

*Low!*

# Political Affairs

APRIL 1951 • 25 CENTS

- |                     |       |   |
|---------------------|-------|---|
| ELIESE DENNIS       | [ 1 ] | Peace—the Supreme and Over-riding Issue       |
|                     | [10]  | Interview of J. V. Stalin                     |
| GEORGE HALL         | [15]  | The Stalin Interview—A Blow at the Warmongers |
| HENRY WINSTON       | [25]  | A Means to Activate the Clubs                 |
| WALTER HUNG         | [28]  | Concerning Practice                           |
| FRED M. FINE        | [43]  | Developing Peace Actions                      |
| ALBERT E. LUMBERG   | [53]  | The Electoral Outlook for '52                 |
| THEODORE R. BASSETT | [64]  | Washington's "Constitution" for Puerto Rico   |
| HENRI MARTEL        | [75]  | Sectarianism Must Go!                         |
| BETTY GANNETT       | [81]  | A Non-Historical Treatment of Democracy       |
|                     | [96]  | Communication                                 |

# Outline Political History of the Americas

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

Enormous in range, this profound analysis of the economic and political development of the Western hemisphere, from the earliest Indian settlements to the present day, places the history of the United States within the total framework of hemispheric development, and sets the history of the Americas within the mainstream of world history.

Actually, this 700-page volume is three books in one. The first part tells the story of the colonial epoch, the settling of the Western hemisphere by the Spanish, English, French and Dutch, the arrival of the first African slaves, the exploitation of the Indian population, and the varied economic, political, and social conditions which developed in different parts of the hemisphere. Part II traces the course of the bourgeois-democratic revolutions which swept the entire hemisphere, the growth of capitalism, the fight against chattel slavery, and the all-important land question. The final section deals with the era of imperialism, the growing domination of U.S. imperialism, the alliance of the imperialist and semi-feudal groups, the national question, the fight against fascism, the rise of an organized working class throughout the Americas, and the formation of the Communist Parties. \$5.00

**NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS**

**832 Broadway, New York City 3**

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

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

 209

N. Y.,  
*Century*  
*books and*  
*foreign*

Vo

By

C

I

fr

it

ag

al

yo

an

ge

hi

St

ab

m

to

A Magazine Devoted to the Theory and Practice of Marxism-Leninism

Editor: V. J. JEROME

## Peace—The Supreme and Over-Riding Issue

By Eugene Dennis

*[Political Affairs joins with the entire membership and leadership of the Communist Party and its scores of thousands of friends in a hearty Welcome Home to Comrade Gene Dennis, the beloved General Secretary of our Party, just released from Federal prison, to which he was sentenced by the fascists and warmakers.*

*[We are proud to present to our readers the full text of his first public speech, delivered at a mass welcoming rally at Rockland Palace, New York City, on March 21.—Editor.]*

Comrades:

I WOULD LIKE to say very simply and from the depths of my heart that it means a great deal to be with you again. I missed you greatly. But at all times I felt your comradeship, your affection, your fighting spirit, and tonight I too feel, well, mighty good.

In the ten months that I was behind the iron curtain of the West Street jail I, like you, did considerable thinking. But the expression of many of those thoughts will have to wait until I get a chance to ex-

change opinions and to catch up on all that happened during my enforced absence.

Tonight I want only to share in a limited way a few ideas—and give you sort of an insider's view of some aspects of what has been going on outside.

First, some impressions about our own Party. All of us can be justly proud of our Party, its leadership and its membership. This is more than an "impression." It is a considered and unqualified statement of fact.

While I was away, we were confronted by many trying problems, and put to two very severe tests. The first was last June, when U.S. imperialism launched its military aggressions against the peoples of Korea and China. The second came in September, when the McCarran police state law was dynamited through Congress.

These events ushered in a new stage of Wall Street's drive toward fascism and a third world war. Our Party met most of the consequences flowing from these developments with unflinching fidelity to principle, great courage, and resolute struggle. It has truly proved its right to be called the vanguard Party of the American working class.

Some of you who are here to welcome me home were present at my going-away party last May. You will remember that I told you then I was confident I left our Party in capable hands.

Experience has shown that my confidence was well founded. Together with Bill Foster, the members of the National Committee and especially the secretaries of our Party have proved their mettle and their worth. And this is true in the first place of Gus Hall.

\* \* \*

Some other impressions I formed in jail have been pretty well confirmed in this first week since my release.

Big changes are taking place in the thinking of tens of millions of people in our country, especially in relation to the question of peace. Two things in particular strike me about this widespread and growing peace sentiment.

The first is that it is not confined only to the Left, to the conscious anti-imperialists. It embraces rural as well as urban America, and even wider sections of the Negro people, the women and the youth. It is now beginning to involve large sections of the workers.

Secondly, I am struck by the fact that this tremendous upsurge of peace sentiment has been developing *in the midst of Wall Street's war of aggression*, in the midst of the Eisenhower and Dulles warmaking missions, in the midst of the frenzied mobilization by Big Business and the Pentagon for a criminal atomic global war. But the peace movement has not shrivelled in the heat of war hysteria and intimidation. On the contrary, it continues to expand and strike new roots as the war enters its ninth month.

Closely related to this growing peace sentiment are the new winds blowing in the ranks of the working class. I get the impression that such developments as the switchmen's strike and the textile strike are more than simon-pure economic struggles. The price-wage-tax squeeze is a factor, of course. But our workers don't shrink from making sacrifices in a just cause. They have shown by

their  
just  
rea, a  
part o  
Wall  
To  
cative  
still f  
and C  
of co  
begun  
musc  
gun t  
san  
many  
perm  
aster  
Th  
spon  
out  
of th  
tradi  
ing  
are n  
ing  
and  
of g  
ary  
inkl  
will  
wor  
the  
cert  
the  
In  
outs  
the  
stru  
equ  
In  
Wi

their actions that they sense the unjust character of the war against Korea, and that they don't want any part of the bigger reactionary wars Wall Street is plotting.

