

copy *low*

affairs

JUNE 1950 • 25 CENTS

- [1] Free Eugene Dennis!
- [3] Cold-War Rulings of the
Supreme Court
- [7] Hoover's Call for a New Axis
- [14] People's Front and
People's Democracy
- [32] Address to Electors
- [46] Vatican Conspiracy in the
Trade-Union Movement
- [58] The Negro in Hollywood Films
- [93] From the Treasury of Marxism

For the Unconditional Prohibition of the Atomic Weapon*

We demand the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon as an instrument of aggression and mass extermination of people, and the establishment of strict international control over the fulfilment of this decision.

We will regard as a war criminal that government which first uses the atomic weapon against any country.

We call upon all people of good will all over the world to sign this call.

We address ourselves to all social, religious groups and workers in culture, all honest people who irrespective of their views concerning the reasons for the strained international situation, are alarmed because of this and seriously desire to see peaceful relations restored between the peoples.

As a basis for agreement we suggest the prohibition of the atomic weapon and the condemnation of the government which first uses the atomic weapon.

* Text of the peace appeal adopted by the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress at its meeting in Stockholm, Sweden, March 15, 1950. Delegates from 52 countries, including the United States, approved and signed this resolution.

Tens of millions of persons in all parts of the world and of the most varied political and religious affiliations have already signed the peace pledge.

The campaign to secure the signatures of millions of trade unionists and unorganized workers, farmers, Negro people, the city middle classes, intellectuals, women, the youth, members of the national groups, etc.—now under way in our own country—should receive the enthusiastic support of all American anti-imperialists and anti-fascists. Through united-front struggle to the victory of peace!

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.

THE
muni
Jail
swers
the f
be st
Jail
prem
enfor
Ame
the
Jai
lists
union
of R
Ab
peria
pose
clam
and
lead
men

W

* S
C P.

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

Free Eugene Dennis*

THE GENERAL SECRETARY of the Communist Party is prison bound.

Jail! That is how Wall Street answers Eugene Dennis' demand that the fascist Un-American Committee be stripped of its usurped powers.

Jail! That is how the white supremacists answer his demand for enforcement of the Fourteenth Amendment and equal rights for the Negro people!

Jail! That is the fate the monopolists prepare for all militant trade unionists and defenders of the Bill of Rights.

Above all, this is how the imperialists and their government propose to outlaw the people's rising clamor for the outlawing of the A- and H-bomb, and to imprison the leaders of the growing peace movement.

* * *

We of the Communist Party Na-

tional Committee burn with righteous indignation at this Hitler-like act. We remind our fellow Americans that the imprisonment of Ernst Thaelmann was an act of preparation for Hitler's war against the German working class, the German people and all progressive humanity.

This criminal sentence is an unwitting tribute to our General Secretary, and to our whole Party. If the imperialists did not have good reason to fear our Party, they would not seek to behead it. But Hitler's disciples know that our Party is the vanguard champion of the American working class, of peace, democracy and Socialism.

Big Business fears our Party because it fears the working people. It fears Eugene Dennis because it fears the growing militancy of labor, its demands for repeal of Taft-Hartley, its mounting unity of action in defense of the people's living standards and democratic rights.

* Statement issued by the National Committee, C. P., U.S.A., May 1, 1950.

Let the frightened men of Wall Street and Washington sleep uneasy tonight. They have won at best a temporary, and a hollow victory.

* * *

Every Communist, every anti-fascist, every champion of peace will now assume the responsibilities carried by Eugene Dennis as his own.

In the name of Eugene Dennis we who retain our freedom of action will redouble our efforts to strait-jacket the monopolists and check the bipartisan Truman Administration's offensive against the world camp of peace, democracy and Socialism.

Under the continuing leadership of William Z. Foster and Eugene Dennis, we will gather new forces to defeat the Mundt bill, the blueprint for a garrison state and mass arrests and jailings.

We will launch a mighty campaign to secure the freedom of

Eugene Dennis and the abolition of the infamous House Un-American Committee.

We call now for a nation-wide initiative, led by labor and the Negro people, to stay the execution of this fascist sentence in order that Dennis may freely participate in preparing the appeal from the Foley Square frame-up conviction in which the freedom of the 11 Communist leaders, and the freedom of the whole American people, are at stake.

Free Eugene Dennis!

Free the peoples from the threat of fascism and war!

For the National Committee
of the Communist Party,

William Z. Foster,
Gus Hall,
Henry Winston,
John Williamson.

MONDAY
famy as
stitution
their wo
these U

In a s
Court
the fre
assembl

Amend
Street's
it bree

As M
his diss
Hartley
cal test
free th
imposi
compro

First
promis

Mon
struck
against
Ameri
the A
sociati
from
weake
strugg

* Stat
C. P., I

The Cold-War Rulings of the Supreme Court*

MONDAY, May 8, will live in infamy as the day on which the Constitution and Bill of Rights took their worst beating in the history of these United States.

In a series of rulings, the Supreme Court sacrificed labor's rights and the freedoms of speech, press and assembly guaranteed by the First Amendment, to the needs of Wall Street's cold war and the cold terror it breeds.

As Mr. Justice Hugo Black said in his dissent to the ruling on the Taft-Hartley issue, "religious and political test oaths are implacable foes of free thought. By approving their imposition, this court has injected compromise into a field where the First Amendment forbids compromise."

Monday's ruling on Taft-Hartley struck with equal-handed force against the United Steel Workers of America led by Philip Murray and the American Communications Association, which he seeks to expel from the CIO. Its purpose is to weaken all labor in the coming big struggles to defend the workers' liv-

ing standards against the developing new economic crisis.

It invites Big Business and its government to use the strikebreaking and union-busting powers of the Taft-Hartley Act for all they are worth, and to intensify every kind of frontal attack on the workers and their organizations. It has already been seized on by Sen. Robert Taft as the springboard for more frame-ups of militant trade-union leaders.

* * *

As a result of the court's action, trade unions are forbidden to elect officers of their own choosing and called on to limit their membership to workers whose political views are acceptable to Big Business.

An earlier decision of the same court in the fishermen's case threatens the very existence of the trade unions by turning against them measures designed to curb the giant monopolies. And on Monday [May 8] the Supreme Court further shackled organized labor by menacing the right to strike and upholding a ban on picketing in organizing drives, especially in the South.

* Statement issued by the National Committee, C. P., U.S.A., May 10, 1950.

This is Harry S. Truman's court. Like the Congress in which the Democratic Party has a numerical majority, the Truman court is betraying the President's phony election promise to repeal Taft-Hartley by further tightening its chains on the labor movement.

On Monday, the Supreme Court also upheld a state ban on the right to picket against Jim Crow employment practices. Its action coincided with the Dixiecrat filibuster against F.E.P.C. and the G.O.P.-Truman-crat sellout of the Negro people. This decision in effect outlaws mass struggle for the job rights of the Negro workers and legalizes discriminatory employment practices.

The Truman court is fast becoming an instrument for the imposition of white supremacy. Monday's action follows its sanction of the white primary system in Georgia and its refusal to pass on the challenge to systematic violation of the 14th Amendment made by Eugene Dennis.

On Monday, the Supreme Court also reversed an earlier decision in the Christoffel case. Restoring the contempt convictions of Helen Bryan and Ernestina Fleischman, it threw out the quorum requirement it had previously recognized. It gave notice to the House Un-American Committee and the McCarthy Inquisition that from now on no holds are barred, and any group of Congressional witchhunters — however small in number — can usurp the

authority of a grand jury or a court.

• • •

How does the Supreme Court try to justify these sweeping assaults on the Constitutional barriers in the way of open fascist rule?

It adopts as its own the Hitler-like lies of a Budenz, of the Foley Square frame-up and the fascist Mundt-Nixon Bill.

As prosecutor of the Nazi war criminals in Nuremberg, Mr. Justice Robert H. Jackson detailed the hideous consequences that flow from the acceptance of these fascist lies about the Communist Party.

But it seems that Goebbels and Goering took the eminent jurist into camp. Concurring in the majority decision in the Taft-Hartley case, Mr. Justice Jackson said the political oath would be unconstitutional if it applied to Republicans, Democrats, and Socialists. He professed to find it constitutional because it applies "only" to Communists.

This is the 1950 version of Chief Justice Roger Taney's ruling in the Dred Scott case, which held that in 1857 a Negro had no rights other than those which the white Americans were bound to respect. But the American people soon saw the truth of Abraham Lincoln's warning: "Familiarize yourselves with the chains of bondage and you prepare your own limbs to wear them." Under what Lincoln called "the single impulse of resistance to

commo
versed

Trun
court.
of the
he wil
the bo
preme
from t
and lai
for th
state.

Mon
of R
shadow
Act is
leader
Mund
ening
munis
Eugen

The
freede
and th
Comm
fense
selves
cism

Just
"cent
laws
gious
beyor

Rec
it is
preter
Comm
gulf
peace

common danger," the people reversed the Supreme Court.

* * *

Truman's court is Wall Street's court. It has exposed the hypocrisy of the President's recent pledge that he will "keep the Bill of Rights on the books." On Monday the Supreme Court cleared the road-blocks from the path of pro-fascist reaction and laid some new legal foundations for the establishment of a fascist state.

Monday's rulings against the Bill of Rights are the lengthening shadow of Foley Square, the Smith Act indictment of the Communist leaders, the current drive to pass the Mundt-Nixon Bill, and the threatening imprisonment of the Communist Party General Secretary, Eugene Dennis.

They demonstrate once again that freedom, like peace, is indivisible and that the defense of the rights of Communists is the first line of defense for all who would save themselves from the twin menace of fascism and atomic war.

Justice Black pointed out that "centuries of experience testify that laws aimed at one political or religious group . . . rapidly spread beyond control."

Recent experience emphasizes that it is precisely those measures which pretend to be directed "only" against Communists that most rapidly engulf all liberty and wreck world peace.

This never-to-be-forgotten experience of Nazi Germany today repeats itself in our own country and in all the lands under Wall Street's heel. The Supreme Court's assault on the rights of American labor and the Negro people, its attempted nullification of the First Amendment, go hand in hand with Wall Street's bipartisan war drive and its efforts to outlaw the Communist Party, not only in the U.S.A., but also in Western Germany, Japan, Australia, Panama and throughout the capitalist world.

* * *

Today the common danger is atomic world war and fascist terror. Faced with that common danger, millions of Americans—Negro and white—cannot but respond to the "single impulse of resistance" spurring them to united action despite their varied political and religious beliefs.

Digging a grave for the Bill of Rights, the Supreme Court on Monday buried the last lingering illusion that it is a bulwark of our civil liberties.

The American people are on their own now. Not the Truman Administration, not the Supreme Court—but only their mass action can hold back the rising tide of disaster and save the Bill of Rights and peace.

We of the Communist Party National Committee have unshakable faith in the democratic spirit of the American working class and people

and in their capacity to impose their sovereign will.

Fresh in our memory is the recent victory of the striking coal miners, the fruit of their own militant struggle and united labor action.

We recall that it was the people, not the court, that nullified the Alien and Sedition Laws of the 1790's, and the Fugitive Slave Law of the 1850's. We recall that it was the people who forced the court to reverse itself and free Tom Mooney and the Scottsboro boys.

When Eugene Dennis was sentenced for contempt of the House Un-American Committee, he quoted the words of Henry David Thoreau: "They are the lovers of law and order who uphold the law when the government breaks it."

* * *

In that spirit, we call on all democratic and peace-loving Americans, and in the first place on labor and the Negro people, to take up the challenge thrown down by the Supreme Court.

We call for united labor action

against all splitting and expulsion policies, and to repeal the Taft-Hartley law *now*.

We call for Negro and white unity to break the Dixiecrat filibuster, defeat the G.O.P.-Truman-crat sell-out, pass an F.E.P.C. bill, and secure the job rights of the Negro people.

We call for vigilance and united action to defeat the infamous Mundt-Nixon Bill, and for repudiation of the Supreme Court's Nazi-inspired caricature of the Communist Party.

We call for more resolute and united struggle to outlaw the A- and H-bombs and defeat the bipartisan warmakers.

The people's struggle that began with the Declaration of Independence did not end in ignominy on May 8, 1950.

The Supreme Court has spoken and acted for Big Business. But the Court will not have the last word.

May 8 must live in glory as a day that initiated a new, more united, and victorious struggle for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness and world peace.

An

THE
speal
pape
Apri
char
calle
mun
"if t
"Ne
peop
"WI
G.C
mag
mob
in
agn
kno
war
C
ince
mer
-f
of
Rep
De
me
-n
slat
I
fail
pre
col

Hoover's Call For a New Axis

An Editorial

THE WARMONGER, Herbert Hoover, speaking before the American Newspaper Publishers Association on April 27, with the brazen effrontery characteristic of this arch-imperialist, called for the exclusion of the "Communist nations" from the U.N., and, "if that is impractical," to set up a "New United Front . . . of those peoples who disavow Communism." "What the world needs today," the G.O.P. chieftain rolled on his demagoguery, "is a definite concrete mobilization of nations who believe in God against this tide of Red agnosticism. . . . The U.S. needs to know who are with us in this cold war and whom we can depend on."

Clearly, what this virulent war incendiary demanded was the dismemberment of the United Nations—for what else would the exclusion of the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe mean? What he demanded was war—new steps to unleash a third world slaughter.

No decent-minded American can fail to be outraged by this criminal proposal. Hoover's speech was a cold-blooded act expressive of the

arrogance and growing desperation of U.S. imperialism. Such a war-inciting policy as he advanced could only mean dashing the hopes of the peace-aspiring millions the world over. Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the United Nations, rightly labelled Hoover's proposal as one that "would lead sooner or later to a third world war."

Hoover's plan naturally won applause and support from the side of the open warmongers. Republican Senator Hickenlooper of Iowa called on Congress to give it "profound and immediate consideration," while Democratic Senator George of Georgia gave sympathetic approval, with the statement, "I have felt such a move is inevitable. . . ." The fascist-minded New York *Daily News* responded to Hoover's incitement with an editorial advocating the ending of the U.N., while Hearst's *Daily Mirror* hailed Hoover as Patriot No. 1.

President Truman, who got himself re-elected to office by gestures in behalf of peace, telephoned Hoover immediately to compliment him for his U.N.-wrecking speech, even though a few days later he was

brought to the necessity of rejecting the U.N. "reorganization" proposal.

* * *

Hoover's call for scuttling the U.N. is but the logical outcome of the unmitigated "cold-war" policy of the Truman Administration, of its artificially created anti-Soviet hysteria and Red-scare. The Truman Administration has cynically bypassed and ignored the U.N. In launching the Truman Doctrine and in foisting the Marshall Plan upon the countries of Western Europe, it bypassed and ignored the U.N. In organizing the militarist North Atlantic Pact, it flagrantly violated the letter and spirit of the U.N. In intervening in the domestic affairs of European and Asian nations, in fomenting civil wars, in setting up Quisling-puppet regimes, in remilitarizing Western Germany and restoring German fascists to strategic positions—in breaking the solemn commitments of our country's representatives at the Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam conferences, it repudiated the principles and purposes of the U.N.

By its arrogantly imperialist refusal to admit the representatives of the 475 million people of New China into the U.N., the Administration has given clear evidence that it looks upon the U.N., not as an instrument for peace and cooperation, but as a tool for Wall Street's design for world mastery. In truth, almost from

the first day of the existence of the U.N., the delegates of the U.S. have flouted the basic principle upon which the U.N. is formed—the principle of unanimity of action of the great powers, which is indispensable for the carrying out of the original peace purposes of the U.N. Yet, by direct and flanking moves, the State Department has carried on a campaign since 1946 to destroy the unanimity principle, notwithstanding the clear warning of the then representative and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., V. M. Molotov, who declared in his speech at the U.N. General Assembly (October 29, 1946):

Imagine, gentlemen, that the campaign to repeal the so-called "veto" was to be crowned with success. What would the political consequences be? It is quite obvious that the repudiation of the principle of unanimity of the great powers, and this is in fact what this proposal for the abolition of the "veto" implies, would mean in practice the liquidation of the United Nations organization, because this principle is the cornerstone of this organization.

In 1948, under the leadership of the U.S. delegation, a "Little Assembly" was established to substitute for the Security Council in order to nullify the vital principle of unanimity. This failed. Now John Foster Dulles, warmonger in his own right, while in words disapproving of Hoover's proposal, has declared that the U.S. would seek to revise the

U.N. c
the Ge
course,
the un

Is it
in pro
minist
the spi
the T
not cl
and ar
partisa
Aches
not co
Party
strateg
gard
rule it

Wh
provoc
Democ
ally, a
Lern
Hoov
of a
ism i
Lippi
this,
temp
their
dang
is th
whic
war
Unio
who
the

U.N. charter at the next meeting of the General Assembly—meaning, of course, that it would strive to abolish the unanimity provision.

Is it not clear from these facts that in proposing to exclude the "Communist nations," Hoover is acting in the spirit of the bipartisan policy of the Truman Administration? Is it not clear that he but voices openly and arrogantly the intent of the bipartisan policy of the Trumans, Achesons and Dulleses? Does this not confirm what the Communist Party has long been saying, that the strategy of the bipartisans with regard to the United Nations is to rule it or wreck it?



What is behind Hoover's new war provocation at this time? The Social-Democratic *New York Post* editorially, and its master confusionist Max Lerner in his column, interpreted Hoover's proposition as the return of a strong trend toward isolationism in the Republican Party. Walter Lippmann said the same. What is this, however, but a deliberate attempt to deceive the people, to blunt their resistance to the increasing danger of war? What isolationism is there or can there be in a policy which virtually calls for an un-holy war alliance against the Soviet Union? Has this arch-interventionist who used "relief" to help overthrow the Hungarian Revolution in 1919,

and who as recently as January of this year publicly called for the use of the Navy to back up the bankrupt Chiang Kai-shek at Formosa, given up Wall Street's Hitler-like objective of world conquest?

It must be pointed out that isolationism never meant non-intervention in the affairs of the world, as shown by the Dawes Plan and by the role played by the American bankers, and Hoover himself, in rearming Germany and militarizing Japan in the 'thirties. So-called isolationism was a tactic of American imperialist struggle for world domination suitable to conditions in which Britain and France steam-rolled the League of Nations. Far from returning to the policy of isolationism, however, the master pirate of Wall Street wants a more rabid, more openly aggressive, anti-Soviet alliance responding with robot-like precision to the dictates of Wall Street. He wants an alliance which would include Spain, Germany and Japan and would more "dynamically," as he expressed it, proceed to ignite the fires of war.

His speech was the programmatic answer to the question of "what now?" debated for some time in upper circles of the bipartisan imperialists after the loss of the illusory atomic-bomb monopoly and the collapse of the U.S. puppet regime in China. The belated discovery that the U.S.S.R. had mastered the "secrets" of atomic energy and the

world-shaking victory of the Chinese Revolution under the leadership of the great Communist Party of China, had an immediate effect upon the American people. These events led to strong expressions for the reopening of negotiations with the Soviet Union and for the ending of the cold war, expressions which even found an echo in the statements, demagogic to be sure, of such conservative Senators as McMahon and Tydings.

Secretary of State Acheson and President Truman in a number of speeches put forward a program of "peace" which added up to the demand for outright yielding by the Soviet Union to Wall Street's world-dominance objectives. Acheson then announced his notorious "total diplomacy." What does total diplomacy mean? What does it mean in practical policy? Both Acheson and Truman rushed to define this new term borrowed from the lexicon of the Goebbelses and Goerings. In essence, what do their explanations boil down to? "Total diplomacy" for "total war"! Everything for war preparations, for "total war" abroad and for "total war" at home—for blotting out everything that is anti-imperialist, democratic and Socialist anywhere on the globe, and for destroying the labor movement, the people's organizations and hard-won rights, for crushing the Negro people's liberation movement, for outlawing the Communist Party—every-

thing that is forward-striving on the shores of our own America.

Acheson calls for "total agreement" of Republicans and Democrats on domestic questions in the interests of heating up the cold war.

The Administration appointed Dulles, rejected by the New York voters in the Senatorial election of 1949, and Sherman Cooper, also a Republican, as advisers on foreign policy. The Truman Administration gives its assurances to its Wall Street masters that it is pursuing a program of sharpened pro-fascist measures, of intensified exploitation, of steeper taxation and impoverishment of the people in the interests of the "total war" program.

Truman further spelled out the meaning of total diplomacy when he gave the green light for Democratic support to the police-state Mundt Bill, and in his hysterical speech "against Communism" summoned the nation to become a camp of stock pigeons.

The meaning of "total diplomacy" as a new stage of the cold war was soon made clear in Wall Street provocations in the "Baltic incident." In this regard the recent interview with Senator Tom Connally, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, in the form of questions and answers, is enlightening, to be sure:

Q. Hasn't this "War is inevitable" sentiment been based largely on the

fear t
like t
flame

A. They
which
ent a
fight.

saying
why n

Q.
may o
a hot

A.

Q.

A.

Ho
diplom

total

can't

It mu

of th

daily

must

wide

Social

ful s

polici

peria

peace

head

power

which

war,

mony

a po

tions

ing I

• U

PAGE 3

fear that some incident might happen like this [the Baltic incident] and inflame the parties into war?

A. Well, a lot of them believe this: They believe that events will transpire which will maneuver around the present an incident which will make us fight. That's what a lot of them are saying: We've got to battle sometime, why not now?

Q. In other words, the cold war may drift on until something makes it a hot war?

A. Exactly.

Q. But nobody knows when?

A. That's right.*

* * *

However, the program of total diplomacy as they want it—that is, total preparation for early war—cannot be had for the mere wanting. It must reckon with the peace desires of the American people growing daily more manifest; above all, it must reckon with the mighty, worldwide camp of peace, democracy and Socialism, which is waging a powerful struggle to frustrate the war policies and preparations of the imperialists and guarantee lasting peace. The anti-imperialist camp is headed by the Soviet Union, that powerful bastion of the peace front which refuses to be provoked into war, boldly unmasking the warmongers and undeviatingly pursues a policy of building peaceful relations with all peoples. The unwavering Lenin-Stalin policy which affirms

the possibility and necessity for achieving the peaceful co-existence of the capitalist and Socialist states thwarts the warmakers, as does its call for a five-power Pact of Peace and the immediate, unconditional outlawing of atomic weapons. The war incendiaries must reckon with the rising tide, at home and abroad, of militant struggle for the defense of peace.

The Wall Street bipartisans, further, face sharpening contradictions and conflicts in the camp of world imperialism, which are intensified as the world capitalist economic crisis develops. Notwithstanding Dollar Diplomacy, Marshall Plan economic pressure, the Atlantic Pact and the Military Aid Program, American imperialism cannot so readily establish a *stable* alliance against the Soviet Union. As Lenin pointed out, the law of uneven development of capitalism inevitably gives rise to inter-imperialist conflicts, with the result that imperialist alliances cannot be solid or durable. Today the rivalry grows because U.S. imperialism is grabbing off the markets, spheres of influence, raw materials and wealth of its allies, while the economy of Western Europe is being ruined by the Marshall Plan and monstrous armaments programs, by the policy of dumping and by the dollar crisis. Thus, the voices grow louder in Marshallized Europe for veering away from firm commitments in the arms program.

* U.S. News & World Report, May 5, 1950, page 31.

As Anne O'Hare McCormick put it in the *New York Times* of April 29, 1950: "But if we took the lead in excluding the Communists, thereby making the division official and irrevocable, the question is whether we should be left alone. The desire for neutrality among our allies is already too vocal for comfort."

The Hoover speech is intended to prepare the ground for more ruthless action by the bipartisans, for surgical action to overcome the growing economic and political crisis of imperialism, for lashing the Western European powers and other satellites into complete submission, for uniting more closely with the reactionary Vatican, for insisting that France, for example, outlaw the Communist Party and bring De Gaulle into power, for rearming Germany in order to secure a strategic base and a mercenary army to fight the Soviet Union. Western Germany is of decisive importance to the Hoover-Acheson total diplomacy, particularly since France can neither raise a large army nor guarantee its "reliability" in a reactionary war. It is a program of desperation in the face of the mounting difficulties of the war camp.

As Comrade Gus Hall stated in his report on the struggle for peace at the March meeting of the Communist Party's National Committee, the "imminent danger to the peace of the world arises from moods of desperation in the war camp."

"There are strong forces in the ranks of the reactionaries," he continued, "who are becoming reckless because they see that time is running against them. . . . It is this that keeps the danger of war constantly on the order of the day."

The present situation calls for firmer, wider, more militant action by the people to stop the war drive. Hoover's speech points up the war danger. There must be a mounting, irresistible, mass movement, particularly in the shops and trade unions, around the central demand for outlawing the atomic bomb. The American people must be rallied behind the ringing appeal of the World Peace Committee issued at the recent Stockholm meeting "to regard as a war criminal that government which first uses the atomic weapon against any country."

The peace petition campaign launched by the Labor Peace Conference should receive the active support of union locals, department committees, shop stewards and rank-and-file workers. The women, the youth, the Negro people, the working farmers and the city middle classes must be mobilized to demand the outlawing of the A- and H-bombs and to press for negotiations with the Soviet Union to achieve a Pact of Peace. The pressure must grow for recognition of, and trade with, the new China, and against the re-Nazification of Western Germany.

Pea
issue,
econ
mass
tenan
right

A
ble!
cham
time
the r
with
viet
racie
trade
the l
W
the p
alism
upon
milit
the
T
worl

Peace is the central, over-riding issue, and it is linked up with the economic and social interests of the masses, above all with the maintenance of the people's democratic rights.

* * *

A third world war is not inevitable! The Soviet Union, consistently championing the cause of peace, has time and again taken its position for the necessity of peaceful co-existence with the capitalist countries. The Soviet Union and the People's Democracies of Europe and Asia desire to trade with the capitalist states on the basis of equality.

What is absent is a similar will on the part of Anglo-American imperialism—a will that must be forced upon the ruling circles by the united, militant struggle of the people, with the working class taking the lead.

