

booksellers in order to conquer Latin America? A basis for this understanding is that North American imperialism must destroy the memory of the May Revolution in the Argentine mind.

All this explains why the cultural

front has so great an interest for us. As you say, it is an essential part of the general struggle for the liberation and dignity of man.

With cordial greetings,

RODOLFO GHIOLDI

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

- The Third Party and the 1948 Elections.* Eugene Dennis. (New Century Publishers) New York, 1948. 62 pp. 15¢.
- Should Americans Back the Marshall Plan?* Joseph Starobin. (New Century Publishers) New York, 1948. 23 pp. 5¢.
- To Secure Jewish Rights.* Alexander Bittelman. (New Century Publishers) New York, 1948. 40 pp. 10¢.
- On the Drumhead.* A selection from the writings of Mike Quin. (Pacific Publishing Foundation) San Francisco, 1948. 244 pp. \$1.50.
- Falsifiers of History: A Historical Note.* Text of a communique issued by the Soviet Information Bureau, Moscow, February, 1948. (*Information Bulletin of the Embassy of the U.S.S.R.*, Washington, 1948. 61 pp.
- A Centenary of Marxism.* Edited by Samuel Bernstein and the editors of *Science and Society*. (*Science and Society*) New York, 1948. 196 pp. Cloth-bound, \$2.50. Paper-bound, 75¢.
- Bases and Empire: A Chart of American Expansion.* George Marion. (Fairplay Publishers) New York, 1948. 200 pp. \$2.00.
- The Thunder of the Grass.* Poems by Aaron Kramer. (International Publishers) New York, 1948. 40 pp. 30¢.
- The Ingrams Shall Not Die: Story of Georgia's New Terror.* Harry Raymond. (*Daily Worker*) New York, 1948. 16 pp. 2¢.
- The Palmer Raids.* Edited by Robert W. Dunn. Prepared by Labor Research Association. (International Publishers) New York, 1948. 80 pp. 30¢.

FROM THE TREASURY OF MARXISM

THE REVOLUTION OF 1848 AND THE PROLETARIAT*

By KARL MARX

[On April 14, 1856, the fourth anniversary of the Chartist organ, the *People's Paper*, the editor, Ernest Jones, entertained the composers and the staff at a supper "which was joined by a large number of the leading democrats of England, France, and Germany, now in London." After supper, Ernest Jones, as chairman, proposed the toast "the Proletarians of Europe." This "was responded to . . . by Dr. Marx. . . ."]

The so-called revolutions of 1848 were but poor incidents, small fractures and fissures in the dry crust of European society. However, they denounced the abyss. Beneath the apparently solid surface, they betrayed oceans of liquid matter, only needing expansion to rend into fragments continents of hard rock. Noisily and confusedly they proclaimed the emancipation of the proletarian, *i.e.*, the secret of the nineteenth century, and of the revolution of that century.

* This speech, delivered by Marx in English, was first printed in the *People's Paper*, April 19, 1856. The text printed here is from *Karl Marx: Man, Thinker, and Revolutionist* (International Publishers, 1927). The *People's Paper* was published in London from 1852 to 1858. Marx supported it as much as he could, wrote articles for it, and sometimes assisted Ernest Jones in the work of editing the paper.—Ed.

The social revolution, it is true, was no novelty invented in 1848. Steam, electricity, and the self-acting mule, were revolutions of a rather more dangerous character than even Citizen's Barbès, Raspail, and Blanqui! But, although the atmosphere in which we live weighs upon every one with a twenty thousand pound force, do you feel it? No more than European society before 1848 felt the revolutionary atmosphere enveloping it and pressing it from all sides. There is one great fact characteristic of this our nineteenth century, a fact which no party dares deny. On the one hand there have started into life industrial and scientific forces which no epoch of the former human history had ever suspected. On the other hand there exist symptoms of decay, far surpassing the horrors recorded of the latter times of the Roman Empire. In our days, everything seems pregnant with its contrary. Machinery, gifted with the wonderful power of shortening and fructifying human labor, we behold starving and overworking it. The newfangled sources of wealth, by some strange, weird spell, are turned into sources of want. The victories of art seem bought by the loss of character. At the same pace that mankind masters nature, man seems to become enslaved to other men or to his own in-

famy. Even the pure life of science seems unable to shine but on the dark background of ignorance. All our invention and progress seem to result in endowing material forces with intellectual life, and in stultifying human life into a material force. This antagonism between modern industry and science, on the one hand, and modern misery and dissolution, on the other hand; this antagonism between the productive forces and the social relations of our epoch is a fact, palpable, overwhelming, and not to be controverted. Some may wail over it; others may wish to get rid of modern arts, in order to get rid of modern conflicts. Or they may imagine that so signal a progress in industry wants to be completed by as signal a regress in politics. For our part, we do not mistake the shape of the shrewd spirit that continues to mark all these contradictions. We know that if the newfangled forces of society are to work satisfactorily, they need only be mastered by newfangled men—and such are the working men. They are as much the invention of modern time as machinery itself. In the signs that bewilder

the middle class, the aristocracy, and the poor prophets of regression, we recognize our old friend Robert Goodfellow, the old mole that can work in the earth so fast, that working pioneer—the revolution. The English working men are the firstborn sons of modern industry. Certainly, then, they will not be the last to aid the social revolution produced by that industry—a revolution which means the emancipation of their class all over the world, which is as universal as capital-rule and wage-slavery. I know the heroic struggles the English working class has gone through since the middle of the last century, struggles not less glorious because they are shrouded in obscurity and burked by middle-class historians. To take vengeance for the misdeeds of the ruling class, there existed in the Middle Ages in Germany a secret tribunal called the Vehmgericht. If a red cross was seen marked on a house, people knew that its owner was doomed by the Vehm. All the houses of Europe are now marked by the mysterious red cross. History is the judge; its executioner, the proletarian.

cracy, and
ession, we
l Robin
that can
t worth
English
orn sou
ly, then
aid the
by the
h mean
class all
univers
every. I
the Eng
through
century
because
rity and
ians. To
leeds of
l in the
a secret
cht. If
l on a
owner
All the
market
History
he pro