To say this is not to deny that decisive sections of our working class still follow misleaders like Murray and Green. Our class still has plenty of cobwebs in its head. But it has begun to open its eyes, and flex its muscles. In its own way, it has begun to see that Wall Street's bi-partisan war program has already cost many lives and liberties, and that if permitted to go on it will lead to disaster.

This growing understanding is responsible for the greater readiness of our workers to struggle in defense of their living standards and their trade-union rights. They are thumbing their noses at Taft-Hartley. They are resisting the dictatorial, war-making National Emergency decrees and the anti-working class collusion of government and labor's reactionary officialdom. This gives us some inkling of what they can do, and will do, when larger sections of the working class learn the score, take the path of united action and concerted use their strength to advance the cause of peace.

In prison, perhaps even more than outside, one is also impressed by the new level of the Negro people's struggles for national liberation and equality.

It was a great day for me when Willie McGee won a stay of execu-

tion last fall, and once again last week.\*

I followed with anxious interest the splendid, though unsuccessful, campaign to save the lives of the Martinsville Seven. Naturally, I was struck by the new unity and militancy of the Negro people themselves. But what stood out in these struggles was that important groupings of white workers and religious leaders have come to understand that the whole American people has a stake in smashing the war-makers' infamous lynch system, which murders innocent Negroes while it frees the Nazi and Japanese war criminals.

\* \* \*

Like you, I have had to answer many questions. My fellow-prisoners saw the polls and other signs that the American people want peace. Many asked: Why then does the war in Korea go on? Why the rearming of Western Germany? Why are troops being readied to fight in Europe? How did Truman dare turn his back on the Martinsville Martyrs? How did he dare to insult the railroad switchmen and break their strike?

The simplest answer happens to be pretty basic: As yet, *not enough people—especially trade unionists—act together* to impose their will, to check

\* Since then, the U.S. Supreme Court has refused to grant a hearing on the appeal for a new trial, notwithstanding the new evidence which would establish beyond the shadow of a doubt the innocence of Willie McGee.—Ed.

and straitjacket the bloodthirsty handful of billionaires who now rule our land and seek to dominate the world. The good and brave things done are still *too little*, and often *too late*.

This is true. I have the impression that none of these recent struggles, or even the "lost battles," were in vain. I come out of prison with a new appreciation of a truth always plain to Communists. It is that *the people determine their own, the nation's destiny. It is struggle which decides everything.* This has been true always and everywhere. But it is especially true for our time and our country.

Let us make a few comparisons between what is and what might have been.

Yes, the valiant fight to prevent passage of the fascist McCarran Act was lost. But the scope and power of the people's fight left their mark. What *might* have happened, didn't happen. Pro-fascist reaction had to alter its time-schedule. Even though the process of fascization is intensified, the people's resistance has delayed all-out enforcement of the Act. Six months have passed—and the United States has not duplicated the tragic experience of Hitler-Germany.

Some people figured that by now we would have come to the end of the road. Instead, we have arrived at a new cross-roads. A new front of struggle is opening up, around the appeal to the Supreme Court and—if that fails—around the illegal hear-

ings themselves. If there is a resurgence of mass activity, if a broader and more militant united front of struggle is forged against the McCarran Act—then this Hitlerite monstrosity can yet be nullified and wiped off the books by the popular will. In any case—win, lose, or draw—the struggle will leave its mark and help to keep open many avenues of democratic expression and mass action.

Another example: Twice since the outbreak of the war in Korea, President Truman threatened to drop the atom bomb. Twice the people intervened. Some doubting Thomases who were approached to sign the Stockholm petition asked, "What good will it do?" Now they know, because half a billion people, including two and a half million Americans, proved the power of united mass action.

Some short-sighted people might say this was also a "lost battle." For the outlawing of atomic weapons has not yet been achieved, and the threat of atomic war still hangs over humanity.

But this struggle left a very big mark. We might already have been plunged into the incalculable horror of an atomic world war. But we haven't been. We have gained precious time—and more. The people have gained in self-confidence and are more than ever determined to save the world from this catastrophe.

Last  
small b  
of Ame  
Out of  
Their r  
their ir  
been a  
"might

By  
spread  
But it  
debt to  
nese pe  
epic, s  
of thei  
eighty,  
to inte  
to pres  
ful ne  
democ

The  
compl  
while  
be a l  
bigger  
racy o  
honest  
the m  
have  
have  
sponsi  
our ov  
peace,  
other  
camp

In  
ment,  
peace  
increa  
its in  
the t

Last June and July a relatively small but very courageous number of Americans raised the slogans: "Get Out of Korea!" "Hands Off China!" Their ranks have been growing, and their influence increasing. This has been a factor in preventing another "might have been."

By now, the war *might* have spread to engulf the whole world. But it hasn't. We owe a very great debt to the heroic Korean and Chinese peoples. Mainly because of their epic, staunch, and effective defense of their territory and national sovereignty, we Americans still have time to intensify our fight for peace, and to press home the demand for peaceful negotiations, for a peaceful and democratic settlement.

These examples are nothing to get complacent about. On the contrary, while they show that things might be a lot worse—they also show that bigger gains for peace and democracy could have been won. In all honesty, we have to recognize that the majority of the American people have been dragging their feet, and have not yet measured up, in responsibility to the best interests of our own nation, to the cause of world peace, to what has been done by other sections of the world peace camp of which we are a part.

In the months of my imprisonment, our camp—the world camp of peace and Socialism—has enormously increased in strength and expanded its influence. I would not yield to the temptation to spell out all the

evidence that confirms this. But I have the impression that many Americans, who are far from grasping the full truth about the Soviet Union and its historic advance toward Communism, are beginning to suspect the truth about its consistent peace policy and its leading role in advancing the cause of world peace. They are thinking deeply about Stalin's interview, about the vast new Soviet construction programs, and not least of all about the price reductions and rising living standards in the land of Socialism.