The peoples of the world, the workers and their allies, the global

camp of peace and democracy, are stronger than the war camp. The American people, led by the working class, can and must join hands with peace-loving humanity everywhere and play their rightful part in the common struggle to impose the common will to peace. In the words that Comrade Eugene Dennis wrote in his article, "Lenin, Stalin and the Mid-Century":

Where our country stands in the year 2,000 A.D., and the relative ease or pain with which the American working class and people advance toward the inevitable Socialist goal—depends, to a great extent, on how effectively labor and all progressives, Communists and non-Communists, work and fight for peace *now*. Today peace—and the struggle for peace—favors and promotes social progress, and is the enemy of pro-fascist reaction. The more lasting the peace, the better for the American people and the worse for the trusts. . . .

People's Front and People's Democracy

by William Z. Foster

DURING THE FOLEY SQUARE TRIAL of our Party and its leaders we were confronted with the charge of having conspired to teach and advocate the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence. To make proper reply to this false charge, we not only had to develop many general principles of Marxism-Leninism, and to make an outline history of our Party, but we also had to indicate the main line of the struggle for Socialism in this and other countries. In its defense, which was basically an attack upon capitalism, our Party developed a correct Marxist-Leninist line. Specifically, we placed the responsibility for violence in the class struggle where it belongs, upon the shoulders of the capitalist class and its Government.

Among the materials presented to the Court was my pamphlet entitled *In Defense of the Communist Party and the Indicted Leaders*. This was unanimously endorsed by the National Committee as Party policy in the trial. In this pamphlet, in meeting the imperative needs of the defense, I undertook, in addition to dealing with Communist policy in general, to outline, in both a theoretical and

practical sense, the world Communist experience with the united-front policy since the Seventh Congress of the Communist International in 1935. In doing this, I analyzed the anti-fascist people's front policy of the prewar years, the national unity policy of the war years and the anti-imperialist people's front policy and People's Democracy policies of the postwar years.

The pamphlet, therefore, covered a tremendous scope of theory and tactics. It dealt with a whole maze of complexities, covering the past 15 years of vital world struggle. To make the task more difficult, much of the territory traversed was quite new. In the main, the fundamental analysis developed in the pamphlet is correct. Naturally, however, in view of the immensity, complexity and newness of the subject matter, as well as the brief manner in which it was dealt with, certain errors and shortcomings could and did creep into it. Of course, as we all know, many European Communist leaders have also made errors in pioneering an analysis on various parts of this general experience. In my opinion the most serious shortcoming of my

pamph
in de
Amer
ber o
gardin
the ne
while
correc
and
elabor
to mi
and
implic
be fu
is all
rade
the M
tional
some
misur
Party
There
with
ing a
of qu
trial,

THE
OF

At
Com
trov,
cial-
that
dle
fasci
torsh
chau
elem

pamphlet is that in the last section, in dealing with the policy of the American Communist Party, a number of important propositions regarding the people's front tactic and the new People's Democracy states, while in themselves fundamentally correct, are stated much too briefly and without clear and adequate elaboration. This leaves them open to misunderstanding and distortion and makes it necessary that the implications of all the matters be fully gone into by us. This is all the more needful for, as Comrade Dennis correctly pointed out in the March 1950 meeting of the National Committee, there have been some tendencies in the Party to misunderstand or to distort the Party's correct line in the trial. Therefore, I am writing this article with the special purpose of clarifying and elaborating upon a number of questions dealt with during the trial, particularly in my pamphlet.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF FASCISM

At the Seventh Congress of the Comintern in 1935, Comrade Dimitrov, sweeping aside the current Social-Democratic drivel to the effect that fascism was "a revolt of the middle classes," correctly characterized fascism as "the open, terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic and most imperialist elements of finance capital." Dimi-

trov also stated that fascism "appears as the result of the decline of the capitalist system." As the general crisis of capitalism becomes deeper, the path toward fascism becomes the inevitable course of monopoly capital in its desperate attempt to prevent the victory of the working class. This is a reality that we must keep firmly in mind in our work. Obviously the big capitalists, who have become aware, from practical if not from theoretical reasons, that their social system is in grave crisis, do not intend to stand about idly while it falls to pieces. Fascism, therefore, with its organized attempt to destroy democracy and Socialism through policies of civil war and world war, is basically the effort of finance capital to overcome the general crisis of capitalism and at the same time to gain for itself (concretely, Wall Street) complete domination of the nations of the world.

Fascism has definite roots reaching back into the very beginnings of the general crisis of capitalism. They were clearly to be seen in the ruthless attempts of reaction to crush the Russian Revolution at its inception and also to put down the post-World War I revolutionary struggles of the workers in Central Europe. Fascism was established as a method of rule, first however, in 1922, with Mussolini's seizure of Italy. It finally became a world threat in 1933, when Hitler seized Germany in the midst of the great world economic crisis.

During this general period, the big capitalists of France, Great Britain, the United States and other capitalist countries had also become infected with fascist conceptions. Fascism, therefore, was by no means simply a German-Italian-Japanese phenomenon, although for specific reasons, it came to power only in the Axis countries. It represented the general trend of the world's biggest capitalists in the face of the deepening crisis of capitalism and the growth of Socialism. The big finance capitalists in the Axis capitalist countries were dreaming of some sort of a fascist world, dominated by themselves, to be initiated by an all-out attack against the U.S.S.R. But the democratic resistance of the peoples, the strength of the Soviet Union and the violent contradictions among the big capitalist powers, prevented the carrying through of this contemplated drive by the Axis powers for a fascist world built upon the ruins of world democracy and Socialism. Experience demonstrates that fascism, instead of liquidating the imperialist antagonisms, sharpens them.

One of the most basic things we have to understand from all this is, therefore, that the drive toward war and fascism was not and is not a passing phenomenon among the big bourgeoisie. On the contrary, it is their fundamental orientation (particularly in the case of American imperialism), their attempt to

overcome the general crisis of capitalism. This explains why the monopoly capitalists of all countries, under the aggressive lead of Wall Street, are so busily trying everywhere to re-organize the fascist groups and movements that were shattered during World War II. Fascism was defeated in the war; but the trend toward fascism of the imperialist bourgeoisie continues. It is still full of virulence. It would be a grave error, indeed, to underestimate the danger of fascism.

Another thing of importance that we must understand about fascism is that it gives the monopoly capitalists a much more highly conscious counter-revolutionary perspective, however impossible, for saving their social system in the face of the deepening general crisis of capitalism. At the Seventh Congress Dimitroff had the following to say in this general respect: "The ruling bourgeoisie is more and more seeking salvation in fascism, with the object of instituting exceptional predatory measures against the toilers, preparing for an imperialist war of plunder, attacking the Soviet Union, enslaving and partitioning China, and, by all these means, preventing revolution."

Prior to the development of the general crisis of capitalism, with its resultant growth of Socialism on the one hand, and the more advanced decay of capitalist institutions on the other, the capitalists and their theoreticians were not confronted

with an acute threat to their social system. But the development of the general crisis of capitalism and the challenge of world Socialism rudely shook the monopoly capitalists. They realized with a shock that their system was in danger. Hence their conscious acceptance of a fascist perspective, however much they may now mask this perspective in order to avert mass opposition. This, of course, does not provide the chaotic capitalist system, as such, with a definite perspective. Nor does it prevent the heaviest collisions among the imperialist powers; indeed, fascism accentuates these collisions. This conscious policy of driving to fascism gives it double malignancy and menace, and we must always keep it clearly in mind.

THE ANTI-FASCIST, ANTI-WAR MOVEMENT

Fascist rule is a ruthless attack upon the living standards, traditional liberties, democratic organizations, national independence and even the very lives of the various peoples of the world. Inevitably, therefore, its growth in the pre-war years evoked a very broad and militant mass movement of democratic resistance. This wide movement drew within its scope workers, peasants, Negroes, intellectuals and small business men; it also largely bridged over ideological differences between Catholics, Social-Democrats,

Liberals, Communists, and non-party elements—a vast array of democratic forces. Never before had these democratic strata and groupings been so united. They were animated with a determination to resist and defeat the new social plague, fascism—to prevent this terroristic rule from becoming instituted and from plunging the world into war.

Two basic characteristics of this great pre-war anti-fascist, anti-war movement were to be remarked. First, there was a large element of the defensive in it. That is, it was directed to preserve cherished democratic liberties and organizations from the assaults of fascism; but at the same time the movement contained great potentialities for the counter-offensive—potentialities which in the war and postwar periods were to result in major victories for the democratic peoples. The second basic characteristic of the anti-fascist, anti-war movement was its tremendous political breadth. As already stated, the people's front policy utilized the existing possibilities for workers of various ideological groupings, as well as various middle-class forces, to stand shoulder to shoulder, although not without many difficulties, against the common fascist enemy.

The most important thing in this general respect for us to keep in mind clearly now is that if war and fascism are a threat in the present

world situation, and surely they are, then so also must the peoples develop a broad united front to fight for peace and against fascism. With the crushing defeat of fascism during the war, there was a tendency, in view also of the democratic developments in the postwar period, to feel that the fascist danger no longer existed and that, therefore, the need for the anti-fascist, anti-war broad people's front had expired. Two major forces cultivated and took advantage of this mass illusion. First, American imperialism, in its drive for world conquest, above all had to break up the broad anti-fascist coalition of democratic forces that had won the war. Second, the Right Social-Democrats, loyal servitors of capitalism, carried out this splitting policy in order to combat the prevalent revolutionary moods of the working class. So these two forces, of course with the help of the Vatican, deliberately split the anti-fascist coalition, including the trade-union movement, in the capitalist world, and created the so-called "third force" movement. This movement, as the sequel clearly shows, is but an adjunct to American imperialism and paves the way to extreme reaction and fascism.

But the "third force," backed though it is by the United States and other capitalist governments, by the Vatican and by Right Social-Democracy, and also considering that many workers are caught in the trap

of the anti-Soviet Red-baiting and imperialist illusions — nevertheless can only be temporary in character. The growth of the new danger of war and fascism which is now rapidly in progress in the world, must result in these democratic masses who are now under Social-Democratic and other reactionary leadership breaking with the whole conception of the "third force" and joining with the Left forces in developing a strong anti-war, anti-fascist movement essentially along the lines of the people's front, although this will not take place automatically. Indeed, there are already strong signs of the cracking of the "third force." These signs were exemplified by the recent strikes in France and Belgium when Catholic, Socialist and Communist workers stood shoulder to shoulder against their "third force" governments and the Social-Democratic and Vatican leaders. The major lesson from this is that the slogan for the people's front still remains valid, although in the present new world situation the main content of this slogan must be anti-imperialist and anti-war, and we must be very flexible in sloganizing its many possible forms and variations.

THE POLICY OF THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

It was a tremendous theoretical and practical political achievement

when th
at its Se
der the
Dimitro
the new
the rise
develop
to fight
war. Th
all dem
against
world
portant
These
boldly r
celebrat
changes
been a
orientat
ternatio
The
orientat
twofold
cist, an
tional
compas
masses
politica
the fas
make
nists, r
particip
ments
anti-fas
new t
reiterat
the wh
princip
Polit
Marx,

when the Communist International, at its Seventh Congress in 1935, under the leadership of Stalin and Dimitrov, grasped the significance of the new world situation caused by the rise of Nazi Germany, and developed the people's front policy to fight the menace of fascism and war. The proposed mobilization of all democratic strata for a joint fight against enslavement and a new world war involved certain important changes in policy and action. These changes were frankly and boldly undertaken. Dimitrov, in his celebrated report, underlined the changes, declaring that "Ours has been a Congress of a new tactical orientation of the Communist International."

The substance of the new tactical orientation of the Comintern was twofold: (a) to provide an anti-fascist, anti-war program and organizational form broad enough to encompass the mighty democratic masses that had been set in motion politically by the capitalist crisis and the fascist war threat; and (b) to make provisions for the Communists, under specific conditions, to participate in people's front governments that could develop out of the anti-fascist, anti-war struggle. These new tactical concepts, needless to reiterate, were in full harmony with the whole body of Marxist-Leninist principles.

Political strategy and tactics, as Marx, Lenin and Stalin have taught

us, are not permanent, all-enduring but must evolve to meet changing circumstances. It is not surprising, therefore, that the tactics laid down at the Seventh Congress, while continuing to be fundamentally correct, have, in the ensuing fifteen stormy years, undergone a certain change, growth and development, with the fundamental change in the world situation. It would be absurd to think that it could possibly be otherwise. Among the later developments may be mentioned: the line of national and international unity followed during the war, the new policies used in the establishment of the postwar People's Democracies of Eastern Europe, Communist participation in the coalition governments of France and Italy and the victorious developments of the great Chinese Revolution, the main line of which was stated by Stalin as much as 24 years back. And no doubt other important tactical developments will take place in Communist policy as the world struggle for Socialism proceeds. It is important to note here that all the tactical, and sometimes strategical, changes that have taken place during the past 15 years are in accord with the solid Marxist-Leninist line of the famous Seventh Congress of the Comintern.

This brings me to the question of the so-called "new route to Socialism" that has been so much talked about since the postwar rise of the People's Democracies in Eastern

Europe. There were for a time a number of unclarities in developing the theoretical analysis of these vital situations, shared in by many of the Communist leaders of the People's Democracies. Such inadequacies of analysis found expression in our Party (including my own writings).

In using the at the time current phrase "new route to Socialism," which has since been rejected by the Parties in the People's Democracies, I, in the pamphlet *In Defense of the Communist Party and the Indicted Leaders*, was speaking in the tactical sense.

Of course, it is a matter of simple, ascertainable fact that, tactically speaking, the workers of the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe and of the Chinese People's Republic are not proceeding toward the achievement of Socialism with the identical tactics used by the Russian working class. And it could not be otherwise. They would not be Marxist-Leninists but political fools who would try to apply rigid, uniform tactics to all these widely ranging situations. These tactical variations are extremely important. Good or bad tactics in a given situation can make the difference between victory and defeat. But, regardless of tactical variations that may be necessary as the class struggle proceeds, the road to Socialism remains the same—through the defeat of the capitalist class and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

SPONTANEITY AND UNEVEN DEVELOPMENT

Let me here interject a few remarks about the question of "spontaneity" and "uneven development" in the class struggle. In my pamphlet, *In Defense of the Communist Party and the Indicted Leaders*, I took occasion to remark that the great Communist movements of the world are "spontaneous" in that they are rooted in the specific national conditions of their respective countries. I cited this obvious fact in refutation of the charge of the Government that these Parties and the great people's movements which they lead are artificial creations, the work of "Soviet fifth columns"—when along comes Mr. Browder, Marxist-in-chief of the National Association of Manufacturers, and lectures me to the effect that Communist Parties cannot be spontaneous but must have the benefit of Marxist-Leninist teachings.

Likewise, on the question of the so-called uneven development of the struggle for Socialism, the renegade Browder, who, with Tito-like agility and unscrupulousness, supports American imperialism with pseudo-Marxist arguments, tries to teach me some A.B.C.'s of Marxism. In my pamphlet, in fighting against the contentions of the prosecution that our Party is working on the basis of a blueprint of the Russian Revolution, I indicated the fact, expressed by Lenin in his law of the uneven

development of capitalism, that the many capitalist countries of the world are at different stages of growth and are developing at different tempos. I also pointed out the obvious fact that these different conditions invariably affect the development of the movement for Socialism in the various countries, determining their structure, strategy and tactics. Nowhere did I state, imply or even hint that the differing degrees and tempos of industrial development in these countries determined the respective order or periods of their revolutions. Indeed, I cited the Russian Revolution to prove, on the contrary, that merely the industrial development achieved by a given country does not determine the revolutionary maturity of the country. What I had to say was Marxist-Leninist and quite correct.

THE QUESTION OF A PEOPLE'S FRONT GOVERNMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

At the outset, in discussing the matter of the people's front government in this country, we must realize that we are not dealing here with a state form which will necessarily have to be established by the American workers as their way to Socialism. We are dealing, instead, with a general political tactic. Already, at the Seventh Congress, Dimitrov handled this question. He warned us that "It would be wrong

to imagine that the United Front government is an indispensable stage on the road to the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat." The truth of this statement is graphically illustrated, of course, by the fact that there was no people's front government in Russia before the workers took power there. And who can say positively that the American working class will not also take this course? Besides, there is also the possibility that fascism might develop in this country before the workers and their allies could succeed in establishing a people's front government.

Nevertheless, and this must be solidly emphasized, our orientation is for a people's front government stated in terms adapted to American conditions. We do not have an "either or" policy, nor do we indulge in vague political speculation on this matter. Dimitrov also made this very clear at the Seventh Congress when, while not laying down the people's front as an *indispensable stage*, he at the same time placed every possible stress upon the burning need for an all-out fight for the people's front. This clear policy is in its basic essentials valid for us now.

A second major thing that we must keep in mind in advocating the people's front is that we can only conditionally presuppose the election of such a government by the democratic masses of the people. That is, it will be possible to elect a people's

front government in the United States only if the workers can maintain sufficient democracy in the country to carry through such an election. In view of the drive of American imperialism toward fascism and war, however, it is by no means certain that they can do this. If the reactionaries should succeed in breaking down the democratic system and in establishing fascism in the meantime, then, of course, the possibility of electing a people's front government would be gone, and the whole class struggle, even over the simplest of demands, would become an open, violent struggle.

In my brief remarks on this general subject in my pamphlet, *In Defense of the Communist Party and the Indicted Leaders*, I pointed out that the "election of such a [people's front] government could be brought about only in face of a violent opposition from organized reaction." I said (page 92): "The whole history of the American class struggle, which is full of employers' violence in strikes and in other struggles of the people, teaches this lesson with unmistakable clarity." Obviously, therefore, a people's front movement would have to be able to smash through this capitalist violence, which, as I pointed out, was inevitable, and force through an election in spite of it.

Now let us examine briefly under what conditions a people's front government might come into existence

in the United States. Undoubtedly, it would have to take place in the setting of a very critical political situation. The aroused democratic masses, heading toward a people's front government, would have to face the world's most powerful bourgeoisie, resolved upon war and already rapidly adopting violent, fascist methods of rulership. The people's front movement, therefore, colliding head-on with the capitalists' main policies of war and fascism, would surely have to confront the full force of their opposition. One would need to be naive to speak of a peaceful election under such circumstances of sharp political struggle. It would be equally silly in the face of the organized violence of the big capitalists to think that it would be simply a parliamentary election struggle. Obviously, and this is a major lesson taught by people's front movements in France, Spain and elsewhere, the trade unions and every other organization of the workers and their allies would have to throw their whole strength into the struggle of the people's front.

A victorious fight to establish a people's front government in the United States would also involve defeating the heavily entrenched labor leaders and the establishment of a solid united front of the working class. And above all, it would require that the Communist Party be far more powerful than it is now—to be able to give strong leader-

ship in the people's front combination. These seem like strong requirements, in view of the difficult situation for the workers now prevailing in the United States. But it may well be that the people's front movement in this country will develop at a very rapid speed. This rapidity could be brought about by a swift spread of peace sentiment among the masses due to dangerous war moves by Wall Street, through a sharpened danger of fascism, through the development of a deep economic crisis, or, as would be most probable, through the joint operation of all these factors.

In my pamphlet, I stated our Party's conditional placing of the question of the election of a people's front government as follows:

Our Party's political line is based upon the assumption that it is possible in the United States, in a crucial economic and political situation, for the broad masses of the people, militantly led by the trade unions and a strong mass political party, to elect a coalition, anti-fascist, anti-imperialist government. Whether this possibility will last in the face of the dangerous fascist trends in this country, however, is problematical.

This is the approved line of our Party and it is a correct one. To take the position that it is impossible to elect a people's front government in the United States (under its specific American forms) would mean to say that fascism is inevitable in this

country and is, indeed, almost upon us. This our Party cannot say, and did not say in the trial. We do not recognize the inevitability of fascism, even as we do not recognize the inevitability of a third world war, and for the same basic reasons.

PARTY POLICY TOWARD A PEOPLE'S FRONT GOVERNMENT

Here we come to one of the more complex theoretical problems—what we consider would be the attitude of the Communist Party toward a people's front government, if it is established in the United States.

The first thing we have to understand about a people's front government in the United States—assuming that the allied democratic forces can beat back the forces of fascism and eventually establish such a government—is that this government would from the very beginning find itself under the heaviest possible fire from the reactionaries. This situation would be inevitable, for such a government, if it at all corresponded to the qualities of a people's front, would place itself directly athwart the war program and world-domination plans of Wall Street Big Business. It would be stupid, therefore, to expect anything else than that this government should, in consequence, be the object of violent assault from the combined forces of reaction; for Wall Street

big capital would never abandon its world-conquest program without a last-ditch struggle.

As I have pointed out, all too briefly, in my pamphlet (page 90) such a people's front government, confronted by the violent attacks of the bourgeoisie, would have to orientate to the Left or it would be destroyed. That is, the people's front would be compelled to pass over from a defensive position to one of counter-offensive. It could not merely stand as a barrier against fascism and war; but in order to accomplish these ends and to enforce its program generally it would be compelled to begin to attack the monopolists in their economic, military and political spheres. It would face death if it failed to do this.

Securing a majority in Congress for a people's front government would not give that majority the control of the capitalist state—Marxist-Leninists require no instruction in this elementary truth. In such a situation, the very foundations of the state—the army, police, industries, courts, banks, government bureaucracy, schools, etc.—would still be within the control of the big bourgeoisie, who would (with the help of their Social-Democratic leaders) use all these institutions against the new people's front government. We may accept it as a practical certainty, therefore, that any democratic coalition government in this country that would

fight the Wall Street program of fascism and war would find itself, as a life-and-death necessity, compelled to attack the monopolists as above stated. It would have to pass over from a defensive program, from one of merely seeking to halt the warmakers—to one of beginning to orientate toward the nationalization of banks and industries, break-up of big landholdings, beginning of a planned economy, elimination of reactionaries from all state institutions, etc., or it would pass from history.

Of course, a Leftward orientation of a people's front government could be achieved only in the face of the stiffest resistance of the capitalist class, including that of its Right Social-Democratic agents within the people's front government itself. It would also require clear leadership from a powerful Communist Party and the active support of the trade unions and all other people's organizations.

The Communists would defend such a government so long as it continues to be a barrier to war and fascism, would defend it against reactionary efforts to overthrow it. The Communists would point out that such a government could not long continue to block war and fascism unless new measures striking at the roots of monopoly power were taken. Whether in the course of defending this government against an armed revolt by reaction these revo-

lutio
or w
refus
supp
the v
mass
pred
In
ernm
victo
dang
This
cialis
W
what
nam
ernm
entat
polic
talist
thro
the
revol
from
thro
is a
front
and
Co
look
feat
gove
We
every
the
as a
do a
rend
Righ
even

lutionary changes would take place, or whether such a government would refuse to take such measures and be supplanted by a new government of the working class as a result of a great mass struggles cannot of course be predicted now.

In any case, a people's front government as such cannot bring final victory, and completely eliminate the danger of fascist counter-revolution. This can only be done by the Socialist revolution.

What we have to bear in mind is what I emphasized in my pamphlet: namely, that a people's front government would be compelled to orientate toward a positive, fighting policy, or it would die. The capitalists would destroy it, either through the treachery of a Blum on the inside, or through the counter-revolutionary violence of a Franco from the outside, or, most probably, through a combination of both. This is a basic lesson taught by people's front experiences in France, Spain and other countries.

Communists could not possibly look with indifference upon the defeat or overthrow of a people's front government in the United States. We would be compelled to try with every means in our power to have the workers use such a government as a means of positive struggle. To do anything else would signify surrendering the people's front to the Right Social-Democrats and to eventual crushing defeat. What such

a defeat would entail we may forecast by recalling the acute political situation in which it would only be possible to establish a people's front government in the first place. The crushing of such a government by the combined assaults of the capitalists and their Social-Democratic tools in a situation of political crisis might well have such disorganizing consequences upon the fighting forces of the proletariat as to enable big capital to launch its projected third world war and/or to establish fascism in the United States. We would find, therefore, we may be sure, that the fate of the people's front government would be a matter of profound political significance. Communists cannot participate in the people's front government on the basis that the government must finally come to a disastrous defeat. We must have a victory perspective throughout.

Communists have not always clearly understood the necessity of fighting solidly for a Left orientation when they have participated in coalition, or people's front, governments. This weakness was exhibited by some of the Communist Parties of Europe in the postwar coalition governments. And even as early as the Seventh Congress, Dimitrov warned sharply against this type of Right mistake by criticizing the actions of the Communist members of the united-front government of Saxony, Germany, in 1923. He pointed

out that "they behaved generally like ordinary parliamentary ministers within the framework of bourgeois democracy" instead of fighting for the revolutionary measures imperatively demanded by the situation. Although the establishment of a people's front or democratic coalition government is not yet upon the immediate political agenda in the United States, nevertheless, as Marxist-Leninists, we can already profitably understand our general tasks in such an eventuality.

THE QUESTION OF PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY

The nature and role of a People's Democracy is another question that did not receive as rounded-out a treatment from us as its complex character warranted. Further elaboration of the question is, therefore, in order for the full clarification of our Party on this question.

There are four general aspects of the People's Democracy that we especially need to be clear about. The first of these is on the question of the use of the slogan itself—for a People's Democracy—in this country. Under present American conditions, it can be agreed that the slogan for a People's Democracy is not one of action, or even of active agitation. Nevertheless, it represents a possible development, although not inevitable, and it is in this respect that we should use it.

The second important thing about the People's Democracy to bear carefully in mind is that between the People's Democracy and the people's front there is a qualitative difference. This basic difference is that a people's front government operates within the framework of a bourgeois state, whereas the People's Democracy is a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The people's front curbs the power of the monopolists and warmakers; the People's Democracy smashes their power altogether and sets out upon the road to Socialism. In my pamphlet *In Defense of the Communist Party and the Indicted Leaders*, I pointed out (page 85) that the People's Democracies are forms of the dictatorship of the proletariat. But generally the basic distinction between the two forms was not made sharp and clear enough to avoid all possible misinterpretations. We must, of course, as Comrade Dennis indicated at our recent National Committee meeting, be careful not to allow our Party line to be distorted into a seeming equation of the people's front with the People's Democracy, or a simple evolution of one into the other.