I also have the impression that millions of Americans have come to recognize and respect the strength brought to the world camp of peace by liberated China and the liberation-upsurge of the peoples of Asia.

Moreover, in spite of the lies and slanders that poison our avenues of monopoly-controlled mass communication, the Second World Peace Congress registered among wide sections of our people. In fact, the greater strength, unity, and militancy of the peace partisans now organized in the World Peace Councils have not only been an inspiration to the peace forces in our own country, but have also enormously enhanced the possibilities of winning the fight for world peace.

\* \* \*

Now, the welfare of our people and the national interests of the United States makes it imperative

that we do all in our power to help our fellow-Americans catch up with their allies and friends in other sections of the world peace camp.

The possibility of doing this has increased, because now new millions and tens of millions are aware that we are coming to another point in international relations where—despite the war provocations and plots of the Trumans, Achesons, MacArthurs, and Dulleses—if the peace forces intervene forcefully and rapidly they can effect certain changes. For one thing, as Gus Hall pointed out, the present military situation, the issue of the 38th Parallel, and the demand of the peoples for peace have opened the way for a new initiative to end the war in Korea. This may materialize if the peoples' demand for cease-fire, withdrawal of all foreign troops, and peaceful negotiations with China and Korea, and for a Five-Power conference is pushed with the greatest vigor.

Likewise—thanks to the initiative and firmness of the U.S.S.R. and the insistence of the peoples of Europe—the possibility now arises for bringing about a Conference of the Foreign Ministers of the Big Four. However, the news from the highly important Paris Conference of Deputy Foreign Ministers makes it clear that only the people can prevent an Anglo-American engineered deadlock. Washington has done all in its power to prevent the convening even of this preliminary conference and is trying to make this a confer-

ence to end all conferences. And this obliges us to make a major pitch for public expressions and big actions in the next days and weeks so that the peoples will compel the doors to be kept open for peaceful negotiations and a settlement, and a resumption of the quarterly meetings of the Foreign Ministers of the Soviet Union, the U.S.A., Britain and France.

The American people, no less than the peoples of Europe, fervently hope for this outcome. And greater numbers than ever before are prepared to struggle to realize this signal peace objective.

In the center of all current efforts to influence events and tip the scales in favor of world peace, is the issue of a Five-Power Pact of Peace. The demand for a Pact of peaceful agreement among the Great Powers already echoes around the world. Now the struggle for a Five-Power Pact of Peace should and can become the rallying cry of all the peace forces in our own country, of all who want to halt aggression, stop the armaments race, and promote a democratic and peaceful settlement of international disputes and conflicts.

\* \* \*

At this critical juncture in the fight for peace, when the people must exert greater efforts if they are to defeat Wall Street's accelerated drive toward war, let me state in capsule form a few additional ideas that should serve as a guide to action for peace.

To  
ing c  
and b  
think  
only t  
tens o  
not on  
opinio  
sentim  
tive p  
In st  
peace-  
influ-  
tations,  
ning  
cals, c  
tions,  
organi  
houses  
to thi  
just so  
of all  
one w  
for pe  
It ca  
if we  
existin  
gle—a  
expan  
peace  
ously,  
courag  
the m  
mass  
tallize  
front  
The  
our c  
course  
broad  
great

To speak realistically of influencing events means to raise our sights and broaden our horizons, means to think in terms of influencing not only thousands and millions, but *tens of millions of people*. It means not only recording their pulse, and opinions, but *organizing* the peace sentiment and helping it find effective public expression and action.

In short, we—and all proponents of peace—have to think in terms of influencing major national organizations, trends and movements, of winning whole shops, trade-union locals, church and fraternal organizations, the youth, women's and farm organizations, whole apartment houses, whole communities. We have to think in terms of winning, not just some of these—but the majority of all of them—and *enlisting them*, one way or another, in the struggle for peace.

It can be done, comrades. But only if we strengthen and build all the existing vehicles for the peace struggle—and particularly if we help vastly *expand the activity* of all progressive peace organizations and simultaneously, and at all costs, if we encourage, promote and cooperate with the most diverse peace elements and mass movements, so as to help crystallize the broadest and most active front for peace.

The strengthening and building of our own Communist Party is, of course, vital to the growth of a truly broad united peace front. And of great importance to advancing unity

of action for peace, to winning whole shops, whole communities, whole mass organizations, is the Party club. I have the impression that the crying need of the hour is for all of us—the whole leadership, every Party committee, every individual member—to assume responsibility in a new way for strengthening our Party's basic core and assuring that every club functions as an around-the-clock builder of united-front peace actions and committees.

Our Party clubs and members are the means through which we can establish living contact with the tens of millions. They must know intimately what their neighbors and shopmates are thinking, and learn to organize activity and mass movements around the single issues on which masses are prepared to act. They must learn to give leadership, without imposing cut-and-dried programs or insisting on forms of actions which others are not yet willing to adopt.

On every level, we Communists can without hesitation support every movement or type of organization which is genuinely advancing the cause of peace. We must not be impatient with those who are confused, or scornful of those who are just beginning to wake up and move with timidity. Nor should we retire to sulk in our tents when we meet with a rebuff. We must always bear in mind that unity of action is not the easiest thing to achieve. It must be

organized, and stubbornly fought for, and won.

Now, we must bear in mind that the factors are today favorable for advancing the peace fight in a way that was not the case a year ago or even six months ago. And this, coupled with the urgency of the situation, demands that we work more boldly, more broadly, and at a higher tempo, especially to mobilize the working class.

Everywhere and always we will energetically promote trade-union solidarity, the united action of labor, Negro-white unity. We are for everything, for every common action that serves the interests of our people and our country.

We will support and join with anybody, anywhere, who struggles against the Wall Street monopolists, the warmakers.

But, always and everywhere, we will hammer home the fact that peace is the supreme and *over-riding issue*. We will do all we can to imbue every sector of the American people engaged in struggle with an understanding that the struggle for peace is *decisive*. It is a life-and-death struggle which will influence the course of human progress for decades to come.

\* \* \*

Because we are Communists, we look on every struggle as a means of advancing the welfare and happiness of the people, and as a school in

which the millions and tens of millions learn from experience. Now, more than ever before, it is our job to help the tens of millions to understand their own experiences. The tens of millions will move and act together, when they really understand what this fight for peace is all about.

So it is our task to explain, and explain again. Those who turned a deaf ear yesterday will perhaps listen today. Those who today are still deceived by the Wall Street propaganda lies, by the enemies of people's unity, will have become wiser by tomorrow, especially if we work effectively.

The big time profiteers and operators in Wall Street and Washington hope to trick the American people into believing that a third world war—the atomic war for world domination which they are trying to unleash—is inevitable. That is why they keep insisting that the advocacy of peace is Soviet propaganda, Korean propaganda, Chinese propaganda, Communist propaganda.

But life shows, and we can and must help demonstrate, that it is in the *most vital interests of our country to end the war in Korea*. It is in the *greatest interest of our country to prevent the re-arming of Western Germany*. It is in the *supreme interest of our country to stop the arms race, promote the peaceful co-existence and friendship of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. and establish a Five Power Pact of Peace*,

It i  
ests o  
inter  
that i  
fight

Du  
Street  
polic  
dange  
come  
dent-  
victor  
our c  
demo  
Social  
Mo  
conv  
abilit  
influe

It is precisely because the interests of our people coincide with the interests of all peoples, everywhere, that it is possible to wage and win the fight for peace.

\* \* \*

During the past ten months Wall Street's aggressions and Hitler-like policies have sharply increased the dangers of war and fascism. But I come back to you supremely confident—as you are—in the ultimate victory of the peoples, of our class and our cause—the cause of peace, of democracy, of economic security, of Socialism.

Moreover, I return more than ever convinced of our ability, of the ability of the people, increasingly to influence the course of events in their

own interests, in the unfolding period as well as in the future.

Comrades, we have become hardened by stormy weather, and are better prepared for the bigger storms which are yet to come. Through the unity of the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism, through clarity and struggle, through united action, we and our working class and people, acting in unison with all peace-loving peoples, can surmount all difficulties, can ride all storms, can win! We have the utmost confidence, even at this late hour, that the peoples of the world, including our own, can still avert the catastrophe of a third world war, by acting unitedly, determinedly, and with the urgency and dispatch demanded by the times.

## Interview of J. V. Stalin\*

RECENTLY a *Pravda* correspondent submitted to Comrade Stalin a number of questions concerning foreign-political matters. Below we print Comrade J. V. Stalin's reply:

*Question:* How do you evaluate the latest statement made by the British Prime Minister Attlee in the House of Commons to the effect that after the termination of the war the Soviet Union did not disarm, that is, did not demobilize its troops, and that since then the Soviet Union has been constantly increasing its armed forces?

*Answer:* I regard this statement of Prime Minister Attlee as a slander against the Soviet Union.

The whole world is aware that the Soviet Union demobilized its troops after the war. As is known, demobilization was carried out in three steps: the first and second steps, in the course of the year 1945; the third step, from May to September, 1946. In addition, demobilization of the older age groups of the personnel of the Soviet Army was carried out in 1946 and in 1947. And in the beginning of 1948 all the remaining older

age groups were demobilized.

Such are the generally known facts.

If Prime Minister Attlee were competent in financial or economic science he would have realized without difficulty that no state, the Soviet Union not excepted, could develop to the full civilian industry; launch great construction projects, like the hydro-electric power stations on the Volga, the Dnieper and the Amu-Darya, which require tens of billions in budget expenditures; continue the policy of systematically lowering the prices of mass consumption commodities, which also requires tens of billions of budget expenditures; invest hundreds of billions in the work of reconstructing the national economy which was destroyed by the German invaders; and at the same time, simultaneously with this, multiply its armed forces and expand its war industry. It is not difficult to understand that so reckless a policy would have led the state to bankruptcy. Prime Minister Attlee should have known from his own experience, as well as from the experience of the United States, that multiplication of a country's armed forces and an armaments drive lead

\* Translated from *Pravda*, February 17, 1951.

to expansion of war industry, to curtailment of civilian industry and halting of large-scale civilian construction work, to increased taxation and rising prices of mass consumption commodities. Since the Soviet Union is not curtailing but on the contrary is expanding civilian industry, is not winding up but on the contrary is undertaking the construction of new mammoth hydroelectric power stations and irrigation systems, is not discontinuing but on the contrary is persisting in the policy of lowering prices, it stands to reason that it could not, simultaneously with this, inflate its war industry and multiply its armed forces without the risk of finding itself in a state of bankruptcy.

If, despite all these facts and scientific considerations, Prime Minister Attlee nevertheless deems it possible to slander the Soviet Union and its policy of peace, this can only be explained by the fact that he seeks, by slandering the Soviet Union to justify the armaments drive in Britain, now being carried out by the Labor Government.

Prime Minister Attlee has to lie about the Soviet Union, he has to depict the peace policy of the Soviet Union as an aggressive policy and the aggressive policy of the British Government as a peace policy—in order to mislead the British people, to foist upon them this lie about the Soviet Union and thus, by means of deception, to draw them into a new world war, which is now being

organized by the ruling circles of the United States of America.

Prime Minister Attlee poses as a supporter of peace. But if he is really in favor of peace why did he reject the Soviet Union's proposal in the United Nations Organization for the immediate conclusion of a Peace Pact between the Soviet Union, Britain, the United States, China, and France?

If he really favors peace, why did he reject the Soviet Union's proposal for undertaking immediately a reduction of armaments and for immediately banning atomic weapons?