A third phase of the general question of the People's Democracy that we must also understand clearly is that before a People's Democracy can be established in a given country the bourgeoisie must be finally and decisively defeated. This implies that the Communist Party

is in
work
(page
politi
ple's
had
"Thu
talist
Lenin
laid
succe
largel
durin
fascis
mach
Euro
attach
racies
decisi

A
that
tion
that
prole
ple's
did
isten
brow
of th
the o
them
again
the g
mocr
coali
erally
the v
Social
Parti
Parti

is in the leading position among the working class. In my pamphlet (page 48) in describing the general political situation in which the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe had come into existence, I said: "Thus, the shattering of the capitalist state machinery, which Marx, Lenin and Stalin had long before laid down as a condition for the successful revolution, had been largely accomplished by the people during the course of the great anti-fascist war." In smashing the Hitler machine, as well as in preventing European counter-revolution from attacking the new People's Democracies, the Soviet Army played the decisive role.

A fourth important consideration that we should bear in mind in relation to the People's Democracy is that it is an evolving form of the proletarian dictatorship. The People's Democracies of Eastern Europe did not come full-fledged into existence as did Minerva from the brow of Jove. While they were forms of the proletarian dictatorship from the outset they grew and consolidated themselves in revolutionary struggle against capitalist reaction. At first the governments of the People's Democracies were made up of broad coalitions of all the parties that generally had combatted fascism during the war. These coalitions included Socialist Parties, Social-Democratic Parties, peasant parties, Catholic Parties and even parties of the

smaller capitalists. The strong leaders of the coalition governments were the powerful Communist Parties. Under the double pressure, on the one hand, of the advancing Socialist-minded workers and the peasantry, and on the other, of counter-revolutionary American and domestic reaction, the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe, with the assistance of the U.S.S.R., all went through a rapid process of strengthening and consolidating themselves. The Communist Parties grew tremendously and finally brought about an amalgamation with the Social-Democratic parties. The trade unions expanded swiftly and enormously increased their strength. The several coalition governments systematically purged the armies, police forces, state bureaus, schools, industries, etc., of reactionary leadership. The bourgeois elements were forced out of the governments and their parties were largely dismantled. The program for the nationalization of industry, the break-up of the big estates, etc., was pushed with great vigor. This was no mere automatic consolidation of the People's Democracies. It was the sharpest form of class struggle, reaching the point of civil war in some countries—Poland, for example. At times the fight against domestic reaction stimulated by American imperialism was so intense as to threaten the very existence of the young revolutionary governments.

ON THE QUESTION OF SOCIALIST "ENCIRCLEMENT"

The substance of this so-called encirclement proposition is two-fold:

(a) Socialism is rapidly expanding in the world as capitalism sinks deeper into general crisis, and (b) the more world Socialism expands, the more it weakens the position of American imperialism. And should American imperialism try to revise this inevitable process by a resort to war, the armed effort would only serve to hasten it, to speed the breakdown of capitalism and the growth of Socialism.

It would, of course, be a grave error to conclude that because the advances of world Socialism weaken the position of American imperialism, therefore the American capitalists would find themselves in a position where they would feel unable to fight. On the contrary, their increasing desperation, bred of the weakening world position of capitalism and the failure of the American foreign policies, renders these capitalists all the more disposed to reckless war adventures, as the present dangerous war campaign clearly illustrates. This principle has long been clear to our Party, and we have stated it many times in our analysis of the war danger. And as Comrade Suslov, paraphrasing Lenin, recently said:

Historical experience teaches that the more hopeless the position of im-

perialist reaction, the more it rages: the more danger of military adventures on its part. (*For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy!* December 2, 1949.)

This whole conception is directly opposite to the one which Browder once tried to fasten upon our Party. With his theory of American exceptionalism and glorification of American imperialism, his idea was that American capitalism had become so powerful as to make it impossible for other important sections of the world to become Socialist—Europe, Latin America, Canada, etc. In this respect we need only recall his infamous letter to the Australian Communist Party, criticizing these comrades as "Leftists" because they had put forward a Socialist perspective for their country. Browder argued with them that Australia was so tied in economically with the United States that it could not adopt Socialism without the permission of Wall Street. Browder's was a policy for the defeat of world Socialism and the permanence of world capitalism, dominated by American imperialism.

The responsibility for establishing Socialism in the United States, of course, rests squarely upon the shoulders of the American working class and its political allies. They will also get powerful and increasing support from advancing world Socialism. It would be silly, of course, were anyone to conclude

from
work-
let th
count
them.
arrive
the c
class
event
great
both
by th
of wo
sition
which
peopl
is all

ON F

In
senten
tions
class
cifica
again
positi
point
tory
to a
of us
to ma
the w
the C
will l
such
be er
cialist
It
us sir

from this that all the American workers have to do is to sit still and let the Socialist workers of other countries solve their problems for them. No working class would ever arrive at such a stupid decision. On the contrary, the American working class in its daily struggle and in its eventual fight for Socialism will be greatly strengthened, not weakened, both in understanding and action, by the knowledge that the advance of world Socialism weakens the position of American imperialism, which tries to make the American people and the world believe that it is all-powerful and invincible.

ON FORCE AND VIOLENCE

In the trial, on the whole, we presented correctly the complex questions of force and violence in the class struggle. In this matter we specifically met the direct indictment against us. The substance of our position was that, as Marx long ago pointed out, no ruling class in history has ever yielded up its position to a rising revolutionary class, short of using every weapon in its power to maintain itself; and secondly, that the working class and its allies, with the Communist Party at their head, will be strong enough to defeat all such ruling-class violence that will be encountered on the road to Socialism.

It was not enough, however, for us simply to repeat the necessity and

certainty of the workers to defeat the employers' violence by their own superior strength. The whole matter of the use of force in the class struggle had to be examined from a tactical standpoint in the light of the present, recently greatly altered relationship of class forces, and the state of the general crisis of capitalism, on both the world and domestic scales.

When we say that the world forces of democracy and Socialism are today stronger than those of war-making capitalist reaction, this formulation carries with it vitally important implications both nationally and internationally, particularly with regard to the capitalists' power to use violence and the workers' attitude toward that violence. That is to say, the forces of democracy, by the mobilization of their potentially superior strength, now face the necessity and possibility of sapping the ability of the bourgeoisie to employ violence against the people.

In my pamphlet I pointed out that immediately after the end of the war there was a widespread relatively peaceful and orderly advance toward Socialism in the People's Democracies. This was a fact, and the only reason why such a situation could exist, even temporarily, was because, on the one hand, the bourgeois state machinery was smashed by the war and by the historic, liberating role of the Soviet Army, whereas, on the other, those of de-

mocracy and Socialism had been greatly strengthened by this historic anti-Hitler victory. Reaction, in this early postwar period, was simply unable to fight the European workers effectively on a general scale, although it tried to do so to the best of its ability—creating civil war in Greece, uprisings in Poland, putsches in Romania, etc. Now, however, the situation is vastly altered. Under the aggressive leadership of American imperialism, European reaction has been able somewhat to pull its weakened forces together again, with the result that virtual potential civil-war conditions have been created in France, Italy, Germany and other countries of Central and Western Europe.

A classic example of the working out of the new relationship of class forces, under the leadership of a strong Communist Party, was that given by Czechoslovakia. There, of course, the situation was highly favorable for the workers. Capitalism had been greatly weakened by the war and was overthrown, the Communist Party was powerful, the workers were in a revolutionary mood and in power, and, above all, there was the near presence of the Soviet Union. The workers and their allied forces, consequently, were so strong and well-organized that when the forces of reaction, stimulated by American imperialism, made their well-prepared counter-revolutionary attack in February 1948—they

wanted to turn Czechoslovakia into another Greece—the powerful democratic Socialist forces, led by the Communist Party, strangled the movement at its inception, prevented the contemplated civil war and passed on swiftly to a decisive strengthening of the People's Democracy and its Socialist program. Other countries, of course, will not be as favorably situated as Czechoslovakia, and will have to collide much more heavily with the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. But the general principle applies, nevertheless, of weakening the fighting capacity of the bourgeoisie beforehand so that it may be the more readily defeated when it does use violence against the people.

The supreme example of capitalist violence is, of course, expressed in imperialist war, in counter-revolutionary world war. Here, by virtue of the greater potential strength of the forces of democracy and Socialism, the effort is to prevent the warlike bourgeoisie from plunging the world into a new war, or to defeat them if they do. No Marxist-Leninist can doubt but that the big capitalists will launch a third world war, *if they are able to do so*. It is the historic task of the democratic-Socialist forces to make it impossible for them to unleash this catastrophe. If we can say that world war is not inevitable this is only because the people's peace forces are now potentially strong enough to prevent such

a war i
and to
will b
with its
rampant
when t
nationa
lutely
peace.
In co
followe
trial, it
rect. W
defend
fully d
formul
day th
people
danger
tionary
society-

a war if they will but act vigorously and together. International peace will be guaranteed in the world, with its rotting capitalist system and rampant imperialist reaction, only when the democratic-Socialist forces, nationally and internationally, resolutely undertake to maintain that peace.

In conclusion: As for the main line followed by our Party in the big trial, it was politically sound and correct. What we have to do now is to defend that line militantly, while fully developing all its theoretical formulations and implications. Today the supreme menace that our people and the world face is the danger of war. All the other reactionary political trends in capitalist society—the many fascist tendencies,

the attacks upon the Negro people, the assaults upon the trade unions, the attempts to jail our leadership and to outlaw the Communist Party—all combine and culminate in making more threatening and acute the great menace of these times: the danger of another world war in the pursuance of American imperialism's insane attempt to destroy international Socialism and to rule the world. To do our full part in combatting this grave threat to civilization and progress, let us never forget that the supreme necessity of the working class and the people is for a powerful mass Communist Party, firmly united and solidly grounded in Marxist-Leninist theory and practice. A strong Communist Party is the key to every success.

Address to Electors*

by V. M. Molotov

COMRADES: Permit me to thank you from the bottom of my heart for your confidence in nominating me as your candidate for the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.

I regard the honor you have shown me first of all as an expression of your trust in our great Communist Party and in the Communists who are boundlessly devoted to the Party.

Now, as before, I am prepared to comply honestly and to the utmost with the will of the great party of Lenin and Stalin and to devote all my energy to my country for the sake of its prosperity, for the sake of the Soviet people's happiness.

POSTWAR ECONOMIC ADVANCE

Comrades: The present election campaign gives us an opportunity to look in retrospect at what has been accomplished in the Soviet Union during the years since the end of the Second World War.

* Text of address by the Vice-Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., V. M. Molotov, at a meeting of the electors of the Molotov constituency of Moscow, held in the Hall of Columns of the Trade-Union House, March 10, 1950. Reprinted from the *U.S.S.R. Information Bulletin*, Washington, D. C., March 24, 1950.

Four years ago, Comrade Stalin, speaking of the first postwar Five-Year Plan, laid emphasis on two basic tasks. First of all, he pointed to the task of rehabilitating the damaged areas of the country, of restoring the prewar level of industry and agriculture, and then of surpassing that level to a more or less substantial degree. He also stressed the significance of another important task—that of raising the living standards of the working people in the Soviet Union. He outlined a firm policy of abolishing the rationing system, of expanding the production of consumer goods to the maximum, and of systematically reducing the prices of all commodities. These tasks were made the basis of the first postwar Five-Year Plan.

You now see how all these tasks have been carried out.

The rehabilitation of the areas of the U.S.S.R. which had been laid waste by the invaders is of tremendous importance to us. It is sufficient to say that on the territories that had been occupied by the enemy, one-third of our entire industrial output used to be produced before the war, and the sown areas of those territories

accounted for almost one-half of the sown area of our country. The rehabilitation work, which has been launched in those areas, has already yielded noteworthy results.

With regard to the national economy as a whole, we have not only attained but have surpassed the pre-war level in all its basic branches.

In agriculture, the prewar level of gross output was exceeded last year. In the year just ended, the total crop of grain, cotton, flax, sunflower seed, and potatoes, as well as the publicly-owned herds of livestock on the collective farms—such as cattle, sheep, and pigs, were larger than in the best prewar year. The grain problem has now been solved. We are now amply provided with grain, including the necessary reserves. Fulfillment of the three-year plan of livestock development, which was adopted last year, will lead to such an increase in the production of meat, butter, eggs, milk, and other dairy and meat products as will make it possible for us to increase the supply to the population in 1951 by at least 50 per cent as compared with 1948.

For its part, the Government is taking serious steps to give more aid to agriculture. In 1949, alone, agriculture received from three to four times more tractors, motor vehicles, and agricultural machines than in the prewar year of 1940.

The main thing, however, is that our collective farms, of which we have 254,000, have grown much

stronger, and there are now many model collective farms where mechanization and labor productivity are on a high level. Many thousands of leading farmers, who have merited decorations and the title of Hero of Socialist Labor, are rising from the ranks of the men and women collective farmers.

Our industry reached and surpassed the prewar level in 1948. In 1949 the prewar level was topped by 41 per cent, which is close to the 48 per cent contemplated for the last year of the Five-Year Plan. In the fourth quarter of last year, our industry surpassed even the level which had been set for the fifth year of the Five-Year Plan, that is to say, for the current year. Whereas in the pre-revolutionary year of 1913, Russia's industrial production totaled 16,000,000,000 rubles in value, in the last couple of years, the mere annual *increase* in industrial production attained 32,000,000,000 to 34,000,000,000 rubles, which means it was double the gross output of all industry in the pre-revolutionary period.

In the first four years after the war, 5,200 state industrial enterprises, not counting the small ones, were built or restored and put into operation. Those enterprises now employ about 1,500,000 workers, engineers, technologists, and office personnel. The volume of capital construction in industry last year, for instance, was almost twice as great as the volume of capital construction in the best pre-

war year. Construction is gaining momentum from year to year. This means that a further and still more powerful development of Soviet industry is guaranteed.

What is most important is that the popular movement for further promoting the development of industry and for improving the quality of industrial goods now involves the majority of workers, foremen, technologists, and engineers; that the number of splendid industrial innovators in our factories is increasing; that collaboration between science and industry, based on the joint effort of Soviet scientists and advanced workers and engineers, is growing stronger; and that such a popular movement is spreading ever wider in industry and transport, and also in agriculture.

Thus, in all the basic branches of the national economy, our country is making successful progress, is fulfilling and overfulfilling the program laid down by Comrade Stalin and the tasks of the first postwar Five-Year Plan.

THE RAISING OF LIVING STANDARDS

The second task outlined by Comrade Stalin during the last election campaign was carried out with no less success.

In raising the living standards of the working people in town and countryside we have scored notable

accomplishments during these past four years. The policy of reducing the prices of consumer goods began with the abolition of the rationing system. The reduction in the prices of goods, introduced in 1947 and 1949, gave the population a saving of 157,000,000,000 rubles per year. The quantity of the most essential goods consumed by the population last year already surpassed the prewar level.

As a result of the increase in labor productivity and the reduction of production costs, a third price reduction covering a vast range of the goods in greatest demand by the population was put into effect on March 1, by decision of the Party and the Government. The cost of bread, meat, and butter has been reduced by 25 to 30 per cent, fabrics and footwear by about 15 to 20 per cent, and certain goods have come down in price 40 to 50 per cent. Together with the price reductions that are inevitable under the circumstances on the collective farm markets and in co-operative stores, this latest price cut will afford the population an annual gain of no less than 110,000,000,000 rubles. This is the result of the fact that the price reduction in our country is being effected while maintaining the present wage level, while maintaining the existing pensions and stipends, and while leaving unchanged the state prices for purchases of agricultural produce from the collective farms.

From
know
tria
24 pe
incom
durin
30 pe
incom
36 pe
the n
sume
1, th
stant
indu
new
ants'
factu
redu
incre
the r
with
sterl
cies.
Unit
othe
earn
from
crea
the i
decl
the
are
A
able
pear
the
pres
atta
U.S.
1949

From figures made public, it is now known that the incomes of industrial and office workers in 1949 were 24 per cent higher than in 1940. The incomes of the peasantry increased during the same period by more than 30 per cent. All in all, the national income of the U.S.S.R. in 1949 was 36 per cent higher than in 1940. With the new reduction in the price of consumer goods, introduced on March 1, there will be an additional, substantial increase in the real wages of industrial and office workers and a new substantial reduction in the peasants' expenses for purchases of manufactured goods. Along with the price reduction, there will be a significant increase in the purchasing power of the ruble and in its rate of exchange with respect to the dollar, the pound sterling, and other foreign currencies. And this, at a time when in the United States, for instance, and in other capitalist countries as well, the earnings of the workers are dropping from year to year due to price increases. This at a time when last year the incomes of the American farmers declined by 17 per cent, and when the currencies of capitalist countries are steadily sliding downhill.

After that, it becomes understandable why the American and European bourgeois press stayed silent on the report which appeared in our press regarding the splendid results attained in the implementation of the U.S.S.R. national economic plan in 1949. It is also understandable why

that press was so perplexed and resorts to unworthy tricks in its reports on the new price reductions in our country, endeavoring by every means to distort the true meaning of this measure, so important to the working people. The bourgeois press, as well as the press of the pseudo-socialist flunkies, is apparently afraid to speak of facts that show convincingly the enormous progress of the Soviet Union's development.

Our country's national economy, and first of all its driving force—socialist industry, is growing from year to year, in conformity with the law of steady development of the socialist economy, which has been established in the Soviet State. Simultaneously, there is a steady improvement in the welfare of the working people, which radically distinguishes the Soviet State from all the countries that belong to the capitalist camp. The steady rise in the living standards of the working people is also one of the basic laws of economic development in the socialist Soviet State.

MEETING THE NEW TASKS

Does this mean that we can rest content with our achievements? No, the Party and Comrade Stalin teach us otherwise. From each of us the Party demands a systematic and bold, critical self-examination of our work. Comrade Stalin teaches us that there

can be no progress without self-criticism, that we need self-criticism as much as we need air. In his well-known letter to Maxim Gorky, Comrade Stalin wrote:

We cannot get along without self-criticism. It just can't be done, Alexei Maximovich. Its absence will inevitably cause stagnation, a decay of the machinery, a growth of bureaucracy, and the undermining of the creative initiative of the working class.

That was said 20 years ago. It fully applies to our day as well.

It is only when in a Bolshevik manner we boldly reveal the drawbacks and errors in our work, when relying on the country's powerful development, we become more exacting toward ourselves, when we show due aptitude in uniting the leading forces of the Soviet people and the Soviet population as a whole and direct their efforts toward the fulfillment of the new tasks that are placed by the Party in accordance with the requirements of the domestic and international situation—that we really move forward. This determines the chief tasks of all our Party and non-Party organizations, of the Soviets of Working People, the trade unions, and the Young Communist League.

We now see that the country's economic rehabilitation, which began after the war, is now completed in the main, and that we have already risen to a higher economic level than before the war. We now have greater opportunities to tackle the so-

lution of such serious questions as housing construction. In the plan now being drafted for the further reconstruction of the Soviet capital—Moscow—great attention is being devoted to the building of new homes, schools, and hospitals.

We have a powerful industry capable of satisfying the growing needs of the population in goods. At the same time our industry produces all types of machines, fine precision instruments, and every kind of technical novelty. We have reached the stage when, in line with a broad State Plan, we are introducing new machines in an organized manner in all branches of the national economy, especially in such fields as coal mining, the handling of freight and cargoes, in construction, lumbering and so on. If we organize this matter in the proper way and make more vigorous efforts to eliminate existing shortcomings, we shall greatly lighten the labor of our workers, shall considerably increase the productivity of labor in a number of branches of industry that are lagging behind, and shall create the necessary prerequisites for further reducing the cost and improving the quality of production.

Today it is Communists and other Soviet people with great practical experience and thorough training who occupy the decisive place and the leading positions in all branches of labor. The growth of our economic personnel was also promoted

by t
of
oth
plac
by:
of t
mus
ber
tech
the
70 P
year
forc
try,
ceiv
men
opp
nom
we
C
stres
on
men
our
only
in t
of s
our
are
this
grow
ners
N
sigh
cists
U.S.
Sov
Sov
brai
cists

by the elimination before the war of Trotskyites, Bukharinites, and other subversive elements that were placed in our enterprises and offices by all sorts of intelligence services of the imperialist states—and this we must never forget. The total number of specialists with college and technical-school diplomas engaged in the national economy today is about 70 per cent more than in the prewar year of 1940. With every year the forces of skilled specialists in industry, transport, and agriculture receive ever larger, new reinforcements. Consequently, we now have opportunities to improve the economic and technical leadership that we did not have before the war.

Comrade Stalin laid particular stress, in the last election campaign, on the need for further development of scientific research. He set our scientists the task then of "not only overtaking, but also surpassing in the near future, the achievements of science beyond the boundaries of our country." The facts show that we are making successful progress along this path. Suffice it to point to the growing number of Stalin Prize winners.

Now everyone can see how nearsighted the German and other fascists were when, in attacking the U.S.S.R., they expected to smash the Soviet people and put an end to the Soviet State. They did not have the brains to realize in time that no fascists of any kind can ever do this,

that the attack of the fascists on the Soviet Union could only end in collapse. The Soviet people bore the main brunt of the Second World War, yet despite all they endured, they emerged from the war stronger and mightier than ever and still more confident of their strength.

Even in the countries which were our allies during the Second World War there were quite a few statesmen who built their plans on the expectation that as a result of enemy occupation and the terrible hardships that had fallen to the lot of our people, the Soviet State would be devitalized and then the imperialists would be able to dictate their will to the Soviet Union. These people also were too nearsighted. They did not have the brains to realize where lies the real strength and what is the inexhaustible source of the might of such a strong socialist state as the U.S.S.R. They did not understand the great significance of the fact that the U.S.S.R. bases itself on such hitherto unknown but truly wonderful new social factors as the indestructible moral and political unity of socialist society, the fraternal friendship of the peoples of the Soviet State, and steadily growing Soviet patriotism, in which Soviet people are reared under the leadership of the Communist Party.

We should not be surprised, that reactionaries of all brands fail to understand what the Soviet Union is, since they look back, not forward,

since like a certain animal they cannot raise their heads.

We, our people, will be correctly understood, and the historic place of of the U.S.S.R. will be properly appraised, as the decisive progressive force of our age only when it is remembered that the Soviet Union was created by the greatest of revolutionaries, Lenin, and that it is being guided by a brilliant leader, our Stalin.

THE GROWTH OF THE CAMP OF PEACE, DEMOCRACY AND SOCIALISM

The victory over German fascism and Japanese imperialism and the decisive role played by the U.S.S.R. in defeating these aggressive forces effected important changes in the international situation.

Consider what took place on the West of the U.S.S.R.

People's Democracies were formed and gained a firm foothold in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria and Albania. They sprang up as a result of the military defeat of fascism in Europe and owing to the fact that the Soviet Army afforded assistance to the peoples of these countries in their national and social liberation. Having won freedom the peoples of these countries pushed out the exploiting classes of capitalists and landlords and removed them from the key positions, and then established

a system of people's democracy, based on an alliance of the workers and peasants headed by the working class under the leadership of the Communist and Workers' Parties.

Prior to the Second World War, a prominent role in the Governments of these countries was often played by the agents of such powers as Great Britain, France, and the United States of America, or the agents of the fascist states—Germany and Italy, and frequently both at the same time. Today the situation is entirely different. Of course, it is not so easy to put an end to imperialist agents in small states. The trial of Rajk in Hungary, the trial of Traicho Kostov in Bulgaria, and many other facts show that the imperialists even send their agents and spies into the leading bodies of Communist Parties, to say nothing of the bourgeois parties. And when the people's democracies finally tackle such a necessary and legitimate job as that of destroying these nests of spies, which serve as a refuge for all sorts of subversive elements, wreckers, and terrorists, then American and European ruling circles make an attempt to interfere in the domestic affairs of these countries. On the pretext of "defense of human rights" they hurl all sorts of threats and charges and resort to reprisals, even to breaking off diplomatic relations, as happened recently with Bulgaria. However, it is not hard to understand the fu-

tility
Dun
people
once a
their c
strong
functi
ship.
of soc
cally
there
and a
a res
The
with
of pe
friend
The
of th
was
cance
gang
mask
count
the r
social
peopl
draw
situat
No
We
a cor
of th
quest
the U
Brita
of th
dism
many
Terri

ility of such aggressive acts.

During the four postwar years the people's democracies have defined once and for all the future trend of their development. They have grown strong as states which exercise the functions of a proletarian dictatorship. They have taken to the road of socialism, showing most graphically that for the peoples of Europe there is no other road to liberty and a rise in living standards except a resolute transition to socialism. The Soviet Union is closely linked with the peoples of the countries of people's democracy by ties of friendship and mutual assistance.

The exposure of the vile treachery of the Tito clique in Yugoslavia was of great constructive significance. Today this criminal fascist gang can no longer hide behind a mask of communism in its own country and can no longer corrupt the ranks of honest democrats and socialists in other countries. The peoples of Yugoslavia will, of course, draw their own conclusions from the situation which has developed.

Now about Germany.

We have not succeeded in finding a common language with our allies of the Second World War on this question. The unilateral actions of the United States of America, Great Britain, and France led to the split of the German State and then to the dismemberment of Western Germany, the separation of the Saar Territory, and also the separation

of the industrial Ruhr. This policy cannot but end in disgraceful failure.

The formation of the German Democratic Republic with its capital in Berlin marks a new era not only in the history of Germany but in the history of Europe as well. Comrade Stalin spoke of this in a very convincing manner when he pointed out that "the existence of a peace-loving, democratic Germany together with the existence of the peace-loving Soviet Union precludes the possibility of new wars in Europe, puts an end to bloodshed in Europe, and makes impossible the enslavement of European countries by the world imperialists." The sooner the German people realize the truly historic significance of the formation of the German Democratic Republic, the sooner will they gain their national unification, and the more firmly will a stable peace be guaranteed in Europe.

Now look East, and compare the present situation with that of several years ago.

Prior to the Second World War there was only one democratic state in Asia, the Mongolian People's Republic. Now a Korean People's Republic has been formed, which seeks complete national unification and will unquestionably secure it. And the important significance of the formation of the democratic Viet Nam Republic is obvious.