If he really favors peace, why does he persecute the partisans of peace, why did he prohibit the Peace Congress in Britain? Can the campaign in defense of peace menace Britain's security?

Evidently Prime Minister Attlee does not favor the preservation of peace but the unleashing of a new aggressive world war.

*Question:* What do you think of the intervention in Korea, what can be its outcome?

*Answer:* If Britain and the United States of America reject finally the peace proposals of the People's Government of China, the war in Korea can end only in the defeat of the interventionists.

*Question:* Why? Are the American and English generals and officers inferior to the Chinese and Korean?

*Answer:* No, they are not inferior. American and British generals and officers are in no way inferior to the generals and officers of any other country. As to the soldiers of the U.S.A. and Britain, as is known, they showed themselves in the best light in the war against Hitler-Germany and militarist Japan. Wherein then is the crux of the matter? It is in the fact that the soldiers regard the war against Korea and China as unjust, whereas the war against Hitler-Germany and militarist Japan they regarded as completely just. The matter at issue is that the present war is extremely unpopular among the American and British soldiers.

Indeed, it is difficult to convince the soldiers that China, which does not threaten either Britain or the United States and whose Island of Taiwan\* was seized by the Americans, is an aggressor, whereas the United States, which seized the Island of Taiwan and which brought its troops up to the very frontiers of China, is resisting aggression. It is difficult to convince the soldiers that the United States has a right to defend its security on the territory of Korea and at the frontiers of China, but that China and Korea have no right to defend their security on their own territory or at the frontiers of their state. This is the reason that the war is unpopular among the British and American soldiers.

It stands to reason that the most

experienced generals and officers may suffer defeat if the soldiers regard the war imposed upon them as profoundly unjust and if, owing to this, they perform their duties at the front in a formal way, without faith in the righteousness of their mission, without enthusiasm.

*Question:* How do you regard the decision of the U.N.O. which pronounced the Chinese People's Republic as an aggressor?

*Answer:* I regard it as a shameful decision.

Indeed, one must lose the last vestiges of conscience to contend that the United States, which seized Chinese territory—the Island of Taiwan—and which invaded Korea up to the frontiers of China, is the party which is defending itself, but that the Chinese People's Republic, which is defending its frontiers and is seeking the return of the Island of Taiwan seized by the Americans, is the aggressor!

The United Nations Organization, created as the bulwark for preserving peace, is being turned into an instrument of war, into a means for unleashing a new world war. The aggressive core of the United Nations consists of the ten member-countries of the aggressive North Atlantic Pact (the U.S.A., Britain, France, Canada, Belgium, Holland, Luxemburg, Denmark, Norway, and Iceland), and 20 Latin-American countries (Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia,

\* Formosa.—Ed.

Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela). It is the representatives of these countries that now decide the fate of war and peace in the United Nations. It was they who pushed through in the United Nations the shameful decision making the Chinese People's Republic out to be an aggressor.

It is characteristic of the present-day regime in the United Nations that, for instance, the small Dominican Republic in America, whose population numbers scarcely two million, has the same weight in the United Nations as India, and much more weight than the Chinese People's Republic which has been deprived of the right to be represented in the United Nations.

Thus, being turned into a tool of aggressive war, the United Nations Organization is at the same time ceasing to be a world organization of nations with equal rights. As a matter of fact, the United Nations Organization is now not so much a world organization as an organization for the Americans, an organization acting in the interests of the American aggressors. Not only the United States and Canada are striving to unleash a new war, the same stand has also been taken by 20 Latin-American countries, the landowners and merchants of which are craving for a new war somewhere in

Europe or Asia, in order to sell commodities to the belligerent countries at excessively high prices and to gain millions from that sanguinary business. It is no secret to anyone that 20 representatives of twenty Latin-American countries are now the most solid and obedient army of the United States of America in the United Nations Organization.

The United Nations Organization is therefore taking the inglorious road of the League of Nations. In this way it is burying its moral prestige and dooming itself to disintegration.

*Question:* Do you consider a new world war inevitable?

*Answer:* No. At least at the present time it cannot be considered inevitable.

Of course, in the United States of America, in Britain as also in France, there are aggressive forces thirsting for a new war. They need war to obtain super-profits, to plunder other countries. These are the billionaires and millionaires who regard war as a lucrative business yielding colossal profits.

They, these aggressive forces, control the reactionary governments and direct them. But, at the same time, they are afraid of their peoples, who do not want a new war and stand for the maintenance of peace. Therefore, they are trying to use the reactionary governments in order to enmesh their peoples with lies, to de-

ceive them, and to depict the new war as of a defensive character and the peaceful policy of the peace-loving countries as an aggressive policy. They are trying to deceive their peoples in order to impose on them their aggressive plans and to draw them into a new war.

Precisely for this reason they fear the campaign in defense of peace, they are afraid that it may expose the aggressive intentions of the reactionary governments.

It is for this reason that they turned down the proposals of the Soviet Union for the conclusion of a Peace Pact, for reduction of armaments, for a ban on atomic weapons, because they were afraid that the adoption of these proposals would undermine the aggressive measures of the reactionary governments and would

make the armaments drive unnecessary.

What will be the outcome of this struggle between the aggressive and peace-loving forces?

Peace will be preserved and consolidated if the peoples will take the cause of preserving peace into their own hands and defend it to the end. War may become inevitable if the warmongers succeed in enmeshing the masses of the people in lies, in deceiving them and drawing them into a new world war.

That is why a widespread campaign for the maintenance of peace, as a means of exposing the criminal machinations of the warmongers, is now of primary importance.

As for the Soviet Union, it will continue in the future, as well, unswervingly to pursue a policy of averting war and preserving peace.