Just lately it has become clear that the most important result of the vic-

tory of the allied countries over German fascism and Japanese imperialism was the triumph of the national liberation movement in China. More than two decades were required for the revolutionary movement of the Chinese people headed by the Communist Party to win its great victory. Today under the guidance of their outstanding leader, Mao Tse-tung, the Chinese people have formed a People's Republic of their own.

After the October Revolution in our country the victory of the people's liberation movement in China is another very severe blow at the whole system of world imperialism and at all the present-day plans for imperialist aggression. It is understandable that close, friendly relations have been established between the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic. The treaty of fraternal alliance between the U.S.S.R. and the People's Republic of China concluded in February transforms Soviet-Chinese friendship into such a great and mighty force in consolidating universal peace as has no equal and has never had any equal in human history.

To all this it should be added that since the Second World War important changes have also occurred in the capitalist countries. In a number of these states, the Communist and Workers' Parties either already occupy a decisive position in the political development of the peoples

or carry on successful work to this end, reorganizing their organizations in conformity with the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism.

For many years after the victory of the October Revolution, the Soviet Union was the only socialist state in a hostile encirclement of capitalist countries. The imperialists made all sorts of plots to strangle the U.S.S.R. Churchill, the die-hard reactionary, blustering in the British Parliament last year, bitterly reproached history for the failure to "strangle Bolshevism" in its embryonic stage. The Soviet Union has not only stood up to its countless tests, but has gained strength in its struggle.

In the Second World War the U.S.S.R. inflicted a smashing defeat on the most impatient of its enemies. Having triumphed in the war and having gained the opportunity to render effective assistance to the liberation movement of other nations, the Soviet Union eventually emerged from its state of international isolation. Apart from having emerged from international isolation, the Soviet Union is now the center of a powerful international, democratic camp, which unites all people's democratic countries. Within the capitalist countries themselves we now have millions of active friends, who are rallying to the ranks of the broad democratic, anti-imperialist movement.

Und
especia
perialis
the Sov
between
earth—
and so
able fo
freedom
a relig
history
fact th
inscrib

THE C
IMP

The
U.S.S.
ple's c
camp
headed
United
Alth
ism a
proved
demi
ten an
to be
has n
this li
its ow
it is t
its he
again
the de
ing to
blocc
reacti
count

Under these new conditions, and especially since the durable anti-imperialist alliance was formed between the Soviet and the Chinese people—between the two largest States on earth—the camp of peace, democracy and socialism has become a formidable force. This camp of peace and freedom is marching forward over a reliable road, a road tested by history, and a guarantee of this is the fact that on its unifying banner is inscribed the great name of Stalin.

THE CAMP OF THE IMPERIALIST POWERS

The democratic camp uniting the U.S.S.R. and the countries of people's democracy is opposed by the camp of the imperialist powers headed by the ruling circles of the United States of America.

Although the positions of imperialism after the Second World War proved in a large measure to be undermined, and the doom of the rotten and moribund capitalist regime to be sealed for good, imperialism has no intention of departing from this life and retiring into history of its own free will. On the contrary, it is trying again and again to rear its head, it is taking draconic steps against progressive organizations and the democratic movement, it is striving to knock together all kinds of blocs from among its allies in the reactionary governments of other countries, and is engaged in devil-

may-care preparations of new and even more criminal acts of aggression in the attempt to realize its aspirations to world domination.

It is our constant task and important duty to keep an eye on the camp of imperialism.

Marxism teaches that the destinies of nations are determined above all by the economic development of states. That is why we must devote particular attention to facts relating to the economic situation in the countries of capitalism.

Take the facts relating to the United States of America, the principal capitalist power of our times.

The capitalists of the U.S.A. made good use of the Second World War. They expanded their industry more than in peace time and filled their pockets well. They also took advantage in no small measure of the post-war difficulties of some countries and, especially of the economic decline in vanquished Germany, Italy, and Japan, to market their goods and put still more gold into their pockets. But very soon after the war there came an end to the artificial boom created for American capitalist industry during the war which had been so ruinous for the nations of Europe and Asia.

Everyone knows from data published, that in the past few years American industry has been working at a level below the war years. It is also well-known that in October 1949 when industrial output dropped

particularly low, the level of American industry was 22 per cent below the October 1948 figures. This happened at the very time when the level of Soviet industry for 1949 had risen by 20 per cent. The American figure—*minus 22 per cent*—is an indication of the economic crisis that has begun in the United States and, at the same time, of the crisis which is developing in all capitalist countries. The Soviet figure—*plus 20 per cent*—speaks of a further powerful upswing of Soviet industry.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE TWO CAMPS

What can be said about the prospects of the economic development of the countries of the two camps?

Only the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy, which are following the path of socialism and relying on the support of the U.S.S.R., furnish a clear-cut answer to this question.

Long ago, during the previous election campaign, Comrade Stalin defined the principal line of the economic development of our country. At that time he outlined the principles of an economic plan for three five-year periods or slightly more, formulating the main task of "raising the level of our industry threefold as compared with the prewar level."

The first of our postwar Five-Year Plans is now drawing to an end. We

see that our country is successfully fulfilling and overfulfilling what was mapped out for these first years.

This year we are tackling the job of drafting the second postwar Five-Year Plan which begins in 1951. Naturally, both the second and our subsequent postwar Five-Year Plans will also be Stalin Five-Year Plans, and this speaks for itself. Everyone knows that the realization of our economic plans raises the economy of our country to an ever higher level and, at the same time, steadfastly improves the well-being of the Soviet people. We know our road ahead well, and we are confident that the plan outlined by Comrade Stalin—that of raising the level of Soviet industry three times over in a short historic period—will unquestionably be carried out.

A different situation obtains in the countries of the capitalist camp.

It is well-known that thanks to the successes of planning in the Soviet Union, the idea of an economic plan has become popular among all the peoples. American leaders wanted to take advantage of this fact and gave great publicity to the so-called "Marshall Plan." But what the "Marshall Plan" is really worth can be seen from the fact that it is in the very years of the operation of this "plan to help Europe" that the economic crisis began to develop both in the countries of Europe and in the United States of America. This is also borne out by

the i
plov
are v
figure
person
ism.
helpe
to gra
of im
Europ
made
dusty
influx
Europ
tional
countr
curtail
ing a
that n
of bre
street

THE S
PEA

Und
comes
Union
democr
tion be
talist s
of imp
of glo
ent adv
develop
tions s
tions
U.S.S.R.
democr
be said

the impressive figure of the unemployed and semi-unemployed who are working a short week, which figure has reached almost 45,000,000 persons in the countries of capitalism. True, the "Marshall Plan" has helped the American monopolists to grasp the reins of many branches of industry and state finance in European countries, but this has not made the position of American industry stable. On the other hand, the influx of stale American goods into Europe is having its effect. The national industry of the "Marshallized" countries finds itself in a vise, it is curtailing production and experiencing a decline, which has the result that new armies of jobless, deprived of bread, are being thrown into the street all the time.

THE SOVIET POLICY OF PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

Under these circumstances it becomes understandable that the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy are for peaceful competition between the socialist and capitalist systems, whereas in the camp of imperialism there reigns a spirit of gloomy uncertainty and belligerent adventures. Every new year of development under peaceful conditions serves to strengthen the positions of such countries as the U.S.S.R. and the states of people's democracy, something which cannot be said of the capitalist countries.

We have no reason to conceal the fact that to carry out its great, long-range economic plans the U.S.S.R. is interested in a stable peace and extensive peaceful co-operation with other countries. A stable peace, peace all over the world—that is the banner under which the U.S.S.R. and the countries of people's democracy are marching ahead.

The ruling circles in the imperialist camp follow a different course.

The imperialists counterpose to the policy of a stable peace the world over, a policy of preparing a new world war.

It is they, the aggressive powers, who in the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization rejected the Soviet Government's proposal regarding a Pact for the Strengthening of Peace. It is they who forced on Western Germany their occupation statute in order to keep German territory under their military occupation as long as possible, depriving Germany of a peace treaty. It is they who do not want Japan to have a peace treaty and are trying to keep Japanese territory unlawfully under their military occupation as long as possible—not realizing that this discredits the occupying power. It is the ruling circles in the United States who spent 6,000,000,000 dollars on fanning civil war in China. It is American planes that are to this day dropping bombs on the peaceful population of Shanghai and on other cities in China, where they are being

sent by Chiang Kai-shek, the puppet of the imperialists. It is the aggressive powers that are conducting a policy of discrimination in foreign trade, aimed against the U.S.S.R. and the countries of people's democracy, but hampering the development of international trade as a whole. It is their press which today shouts endlessly about the need to conduct what is called a policy of "cold war" against the U.S.S.R., and the countries of people's democracy, clamoring that war budgets be increased more and more, that new military bases be built all the time, and that the policy of perpetual threats toward the peace-loving countries of the democratic camp be continued; this the capitalists in the countries of the Anglo-American bloc are taking advantage of in order to get more and more war orders and new thousands of millions in profits.

Yesterday all kinds of blackmailers from that camp threatened us with the atom bomb. Today they threaten us with a so-called "hydrogen bomb," which does not even exist as yet. They should not boast so and would do well to learn by heart that while they were engaged in blackmail about monopoly possession of the atom bomb, Soviet people are known not to have been idle, they mastered the secret of producing atomic energy and the atomic weapon. Only fools like a certain mad secretary can indulge in crazy plans to frighten the Soviet Union and

mislead their people by advertising all sorts of aggressive plans, not realizing that by rejecting peaceful competition and unleashing a new war under present-day conditions, the imperialists would inevitably provoke such justified and resolute indignation of the peoples as would forever sweep from the face of the earth imperialism and aggression.

We wholeheartedly support the Leninist-Stalinist principles of the peaceful co-existence of the two systems and their peaceful economic competition. But we are well aware of the axiom that so long as imperialism exists, there exists a danger of new aggression, that in the existence of imperialism and its aggressive plans, wars are inevitable. That is why the supporters of a stable peace among the nations must not be passive, must not turn into mere pacifists indulging in phraseology, but must wage a day-to-day, staunch and ever-more effective struggle for peace, drawing the masses of people into it, and not shrinking from taking appropriate measures when the imperialists attempt to unleash new aggression.

We look upon the mass movement of peace supporters that has developed in all countries as an important rampart in the preservation of peace all over the world, for this movement is truly expressive of the best aspirations and hopes of all the nations. We now have what did not exist before the Second World War.

Before
sion
among
among
the s
united
single
tion is
of pea
intern
masses

In t
Union
nese P
ple's d
lation
that is
ulation
of mil
tries a
stable
perialis
ing the
vital i
Comm
tralia
declare
tries w
U.S.S.R
racies,
tries d
of im
courage
tions,
growth
masses
tional
and me
for pea
terests

Before the war opponents of aggression, supporters of peaceful relations among the nations also predominated among the masses of people, but then the supporters of peace were not united, were not organized in a single mighty camp. Now the situation is different. Now there is a front of peace supporters organized on an international scale, one in which the masses of people are taking part.

In the same camp with the Soviet Union are such countries as the Chinese People's Republic and the people's democratic states—their population numbers 800,000,000 persons, that is, more than a third of the population of the entire globe. Hundreds of millions of people in other countries also support the cause of a stable peace and are opposed to imperialist aggression. As those holding the front lines in defending the vital interests of the people, the Communists of France, Italy, Australia and other countries publicly declare that the people of those countries will not go to war against the U.S.S.R. and the people's democracies, that the people of those countries do not want to be the tools of imperialist aggression. These courageous and powerful declarations, expressing as they do the growth in the consciousness of the masses of people, are of great international significance, mobilizing more and more millions of people to fight for peace, for active efforts in the interests of all the peace-loving na-

tions, to fight against the fomenters of war, against new aggression.

If the supporters of peace in all countries wage a persistent struggle for a stable peace among the nations, exposing all and every instigator of war, extending and consolidating their ranks, the international movement of peace supporters will fulfill its historic mission—that of preventing new aggression from being unleashed, and mobilizing against the aggressive forces of imperialism such might of the peoples as will muzzle any aggressor.

Now to sum up.

From this, certain conclusions can also be drawn concerning our future tasks.

Comrades: Everyone understands why the present elections to the Supreme Soviet are again being held under the militant banner of the Stalinist bloc of Communists and non-Party people.

This bloc unites the workers, farmers, and intellectuals—the entire Soviet people under the leadership of the Communist Party.

This bloc is the basis of our victories and the earnest of the further achievements of the Soviet State.

Long live the victorious bloc of Communists and non-Party people!

Long live the mighty Soviet people and their great Party of Bolsheviks, the party of Lenin and Stalin!

Long live our great and sagacious leader, our dear Comrade Stalin!

The Vatican Conspiracy in the American Trade-Union Movement

by George Morris

In the last war we joined the Communists to fight the fascists. In another war we will join the fascists to fight the Communists. . . . (From the speech of James B. Carey, New York *Herald Tribune*, January 29, 1950.)

THE ABOVE STATEMENT was delivered before the American Legion-sponsored "All American Conference" against Communism, with Carey the Secretary-Treasurer of the C.I.O., an official delegate of that labor body. His words, uttered only three months after the Cleveland C.I.O. convention, measure the depth to which some C.I.O. office holders have sunk and the rapidity with which some of them are degenerating.

But Carey's speech reflects most of all the extent to which the hand of the Vatican has reached into the affairs of the once-progressive-led C.I.O. The Cleveland convention, at which the dominant combination of the hierarchy and Social-Democracy launched a program of splitting the C.I.O. and expelling its most progressive unions, advanced the Vatican closer than ever to its long-cherished goal of clerical-run unionism in America.

The agents of the Roman Catholic hierarchy were never so arrogant as

they have been since the C.I.O. convention. Spurred by a fresh set of papal pronouncements, including an excommunication decree—even a ban on a Catholic newsboy's right to sell a Left paper—Vatican agents openly assert their "right" to interfere in the trade unions.

When the C.I.O.'s top leaders decided to use the convention's platform as a launching base for a "blitz" to destroy the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, they counted much on the ready aid of hundreds of priests and higher clerics to mobilize members of the Catholic faith for the Right-wing faction.

Already last summer, during the election of delegates for the U.E. convention of September 1949, the clerical forces intervened openly to help the Carey group. In Erie, Pennsylvania, for example, where the giant General Electric plant is located, Father Henry Paul wrote as follows, on the eve of the local's elections, in that city's Catholic paper, which was distributed to the U.E. membership:

. . . Should a Catholic deliberately vote for a Communist officer, be he a municipal or union officer, he is voting against God.

What is most perplexing is the fact

that there are many Catholics working at General Electric who say publicly that priests have no business interfering in the affairs of their union. (*The Lake Shore Visitor-Register*, May 27, 1949.)

When the U.E. convention met, the Roman Catholic authorities had the effrontery to send fifteen priests, "specialists" as labor chaplains or in a similar capacity, among them Father Charles O. Rice, for "spiritual" advisory activity among the delegates. Their weapon was religious terrorism. Father Rice, binoculars in hand, watched the proceedings from a gallery and sent messages to delegates.

No sooner was the U.E. expelled and the I. (for imitation) U.E. headed by Carey chartered by the C.I.O., than a priest entered a local U.E. meeting in Pittsfield, Massachusetts, and declared the issue was "Christ or Stalin." On that basis he called for a standing "vote" and the newspapers gleefully heralded the victory for "Christ." There were a few other such cases in the initial stages of the "blitz." But when the first stage of the hysteria wore off, the "right" of priests to interfere in unions was vigorously challenged and the tide began to show a marked shift for the progressives, and, significantly, most often in areas predominantly Catholic.

In Elizabeth, N. J., for example, the pro-U.E. forces won in the Monroe Calculator Corp. in face of daily open campaigning by a priest for the Carey forces. In Greenfield,

Massachusetts, the results were similar, despite the appeals of priests of eight Catholic churches during Sunday services in support of the Carey forces. While Catholics predominate among the workers there, 90 percent of the employees of the two largest General Electric plants, in Schenectady and Erie, signed dues checkoff authorization cards for the U.E.

The Roman Catholic hierarchy has in the recent period gained a greater foothold in the unions, particularly the C.I.O. But it is also apparent from instances such as the above that America's workers of Catholic and other faiths are resisting clerical-dominated unionism with greater vigor than ever. The Vatican State may find Wall Street's foreign policy an anchor for its diplomacy, but America's working class, comprising many national origins and faiths and having a long-standing tradition rejecting religious interference in unions, is definitely not a fertile soil for clerical unionism. A united front of workers of all faiths is bound to grow against such church intrusion.

THE REAL SOURCE OF CAREY'S LINE

To understand the menace, it is first of all necessary to examine the real source of guidance for one like Carey. We will not enter here into the elementary fact that labor officials of the Carey stripe are tools of Wall Street imperialist policy within union ranks. But the greater than average

viciousness displayed by one like Carey, as shown in the brazen gall even to call for an alliance with fascism, is accounted for by the special inspiration the Vatican gives to its tools in the labor movement. Carey defiantly reaffirmed his statement of January 28 before a meeting of the Philadelphia C.I.O. Council on March 23.

Vatican authorities always stress that the Roman Catholic doctrine on labor and the "social order" are based on the encyclicals *Rerum Novarum*, issued by Pope Leo XIII in 1891, and *Quadragesimo Anno*, issued by Pius XI in 1931.

We examined *Rerum Novarum* in considerable detail in an article entitled "The Vatican's Labor Philosophy," which appeared in the April 1949 issue of this publication. In brief, we showed that the document was issued essentially in an effort to stem the onrushing tide of Socialism, whose influence already embraced many millions of workers. Leo XIII, admitting his alarm over the drift of workers away from the influence of the Roman Catholic Church, partially conceded some of the rights that workers in most countries had already won through Marxist leadership.

Leo XIII further counseled Catholic toilers to take their lot for granted and not seek to violate God's will that they bear their lot. He quoted generously from Christ and other Biblical sources informing the poor that they are blessed because they

will enjoy eternally the kingdom of heaven after their brief trial on earth. On that basis he cautioned against violation of the "natural right" of the rich to possess their wealth. He called for labor-capital cooperation.

The Vatican's program today stems more directly from the encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*, which marks the 40th Anniversary of the earlier encyclical, reaffirms it and "adjusts" it to the new times.

What was the world like when Pius XI issued this document?

The Soviet Union was nearly 14 years old and its first Five-Year Plan was nearing completion. The labor movement was split, with the Social-Democrats turned handmaidens of capitalism everywhere and the Communists carrying the torch of the Socialism that Leo XIII had condemned so bitterly. The world was in the grip of an unprecedented economic crisis, with an estimated fifteen million unemployed in rich America. Fascism was a decade old in the very country where Vatican Hill is located. Hitler was advancing rapidly in Germany. Hungry workers in many areas were shifting away from the Socialists, whose fancy theories of gradual "growing into Socialism" crashed on the rocks of the crisis.

In the United States, the trade-union movement was very ineffective after a decade that saw the hey-day of company unionism and open-shop terror, monopoly-sponsored paternalism in the plants, profit-sharing

employee-stockownership and other labor-management "cooperation" schemes as "substitutes" for class-struggle unionism.

Quadragesimo Anno drew on fascism, company-unionism and Right-wing Social-Democracy to concoct a hodge-podge that is today the pattern for the economic structure of clerical fascism in countries like Spain, Portugal and certain Latin-American countries.

The Pope's principal theme is "abolition" of the class struggle. As he stated it:

Now this is the primary duty of the State and of all good citizens: to abolish conflict between classes with divergent interests and thus foster and promote harmony between the various ranks of society.

But in calling for a "common effort of employees and employers" in production, the Pope stressed repeatedly the "re-establishment of vocational groups." This is in line with the regret Leo XIII had expressed over the disappearance of the guild societies of feudal days on the grounds that they were "ideal" because they expressed the unity of workers and masters in the same establishment. But Pius XI saw the answer to what Leo XIII sought. It was in Mussolini's corporative form. He wrote:

Within recent times, as all are aware, a special syndical and corporative organization has been inaugurated which, in view of the subject of the present encyclical, demands of us some mention

and opportune comment.

The corporations are composed of representatives of the unions of work- ingmen and employers of the same trade or profession, and as true and genuine organs and institutions of the state they direct and co-ordinate the activities of the unions in all matters of common interest. Strikes and lockouts are forbidden. If the contending parties cannot come to an agreement, public authority intervenes.

Little reflection is required to perceive the advantage of the institution thus summarily described; peaceful collaboration of the classes, repression of Socialist organizations and effort, the moderating influence of a special ministry.

Pius XI took notice of the popular antagonism to fascism and to its economic slavery. But he viewed the corporate state as a "lofty purpose" that could be of "true and permanent advantage," given "Catholic principles and their application." He viewed Mussolini's system as ideal because the class struggle is "abolished," even unions led by Right Social-Democrats are wiped out or sent underground, and a government ministry "arbitrates" everything. And that was exactly what happened where either the Mussolini or Hitler brand of fascism or Vatican brand of clerical, Franco-style fascism was in power.

In 1948, when General de Gaulle issued his "feeler" for clerical fascism in France, he practically lifted the words from *Quadragesimo Anno* in describing his plan of establishing

"vocational organizations" in place of unions. The A.C.T.U.'s organ, the *Wage Earner*, at that time hailed the de Gaulle program as being essentially its "industry council plan," which is also the pet program of Philip Murray that he periodically gets endorsed at C.I.O. conventions.

The corporative state idea as a substitute for unions was reaffirmed recently in a broadcast of Pope Pius XII, who, as Cardinal Pacelli, had been Pius XI's secretary of state. It is Pius XII that framed the Vatican's concordats with Hitler, Mussolini and Franco, supporting their aggressive war aims. After restating the corporative-state plan as outlined in *Quadragesimo Anno*, the present-day Pope broadcast in August 1949 to German Catholics:

May it please God that the day be not distant in which those organizations of self-defense could cease to function, which defects of the economic system until now existing and above all the lack of Christian morality have made necessary.

This unusually plain language from a pope in regard to trade unions caused consternation in the ranks of Carey's A.C.T.U. friends. Father Carl Hubble, Detroit A.C.T.U. chaplain and chief writer for the *Wage Earner*, hurried with an article in the September issue of that paper to somehow "interpret" away the damage. His mental acrobatics brought forth the view that by "organizations of self-defense" the Pope

meant, not unions, but "only a description of one of the functions of unions." Evidently some people in the Roman Catholic Church hierarchy believe that its subjects are still as illiterate as they were in the Middle Ages.

Vatican agents in the U.S. find it necessary forever to "interpret" and "explain" papal pronouncements because so much in them violates the popular acceptance of unionism and opposition to fascism or church intrusion in union or public affairs. Hence their use of terms such as "industry councils" in place of "syndical" or "corporative" state.

Also very embarrassing to the Vatican's agents in the labor movement is the blessing the Pope gives to the familiar American-type company union and profit-sharing speed-up schemes. Pius XI said:

We deem it advisable that the wage contract should, when possible, be modified somewhat by a contract of partnership, as is already being tried in various ways to no small gain, both of the wage earners and the employers. In this way the wage earners are made sharers of some sort of ownership, or the management of the profits.

A measure of the value of papal economics for the workers was given during the long and bitterly fought strike of 5,000 asbestos workers in the French-Canadian town of Asbestos. So abused were the workers by the American-owned Johns-Manville Corp., that even some in the Catholic clergy supported them and the Mon-

treal and Quebec Archbishops ordered collections for them in the churches. But Lewis H. Brown, chairman of the corporation, challenged them with a pamphlet to the workers in May, 1949, in which he made very generous use of lengthy quotations from *Quadragesimo Anno* to "justify" the company's position in the strike. The quotations read like an answer to a prayer of an advertisement writer for the National Association of Manufacturers. And Brown had no need of distorting those quotations, as Father Charles O. Rice, the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists' leader, charged. Some months later the Archbishop of Montreal resigned "for reasons of health" and the resignations of the Quebec Archbishop and of a bishop were reported in Vatican circles, according to the *New York Times* of February 12, 1950.

Quadragesimo Anno also altered the papal attitude to the Social-Democrats. It noted the division that has occurred in the "camp of socialism" with a "moderate" and a Communist wing. The latter now drew the brunt of the wrath that Leo XIII directed against the early socialists. But of the Right wing, Pius XI said "it cannot be denied its programs often strikingly approach the just demands of Christian social reformers."

"If these changes continue," went on the Pope, "it may well come about that the tenets of mitigated

socialism will no longer be different from the program of those who seek to reform human society according to Christian [i.e., Roman Catholic] principles."

Thus the Pope recognized that the Right-wing class collaboration program differed little from his own, the "corporative" type. And hadn't Mussolini borrowed his class-collaborationist line mainly from the Right-wing Social-Democrats whence he came? The Vatican-Social-Democratic united front we see today, especially in the Right-wing leadership of unions, is essentially based on the line set forth in 1931.

Quadragesimo Anno also laid down the basis upon which organizations like the A.C.T.U. were formed. Leo XIII gave Roman Catholics permission to join Catholic unions, in an effort to divert them from Socialist-led organizations. Already before 1931 the Vatican was forced to make some interim concessions, leaving it to local bishops to dispense with the restriction on joining "neutral" (non-denominational) unions. The Catholic workers were not paying much attention to Leo XIII's restrictions anyway. By 1931 it was so plain that the reactionary-dominated Catholic unions were doomed as a substantial movement, that Pius XI lifted the restriction entirely, provided some precautions were taken:

Among these precautions, the first and most important is that side by side

with these trade unions, there must always be associations which aim at giving their members a thorough religious and moral training, and these in turn may impart to the labor unions to which they belong the upright spirit which should direct their entire conduct.

The Pope decreed it is "our right and our duty to deal authoritatively with social and economic problems," that have a "bearing on moral conduct." In fact, he added, the Roman Catholic Church must "demand that both social and economic questions be brought within our supreme jurisdiction."

Thus developed the "principle" that the Vatican has the "supreme jurisdiction" over the morals and social and economic policies of labor and a "right" to train its followers to "impart" its dictums into the unions.

The claim of religious supremacy is, of course, not new for the Vatican. But in recent weeks talk has developed on a new approach by the Vatican—its proposal to form an anti-Communist "Christian Front" with other Christian denominations. Although papal spokesmen stress that this proposal is in no way a compromise on religious doctrine, some Protestants expressed hope that the proposal is a departure from the claim that the Vatican speaks for the "only true church."

Parallel with the Pope's proposal for an anti-Communist Christian front, there is also talk of a similar Mohammedan-Catholic united front.

The Pope's move only bears out the fact that the Vatican is in the first place a political institution for reaction and, as always, will not hesitate to twist religious dogma to fit into its political objectives. Thus, for example, Catholics are now told by the Vatican that Bishops can authorize meetings between Catholics and non-Catholics provided discussions steer away from the tenets of Catholic doctrine. In practice this is a program that envisages Vatican leadership in a world anti-Communist united front.

THE A.C.T.U. IS BORN

The birth of the A.C.T.U. and the hierarchy's concerted drive to "impart" its program did not get under way in the United States until 1937. But already in the early 'thirties the notorious fascist, anti-Semitic radio priest, Father Charles E. Coughlin, began the task. He formed the National Union for Social Justice, through which he sought to head off the already then evident unionization movement of Catholics in the mass production industries.

Coughlinism failed because Hitler's march was stopped. Its movement was anchored on the conviction of the Vatican's diplomats that Hitler would conquer the world. It was in line with that conviction that Cardinal Pacelli (now Pope) directed a diplomacy of support to Hitler in all countries in the path of the Nazi march. This is well described in Avro Manhattan's *The*

Vatican in World Politics (Gaer Associates). When Hitler's victory began to look doubtful, and the Vatican shifted toward anchoring its fortunes to Wall Street, Coughlin became a source of embarrassment to the Vatican and had to be silenced by the Detroit archbishop.

The new line as it affected labor was developed through the A.C.T.U., numerous labor schools and an extraordinary propaganda in the trade unions, directed especially through publishing and educational institutions of the Jesuits. *Quadragesimo Anno* was brought into the unions with full force. Poisonous anti-Communism became the primary content of A.C.T.U. activity. The A.C.T.U. forces formed a united front with the Social-Democrats, Trotskyites and America Firsters on a policy of sabotage of the war against Hitler.

They sabotaged the Allied war effort just as long as there was even slight hope for a negotiated peace with Hitler and a shift of the war against the U.S.S.R. It was when the Vatican took the final step to tie its fortunes to the Truman Doctrine, that the A.C.T.U. and allied Catholic groups became ardent forces for the cold war and equally ardent for the papal class-peace line in industry.

Never in all American labor history was a disruptive force within it as vicious. The first of the current wave of cannibalistic raids on progressive-led unions, begun in Con-

necticut in 1947, was aided by priests who waved the threat of excommunication over those who refused to join the Right-wing raiders. Ever since, those raids have been blessed by priests with Philip Murray's close friend, Father Charles O. Rice, the most notorious among them.

American unions, virtually free of religious dividing lines in their long history, were getting it now in extra large doses. Where the A.C.T.U.'s influence dominated, there also came the stench of intolerance, especially that subtle anti-Semitism so characteristic of Vatican influence.

By the time of the 1949 convention of the C.I.O., the hierarchy's forces advanced in that organization to positions stronger than they had ever held in any American union.

The fruits of that convention's policy were not slow in maturing. Several weeks later came the London conference at which that Marshall Plan tool, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, was launched. It was highlighted by an invitation extended to the Catholic unions of Europe to join. It was to the two American delegates with a "Socialist" reputation in Europe, Walter Reuther and David Dubinsky, that the task was given of selling the Roman Catholic invitation idea to the traditionally anti-clerical Socialist delegates. The two were credited with the "compromise" that eventually carried—and even then over the opposition of a bloc of Socialist votes.

The *Brooklyn Tablet*, organ of the diocese and notorious for its Coughlin-like line, hailed the results. The *Tablet* was happy because the American unions, not Europe's socialist-led unions, dominated the international conference and that they "used this strong position to favor the Christian rather than the Socialist trade unions."

Another post-convention development was a rash of newspaper and magazine publicity for labor-management sweetheart plans. The attempt to revive them is obviously encouraged by the belief that Catholic influence will help further them.

Fortune magazine of January 1950 features a case history of a plant where the "Scanlon" plan, a labor-management council and profit sharing to speedup production, is in operation. The author of the plan, now working to introduce it in many plants, is Joseph Scanlon. He is a former official of Murray's United Steelworkers of America, and has its blessing for his plan.

Eric Johnston, boss of the film industry, has again come out with his periodic rewrite of a blueprint of labor-management love and peace. Johnston, who operates his own plants on a profit-sharing plan, has been hailed by the A.C.T.U.'s forces as an employer in the spirit of the encyclicals.

George Baldanzi, executive vice-president of the Textile Workers Union (C.I.O.) appeared before the Association of Profit Sharing Indus-

tries and delivered an endorsement of their schemes, apparently unconcerned with the fact that most of the association's member companies are non-union. It was Baldanzi who stunned a considerable number of Jewish delegates at the C.I.O. convention when he bombastically concluded a speech by saying he longed for the day when "we can live in peace, security and happiness as Christian people in this Christian world were intended to live."

It was hardly surprising, therefore, that the C.I.O. was listed among the participants of the reactionary "All American Conference" along with the N.A.M., U.S. Chamber of Commerce and such notorious pro-fascists and anti-Semites as Mervin K. Hart. Carey and his secretary, Harry Read, founder of the A.C.T.U., were fitting as delegates of the C.I.O. The conferees, very desirous of a "liberal" front, named Read as chairman of the continuations committee they formed. Carey's speech, quoted at the opening of this article, hardly revealed him and Read as the "liberal" side of the reactionary united front. The C.I.O.'s subsequent withdrawal was entirely due to rank-and-file pressure.

Meanwhile, signs multiply to show that the influence of clerical fascism brings its inevitable fruits into the life of the C.I.O. Since the Cleveland convention, the C.I.O.'s cartoonist revived Julius Streicher's anti-Semitic character of a Jew and tagged it "expelled unions." The cartoon ap-

peared at least twice in the C.I.O.'s official organ and several times in Carey's *I.U.E. News*. There is also increasing evidence of Jim Crow in the C.I.O. Right-wing unions, in a number of cases, had notations to their convention calls that credentials of Negroes be noted so accommodations could be arranged for them where they would be "tolerated." Many members have been shocked to learn that in the Memphis C.I.O. hall separate washrooms are marked for "white" and "colored." Add to this the fact that in the past year the C.I.O.'s main energy in the South has been devoted to smashing the unions that have been exemplary in the advancement of the interests of the Negro workers (Bessemer, Winston-Salem) and we get quite an ugly picture of race supremacy.

HOW TO MEET THE MENACE

From the foregoing it is evident that Carey's call for an alliance with fascism was not a sudden brainstorm. It flows directly from his Vatican handbook. Has not the Vatican been, or still is, in alliance with every fascist power in the name of "anti-Communism"—with Mussolini, Hitler, Franco, Salazar, Vichy France's Petain, Tiso of pre-democratic Slovakia, and Peron? At this writing it seems inconceivable that even a sizable minority in the C.I.O.'s leadership would support Carey's pro-fascist call. But the fact that the Secretary-Treasurer of the

C.I.O. had so openly and brazenly taken such a stand indicates how far the Vatican's hand has already reached and how arrogant its stooges in labor ranks are becoming.

Faced with the gall of Vatican tools like Carey, and others like him who still hold their tongues in check, the labor movement will undoubtedly become more aroused than ever against the menace. The Left-progressives have the responsibility of showing initiative and effective leadership in this struggle.

First and foremost, it is urgent to distinguish the Catholic hierarchy and its agents from the millions of workers and other common people of Catholic faith. The former represents a reactionary force in the world, the rich industrialists and landowners, among whom the Vatican itself is one of the most powerful; and it is anchored to the diplomacy of Wall Street imperialism. On the other hand, the mass of Catholics in America are the most numerous dwellers of the cities and the largest single denomination among the industrial workers, especially in the major industries like auto, mine, steel, shipbuilding, building trades, transport, textile, electrical. These workers also make up the most significant section of the trade-union movement—and often its most militant.

It is the height of stupidity and falsehood to throw the hierarchy and the mass of Catholics into one group. Their economic and political

interests are as contradictory to each other as a large corporation and the union of its workers. The Vatican is, in fact, one of the world's great property owners that has a definite stake in the capitalist system. A common religion cannot erase the basic class division that exists. In fact, the Catholic workers, who predominate in the cities and the major industries, are not likely to be humbugged by the company-union love-the-boss line of the papal encyclicals.

The Left-progressive militants in the labor movement really express the vital interests of the Catholic workers, as they do of all others, and not the agents of that foreign power, the Vatican State. The Left-progressives should approach the Catholic workers in precisely that spirit—the spirit of a united front on every issue that affects their economic, anti-war and other immediate interests. In such a united front the Catholic workers will learn by experience who really expresses their interests.

Secondly, it is time progressives in unions took up more aggressively the struggle against injection of religion—any religion—into public affairs, especially unions. The United States has been spared the costly experience of a trade-union movement divided along religious lines. The mere entrance on the scene of a trade-union faction that calls itself "Catholic" is a violation of the traditional democratic principle of complete separation of church and state. We have already seen it develop to a

point where the Roman Catholic faith of trade-union members is being openly exploited for factional purposes in a union without regard for the elementary principle of inter-faith unity that must be preserved in a labor organization. The great majority of America's workers, the Catholics included, resent religious interference in affairs outside the church, or the exploitation of their faith as a cover-up for reactionary causes.

Thirdly, it is important to demonstrate to the Catholic workers the contradiction between their class interests and those of the hierarchy. Too often, this contradiction is blurred by the wide publicity for the hierarchy's social activities. Most often overlooked however, is its stand against Federal child labor legislation. In Massachusetts, the hierarchy's opposition to a bill providing state-administered sick benefits amazed the trade-union leaders of that state, including those of Catholic faith. Evidence that the A.C.T.U. is actively involved in the Ohio conspiracy to sabotage labor support for a movement to unseat Senator Robert Taft is another example. The most brazen example of what Vatican "labor policy" leads to, is the open scab position the A.C.T.U. took on the recent bitterly fought strike of the coal miners. Its organ, the *Labor Leader*, ran editorials siding with the coal operators on every demand and slandering John L. Lewis in the most shameful

manner for standing by those demands. This was done at a moment when miners were in their worst starvation period and organizations everywhere were gathering food to sustain them in that fight. The A.C.T.U. organ openly counseled the coal operators not to give the miners a raise.

Fourthly, the implied bigotry in the very idea of a Catholic-dominated trade-union movement should be noted. As we have shown, the theory of *Quadragesimo Anno* is that the problems of a union come under the "supreme jurisdiction" of the Roman Catholic Church, and that through its followers organized in "associations" within a union it seeks to "impart" an influence over the "entire" union that obviously leaves non-Catholics in a second-class category. Anti-Semitism and "white supremacy" are inevitable by-products of such intolerance, much of which had already revealed itself since the Vatican's influence became pronounced in the C.I.O.'s life.

Fifthly, the A.C.T.U. and other agencies of the hierarchy in labor's ranks are an extremely tiny group. Their activities are obviously not a popular attraction among the Catholic workers. Moreover, they operate as secret groups, with a handful of operators behind the scenes. They barely put out much literature in

their own name, relying almost entirely on the widely-distributed books and pamphlets issued by the Paulist Fathers and other Roman Catholic publishers. They rely mainly on the disciplinary power of the church among Catholics and religious prejudice to mobilize support for their disruptive campaigns in the unions. Their exposure as a small clique that masks its objective by a religion would strip them to the handful they really are.

Finally, the company-union, class-collaborationist nature of the papal and A.C.T.U. program for labor is seldom brought out, even by those who do challenge the Vatican's power. The A.C.T.U. and Jesuit writers frankly point to the profit-sharing schemes, labor-management speedup setups (notably in non-union fields) as examples of what they want for all America (*Spotlight on the Labor Unions*, by Father William J. Smith, S. J.). The A.C.T.U. ideologists have tried to embellish their "industry-council plan" as some sort of a new social order in an effort to appease the growing mistrust among Catholic workers in capitalism. Their program should be reduced to what it is and exposed and fought as such—company unionism and the negation of the line of militant struggle.

The Negro in Hollywood Films*

by V. J. Jerome

NOT SO LONG AGO the entertainment trade journal *Variety* announced in its slick corporate cant, "More Adult' Pix Key to Top Coin." For those who are not initiated into this monosyllabic moronism let me explain that this means that the more serious motion pictures are now a source for richer revenue. It is clear that the devil must be ill indeed to want so fervently to be a monk. The old worked-to-death formulae, clichés, stereotypes, and taboos of the venal screen have not proved so profitable of late. Or, as the president of the Motion Picture Association of America, Eric Johnston, conceded the point, in addressing Hollywood's big studios:

America is growing up and films must catch up with that "phenomenon."

And as Gilbert Seldes wrote in the *Atlantic Monthly* for September, 1949:

Statistics were on Mr. Johnston's side. At the time of his talks, the nine most profitable pictures included three that were definitely aimed at intelligent adult audiences (*Hamlet*, *The Red*

Shoes,* *The Snake Pit*) and three others (*Joan of Arc*, *A Letter to Three Wives*, *Command Decision*) were far out of the ruck of violence and sentimentality.

HOLLYWOOD'S "NEW LOOK"

Increasing admissions of this kind, needless to say, are not to be taken as a sudden change of conscience on the part of the Hollywood studio magnates for having unconscionably debased their cultural product for over half a century. Rather, they should be seen as a bow to the compulsions both of the home public and of the foreign market. When Eric Johnston says that "America is growing up," he acknowledges that there is a growing dissatisfaction with the current Hollywood product; and when he says that "films must catch up with that 'phenomenon,'" he means that new ways must be found for carrying out the reactionary ideological aims of the monopolists through the screen medium. What he also means is that new ways must be found to counteract the continuously falling box-office returns.

* Elaboration of a Speech delivered at a public meeting held at the Hotel Capitol, New York City, on February 3, 1950, under the auspices of *Masters & Mainstream*.

* *Hamlet* and *The Red Shoes*, which were distributed here, are British-made pictures.

These economic pressures from home and abroad stand out in their full clarity when seen in the larger political context of the postwar expansionist program of American Big Business and its bipartisan administration.

Profits apart, Hollywood's glamor-films are counted on to serve as "cultural" missionaries in "softening up" the Marshall Plan countries to accept their status of satellites of Wall Street. Thus, the head of the Motion Picture-Photographic Branch of the Department of Commerce has been urging the appointment of a European Film Attaché, with the status of a Minister, "to serve and advise the U.S. Embassies" in these countries, "because of the significance and importance foreign governments attach to film matters."*

But, alas for the monopolists, the season for their missionaries—cultural or otherwise—is growing short, and Hollywood has been hard put to it in attempting to spread the gospel according to St. Marshall. Far from being softened up, the people in Europe and in Asia are hardened into resentment by the Hollywood film fare, as is attested by numerous facts and by commentator after commentator.

In our own country, and much more so abroad, growing numbers of movie-goers and popular organizations have conducted unprecedented campaigns and struggles against the Hollywood "culture" of

violence, sadism, degradation, racism, and anti-Sovietism. This mounting resentment has been manifested in the numerous struggles against the showing of the Soviet-slandering film *The Iron Curtain*. In the United States, protest campaigns, picket lines, and mass demonstrations occurred in New York, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Denver, Milwaukee, Dayton, New Bedford and many other cities. On a world scale, there were picket lines against the film in such major cities as Toronto, Montevideo, Delhi, Sydney, Wellington (New Zealand), Amsterdam, Paris, Rome, Milan and Venice. In the United States, the film trade papers plaintively admit the colossal box-office failure of the rash of Red-baiting films—*The Iron Curtain*, *The Red Menace* and *I Married A Communist*.

The same journals stress the box office popularity of the latest cycle of films on Negro subjects. The analysts of box office currents seek to ascribe the success of this film cycle as against the failure of the Red-baiting films solely to the superiority of the former on the artistic level. But the simple fact of rejection of Red-baiting content and of the tremendous interest in any film even approaching a dignified portrayal of a Negro is proof of a much higher mass consciousness of this question than Hollywood would care to admit.

This growing international resent-

* *Variety*, November 7, 1949.

ment is to be seen, further, in the gathering support, here and abroad, for the cause of the Hollywood Ten against the un-American thought-controllists. Outstanding actions were the Amicus Brief addressed to the Supreme Court for the reversal of the conviction of screen-writers John Howard Lawson and Dalton Trumbo of the Hollywood Ten, with over 200 Hollywood actors, writers, and directors among the signers, and the resolution of the International Film Congress, held in September 1949 in Perugia and Rome, which "urges all European and American organizations of film workers and all other cultural and pro-democratic organizations to protest this persecution of the Hollywood Ten."

The resentment is further seen in the rising struggles of film workers and other democratic forces in France, Britain, Italy, etc., against the Marshallized undermining of the native film industries. In France, the Committee for the Defense of the French Cinema, a broad coalition movement launched in May, 1948, at a mass demonstration of professional and audience groups, has demanded the abrogation of the Blum-Byrnes agreement of 1946, which gives American films a priority of 9 to 4 on French screens without reciprocal arrangements. In England, the Association of Cinematograph and Allied Technicians, at a big meeting held in December, 1949, pointing to the near-bank-

ruptcy and mass lay-offs in the industry, demanded a sharp curtailment of Hollywood films in British theatres.

The resentment is further manifested in the many protests and picket lines in various American cities against the recent re-issue of the Kluxist film *The Birth of a Nation*; in the fact that, in 1948, 14,000 Philadelphians, Negro and white, including Mayor Bernard Samuel, signed a petition to Eric Johnston, protesting the offensive treatment of the Negro by Hollywood.* The Negro press and Negro people's organizations have carried on a constant campaign of protest against Hollywood's white supremacy pattern, a pattern manifested either in flagrant racism or in the utter ignoring of the existence of the Negro people. Further, in the trade unions, "talent guilds," and other organizations of Hollywood film artists and workers, resolutions have increasingly been adopted calling for an end to Negro stereotyping, and, more recently, for a truthful, full and dignified portrayal of Negro life, as well as an end to discriminatory practices in employment. A typical example of what Hollywood films face on this question in the colonial countries is the resolution submitted in 1949 by Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, member of Ni-

* The petition, known as the "Mile-Long Petition," from the fact that the scroll of signatures stretched eight city blocks long, is now on exhibition at the Washington office of the Motion Picture Association of America.

geria's Legislative Assembly, to that body, for the banning of "films which are derogatory and humiliating to the Negro race . . ." Not least, the increasing revulsion to the typical Hollywood "culture" is to be seen in the growing world-wide popularity—wherever their exhibition is not prevented—of the truthful and superior films produced in the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, as well as films created by progressive artists in Western countries.

A reflection of this state of affairs in the postwar years is to be seen in a statement by Martin Quigley, publisher and editor of motion-picture business papers. In the course of an article extolling the Hollywood product,* Quigley broke into his panegyric with the angry words:

Yet in the halls of Congress, there have recently resounded such intemperate remarks as the assertion that the films shown abroad are portraying the U.S. as "a nation of morons and gangsters." . . .

Let me leave without comment Mr. Quigley's modest defense that Shakespeare too has his "murder, theft, and intrigue." More to the point is his statement:

But such of these impressions as may be inconsistent with the role which the Nation has assumed in world affairs properly becomes the subject of grave concern to all thoughtful persons.

* "Importance of the Entertainment Films," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, November, 1947, pp. 65-69.

In other words, if the Nation (read: Wall Street) is to maintain its pose of "world leader," it cannot go on altogether with the old-line film depictions that expose its Achilles' heel.

The monopoly owners of America are confronted with the task of turning the powerful mass propaganda medium of the film to full account in the service of their war program aimed at world domination. At the same time, they are compelled to acknowledge the wide discredit of the Hollywood product among audiences abroad; their anxiety mounts at the evidence that the treatment accorded the Negro on the Hollywood screen universally shows up the Wall Street "dispenser of democracy" as a false Messiah. The world-wide criticism of anti-Negro discrimination and terror in the United States is noted with grave disconcertion by many apologists for American imperialism who have visited abroad. Thus, Walter White, of the N.A.A.C.P., stated in the autumn of 1949 upon his return from a round-the-world tour that he had encountered everywhere "questions about the contradiction of American ideals of freedom and racial and religious discrimination in the U.S." He sought to alarm the white ruling class into the recognition that such incidents of discrimination "are used with devastating effectiveness by the enemies and critics of the United States to dis-

credit American democracy" (*California Eagle*, November 3, 1949).

Hence, the need of American imperialism for a "new" brand of films designed to beguile the peoples of the Marshallized countries with regard to its treatment of the Negro people, as well as to neutralize the colored colonial peoples, who feel a sense of fraternity with the American Negro in the common anti-imperialist struggle. The "new" brand of films, by showing that the Negro in the United States is not treated "so badly," can hope to cover up the imperialist Jim-Crow oppression of the Negro people.

At home the American ruling class, which always seeks to adjust its tactical use of the various propaganda media at its command to new political developments, is confronted with a rising movement of the Negro people. This political upsurge following World War II occurs in a situation that differs greatly from that which followed World War I, when the trade-union movement did not count masses of Negro members in active participation and the employers could split the workers' ranks on the "race issue." Today, the numerous organized Negro workers constitute an organic part of the American trade-union movement, notwithstanding persisting white-chauvinist policies of the dominant leaders in the A. F. of L., C.I.O., and Railroad Brotherhoods. In the great economic struggles of organized labor since the war's end

the Negro workers have played an outstandingly militant role. The effect of this marked progress in the trade-union sphere has been to advance considerably the leadership of the Negro workers in the Negro people's movement, as well as to strengthen the solidarity of Negro and white workers.

The Negro people emerged from the anti-Axis war resolved to fight on the home shores for that democracy and that equality which the United States had proclaimed as its cause before the world. Postwar reaction hit hardest the Negro masses, in the furious bipartisan offensive to rob them of their war-time gains and to impose on them the main burden of the developing economic crisis. The white ruling class set out with new lynch-orgies, unspeakable police brutality, and intensified terror to put the Negro "back in his place." But it had to reckon with an aroused movement and a gathering militancy among the Negro people, and with a strengthened bond of Negro-and-white popular unity.

And with every fresh blow for freedom by a people under imperialist oppression—in Indonesia, in Viet Nam, in Malaya, in Africa, in the Philippines—the resonance of solidarity rings in the breasts of the Negro people here. What new stirrings of hope, what new flashes of the oncoming freedom the liberation of the Chinese people has sent into the hearts and minds of the American Negro masses! And what

though
war-n
ever
mirat
nation
true
nation
cently
tic ro
rising
the
name
The
the I
all an
ican
Robe
fairs

In
ple o
front
peria
targe
and
wher
back
peria
right
it is
gle e
desc
Amc
tical
unic
class

T
the
Loc
peo
Rig
the

thought-control can repress, what war-mongering anti-Sovietism can ever quench the Negro people's admiration for that land—that multinational Socialist State—where the true freedom and brotherhood of nations and peoples have but recently been symbolized in the gigantic rock-hewn head of Paul Robeson rising high on a mountain-peak in the Caucasus now bearing his name?

The anger and fighting mood of the Negro people are evidenced in all areas of struggle upon the American scene. In the forceful words of Robert Thompson, in *Political Affairs* for June, 1949:

In the present period, the Negro people occupy a unique position in the front of struggle against American imperialism. Everywhere they are the first targets of the growth of fascist reaction and chauvinist nationalism. Everywhere they are resisting and fighting back. At a time when American imperialism is proclaiming the divine right of Anglo-Saxons to run the world, it is confronted with a mounting struggle of 13 million Americans of African descent for a position of equality in American economic, social, and political life. The Negro people are a unique ally of the American working class.

These are the facts that are behind the Truman Administration's "New Look" posturings before the Negro people. The President's "Civil Rights" fanfare, in conjunction with the entire "Fair Deal" and "Welfare

State" masquerade, expresses the need to recognize the growing militancy of the Negro people, in the context of the strengthened position of the world peace camp and the developing peace movement in our country. And the compulsions upon the counting-house in Wall Street and upon the White House in Washington have their reflection in the studio of Hollywood.

With this political situation for background, we are now in a position to discuss the current series of Hollywood films dealing with aspects of American Negro life.

THE UNDERLYING STRATEGY

The treatment of Negro themes and characters by Hollywood, during successive periods in the past fifty years, has borne a clear relationship to the concrete political program of monopoly capital in each of these given periods. Each phase of Hollywood policy in this regard may be viewed in a frame of reference of the particular stage of advance of the Negro people's movement, and of its alliance with the American working class.

While making certain concessions on the screen, designed to "adjust" to the Negro people's forward movement, the controlling interests have sought tenaciously to retain the clichés and discriminations of the past in one form or another. *These concessions, being tactical in character, have always been utilized by*

monopoly capital with a view to furthering and strengthening its basic strategy. The objective of that strategy is to perpetuate the myth of "white supremacy" in order to hold back the developing labor-Negro alliance for the common struggle against fascism and imperialist war; to weaken the fight of the trade unions and white progressives for a Fair Employment Practices Commission bill, for the abolition of the poll tax, and for the outlawry of lynching; to prevent the organization and the full integration of the Negro workers into the trade unions, in order to hamper the unification of the white and Negro workers in a powerful American labor movement. It is the objective of that strategy, at all times, to undermine the movement of the Negro people and to prevent it from developing its full force, and to keep the Negro people from understanding the true basis and nature of their oppression. The objective is to keep them from understanding that the lynch-law and Jim-Crow discrimination and segregation are inspired by Wall Street and Southern landlord reaction. The objective is, furthermore, to keep from the Negro people the truth of the scientific teaching of the Communist Party that their oppression is *national* in essence, and that their struggle is fundamentally a struggle for national liberation. It is the objective of that strategy to weaken the ties of the Negro people with the white

workers and other popular allies and thereby to retard the general working-class struggle for emancipation from capitalism. It is the aim of that strategy to isolate the Negro people's movement and rob it of self-confidence; and, finally, thus to prevent the Negro people from taking the anti-imperialist road to national liberation.