By G

THE  
alertnew  
advan  
after  
men  
willA  
offer  
bilit  
oper  
of th  
are

T

Fou  
ent  
offer  
Wit  
viet  
of p  
for  
ence

T

bor  
ister  
been  
ever  
dire  
nite  
ina  
by

# The Stalin Interview—A Blow at the Warmongers

By Gus Hall

THE PEACE MOVEMENT must be on the alert to exploit to the maximum the new possibilities that open up to advance the struggle for peace. Very often such possibilities are but momentary, and if not seized in time, will pass, perhaps even unnoticed.

A number of new opportunities offering in a fresh way new possibilities in the struggle for peace have opened up in the recent period. Some of these are very temporary; others are of a more lasting character.

The proposed meeting of the Big Four foreign ministers and the present meeting of the deputy ministers offer one of these new opportunities. With this proposed meeting the Soviet Union, leader of the world camp of peace, has opened up new doors for a peaceful settlement of all differences.

The State Department has stubbornly resisted calling a foreign ministers' conference. Now that it has been forced to go along, it is placing every obstacle in the way of honest, direct negotiations. Despite the definite attempts to sabotage the preliminary sessions of the deputy ministers by the representatives of the United

States, Great Britain and France, these meetings can be turned into weapons in the struggle for peace. A mass movement of protest against the sabotage of peaceful negotiations can result in unmasking the war aims of the imperialist camp, in narrowing down the area of demagogic maneuvering by the war makers.

Likewise, the present military and political situation created around the issue of the 38th parallel also opens up new possibilities for the people to compel the Truman Administration to accept the Chinese proposals for a peaceful settlement of the war in Korea. There is great resentment in the United States and in the world against MacArthur's attempts again to invade the territory of North Korea in the drive to carry the war to Manchuria. This very powerful mass sentiment against a new invasion creates new possibilities for stimulating an ever greater popular movement to stop the hostilities at the 38th parallel, to open direct negotiations with the democratic republics of Korea and China, for the withdrawal of all foreign troops and for a unified, democratic Korea.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE  
STALIN INTERVIEW

The recent historic answers of Joseph Stalin to questions put to him by a *Pravda* correspondent are of special significance to the working class and the people of the United States. Stalin's answers have exerted a great influence on all who have read them. The overpowering logic and the great truth of his arguments, the simplicity and clarity of his style, and his ringing call for world peace have penetrated through the wall of lying war propaganda and have definitely influenced the thinking of marked sections of the American people. The power of this argument for peace is testified to by the fact that there has been no serious attempt by the ideologists of the war camp to debate the questions Stalin raised. Some imperialist ideologists have tried to ignore the interview, while others attempted to pass it off by some slanderous remarks. Still others, especially the liberal and Social-Democratic variety of the bourgeois apologists, misinterpret and distort Stalin's words, refusing to accept the simple truth that when Joseph Stalin makes a statement, one need not speculate or guess its meaning. One needs only to read the clear, frank, honest statement. But people who year in and year out make a living by prostituting themselves, by turning out lying war propaganda are evidently not capable of grasping this simple truth.

What are some of the central ques-

tions in this historic document that are of special significance to us—the people of the United States—who live in the country which the Wall Street monopolies have turned into the world base for war and aggression?

Above everything else, Stalin's statements are an additional powerful call for world peace, for the peaceful settlement of all problems affecting world peace. It is to the best interest of the American people to understand and fully evaluate Stalin's concluding words: "*As for the Soviet Union, it will continue in the future, as well, unswervingly to pursue a policy of averting war and preserving peace.*"

It is a source of great strength to all lovers of peace to read the calm words of Stalin in the midst of the cannibalistic warmongering. Asked if war was inevitable, he said: "*No. At least at the present time it cannot be considered inevitable.*"

In a fresh way, along with reviewing the key factors of the postwar world situation, Stalin again stated the undeniable truth that the danger to world peace flows from the greed for profits of the capitalist class in general, and, in the first place, from the greed of the Wall Street financiers and monopolists. This is the motivating factor in the drive of American imperialism to enslave the peoples of the world. War is a method by which the capitalist class enslaves peoples for the specific purpose of extracting higher profits. Therefore, for ruling circles of capi-

talist countries to accept policies of peace means simultaneously to reject policies of super-profits which flow from the exploitation of enslaved peoples.

Stalin firmly re-stated the fact that world peace is the guiding principle of the foreign and domestic policy of the Soviet Union. He firmly nailed this down with his penetrating facts about the impossibility of building for peace with a war economy or of preparing for war with a peacetime economy. To the broad masses in the capitalist world who feel the effects of a rising war economy on their hides through mounting prices, soaring taxes and growing speedup, Stalin's arguments made profound sense.

Stalin brought up to date the analysis of world developments and on this basis sharpened up the approach to a number of forces and factors making up the present-day world situation:

a) This is especially true of his remarks about the role of the United Nations. "*The United Nations Organization, created as the bulwark for preserving peace, is being turned into an instrument of war, into a means for unleashing a new world war.*" There is great need concretely to show to the masses how the imperialist forces have been able completely to reverse the functions of the U.N.

b) He placed a new and most urgent stress on the danger of the masses getting entangled in the web

of lies of war propaganda and therefore the need to do more in exposing these war lies.

c) He further emphasized the role and responsibility of the people as the only serious obstacle to the war plans of Wall Street imperialism.

d) He placed greater importance on the role of the governments of Canada and of the South American countries as stooges of Wall Street imperialism. If one takes into consideration both the present role of the ruling class and government of the United States and the new emphasis Stalin placed on the position of the governments of Canada and South America in the United Nations, the question of the role of the Western Hemisphere as a base for world reaction and war is given new meaning and significance. That role is being fully exposed at the conference of foreign ministers of American states now being held at Washington, where Acheson, in the name of "freedom" and "security" from "Soviet aggression," ordered the stepping up of reaction against the peoples and intensified militarization so as to provide Wall Street with more Latin-American cannon fodder. This situation further emphasizes the need for closer relations and unity of the peace forces and peoples of the Western Hemisphere.

After lucidly analyzing the most important recent developments, Stalin indicates that the war danger has grown sharper. It is probably easiest for us in the United States

to understand this fact, because one cannot take a breath without seeing, feeling and hearing the preparations that are going on in our country for war. As these preparations for war advance, the danger to world peace increases. The increasing transfer of our economy to war production, the growth of the standing army and the process of fascization of our country are all danger signals to world peace. The most conclusive proof today that Wall Street and the United States government it dominates are hellbent on launching a new world war and fear peace more than anything else in the world are the obstacles that the representatives of the war camp, under the leadership of the United States, are placing in the way of even convening a foreign ministers' conference to discuss the possibility of peaceful settlement of problems, especially as they arise in Europe.

The United States representatives consider the foreign ministers' conference especially dangerous at this time because their war plans in Europe have been greatly advanced and the schemes for creating war incidents and provocations have received high priority in the war councils of Wall Street and its allies. These advanced preparations are pin-pointed by the remilitarization of Western Germany, the restoration of the Nazi generals and cartellists, the appointment of General Eisenhower as the European Commander-in-Chief and his hurried military conferences, as well as the setting up of his general

headquarters in Paris. This danger is sharpened by the increased provocations on the part of Wall Street's henchman Tito and its other stooges, the rulers of Greece and Turkey. Evidence is mounting daily that the representatives of Wall Street have well-advanced and long-reaching plans for provoking military incidents on the borders of Bulgaria, Albania, etc. The plans call for a repetition of the Korea master plan for using the forces of Greece, Turkey, or Yugoslavia, or all of them, to attack the peoples of the New Democracies and then, again under the flag of the United Nations, for American bombers and troops to invade these countries under the guise of fighting aggression. All discussions about the so-called Mediterranean Pact patterned after the Atlantic Alliance is part of the preparations for unleashing the war in Europe.

#### NEW WEAPON AGAINST WARMONGERS

Stalin provides all lovers of peace with a new weapon for exposing warmongering. The special salvos he directed in the interview against the main pillar of the war propaganda, namely, the big lie that the Soviet Union is the aggressor in preparing for war, is of special significance to us. For, once the American masses grasp the truth that there is no need to fear aggression from the Soviet Union, once they understand the in-

herent peace character of the Socialist system, then the whole structure of the war propaganda has nothing to stand on and collapses of its own weight.

The wall of lying anti-Soviet propaganda is built for a twofold purpose. First, it aims to hide from the American masses the mighty successes of Soviet industry and agriculture which establish the superiority of Socialism as a system of society. Secondly, it has the purpose of keeping from the masses of our people this powerful proof of the peaceful intentions of the Soviet people, government and leadership. The masses of Americans know from their own experience that to the extent that our economy is put on a war footing will civilian production be curtailed. The people can see that to the same extent there is an increase in the burdens they are forced to bear in terms of higher taxes, higher prices, higher rents and growing shortages of civilian goods. The memory of the experiences of the fascist economy in Italy and Germany is still fresh in the minds of many. Once the war-makers were solidly in power in those fascist countries, they saddled upon the people the cost of the war economy as expressed in the brazen slogan "guns, not butter." Now, once the masses are able to contrast their own experiences in the developing war economy with the constant growth of peace economy in the Soviet Union, which is resulting in constant reduction of prices and

taxes and in a general steady rise in the living standards, it becomes the most powerful argument in destroying the central pillar of the war propaganda structure, namely that the U.S.S.R. is preparing for aggression.

The two economies, that of the United States and that of the U.S.S.R., are living proof of the two diametrically opposite political policies. Everything possible, with the greatest speed possible in the American economy, is diverted to fit into an economy for war. The economy of the U.S.S.R., on the contrary, is being built to produce, and is producing, goods for civilian consumption; while gigantic projects of peaceful construction, unparalleled in history, are launched at this time. The government budget in the United States is a war budget. The budget of the U.S.S.R. is a budget of peaceful construction.

There is a need to do much more in bringing to the light of day the whys and wherefores of the developing war economy in the United States. The masses of Americans do not yet fully see that the central cause for the war drive is the monopolists' greed for profits. As yet there is not the full understanding that the sacrifices the masses are forced to make are not for the defense of our country but only to support that greedy drive for profits. To workers who have a clear understanding of these basic factors behind the war drive and the war economy, the struggles for the defense and improvement of

their living standards takes on a new and different meaning.

In the broadest sense the masses must be made to see the close connection between the peaceful character of construction under Socialism, which is inherently a system of peace, and the proposals for peace consistently advanced by the representatives of the Soviet Union and the countries on the road to Socialism.

The note of the Soviet Government to the Government of Great Britain (February 25) provides irrefutable proof of the extent of demobilization of the armed forces of the Soviet Union and its pre-occupation with peaceful construction:

... In reality the Soviet Government effected a fundamental and extensive demobilization of its troops, having demobilized thirty-three age classes. No one needed an extensive demobilization of the Soviet troops as much as the Soviet Union, since without the returning of millions of demobilized men to the fields and factories the Soviet Union, far from being able to organize an economic advance after the war, would not have been able even to rehabilitate the areas, towns, railways, industry, and agriculture destroyed by the German occupationists. Only people who have the intention of villifying the Soviet Union can deny these facts.\*

One of the most cynical tricks of imperialist war propaganda, especially supplied by reactionary Social-

Democracy and now worked to death by Truman and Acheson, is the cry of "Red Imperialism." The attempt here is completely to distort all truth and to label as "Soviet imperialism" the very movements and struggles of the peoples everywhere for *freedom from the domination of imperialism*. This type of warmongering bases itself upon the degenerate philosophy of Hitlerism that if you repeat a big lie often enough, at least part of it will be believed by the masses. The Soviet note to Britain deals with this question in the following words:

... It is necessary to explain that as long as imperialist oppression exists in the world, there will also exist the liberation movement of the oppressed people, irrespective of the will and sympathies of some rulers or others. To accuse the Soviet Government of the existence in different countries of liberation movements caused by the oppression of imperialism is just as absurd as it would be absurd to accuse it of the occurrence in the world of earthquakes or tides.\*

There are a number of important lessons for us, for the broad masses of Americans in Stalin's statements regarding the war in Korea. It is of the utmost importance that the people know Stalin's statement that it is still possible to prevent the spread of the war and that it is still possible peacefully to settle all disputes. But it is just as important for the masses to know also Stalin's statement that

\* *The New York Times*, February 26, 1951.