THE "NEGRO INTEREST" FILMS

It is in this larger framework that we must examine the new series of Hollywood "Negro interest" films, so far represented by *Home of the Brave*, *Lost Boundaries*, *Pinky*, and *Intruder in the Dust*.

One key question can lead us to a keener understanding of these films, and their role in monopoly capital's blueprint for dividing and conquering. It demands the fullest analysis and the clearest answer. Far more than the application of mere labels, such as "progressive" or "reactionary," must be yielded from our examination of these films. For with them, Hollywood has forged a cultural weapon. It now assumes the appearance of a crusading sword, raised in defense of the Negro people. But what hand holds the hilt? Is it aimed accurately at the deep roots of oppression—or is it aimed and wielded, after all, against the Negro people? Let us watch the sword in action.

Our key question, then, is: Does

this n
advan
of the

It c
forma
leave
wood
theme
to bea
stereo
sub-h
relief
or th
singi
field
tality
a nat
the i
ern i

In
tures,
least
a ser
of th
tral r
throu
tions
(wit
ideol
of th
tago
tago
serie
age,
duct
equa
char
we
seen
com
dram

this new film cycle signify a real advance in Hollywood's treatment of the Negro?

It cannot be disputed that, in a formal sense, these films seem to leave behind the traditional Hollywood cliché Negro. Their central themes and characters do not seem to bear the mark of the Uncle Tom stereotype; or the viciously libellous sub-human brute type; or the "comic relief" calumny à la Stepin Fetchit; or the bucolic myth of laughing, singing, romping, happy-all-the-day field hands possessed of the mentality of children and blessed with a natural contentment that makes the idea of freedom a rude, Northern interference.

In each of the four motion pictures, we see an attempt, or at least the outward intent, to make a serious and dignified presentation of the Negro, in a full-drawn, central role. The hero or heroine moves through unfolding dramatic situations that are calculated to evoke (within the limitations of the film's ideology) the sympathetic response of the audience for the Negro protagonist. The composite Negro protagonist emerges from this film series with qualities of moral courage, devotion and principled conduct. Not all of these qualities apply equally to each of the Negro central characters in the films. Nevertheless, we have in these films what would seem at very long last the Negro come into his own in the screen drama.

So obviously does this represent a sharp departure from Hollywood's past patterns that, to those who are content with first impressions, these films constitute nothing short of a revolutionary change. Regardless of what must be said in criticism—and what must be said here is *fundamental* criticism—it would be anything but realistic not to see in this new screen depiction of the Negro the fact that the advancing movement of the Negro people, together with their white labor and progressive allies, has forced a new tactical concession from the enemy. At the same time, it would be even more unrealistic not to see in this very concession a new mode—more dangerous because more subtle—through which the racist ruling class of our country is today re-asserting its strategic ideology of "white supremacy" on the Hollywood screen.

Let us examine the films themselves, matching reality against appearance, in theme and content, and in mode of presentation; comparing total impression with presumed intent, in the messages these films purport to convey to the millions.

THE NEW STEREOTYPE

We begin with *Pinky*. The film deals with a Southern Negro young woman, named Pinky (the slang term for a light-complexioned Negro who can pass for white). While studying in Boston to become a registered nurse, Pinky (Jeanne Crain)

falls in love with a white doctor. Unable to tell her suitor of her Negro origin, Pinky runs away from what has become for her an impossible situation. She returns to the South, home to her washer-woman grandmother, Aunt Dicey (Ethel Waters). There, she again encounters the real life of her people at first hand. The young Northern doctor, who follows her to the South, where he learns from her that she is a Negro, urges her to marry him, on condition however that she return North with him, "come away from all this," and keep from the world her Negro identity. She spurns his request. He leaves. At the insistence of her grandmother, much against her will, Pinky engages herself to nurse a white aristocratic, cantankerous, old woman—Miss Em (Ethel Barrymore)—who is dying in her decaying plantation mansion.

From an early revulsion, there comes about a mutual attraction between Pinky and this hard-shelled woman with the "heart of gold." The change is not too clearly motivated, although an indicated factor is Miss Em's detestation of her designing relatives. The old woman dies and—lo! has bequeathed her estate to Pinky. Pinky, however, does not find it easy to inherit "white" property. Miss Em's aristocratic relatives challenge the will. Pinky fights courageously for her rights. And—God's in his heaven: All's right with the South—Pinky

is awarded the estate! Her new property is converted into a combination nursery-clinic-training school for Negroes, over which she presides, to live happily ever after, as the fairy tale ends.

That is the bare narrative. What are this picture's positive values—values that the people have forced upon Hollywood?

First among this film's positive aspects, then, are the indicting scenes of exposé. The wretched facts of anti-Negro discrimination in the South are memorably etched in several scenes, perhaps the sharpest scenes of this kind in the entire film series.

There is the scene in which the police arrest two Negroes, a man and a woman. Pinky, who is with them, is at first mistaken for white. She is gallantly deferred to by the policemen, who "protect" her from the Negroes at her side. But Pinky defiantly declares herself to be a Negro. Instantly, there is a change in the conduct of the police toward her. We see white ruling-class justice, the only Southern justice, suddenly rip off its mask of chivalry to reveal itself as the racism we know it to be. This is a great, overpowering moment of film realism.

Later, two white joy-riding youths attempt to rape Pinky in a scene of terrifying dramatic impact. White rapists in a Hollywood film! A rare flash of truth on the American screen, which has the effect of exposing the "rape" libel used to

frame-up
hood, de
ous actu
white ru
The in
stry is
the scēn
we are sl
anti-Neg
ward pri
customer
merchan
Negro.
and it is
"Americ
Final
film, the
of Pink
these in
evaluati
In the
Em's p
heavy v
the So
illusion
lywood
the jud
for the
favor o
rich w
no ma
on the
shown
only o
are re
Negro
class s
rich w
issue
white
white

frame-up Negroes as a bestial falsehood, devised to conceal the notorious actuality of legally protected white ruling-class rapism.

The indictment of Bourbon bigotry is documented once again in the scene of the town store, where we are shown dramatically the cruel anti-Negro differential in the upward pricing of commodities to the customer Pinky, when the white merchant discovers that she is a Negro. This is reality caught cold, and it is a piercing comment on the "American way of life."

Finally, on the credit side of the film, there are the positive elements of Pinky's character. Let us examine these in relation to the total realistic evaluation of the film.

In the unfolding struggle for Miss Em's property, there takes place a heavy veiling of true conditions in the South and a busy sowing of illusions in Bourbon justice. In Hollywood's "typical" Southern town, the judges are on the side of justice for the Negro! The court rules in favor of the Negro, and against the rich white plaintiff. What is more, no mass pressure is brought to bear on the court. In fact, the masses are shown as the counter-pressure. The only ones in the entire drama who are really against Pinky and the Negroes are the poor whites; the class struggle between them and the rich whites seemingly rages over the issue of justice for Pinky: the poor whites are against her; the rich whites are for her. Where but on

the Hollywood screen can we get such insight into the class alignments of social conflict! Ergo, cogitates Hollywood, prejudices may exist in the mass mind of the poor whites, but right prevails on the scales of white ruling-class justice.

The rose-tinting of bigotry and discrimination, of violence and oppression; the toning down of everything that might be a little "too stark"; the deliberate evasion of the fact of existing, mounting legal and extra-legal brutality—these emerge as underlying purposes of the film. In this picture, so high with pretensions of "fairness" to the Negro, the shame of all this is not only ignored; it is sedulously denied by the substitution of happenings no Southland ever saw.

The good white fairy of Hollywood and Wall Street has waved her wand: A white aristocratic woman bequeaths her property to her Negro nurse. The town's outstanding lawyer, a former judge, takes Pinky's case, without retainer. A Southern judge rebukes the ranting lawyer who seeks to rob Pinky of her legacy. A Southern white courtroom mob sits and only mutters; even when the court rules in favor of the Negro, the mob does not act. After the court decision, Pinky is prevented by no one from opening her nursery center on the inherited estate, presumably with fairy gold. And, final triumph of the magic wand: The Ku Klux Klan never arrives!

Variety (November 23, 1949) reports that at one sequence, both Negro and white members of the Atlanta audience applauded. (The audience was segregated, of course.) That was the scene in which Pinky won the court fight. How should this be explained? For the Negroes, that scene was the only moment of victory—false and illusory, contrary to all realities, as it was. While for a section of the whites this scene undoubtedly expressed their approval of just decisions for Negroes, for many others it “proved” how nice and how decent Southern white justice “really is.”

Indeed, the point about the Atlanta audience opens up for consideration the calculated effect of the focal court-room scene on the varying class and social elements among the American movie-goers.

Insofar as the film addresses itself to the worker in the audience, the depiction of the lynch-eager mob, shown to be predominantly made up of poor whites, insults the working class and makes it out to be the social villain of the piece. By deliberately screening from view the lynch-law guilt of the “better classes”—the landlords, industrialists, and bankers—the film aims to break down in the worker his self-confidence and self-respect, and to retard the development of his class consciousness.

To the white middle classes the film addresses itself through the court-room scene somewhat as fol-

lows: The workers, clearly, are uncouth and Klux-ish. Your alliance cannot be with them. The “superior” class forces in the film—all the way from landlord to lawyer—they are the ones who battle in the cause of justice, against the white workers and farmers. Here is the road for your alliance!

To the Negro members of the audience the film, through the court-room scene, seems to say: Your enemy, you can see, is the camp of the poor whites; your protectors and allies are the others, the “best” whites. With these you must work out your destiny. Shun struggle and Negro-white unity. Under the aegis and paternalistic protection of the plantation rulers and their courts of justice, resign yourselves in permanence to your “racial inferiority.”

Bourbon justice has been flattered. And Pinky’s magnanimous attorney, now that her victory is achieved, solemnly states: “You’ve got the land, you’ve got the house, you’ve got justice; but I doubt if any other interests of this community have been served.” This is a dramatic and ideological high point of the film, artistically underscored. Actually, those are the only memorable lines in terms of idea content. In other words, the picture raises the question: Is the whole thing worth while? We white upper-class people have been very decent and courageous in showing the problem. But in the final analysis, isn’t it perhaps all a

mistak
come
defen
“phila
cally
pact

Wh
A l
stand
homo
of he
bigue
Negr
She
had
back
thro
her
dren
peop

Y
forc
to
with
in
Ne
acc
for
her
ser
yea
Pin
arr
me
me
is
as
or
“I
ou
ho

mistake? And since these words come from the lips of Pinky's white defender, whose "altruism" and "philanthropy" have been dramatically established, their calculated impact is indeed cogent.

Who is Pinky?

A key to knowing her is to understand the reason for her return home. She has left the North because of her inability to go on in her ambiguous position of concealing her Negro identity from her admirer. She is embittered because she has had to run away. She has not come back to her people. When she walks through the streets, she walks with her head up past the Negro children, past the Negro houses and people.

Yet her very running away has forced her to see herself as belonging to the Negro people. This conflict within her explains her declaration in the arrest scene that she is a Negro. It enters into her refusal to accept her white suitor's "condition" for their marriage. It is a factor in her sharp emotional outburst against serving Miss Em, who has for many years exploited her grandmother. Pinky's initial rebellion against this arrangement which her grandmother seeks to effect is confusedly motivated. On the one hand, there is her resentment at being treated as a Negro and even considered as one despite her light complexion: "I'm as white as you are!" she cries out to Miss Em. On the other hand, her emerging sense of identification

with her people, together with her newly acquired sense of professional independence, suggests a socially conscious element in her resistance to the paternalistic summons of the over-bearing old white woman in the Big House.

Aunt Dicey sees the conflict in Pinky and seeks to mold her granddaughter in her own image. She is motivated by the desire to survive and to protect her own. But in her abjectness bred of fear and unconsciousness of any way out, she urges upon Pinky to resolve the conflict within her by kneeling to white "superiority." When, at the outset, she reproves Pinky for her "passing," it is not because she holds that her granddaughter should be conscious of the dignity of her people, but that she should "know her place" as a Negro.

Pinky is a "white" Negro, a Negro who can "pass." She is presented in total effect as the "unusual" Negro. She has trained herself in the mannerisms of the whites. She is always conscious of the fact that she has acquired a profession, a skill, which is denied to the masses of the young Negro men and women. She is so deliberately contrasted to the other Negro characters as to appear obviously "superior" to them all, and worthy of doing "uplift" work among her people. Because of all this, in Hollywood's alchemized South, a white ruling-class court could not find it out of keeping with its sense of "justice" perhaps even

to award a verdict to her.

To give the finishing touch to Pinky's "superiority," Hollywood assigned her role to a white woman. Not a Fredi Washington or any one of a score of unquestionably qualified Negro actresses of light complexion was chosen for the leading role of Pinky, but the white actress Jeanne Crain was cast for the part. With all due appreciation for Miss Crain's creditable performance, this fact bears significantly on our evaluation of the film's central character. For, clearly, it would be going "too far" to let an *actual* Negro woman, even in a film pretending to have a Negro heroine, defy in a white men's court, the white supremacist code of robbery of the Negro's right to inherit; or to let an *actual* Negro woman be seen in a white lover's embrace, even though that love remains, by taboo of the Hollywood racist Code, unconsummated. If a degree of concession must be made in a Negro character, let it at least be made to a white player, says Hollywood. The logic is plain. The logic is cruel.

Pinky is a character capable of resolute decision and sustained, unflinching action. Hollywood cannot permit her initial rebellion against Miss Em to be a basic rebellion. The film, in effect, sets down that act of defiance against her white benefactress-to-be as merely a mistake of impetuous youth. The *New York Times* adds the touching comment: "It also presents a tender aspect of

the mutual loyalties between Negro servants and white masters that still exist in the South."

1949!

What solution does *Pinky* offer to the Negro "problem"? It is given by the reformist Negro doctor, representing the Booker T. Washington ideology of gradualism and accommodation to the white rulers. Pinky, let us remember, is schooled; she is a graduate nurse. She cannot be expected to grow into the stereotyped bandana-wearing "Mammy." Aunt Dicey needs to be "renovated," cast into a new mold. And so, through the ghetto path of "cultured" acquiescence and segregated "uplift" work, Pinky's potential rebelliousness is channeled away from the course of significant struggle, away from the Negro people's movement directed essentially toward national liberation. She moves "forward" into a segregated existence in which she administers a segregated school—a nice, well-mannered, trim Negro woman who "knows her place" and is liked and helped by the "best" white folk. Here is the "modern," "streamlined" version of the "Mammy" cliché. Hollywood reverses the old stereotype to create the New Stereotype.

Yes, *Pinky* offers a solution. A reformist, segregationist, paternalistic solution. It is a "solution" which, as in all past Hollywood films, builds on acceptance of the "superiority" of the whites and ends in endorsement of Jim Crow—in this case, "liberal,"

"benevolent
apologetic

Pinky

New

for t

about

the p

Dacey

press

an U

white

"Mar

Ethel

vest t

other

the

loafe

with

Jake

The

McK

and

razo

is re

ing

tion

H

Ellis

Neg

on

C

Dar

Phi

pro

tive

spo

goo

"li

pic

po

"benevolent," Social-Democratic apologetics for Jim Crow.

Pinky, perhaps for fear that the New Stereotype is as yet imperfect for the function of *Pinky's* role, abounds in hideous stereotypes of the past. *Pinky's* grandmother, Aunt Dicey, who has accepted her oppressed status and moves about with an Uncle Tom loyalty to the "good" white folk, fulfills the old-style "Mammy" cliché, notwithstanding Ethel Waters' brave attempt to invest the part with some dignity. Another stock-character Negro, Jake, is the "bad" shiftless type, the loose loafer and money-loving schemer, with "comic relief." Then there is Jake's "woman," who "totes a razor." The arrest scene, in which Nina Mae McKinney is made to raise her skirt and the white policeman extracts a razor from the rim of her stocking, is reminiscent of the shameful, vilifying tradition of *The Birth of a Nation* and *Gone With the Wind*.

How true is the insight of Robert Ellis who wrote in the progressive Negro weekly, *The California Eagle*, on October 20, 1949:

One really must judge harshly here of Darryl Zanuck and Elia Kazan and Philip Dunne and Dudley Nichols (the producer, director, and writers respectively). For theirs is the main responsibility, and although they had good intentions, and are, I am sure, "liberals"—yet they approached this picture with too much money in their pockets and too much condescension,

patronization, paternalism, in their hearts and minds.

And the same incisive critic puts the question to the film makers responsible for this Jim-Crow practice:

Have you ever stepped down from a railroad car and hunted for the colored toilet—gone hungry because there was no colored seat at the counter—walked along the street and felt the hatred and coldness in most people's eyes merely because of color? . . . How can a studio, how can an industry that doesn't employ Negroes as writers, producers, directors, technical directors, cameramen—how can they write, direct, produce, or film a picture which has sincere and real sensitivity (shall we say artistry) about Negro people?

Who can challenge this bitter truth?

THE INNOCENT OPPRESSORS

In *Lost Boundaries*, a pseudo-documentary, which selects for its study the Negro professional man and his family, the story once again revolves about the theme of "passing."

A Negro medical school graduate, unable to find employment, especially after he is turned down by a Southern Negro hospital because of his light skin, finds no other recourse but to "pass." He and his wife find a haven in a little New Hampshire town, Keene, where he works as a physician for twenty years, the community accepting him and his family as white. He has kept his secret also from his son and daughter.

When, upon the outbreak of the war, he applies for a commission in the Navy, an investigation discloses his Negro origin. Rejection, ostracism, and loss of caste swiftly engulf the doctor and his family. But, through the intervention of a "tolerant" white minister, who devotes a Sunday sermon to the subject, the Christian hearts of the townspeople are opened. The doctor is reinstated in the white community's good graces, he resumes his practice, and, but for the following news item, he and his family seem destined to live happily ever after, as sequel two of the new Hollywood fairy tale comes to a close.

News item: "Dr. Albert Johnston, the Negro doctor whose story is dramatized in the motion picture, *Lost Boundaries*, said last week . . . that the Elliot Community Hospital, which he has served as radiologist since 1940, this year has declined to renew his contract. . . . He would rather, Dr. Johnston said, not believe himself a victim of racial discrimination; yet he can put only this construction on the sequence of events" (*New York Herald Tribune*, October 16, 1949).

They must have been in the wrong church that Sunday morning.

In *Lost Boundaries*, Hollywood has chosen a "superior" Negro for its hero—a non-working class and light-skinned Negro. By central design and through a steady current of ideas, this film seeks to attach false "superiority" to a lighter com-

plexion and to build up a false pride and a false sense of security in petty-bourgeois Negro status. By offering middle-class Negroes, particularly those of a lighter skin, in return for denying their people, the reward of "acceptability" by "good whites," it aims to undermine the solidarity of the Negro people. It serves, further, to block the advance of the Negro workers to leadership in the Negro people's movement.

Once again, with *Lost Boundaries*, Hollywood offers a booby-trap gift. The film "exposes discrimination," dramatizes the social disabilities of the Negro physician, makes it the motivating force for his "passing" and—*shunts the blame for it all to his fellow-Negroes!*

In this "crusading" Hollywood movie, the real oppressors are "innocent." True, white hospitals are shown to discriminate against the Negro doctor. Letters of application sent by his wife are returned with rejections. But never do you *see* the act of rejection dramatically presented. Nowhere does the audience actually *see* an example of direct discrimination by whites. *But the audience is made to see in dramatic scenes discrimination by Negroes against the Negro doctor—the only personified act of bigotry in the film.* Thus, the onus of the guilt for his "passing" falls upon the Negro institution. In fact, *Lost Boundaries* has no villain. The missing villain, the real and essential villain—the white ruling class—is by monopoly dictation

unrepre
sonae
Bounda
matial
man s
against
gro ho
jects t
tion fo
But
discrim
plexion
ternesh
hospita
ical A
constit
ship,
many
cians
tional
shame
what
tary"
the r
this e
Negro
nate a
order
whole
again:
from
ruling
thus
upon
ing t
of re
* N
is a r
coney
medica
Distric
cians
the 19
this di

unrepresented in the *dramatis personae*, in consequence of which *Lost Boundaries* remains as a whole dramatically unachieved. The only human symbol of oppression pitted against the Negro doctor, is the Negro hospital superintendent who rejects the young graduate's application for an internship.

But what are the facts? *In fact*, discrimination against light-complexioned Negro applicants for internship is not a practice in Negro hospitals. *In fact*, the American Medical Association, although it has no constitutional bar to Negro membership, excludes Negro physicians in many areas.* *In fact*, Negro physicians are segregated into the National Medical Association. Yet these shameful facts go unmentioned in what has been called a "documentary" film "indictment" of bigotry in the medical profession. Certainly, this entire sequence, in which one Negro is falsely shown to discriminate against a fellow-Negro, fits "to order" into a film designed as a whole to divide the Negro people against itself and to divert its wrath from the legitimate target: the white ruling-class oppressors. Hollywood thus increases the load of oppression upon the Negro's shoulders by laying there the unmentionable burden of responsibility for discrimination.

* No physician can join the A.M.A. directly, but is a member on the basis of admission into his county medical society. In 1948 the county medical societies of 17 states, in addition to the District of Columbia, prohibited Negro physicians from joining. An amendment offered at the 1948 convention of the A.M.A. to abolish this discrimination was defeated.

Indeed, the teeth of this gift horse are rotten to the core!

Among the other distortions of *Lost Boundaries*, one of the least noticed, yet most deserving to be exposed, is the dishonest use of the white Protestant minister. Of course, there are many Protestant churchmen who are far more progressive than the Keene minister of this film; but if he is meant to be representative of Protestant Church policy with regard to the Negroes, then Truth summons us to defend her. The facts about anti-Negro discrimination in the Protestant "Christian" Church are appalling. *The Protestant Church and the Negro*, by Frank Loescher, published in 1948, makes shocking revelations of wholesale discrimination against Negroes in the Protestant Church, facts that indict Jim-Crow policy and practice in congregations and church-controlled educational institutions. The *New York Times* for November 22, 1949, carried this story: "Methodists Study Own Segregation. Youth Group Aims at Reform in the More than Half of its Colleges Barring Negroes." Protestant leaders today are desperate to stop Roman Catholic infiltration amongst Negroes, a phenomenon which results considerably from the Nordic "superiority" attitude and policy of Protestant churches toward the Negro people. This condition the Roman Catholic hierarchy, itself steeped in Jim-Crow guilt, knows well how to exploit. Yet *Lost Boundaries* fosters a myth

of Protestant egalitarianism, through its presentation of an upper-class minister who is the good white shepherd of all, Negro and white.

How the Negro character in its mass, or representative, form is conceived in this film becomes glaringly manifest from the vicious, old-style libel-cliché Harlem scene, when the doctor's son, upon learning that he is Negro, decides to go to Harlem to see for himself how his people live. All the evil-looking, evil-sounding, evil-smelling slander-furies set loose from the racist Pandora's box of white supremacy assail him from the moment he sets foot on the pavements of the Negro ghetto. Such continuous scenes of violence, crime, brutality, and depravity, you are made to feel, not only sum up the Harlem Negro community, but issue out of its very "nature." As raw an act of acquittal of white ruling-class criminality as has ever been perpetrated! And who is good in Harlem? The Harlem police! The police, whose brutality to Negroes is a horrible reality, are depicted as the understanding and humane representatives of Harlem! This monstrous distortion is not mitigated by the film's preposterous representation of the police as exclusively Negro—an outright falsification in the face of the overwhelmingly white police force which is assigned for "duty" to Harlem as to an occupied territory.

In *Lost Boundaries* the logic of blame upon the white ruling class

and its State power shades off to the invisible. The Navy's letter of rejection reads: "... inability to meet physical requirements." When the minister announces in his sermon that the Navy has opened its door to commissioning Negroes, the audience applauds. But what are the facts? During the war years (from December 7, 1941 to December 31, 1946) there were altogether in the entire United States Navy 60 Negro officers.* In January, 1948, the total number of Negro officers on active duty in the Navy was 4.** Thus, the film omits essential facts about the Navy's discriminatory policies. There is happiness in the *Lost Boundaries* church and in the theatre, as the Navy is (by these omissions!) cleared of the guilt of white chauvinist practice.

Most embarrassing, among the many embarrassing problems that beset the makers of this film, must have been the resolution of the romance between the Negro doctor's daughter (played by Susan Douglas) and her white suitor, who had participated in ostracizing the doctor's family. Hollywood's slippery techniques for "resolving" a difficult social conflict dishonestly are here demonstrated in a transparently contrived scene. After the church sermon which softens the hearts of the town-people, the young woman's white admirer smiles benignly at her brother, as he passes his pew. The

* *Negro Year Book*, 1947.

** *Negro Year Book*, 1949.

implication is that he will now resume his courtship. The Negro daughter, emotionally upset by the entire turn in the family's situation, suddenly dashes out of the church—obviously by Hollywood's design to remove any suspicions of an ending in inter-marriage.

In *Lost Boundaries*, we are asked to accept the contradiction of the all-white cast for the main Negro characters—the doctor and his family. Here, as in *Pinky*, the insult is direct: Negro actors may be used for stereotypes or for subordinate parts; but "heroic" roles belong to white players. Not one Negro actor or actress, as the Negro newspaper *Chicago Defender* revealed on March 19, 1949, was even considered for the leading roles, despite the unquestioned availability of highly talented light-complexioned Negro players.

It is significant that two of the four "Negro interest" films deal with "passing." "This is a season for pictures about Negroes pretending to be white," said the film reviewer of *The New York Sun*. It would be truer to say that this is a season for pictures about whites pretending to be Negroes. It would, of course, be asking too much of a capitalist newspaper to face and reflect the truth that this is a season for gross avoidance of the real, vital issues in the life and struggle of the Negro people, that this is a season for shunting the emphasis on the Negro question to marginal and non-determining areas.

Both *Lost Boundaries* and *Pinky*

lead to the acceptance of the racist brain-coinage of "white supremacy," and both hold out to Negroes—to certain Negroes—the prize of "acceptability" at the hands of whites. Between the two films there takes place a division of labor. In *Pinky*, the fatalistic acceptance of the status of Negro "inferiority" leaves for the "exceptional" Negro a "way out" through segregated uplift work under the aegis of Southern white ruling-class paternalism. This explains why *Pinky* was approved by the Atlanta local censor board, which had earlier banned *Lost Boundaries*. In *Pinky*, the Bourbon "master race" finds the "Southern way" of solving the problem. It does not want Negroes to pass for white under any circumstances, because of the integration it suggests. Such a "solution" would be too dangerous for its white supremacy segregation system. Moreover, *Pinky* is propaganda for the theory of the good slavocrat. It embellishes the myth of fine harmony between loving slave and paternalistic master, a propaganda line that is being assiduously fostered in our day by Plantation rule apologists.

Lost Boundaries, the Northern counterpart of this formula, seeks to "soften up" the Negro into acceptance of a fate-ordained white-supremacist America by its pervading idea that it is a misfortune to be a Negro. However, the almost "white" Negro, provided he is not of the working class, but belongs to the nice professions, if he has long

atoned with his services to the "best" whites and has to all appearances expunged the Negro from himself—this "tragic mulatto" under the "curse" of being colored may be forgiven and—but for the loss of his post, once the "documentary" is over, and but for his daughter's broken heart—is accepted into the white community. Truthfully, such is the milk of human kindness in white, Protestant, upper-class New Englanders, that when it does flow, the "exceptional" white-seeming and well-groomed middle-class Negro may gratefully look for commiseration and forgiveness to these whites of the "better classes." As the cited *New York Herald Tribune* report tells us with regard to the Negro doctor's wife: "Their friends in Keene, Mrs. Johnston recalled, 'came to see us, sent us cards and flowers, and we weren't quite sure whether they were congratulating us or condoling with us.'"

"What," asks a Negro quoted in a metropolitan daily newspaper film review, "has this got to do with the problems of Negroes in the United States? It reminds me of a kid I know who was telling what he learned from *Gentleman's Agreement*. It was: don't be mean to a Jew; he might turn out to be a Christian."

Where is the positive element in *Lost Boundaries*?

It is present in a brief, solitary moment in the drama, in a swift onrush of truth which is halted in

its course and forced violently back.

When the doctor's son (poignantly played by Richard Hylton), now knowing himself as a Negro, goes to Harlem in order to be among his people, he is setting forth to do what the supine father failed to do. He goes with a storm of conflict within him—bewilderment in his new recognition of himself as a Negro and resistance to that recognition, fierce resentment against his parents' hypocrisy, and the deep, strong tug of his new-found people. He senses something of the full measure of the sufferings and indignities visited upon the Negro people—his people. And this realization, this first-conscious sharing of his people's pain, becomes his first step on the road to liberation.

But there is never more than that moment. The rest is drowned out in waves of tumult and violence, of crime and brutality—the old Hollywood stereotype flashed before you under the title, HARLEM. The youth never gets to his people! Through the "considerate" police the son is brought back to his parents. He has been "saved" from his people. . . . No boundary is lost in *Lost Boundaries*—a potential is lost.

"KEEPERS OF OUR CONSCIENCE"

A theme far from marginal in the United States—the theme of the lynch mob and the frame-up of Negroes—is treated in the next film of

this
In T
Will
name
Mado
fidel
racist
ing
down
part
town
thus
Th
chan
prou
never
man,
Herr
all th
Arre
ing
disda
dere
him-
ing
sixe
boy,
Juni
rescu
ing
His
men
one
shot
effor
men
of t
in th
they
dere
a b

this series to be discussed, *Intruder In The Dust*. The film is based on William Faulkner's novel by that name, which the screenplay by Ben Maddow follows with considerable fidelity, minus the book's downright racist passages and with its motivating reactionary mystique thinned down. The picture was for the most part filmed in the author's home town, Oxford, Mississippi, and has thus authentic Southern settings.

The central character, Lucas Beauchamp, an elderly Negro landholder, proud, dignified, strong-willed, who never sirs or steps aside for a white man, is magnificently acted by Juano Hernandez. He towers easily over all the white characters in the drama. Arrested on the false charge of shooting a white man in the back, he disdains to name the white murderer, whose identity is known to him—even in the face of the gathering lynch mob outside the jail. A sixteen-year old white high-school boy, Chick Mallison (Claude Jarman Junior), whom Beauchamp once rescued out of a creek after a hunting accident, now comes to his aid. His sole clue is Beauchamp's statement to him, "My pistol is a forty-one Colt and Vinson Gowrie wasn't shot with no forty-one Colt." Chick's efforts to clear Beauchamp are augmented by an eighty-year old woman of the locality and by a Negro lad in the hire of Chick's uncle. Together they dig up the grave of the murdered man in the hush of night, in a breathless macabre detective hunt,

to secure proof of Beauchamp's innocence. Chick prevails on his lawyer-uncle, John Gavin Stevens (David Brian), a "liberal" white supremacist, to take Beauchamp's case. The eighty-year old woman holds off the lynch mob by sitting at the entrance to the jail with her darning. The brutal leader of the mob, Crawford Gowrie (Charles Kemper), is exposed and brought to book as his brother's slayer. The patient lynch mob disperses. Lucas Beauchamp has obtained justice in the Bourbon South.

As regards both choice of subject matter and conception of the central character, *Intruder in the Dust* is easily superior to *Lost Boundaries* and *Pinky*. As against their detour theme of "passing," the subject here projected is central and challenging: lynch law and the frame-up of Negroes. Lynch mentality is under attack in this film. The lynch-mob leader is depicted as a fratricidal and brutal villain. The tug of reluctant friendship which Chick senses for the falsely accused Negro man, whom he admires, proves stronger than his implanted prejudice of "white superiority." Finally, poetic justice is on the side of the framed-up Negro.

Again, unlike the treatment in *Lost Boundaries* and *Pinky*, the central role is rendered by a Negro player—Juano Hernandez — who is given range for his magnificent talent.

Yet, the over-all impact of *Intruder in the Dust* is an echo of *Pinky*—re-fabricating the myth that the Ne-

gro people can depend for their safety on the courts of the lyncho-crat South. Truly, the art of alchemy is not lost. Hollywood has transformed the basest of metals into pure, shining gold. For this gilded climax is as unreal as the lynch mob that patiently waits and mutters outside the jail, until it disperses peacefully; as unreal as the absence of the Ku Klux Klan from the scene; as unreal as the Southern law enforcers who are only waiting for proof of Beauchamp's innocence; as unreal as the assurance that the white supremacist lawyer will take Beauchamp's case; and as unreal as the fact that a high-school boy and an eighty-year old woman will win the day against the stacked "justice" of Southern mobs, police, and courts.

But that is not the full measure of twisted logic and imagination which deforms *Intruder in the Dust*. What if the Negro had shot the white man? By inference, since lynch law as such is not under attack—but only lynch-mindedness in the context of a framed-up charge—Beauchamp could justifiably be lynched by that mob.

Intruder in the Dust, like *Pinky*, "compensates" for the Negro hero by the deliberate injection of a time-worn travesty, in the nocturnal gravedigging scene—the stereotyping, for "comic relief," of the Negro lad, Aleck, whose eyes are made to roll in the presence of the tombstones. Deliberate—especially because it is not present in the novel. It is

thrown in, as it were, "for good measure."

Lucas Beauchamp himself, achieved in Hernandez's superb portrayal as a figure of marvelous stature, a man indomitable and possessed of supreme self-command, is however made to stand alone among Negroes. Taciturn and crag-like in his defiant strength, he is shown without kinship to fellow-Negroes, and, consequently, without warmth for his own people. This aloneness, this magnified uniqueness implies that all other Negroes are of a totally different mould. Thus, his very cast of heroism is used to produce misconfidence in the fighting capacities of the Negro people.

It is not Lucas Beauchamp, but John Gavin Stevens, who is the "overtone" of the film, the voice of Faulkner. Through this middle-class liberal lawyer, in whom the scales tip but slightly on the side of justice for the Negro, the novel's underlying philosophy achieves its attenuated expressions on the screen.

In the novel, the middle-class Southern white lawyer says to the middle-class Southern white high-school student:

... we alone in the United States ... are a homogeneous people ... only from homogeneity comes anything of a people or for a people of durable and lasting value—the literature, the art, the science, that minimum of government and police which is the meaning of freedom and liberty. . . .

The c
coming
fittingly
State of
and pol
Dust w
no less
tor and
that self
the cul
and libe
The
ner's vo
discharg
on recit
we are
lege to
ourselve
Tuesday
believe
into ne
ratificati
paragra
Faulk
fend th
free hin
after ne
yer say
cell: "L
you tha
white p
meant
here no
And
contem
"liberat
now. I
to the
here ar
Faul
South

The durable and lasting value coming from that homogeneity is fittingly symbolized in that famous State of "minimum of government and police" where *Intruder in the Dust* was written and filmed, and no less symbolized in the late Senator and present Congressman from that self-same State of Mississippi—the cultured pursuers of freedom and liberty, Bilbo and Rankin!

The lawyer who carries Faulkner's voice, and whose every pore discharges white chauvinism, goes on reciting his thesis: "That's what we are really defending: the privilege to set him [the Negro] free ourselves. . . . But it won't be next Tuesday. Yet people in the North believe it can be compelled even into next Monday by the simple ratification by votes of a printed paragraph. . . ."

Faulkner-Stevens proceeds to defend the privilege to set the Negro free himself (always on the Sunday after next Monday) when the lawyer says to Beauchamp in the jail cell: "Lucas, has it ever occurred to you that if you just said mister to white people and said it like you meant it, you might not be sitting here now?"

And Lucas answers with burning contempt for their time-table for his "liberation": "So I'm to commence now. I can start off by saying mister to the folks that drags me out of here and builds a fire under me."

Faulkner-Stevens endows the South (by which he means the mid-

dle-class Southern whites) with a unique moral equipment for its manifest mission. The condition of the Negro in the South, Chick's uncle tells him, is not a matter for interference by Northern, Eastern or Western "outlanders": "The injustice is ours, the South's. We must expiate and abolish it ourselves, alone and without help nor even (with thanks) advice."

What these words convey in effect is that the "problem" is not an objective one, not a political or social question, not really the problem of the Negro, but a subjective issue, the "moral" problem of the whites, the South's whites fashioned in the "better class" image of Faulkner-Stevens.

And so, the lawyer comments: "We were in trouble, not Lucas." And, in the film's closing scene, as he looks out of his office window upon the departing Beauchamp walking upright and dignified among the pedestrians on the street below, he turns to his nephew and says: "He is the keeper of our conscience." Thus, the film tells us, lynchings are the problem of a few "right-thinking," educated, "better-class" whites. It is really not the Negroes' problem at all. They just get lynched. But see what it does to the nice white upper-class consciences!

It would, of course, disturb the pattern to represent the lynch mob as anything but a rabble of poor whites. (It is a working-class woman with her baby in her arms who is seen going up to the leader of the

mob to ask: "Well, Mr. Gowrie, when you reckon on gettin' started?"). It is true that lynch mobs have been often largely made up of poor whites. But these mobs are organized and guaranteed immunity by the Bourbons who control the local political set-ups. The refusal, year in, year out, of the Federal Government to enact anti-lynch legislation gives Federal sanction to lynching, and places the government—yes, the sanctimonious "Civil Right"-championing Truman Administration—side by side with the Southern lynchocrats.

When, therefore, *Intruder In The Dust* seeks to present starkly the mob of poor whites as the camp of the lynchers, and the judicial arm of the Government as the "protector" of the Negro against the poor whites, it is shielding the villain of the drama—the state power of the class which enforces "white supremacy" and organizes and protects lynch mobs. Faulkner-Stevens says of the crowd of poor whites, following its voluntary dispersal: "They were running from themselves." But the lawyer says assuringly, everything will always be all right "as long as one of us doesn't run."

And so, the salvation of the Negro people lies in the hope that there will always be a sixteen-year old white schoolboy geared to middle-class "conscience" or an eighty-year old white spinster who believes in "doing what is right" or a white sheriff with a "strong sense of duty"

(assuming that he will always be played by Will Geer)—or even only one of these. For does not the lawyer assure us in the novel?—"three were enough last Sunday night, even one can be enough."

What answer can the film give to the question of the *Daily Compass* reviewer Seymour Peck, who wrote in his column of November 23, 1949: "We are glad Lucas has been saved from lynching, but we remember the many who were not saved. We wonder: where were the consciences of white men when they died? The lynch mob disperses and goes home but we have the feeling that they will be back again sometime for some other victim. Will their consciences stop them?"

It has been stated by one critic on the Left that *Intruder in the Dust* is in the tradition of *The Birth of a Nation* and *Gone With the Wind*. Yes, if by this tradition is meant the basic strategy of the bourgeois-bourbon enslavement of the film medium to promote the white "master race" ideology and to hold back the labor-Negro alliance and the Negro people's movement for national liberation. But let us not blur that which is new in a film presenting a Negro as the central character, the hero of the drama, as against films that were landmarks of racist viciousness, an exaltation of the Southern slaveholders and a hideous vilification of the Negro people, a rationale for lynchings and a direction for the Klan to ride. The strategy of the

enem
recogn
tical
Intr
par a
wood
consci
der n
the r
peopl
white
comp
meth
the N
diver
tactic
a we
in re
weap
the N
type
to e
again
lynch
the f
Intr
issue
the l
in th
of th
the
lead
is cl
unm
whit
belie
since
"one
at l
ques
that

enemy cannot be fought unless it is recognized and combatted in its tactical manifestations.

Intruder in the Dust manifests, *par excellence*, the fact that Hollywood and Wall Street are keenly conscious of the need today for subtler methods to meet and throw back the rising movement of the Negro people and the developing Negro-white unity. Reaction today feels compelled to develop film-making methods which seemingly deal with the Negro question, but in reality divert the onlooker from it. It is a tactic for disarming. It seems to put a weapon in the people's hand, but in reality takes from the people what weapon it holds. It does not present the Negro in the calumnious stereotype of brute or sub-human. It seems to equip us with a fighting film against discrimination and against lynching, but in actuality it weakens the fight.

Intruder in the Dust "tackles" the issue of lynching, only to lull us into the belief that lynchings are foiled in the South, with the aiding arm of the law. It "tackles" the issue of the frame-up of Negroes, only to lead us to conclude that the victim is cleared and goes forth free and unmolested. It gives to the Negro white "allies," only to bring him to believe that he needs no mass allies, since there will always be the token "one who will not run." It "tackles," at last it would seem, the Negro question, only to have us conclude that there is no Negro question—

that the problem of the Negro is really the problem of the white man, his "moral" problem.

HOLLYWOOD'S FALSE EQUATION

Most important, because it comes closest to being "our film" and yet in a sense is furthest removed from it, is *Home of the Brave*, the first picture of the series. It is not a film about "passing" or any other fringe-problem. Nor is it a film about white-middle-class conscience-saving. This seemingly realistic film of the Negro on the battle-field is the most meaningful American picture emanating from the war.

The story is well known. *Home of the Brave* was adapted from Arthur Laurents's stage play of that name, in which the protagonist was a Jewish soldier. In the film, a Negro soldier named Moss is the hero. Together with a group of four white G.I.'s, Moss goes on a dangerous reconnoitering mission to a Japanese-held Pacific island, in the course of which he encounters anti-Negro prejudice, mainly on the part of one of the men, T.J., a "white supremacy" bigot who was a successful executive in civilian life. At a climactic moment in the physical action, Moss' white friend Finch, his intimate chum since school days, quarrels with him, is about to utter an anti-Negro epithet, but checks himself, almost immediately before he is fatally wounded by a sniper's bullet. Before his death he asks Moss

to forgive him. The Negro soldier is torn away from his dying mate in the jungle by the press of military duty. Finch's death produces in Moss a psychological shock and results in the paralysis of his legs. Later, in a field hospital, an Army psychiatrist causes him to relive his experiences on the island in flashbacks. According to the psychiatrist, his paralysis was caused by a guilt-feeling—his experience of happiness at having remained alive, even though his chum had been killed; a guilt-feeling that has been complicated by his conviction, as a Negro, that his subjection to that mental torment manifests the fact that he is different from the whites. The problem before him, the psychiatrist tells him, is to adjust himself to reality through realizing that his trouble is "sensitivity" and that he is not different; with this realization, his problem will be solved, his adjustment made. By the therapy of shocking his patient into an angry response to an anti-Negro insult, the psychiatrist brings Moss to regain the use of his legs.

What elevates this film *qualitatively*, in a political sense, above *Pinky*, *Lost Boundaries*, and *Intruder in the Dust* is its projection, even though distortedly, of the theme of equality for the Negro. The theme of none of the other three films, as we have seen, pierces the circumference of "white superiority." *Home of the Brave* is the first Hollywood film to attempt full-length treatment of the thesis of anti-Jim Crow and

of Negro-white fraternity—a fact that is noteworthy quite apart from the question of its treatment of that central idea.

In the soldier Moss, vibrantly portrayed by the young Negro actor, James Edwards, more than in the protagonists of the succeeding three films of this cycle (save for certain aspects of Lucas Beauchamp), the screen depiction of the Negro represents a departure from the Hollywood pattern. For, in this Negro leading character, we have not only a self-respecting and dignified person, prepossessing, intelligent; not only a man devoted as friend and as patriot, and unflinching before danger; but a son of the common people, with their speech and their warm-heartedness. We have in this hero, not a middle-class professional, or a landowner, but a regular G.I., thrown into a common situation with fellow-G.I.'s in a drama of real conflict, roughing it with them, facing danger and death with them, proving himself—in the final balance sheet—equal, if not better, than the next man, who happens to be white.

Let us now see the film's unfolding of the thesis of Negro-white equality, which occurs most explicitly in the scene between the psychiatrist and the Negro soldier:

Doctor: Peter, every soldier in this world who sees a buddy get shot has that one moment when he feels glad. Yes, Pete, every single one. Because deep down underneath he thinks: I'm glad it wasn't me. I'm glad I'm still

alive. .
because
crack a
be later
But at
wasn't
glad yo
the wh
been th
kind of
somethi
else. Yo
ent, at
Moss
Doct
that's t
there b
island.
legacy.
slavery
being
of diff
you we
you tu
You've
—that'
feel gu
same I
who tr
do it
they're
need a
despise
me, th
—may
Befo
thesis
very r
gro-wi
differ
film.
Lenin
masse
is, als

alive. . . . You thought you were glad because Finch was going to make a crack about your being a Negro. Maybe later you were glad because of that. But at that moment you were glad it wasn't *you* who was shot. You were glad *you* were still alive. . . . You see the whole point of this, Peter? You've been thinking you had some special kind of guilt. But you've got to realize something. You're the same as anybody else. You're no different, boy, no different, at all.

Moss: I'm Colored.

Doctor: There—that sensitivity—that's the disease you've got. It was there before anything happened on that island. It started way back. . . . It's a legacy. A hundred and fifty years of slavery and second-class citizenship, of being different. You had that feeling of difference pounded into you when you were a child—and being a child you turned it into a feeling of guilt. You've always had that guilt inside you—that's why it was so easy for you to feel guilty about Finch. . . . The very same people who make the cracks—who try to make you feel different—do it because deep down underneath they're insecure and unhappy, too. They need a scapegoat—somebody they can despise so they can feel strong. Believe me, they need help as much as you do—maybe more.

Before proceeding to examine the thesis itself, we need to ponder the very raising of the question of Negro-white equality through the "no different" formula presented in this film. For adherents of Marxism-Leninism, who know the Negro masses to be oppressed doubly, that is, also nationally, the question log-

ically suggests itself: Is not the projection of such a thesis on the screen, by its concealment of the special oppression of the Negro people, a reactionary step leading away from any program of concrete struggle for Negro rights?

This critical emphasis marked some of the reviews of the film in a section of the Left press. In a measure, those reviews contributed to counteracting the outright endorsement of the film's thesis in bourgeois, reformist, and Social-Democratic publications, as well as tendencies in that direction on the part of certain other Left commentators. However, the answer to the question just posed was presented in those Left reviews in an over-simplified and sectarian manner. The answer did not indicate sufficient attention to what is new in the fact that the pressure of the Negro people's movement for equality has forced its way upon the Hollywood screen. Thus, while those reviews correctly rejected the film's misleading thesis of "no different," they also tended to overlook the significance of the fact that a Hollywood film had been compelled to raise, however inadequately, the question of Negro equality.

To develop this point but a little. When, for example, the Negro newspaper *The Pittsburgh Courier* presents the view (in an article by Marjorie McKenzie, October 29, 1949) that "*Home of the Brave* is a healthier, more useful movie than *Pinky* because . . . in it a Negro is helped

to understand himself in relation to white people as being not different," what is the task of the Communist film critic? Can there be any doubt that he is called upon to shed the clear light of Marxism-Leninism on the decidedly positive intention of the statement? For on the Hollywood screen, which for half a century has depicted the Negro as "less than the white man," and as "less than human," we witness a drama in which the idea is presented that the Negro is not different from the white man.

It stands to reason that the Marxist critic must further point out the inadequacy of the thesis as presented in *Home of the Brave*. He must show that the formula of "no different" avoids the objective reality of the differentiated status of the oppressed Negro people—the status of national oppression that is rooted in the Black Belt, where the subject Negro majority population, in struggling for freedom, is struggling for nationhood, for full equality as a nation. The Marxist critic must show, further, that the struggle for equal rights for the Negro people throughout the country is interconnected with the struggle of the subject Negro nation in the Black Belt and, hence, is at bottom an anti-imperialist struggle. On this basis he can make evident the common cause of all—Negro and white — who are struggling against the same imperialism with its program of war and fascism. On that basis, further, he can expose those who demagogically resort to the

argument of "no different" in order to reject the fight for the special demands of the Negro people, that is, the fight against national oppression, whose destruction is the road to Negro equality.

But *Home of the Brave*, instead of presenting the Negro question as grounded in economic and political reality, requiring a political solution through the collective liberation movement of the Negro people, reduces it to an abstract moral issue, to a personalized problem of individual adaptation to the status quo.

If in *Intruder in the Dust* the Negro's problem is really not his problem but that of the white man's conscience, in *Home of the Brave* it is the Negro's problem—but, in the ultimate sense, only because he himself creates it. It is his problem, subjectively, in terms of his "guilt-feeling," his "sensitivity." True, we have in the film an objective, realistic situation of white chauvinist attitudes in the American army, in a war that is officially being fought against the fascist Axis. Moreover, the villain of the piece is the Negro-baiter, and the Negro protagonist is given allies from among his white fellow-soldiers. There is conflict, there are alignments of forces, there is an outcome in social symbols. But all this objectivity and all this reality fade in the light of the pervading subjective idealist thesis that the problem is ultimately in the mental attitude of the Negro soldier, on the one hand, and of his white tormentors,

on the
because
ent, an
which
scapego

In th
film to
questio
objecti
side th
shifts
capital
politic
a prob
oppres
oppres
sought
from
There
only N
ized i
cause,
gle fo
is at
Negro
his "c

The
film-n
gro h
the sc
him.
ment
lain.
film's
ality
hero;
nition
his st
with
himse
No

on the other—in his feeling of guilt, because he considers himself different, and in their feeling of insecurity which begets in them the need of a scapegoat.

In the deeper sense, therefore, the film tells us that there is no Negro question, or rather none which has objective existence. The issue is inside the Negro himself. The film shifts the emphasis from American capitalist society, from the reactionary politics of the white ruling class, to a problem that resides in no state of oppression, except in his state of self-oppression. The liberation to be sought is thus essentially liberation from his self-inflicted guilt-feeling. There is no Negro people; there are only Negro people—15,000,000 atomized individuals. Hence, there is no cause, no goal, no program of struggle for the Negro people. Equality is at hand—if only each individual Negro will remove the roadblock of his "over-sensitivity."

There has been criticism of the film-makers for thwarting the Negro hero's dramatic affirmation in the scene where the bigot T.J. baits him. He is robbed of the high moment of striking the chauvinist villain. Yet, viewed in the light of the film's thesis, this omission is in actuality no dramatic hedging of the hero; it is his "fulfillment." By definition of the thesis, he *cannot* fight—his struggle must be with himself, with the "guilt-feeling" deep within himself.

Not only can he not fight the

Negro-hater, but he must try to understand that "deep down underneath" T.J. and other white supremacists like him, are "insecure and unhappy, too," that they need help as much as he himself does—"maybe more." In the great moment when life—on the stage or off—summons the baited and oppressed to self-affirmation through struggle, through striking back, the Negro soldier Moss, in this film, can only give vent to his resentment by slumping and burying his head in his hands. It is a practice that is in unison with the "theory" of *Home of the Brave*.

From the psychoanalytic thesis of the "equal unhappiness" of the racist and his victim proceeds the film's false approach to the question of Negro and white equality. We have seen how this reactionary ideology impairs the fighting spirit of the Negro protagonist. But this equation of negatives — "guilt-feeling" and "insecurity"—is extended in the film to all whites; it becomes the basis also of the Negro-white friendship and alliance.

Let us remember the psychiatrist's speech to Moss: ". . . every soldier in this world who sees a buddy get shot has that one moment when he feels glad. . . . You're the same as anybody else. You're no different. . ." Therapeutic intent notwithstanding, this idea is offered in the dramatic context of the film as a world outlook for the Negro soldier: his "road" to equality. Essentially, the film says that the basis for equality

or alliance of Negroes and whites is their common human weakness. "Coward, take my coward's hand" is a line of verse that runs like a refrain through the film. It is spoken at the *finale* between Moss and the white sergeant Mingo, who lost his arm in battle, as they go off together to open a bar-restaurant in partnership.

The climactic point in the equation of "negatives" comes a little before, when Mingo, proposing the alliance, seeks to reassure his hesitant Negro friend that they have something "in common." He lifts his empty sleeve and says: "There's nothing in this sleeve but air, kiddo." And so, we have the racist equation of "equal unhappiness": a man of dark skin = a white man with one arm!

Not of such stuff is the equality to which the Negro people is striving and for which they are today struggling. The alliance of Negro and white is not a pooling of common weakness, but a compounding of *common strength*. It is an alliance of common resoluteness and common faith and confidence. To the extent that the Negro people's movement and the labor movement become conscious of the strength, present and historic, in themselves and in each other, will the alliance of the working class and the Negro people, which is basic to the entire Negro-white alliance, grow and be strengthened.

Nor is the issue a question of Ne-

gro "guilt-feeling" and white man's sense of "insecurity"; it is not a relationship of colored man's state of mind and white man's state of mind. It is an objectively existing relationship of oppressed and oppressor, the struggle of an oppressed nation against an oppressor nation. The fact that the oppressed nation is Negro, that is, of a color different from that of the oppressor nation, has been converted by the white ruling class and its chauvinist ideologues with their "scientific" and "sociological" clap-trap into a "justification" of the racist thesis of white supremacy. But, as true science shows, the fact that the subject nation is Negro and the dominating nation white, has its cause, not in "human nature," but in history. The "colored" Japanese, not only the white Britons, French, Dutch, and Americans, oppressed the Asian peoples of color. The white Irish came under the imperial heel of the same white Britons that have trod down the "colored" Indians, Burmese, Malaysians, and South Africans. And the white Germans who oppressed the "colored" East Africans brought under their heel the white Europeans of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, France, Norway, and other nations.

It is a question of national oppression; it is an issue of national liberation. It is on the road of the Negro people's movement for national liberation, constantly strengthened by the growing consciousness of its strength, that its vital alliance with

the c
comm
basis

ADD

Ho
ries,

must

geth
of fil

ally

peop
prom

ance
divis

The
"dig

type

Tom
whil

The
the

prom
"bes

tion
tion

"res
for

in
Neg

to p
adv

peo
T

tor
tion

blar
Ne
fil
Ne
ene

the oppressed white masses will in common struggles be forged, and the basis for real equality achieved.

ADDING UP THE SCORE

Home of the Brave, Lost Boundaries, Pinky, Intruder in the Dust must be labelled clearly. Taken together, they constitute a new cycle of films that seem to arm, but actually attempt to disarm, the Negro people's movement; that seem to promote the Negro-and-white alliance, but actually attempt to set divisions between Negro and white. They are films that, in the guise of "dignity," introduce a New Stereotype—a continuation of the Uncle Tom tradition, in "modern" dress, while retaining the old stereotypes. They are films that attempt to split the Negro people's solidarity with promises of "rewards" from the "best" whites—"justice" and "positions" for light-skinned, in distinction from dark-skinned, Negroes; "respectability" and "social station" for Negro middle-class professionals, in distinction from working-class Negroes. They are films that seek to prevent the Negro workers from advancing to leadership in the Negro people's liberation movement.

They are films that through distortion and dramatic misrepresentation of fact attempt to shift the blame for Negro oppression to the Negro people themselves. They are films that attempt to inspire in the Negro people trust in their worst enemy—the white ruling class, by

portraying that class as the Negro's benefactor and legal protector, while arousing in them mistrust, fear, and hatred against the white working people, who are depicted as the would-be lynchers, as the camp of the lynchers. They are films that seek to make the Negro feel beholden to the white free-enterprisers and to be on his best behavior in expectation of "gradual" emancipation. They are films that attempt to deprive the Negro people of self-confidence in their capacity to struggle, to divert Negroes from collective, mass action, from the Negro people's movement, into individual grapplings with oppression, into efforts at personal "adjustment." They are films that attempt to deny the objective existence of the Negro question, by making lynch-law appear a "moral" problem of the "better class" whites, by making Negro-baiting appear a matter of the Negro's "sensitivity" due to "guilt feeling" and of his baiter's "unhappiness" and sense of "insecurity." They are films that seek to weaken the Negro people's understanding of the source and nature of their oppression, by means of the Social-Democratic thesis of "no difference" which leaves the Negro masses defenseless against their double oppression, class oppression and national oppression. They are films that aim to undermine the Negro people's struggle for national liberation from the "master race" domination of landlords, industrialists, and bankers, and to blunt any

kind of struggle against the monopolists and their war-and-fascism program.

In terms of the white audiences, similarly, this cycle of films expresses a reactionary ideology. In their total impact, these films would have the white masses believe that the ruling class is concerned over the Negro people's plight, that it seeks to promote their welfare, is democratically minded toward them, and aims to do away with lynchings and discrimination. Implicit in such propaganda, insofar as it is directed to white workers and progressives, is the negation of the mutually vital need for the alliance between the working class and the Negro people's liberation movement. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Social-Democratic, labor-reformist, and liberal publications joined with the open bourgeois press in acclaiming these films. They said in effect: Leave it to the ruling class, leave it to the Truman Government, leave it to the courts, leave it to the churches, leave it to the moral sense of the "right-thinking," "better-class" whites.

This film cycle in an over-all sense leaves to the white masses the ideological residue that the Negro must "know his place," and that whatever rights need to be accorded him must be done within the framework of that idea. The white spectator is taught to regard the Negro people as "unfortunate" beings, toward whom the whites should exercise

"tolerance" and to whom they should give moral "hand-outs." By means of this patronizing, white chauvinist "morality," such films seek to perpetuate the myth of Negro "inferiority" and to beguile the white masses with the fiction of "white superiority" — that deliberately- and artificially-fostered ideology from which only the white rulers profit.

These films, moreover, in presenting the poor white masses as the lynchers, attempt to make *them* appear responsible for the Jim-Crow segregation and oppression of the Negro people, to make *them* appear the breeders of white chauvinism. Thus, white chauvinism, the ideological weapon with which imperialism buttresses its national oppression of the Negro people, is made to appear "inherent" in the white masses, who are victims of the same ruling class. Of course, the poison of chauvinism infiltrates the ranks of the masses of the oppressor nation; and to the extent that they fail to join in fighting alliance with the subject nation, they bear an onus for the national oppression and for the pernicious chauvinist ideology. But the chauvinism which these white masses manifest is alien to their interests and to their class morality, and has to be purged from their midst. Indeed, the very idea that chauvinism is inherent is itself chauvinist. Inasmuch, therefore, as these films have the effect of disorienting the white masses from the clear view of their responsibilities to the oppressed Ne-

gro P
men
is vita
and fa
tion a
The
pear
Negro
increa
sion.
tistic
litical
the r
strugg
jobs,
and p
Am
its Tr
to con
surge
hands
their
in eve
ter, a
tolera
ings o
pay n
Paul
This
persis
partic
Fair
missi
anti-ly
Jim C
to pas
ure. I
there
exclus
their
limite

gro people, they retard the development of the Negro-white unity which is vital for the struggle against war and fascism, and for national liberation and Socialism.

These "Negro interest" films appear at the very time when the Negro people are being subjected to increasing discrimination and oppression. The falsity of these films in artistic terms is in measure to their political service to reaction. They ignore the reality of the Negro people's struggle, which is concerned with jobs, housing, education, equal rights, and peace.

American imperialism aims with its Truman "New Look" demagoguery to convince the Negro people in upsurge that their fate is safely in the hands of the "best" white folk, that their social condition is every day in every way getting better and better, and that therefore they should tolerate "occasional" Georgia lynchings or Harlem police shootings, and pay no heed to the "trouble-making" Paul Robesons and Ben Davises. This propaganda tries to conceal the persistent failure—chargeable to both parties of capitalism—to establish a Fair Employment Practices Commission, to enact anti-poll tax and anti-lynching legislation, to outlaw Jim Crow in the armed forces, and to pass a Federal Civil Rights measure. It puts a veil over the fact that there is taking place a systematic exclusion of Negro workers from their positions in basic industries limitedly acquired in war time,

through wholesale firings, through downgrading on the jobs, and through restriction of job openings for Negroes to the hardest and most menial work. This general condition is reflected in the sharp rise of Negro unemployment: In New York, as of 1949, Negroes constituted about 20 per cent of all unemployed, whereas their population percentage (1940 census) is 6 per cent; in Chicago and Toledo, nearly half of the registered unemployed were Negroes.* In city after city, the majority of the unemployed Negro workers have already consumed their unemployment insurance and are at the mercy of the inadequate and precarious relief dispensations.

Truman's showy "Civil Rights" bunting would cover up the shocking living conditions in Negro ghetto communities—such appalling facts as that rentals in Harlem's dilapidated, rat-infested, stifling tenements consume 45% of the family income, as against 20% in the rest of Manhattan; that Harlem's maternal death rate is double that of the rest of New York City's and its tuberculosis rate quadruple.**

And in the field of education the President's "Civil Rights" demagoguery would drown out the growing protests against the quota system for Negro students in colleges, and against the appalling segregation in public schools legally authorized in

* *The Economic Crisis and the Cold War*. New Century Publishers, New York, 1949, p. 70.

** See *Look* magazine's article "Harlem New York's Tinder Box" (December 6, 1949), by its staff writer, Lewis W. Gillenson.

twenty-one states and the District of Columbia, and permitted in eleven others.* In the sphere of the arts and professions the same demagoguery would silence the incensement against the notorious discriminatory practices, as shockingly exposed in March 1947 at the conference of the Cultural Division of the former National Negro Congress.** In the sphere alone of our present survey, the film industry, we must take sharp note of the fact that Hollywood does not employ a single Negro writer, director, sound man, camera man, or any other technician. And, as we have seen in regard to the very films that are offered as an earnest of a "new approach" to the Negro people, in two of the four pictures in the cycle the major Negro characters were denied to Negro actors.

In the face of these glaring facts, Mrs. Roosevelt writes in her column:

Things have been improving in the economic field and in education for the colored people. I would also say in the field of arts that there is an increasing opportunity for them to gain recognition on an equal basis. But if Mr. Robeson succeeds in labelling his race as a group as Communists, many of these gains will be lost, I am afraid, in the future (*New York World-Telegram*, November 3, 1949).

* See the article, "Civil Rights and Minorities," by Paul Hartman and Morton Paner, *New Republic*, January 30, 1950.

** For some of the facts relating to discrimination against Negro artists and workers in the cultural media, see *Culture in a Changing World*, by V. J. Jerome, New Century Publishers, 1947, pp. 31-33.

In plain words, the Negro people must be made to understand: either you line up on the political side the "best" white people choose for you, or else—. This is the same Mrs. Roosevelt, chairman of the U.N. Human Rights Commission which was castigated in a written group petition prepared by the eminent Negro scholar Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois: "We charge that the Human Rights Commission under Eleanor Roosevelt, its chairman . . . have consistently and deliberately ignored scientific procedure and just treatment to the hurt and hounded of the world."*

Imperialism draws willing aides for its chauvinist propaganda from the reactionary Social-Democrats and reformist labor leaders, as well as from Negro bourgeois nationalist leaders. Their role in the mass organizations of the Negro people and among Negro trade unionists is to undermine the self-confidence and arrest the militant advance of the Negro people's movement, and, above all, to thwart the historical alliance of that movement with the American working class.

In this light, we can perhaps more readily understand the policy of "elevating" certain upper-stratum Negro leaders which serves to give the impression of full integration of the Negro people in American life. The particular cultivation in this period of a tissue-thin top layer of Negro aristocracy, even while the

* *National Guardian*, December 5, 1949.

white ruling-class violence and terror, both legal and extra-legal, are intensified, is part of the new tactic of American imperialism. It is designed to reinforce its ideological transmission belt among the Negro people and to bring false comfort to the enraged Negro masses in order to blind them with illusions and blunt their capacity for struggle, in order to break their resistance to the imperialist despoilers and war-mongers.

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

While Marxists seek to dispel any illusions as regards the "democratization" of Hollywood's output under capitalism, they warn against any fatalistic notion of "waiting for Socialism" to "take care" of the matter. Not because Socialism in the United States will not solve the Negro question, in life and in the arts, as Socialism has solved the national question in the U.S.S.R., but because to them who wait for it, but do not struggle for it, Socialism will never come.

We must fight against white chauvinism in film content—its every manifestation, not only the obvious stereotypes—and against discrimination in the employment and assignments of Negro film artists and workers. The two struggles are one. They must be intensified, broadened, extended, and linked as one struggle.

The economic and political struggles on these issues must be accom-

panied by a sharp fight against the anti-Negro "theories" used to justify the national oppression of the Negro people and its reflection in the arts. Only by recognizing and acting on the basis of this interconnection shall we be able effectively to fight white chauvinism in practice and in ideology.

It is a false notion that the battle for honest, realistic depiction of the Negro in the film stands in contradiction to the fight for greater employment of Negro artists and workers in the motion-picture industry. The fight to eliminate stereotypes is not to be seen as leading to the elimination of the Negro artist from the industry; it is, rather, a fight for content and form that will enable the Negro artist to express himself with dignity. It is a fight for the *greater* employment of Negro film artists and workers—not less. The perpetuation of the stereotype on the celluloid helps perpetuate the discrimination against Negroes at the employment office. This is true not only in the general sense; by limiting the use of Negro artists to the stereotype, films of white-chauvinist content drastically delimit the types of roles for which Negro artists are employed.

Any and every re-issue of such racist films as *The Birth of a Nation* must be met with prompt and decisive action by the mass organizations and all partisans of peace and democracy—in the form of picket-lines, leaflets, mass delegations, let-

ters and telegrams of protest. Any and every new film which libels the Negro people must be greeted with a similar mass protest.

We must press through effective united-front audience organization—which can and must be established—for ever greater and better output of films honestly depicting the life and struggles of the Negro people and for the outlawry of anti-Negro themes and clichés on the screen. At the same time, greater publicity and support than ever before must be given to all independent efforts to film and exhibit genuinely realistic motion pictures dealing with the Negro question. There is today a real possibility of securing support for independent production and exhibition of films dealing with the heroic history of the Negro people and with their present militant struggles. When shall we have a film dramatizing the life of Frederick Douglass or Harriet Tubman or Sojourner Truth?

Another vital form of action is greater mobilization of support for the honest and progressive artists in Hollywood fighting against the un-American thought-control agents, who are, not by accident, among the most notorious of the white supremacists.

The trade unions and guilds in the movie industry especially face the task of fighting resolutely to combat racist content and root out discrimination and segregation in every aspect of film production and

theatre exhibition. This fight, which can best be initiated through unified action by all unions and guilds in the cultural field, must be broadened to involve the general labor movement and the people's mass organizations. It is a major responsibility of the white progressive forces, Communists and non-Communists, to wage this struggle as a basic determinant of Negro and white unity.

Finally, great stress has to be placed on the role of honest and courageous comment and criticism, which is today spearheaded by the Communist press. True, scientific criticism of films dealing with Negro life requires as its basis the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the relationship of art and society and especially the teaching on the national question, with its concrete application to the national-liberation movement of the Negro people. The Communist Party, guiding itself by this understanding of the Negro question, has played the role of vanguard in the struggle against the racism and white chauvinism permeating capitalist America. The Communist Party will relentlessly continue this struggle until the working class, by forging an ever firmer alliance with the Negro people and its other allies, will establish the final guarantees for a true representation of the full stature of the Negro people on the screen, and will create the conditions for the Negro people to come into their own in the Socialist life and art of America.

PA
[
of
Len
[
surg
cal
kina
num
Mar
Den
ous
Mar
sup
ciple
and
ary
T
here
diffe
ing
LITE
ature
toms
priv
press
ary
"aris
—the
vanc
ture,
put
plete

From the Treasury of Marxism

PARTY ORGANIZATION AND PARTY LITERATURE

by V. I. Lenin

[Printed below is the major part of a celebrated article written by Lenin in November 1905.

[During the great revolutionary upsurge of the preceding months, political and literary publications of all kinds mushroomed into existence, a number of them claiming to speak for Marxism and for the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party. Lenin, zealously championing the purity of Marxism, denounced the "literary supermen," who flouted the principle of the Party spirit, leadership and discipline in the sphere of literary production.

This principle, brilliantly set forth here by Lenin, though in an entirely different setting, holds great meaning for us today.—Editor.]

LITERATURE MUST BECOME Party literature. In contrast to bourgeois customs, in contrast to the bourgeois privately-owned and commercialized press, in contrast to bourgeois literary careerism and individualism, "aristocratic anarchism" and rapacity—the Socialist proletariat must advance the principle of *Party literature*, must develop this principle and put it into effect as fully and completely as possible.

What is this principle of Party literature? It is not only that for the Socialist proletariat literary activity cannot be a means of gain for individuals or groups of individuals, but that in general it cannot be the private affair of individuals, independent of the general interests of the proletariat. Down with non-Party publicists! Down with literary supermen! Literary activity must become *part* of the general proletarian cause, a "cogwheel" in the single unit of the great Social-Democratic mechanism, which is set into motion by the whole class-conscious vanguard of the whole working class. Literary activity must become a component part of organized, methodical, united Social-Democratic Party work.

"Every analogy limps," says a German proverb. The same can now be said of any comparison between literature and a cogwheel, a live movement and a mechanism. I dare say there may even be some hysterical intellectuals who will raise a howl about such a comparison, claiming that it degrades, deadens, "bureaucratizes" free ideological struggle, freedom of criticism, freedom of literary creations, *etc., etc.*

As a matter of fact, such outcries would merely be an expression of bourgeois-intellectual individualism. No one disputes that literary activities are least amenable to mechanical regulation, to levelling, to majority rule. No one disputes that in this field it is absolutely necessary to ensure greater scope for personal initiative and personal inclination, free play for ideas and imagination, form and content. All this is indisputable; but it only goes to show that the literary side of proletarian party work cannot be mechanically identified with the other phases of proletarian party work. All this in no way refutes the proposition, so alien and strange to the bourgeoisie and to the bourgeois democrats, that literary activities must absolutely and categorically become a part of Social-Democratic Party work linked up inseparably with the other phases of this work. The newspapers must become the organs of the various Party organizations. Writers must be required to join Party organizations. Publishing houses and distributing agencies, book shops and reading rooms, libraries and the various book trade establishments—all these must come under Party control, be accountable to the Party. All this work must be watched over by the organized Socialist proletariat, which must exercise control over all of it and must bring into all this work, without exception, the fresh stream of the live proletarian cause, thus cutting the ground from under

the old, semi-Oblomov*, semi-mercantile Russian principle: the writer just does the writing, and the reader just does the reading.

We shall, of course, not assert that this transformation in the sphere of literature, which has been so polluted by the Asiatic censorship and the European bourgeoisie, could be effected at once. We do not have the slightest intention of advocating some uniform system or a solution of this problem by adopting a few decisions. No, schematism in this field is entirely out of the question. What is necessary is that our Party, the whole of the class-conscious Social-Democratic proletariat throughout Russia, should perceive this new problem, should present it in a clear fashion and should everywhere undertake its solution. Released from the captivity of feudal censorship, we neither desire nor intend entering into the captivity of bourgeois commercialism in literary relationships. We wish to create and we will create a free press, free, not only from policy interference, but also in the sense that it will be free from capital, free from careerism—more than that, free from bourgeois-anarchist individualism.

These last words may appear paradoxical or mere mockery at the readers' expense. What! some intellectual, an ardent supporter of liberty, will probably exclaim. What!

* Oblomov, hero of the famous novel by that name by Ivan Goncharov, published in 1859, the eve of the abolition of serfdom in Russia, is an indolent ineffectual landowner.—Ed.

You want to subject such delicate individual activity as literary creative work to collective control! You want the workers to decide questions of science, philosophy and aesthetics by majority vote! You deny absolute freedom to the absolutely individual creative work in the field of ideas!

Calm yourselves, gentlemen! In the first place, what we are referring to here is Party literature and its subordination to Party control. Anyone can write and say what ever he pleases, without the slightest constraint. But any free association (such as our Party) is likewise at liberty to expel such of its members as use the name of the Party for the purpose of preaching anti-Party views. There must be full freedom of speech and of the press. But freedom of association must also be complete. In the name of freedom of speech I am bound to concede to you an unlimited right to shout, to lie and to write about anything you please. But in the name of freedom of association you are bound to concede to me the right to enter into and dissolve alliances with people who say this or that. The Party is a voluntary association which would inevitably fall to pieces, first ideologically, then materially, if it did not urge itself of members who preach anti-Party views. And in order to determine the boundary between Party views and anti-Party views, we have our Party program, the resolutions of the Party on tactics, and the Party Rules; finally, we have the

entire experience of the international Social-Democratic movement, of the international voluntary associations of the proletariat, which has constantly been incorporating in its parties individual elements and tendencies that are not quite consistent, not quite purely Marxian, not quite correct, but which has also constantly been carrying out periodical "purgings" of its parties. And this, gentlemen who support bourgeois "freedom of criticism," is just what we shall have *within* our Party. Our Party is now becoming a mass party all at once; we are now passing through a period of abrupt transition to open organization; we shall now inevitably be joined by many people who are inconsistent (from a Marxist standpoint), possibly even by some Christians, possibly even by some mystics. We have strong stomachs, and we are adamant Marxists. We shall digest these inconsistent people. Freedom of thought and freedom of criticism within the Party will never make us lose sight of the freedom of people to align themselves in free associations, called parties.

In the second place, Messrs. bourgeois individualists, we must tell you that your speeches about absolute freedom are sheer hypocrisy. In a society based on the rule of the money-bags, in a society where the toiling masses live in destitution while a handful of rich people live in idleness, there can be no real, no genuine "freedom." Are you free

from your bourgeois publisher, Mr. Author? Are you free from your bourgeois public, which demands that you supply it with pornographic pictures, with prostitution as a "supplement" to your "sacred" scenic art? As a matter of fact, this absolute freedom is only a bourgeois or anarchist phrase (for anarchism, as a philosophy, is bourgeois ideology turned inside out). You cannot live in a society and be free from society. The freedom of a bourgeois author, artist or actress is nothing but masked (or hypocritically camouflaged) dependence on the money-bag, on corruption, on prostitution.

And we, the Socialists, are exposing this hypocrisy, tearing down the false front—not in order to obtain a non-class literature and art (this will be possible only in Socialist, non-class society), but in order to contrast literature which hypocritically professes to be free, while in fact it is tied to the bourgeoisie, with genuinely free literature, which is *openly* bound up with the proletariat.

This will be a free literature because it will be, not selfish interests nor careers, but the idea of Socialism and sympathy with the toilers, that will draw more and more forces into its ranks. This will be a free literature because it will cater neither to a blasé heroine nor to the bored and surfeited "upper ten thousand," but to the millions and tens of millions of toilers, who constitute the flower of the country, its strength, its future. This will be a free literature,

which will use the experience and living work of the Socialist proletariat to fecundate the last word in the revolutionary thought of mankind, and which will produce a constant interaction between the experience of the past (scientific Socialism, which is the consummate development of Socialism from its primitive, utopian forms) and the experience of today (the present-day struggle of our worker comrades).

Let us buckle down to work, comrades! We have before us a new and difficult, but at the same time great and gratifying task—to organize widespread, many-sided, multiform literary activities in close and indissoluble connection with the Social-Democratic labor movement. All Social-Democratic literature must become Party literature. All the newspapers, magazines, publishing houses, etc., must immediately start the work of reorganization, must start making preparations for a state of affairs in which all of them will be incorporated, in one way or another, in some Party organization. Only then will "Social-Democratic" literature become such in reality, only then will it be able to fulfill its duty, only then will it be able, even within the framework of bourgeois society, to escape bourgeois bondage, and to merge in the movement of the genuinely progressive and consistently revolutionary class.

[Translated from the *Collected Works* of V. I. Lenin, Third Russian Edition, Vol. VIII, pp. 386-390.]

RECENT BOOKS AND PUBLICATIONS

EITHER THE CONSTITUTION OR THE MUNDT BILL, <i>by Simon W. Gerson</i>	\$.03
THE PLOT TO GAG AMERICA, <i>by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn</i>03
COLD WAR IN THE CLASSROOM, <i>by Samuel Sillen</i>10
THE C.I.O. TODAY, <i>by George Morris</i>10
AFRICA FIGHTS FOR FREEDOM, <i>by Alphaeus Hunton</i>05
WORKING CLASS UNITY FOR PEACE, <i>by M. Suslov, P. Togliatti, and Gh. Gheorghiu Dej.</i>25
F.E.P.C., <i>by Rob Fowler Hall</i>03
THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THE C.P., PART I (<i>Revised</i>)...	.15
THE DEPORTATION TERROR, <i>by Abner Green</i>05
THE NEGRO PEOPLE AND THE SOVIET UNION, <i>by Paul Robeson</i>02
THE STORY OF THE TRENTON SIX, <i>by Elwood Dean</i>05
THE COAL MINERS AND YOU, <i>by Elmer Felhaber</i>03
MUST WE PERISH, <i>by Hershel D. Meyer</i>	1.00
THE COMMUNIST TRIAL, <i>by George Marion</i>50
ECONOMIC CRISIS AND THE COLD WAR, <i>edited by James S. Allen and Doxey Wilkerson</i>	1.00

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3

ence and
ist prole-
word in
of man-
produce a
n the ex-
fic Social-
ate devel-
from in
and the
resent-day
parades).
ork, com-
new and
ime great
organize
multiform
and indivi-
ne Social-
t. All So-
must be
the news-
g houses,
the work
t making
affairs in
incorpo-
r, in some
then will
ture be-
then will
only then
the frame-
to escape
merge in
inely pro-
evolution

Collecte
d Russian
5-390.]

ISRAEL IN CRISIS

by A. B. MAGIL

Six months in Israel as *Daily Worker* correspondent, including coverage of important battle points in its war of independence, interviews with cabinet ministers and leaders of political parties, and discussions with hundreds of citizens in all walks of life, provide the background for this rounded-out study of the past, present and the future perspectives of the new state of Israel.

A. B. Magil's *Israel in Crisis* describes the various political parties, the role of the labor movement, and the influence of religion on the political life of the country. The author analyzes the role of foreign capital (particularly U.S.) in Israel, the perspectives for Arab-Jewish co-operation, and many other important points.

Through the entire book, just published by International Publishers, runs the main theme of Israel's independence threatened by the efforts of Anglo-American imperialism to dominate the economics and politics of the country.

Paper - \$1.25 - Cloth - \$2.50

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3

COLLE

10