\* *Ibid.*

unless the leaders of the war camp take advantage of these opportunities for peaceful negotiations their defeat will inevitably follow.

Stalin's solemn warning that

If Britain and the United States of America reject finally the peace proposals of the People's Government of China, the war in Korea can end only in the defeat of the interventionists. . . .

applies not only to Korea. For, it is clear that as long as U.S. imperialism should extend its aggressive policies, its unjust war, to the rest of Asia and to Europe, it will face a similar fate. The difficulty for the imperialist aggressor is two-fold: On the one hand the population of the invaded country is determined to expel the aggressor. At the same time, the soldiers sent by Wall Street ostensibly to "defend" the United States against an alleged threat to its shores from 5,000-mile-away Korea are not "sold" on the war propaganda. Consequently they cannot be filled with the moral-political fervor for sustained, victorious warfare. The fact is that the great majority of Americans cannot be made to accept this war propaganda. In spite of a full year of beating the drum, the Truman Administration has not been able to sell this war to the American people.

Some comrades have correctly indicated that the problems of the German warmakers in their recent aggressive, unjust war were not the same as those today facing the Wall

Street warmakers. The differences in the problems facing the Wall Street warmakers, as compared to those of the German fascist imperialists, are very important for us to understand. The main difference, of course, is due to the changed historical and political background. The German warmakers were able demagogically to use the status of a nation oppressed by the Versailles Treaty. They were able to whip up extreme national chauvinism with the demagogic slogans of bringing back all Germans lost as a result of the Armistice and of reclaiming German territories. The process of fascistization, brutalization and the unleashing of rabid, chauvinist nationalism has not reached a comparable stage in the preparation of the war drive of the Wall Street warmakers. Besides lacking such demagogic arguments that sounded justifiable to the German people, the U.S. war propagandists face the additional difficulty of the democratic background and heritage of the American people. These are obstacles on the road of the Wall Street warmakers.

However, in seeing these differences we must not underestimate for a moment the very definite spread of Anglo-Saxon chauvinism. The acceptance by the masses of people of the big lie relative to the "danger of Soviet aggression" continues to serve the monopolists with a major instrument in the drive to war. In duly noting what Stalin said about the unpopularity of the war among

the American troops is correct, we must still bring to the attention of the American people the cruel, inhuman atrocities that are nevertheless committed in Korea by our troops for which the American people must accept responsibility.

#### NO LONG-TERM CURE FOR CAPITALISM

There is no long-term cure that capitalism can find for its ills. When the foundation of a building is decayed and worm-eaten, one can make temporary repairs; but such repairs can have no lasting effect. The building will continue to shake, twist, and warp, until it finally crumbles. So it is with world capitalism in this, its last historic stage. World capitalism has never really recovered from the condition in which the last war left it. It has remained in the constant throes of its general crisis. However, in the general period of its decay there are brief moments when its throes are not quite so painful. We have witnessed such a moment during the last few years. What were some of the signs indicating such a momentary relief experienced by capitalism?

1) Because of a series of war measures, such as high monetary appropriations, large loans to private industry, higher taxes, the export of part of the economic crisis onto the backs of the peoples in the colonies and of other capitalist countries, and the tremendous increase of the war

sector of the national economy—because of these factors capitalism in the United States was momentarily able to divert the course of the developing economic crisis.

2) Because of a number of measures, such as large-scale loans which placed large sections of the world into hock to Washington and Wall Street, and by forcing down the living standards of the masses throughout the capitalist world, capitalism in a number of major countries has been able to postpone the disaster it faced. The very brief period during which there was an improvement in the dollar reserves of Great Britain as well as of some other countries, about a year ago, was a sign of the slight easing of the pains of dying imperialism. These temporary developments, of course, have had some effect on the political situation in all of these countries.

Developments now clearly indicate how temporary was the easing of these pains. No sooner did U.S. imperialism pass on to the stage of open military aggression, than the pains began to increase. U.S. imperialism not only began to demand greater sacrifice from the people of the United States but it also began to put the squeeze on their junior partners. There are many signs of the growing ills of the war camp. Its economic problems are mounting, as is attested by the growth of the strike movement in France, in Italy and Great Britain. The mass resistance to the new war measures

is ga  
ment  
has  
Cabin  
trem  
ing c  
pecia  
ard c  
mass  
reach  
perio  
new  
Thes  
in th  
Labo  
incre  
the p  
ment  
Be  
great  
of S  
goin  
ish p  
At  
Stalin  
natio  
peop  
pone  
Pe  
date  
of ha  
may  
mon  
mass  
ing  
new  
T  
for  
mea  
natio  
prim

is gathering new strength and momentum. The small dollar reserve has now again begun to disappear. Cabinets are beginning to shake and tremble. In this situation, the ruling class of Great Britain faces especially critical problems. The standard of living of large sections of the masses in the British Isles has never reached above the level of the war period, and now they are faced with new cuts in food, clothing and fuel. These increased pains are reflected in the growing differences in the Labor Party which result from the increased mass disillusionment in the promises of the Labor Government and trade-union officialdom.

Because of these developments, the great truth and logic of the words of Stalin is bound to have a deep-going effect especially upon the British people.

At the conclusion of his interview, Stalin states the central, all-dominating question that the peace-loving peoples of the world must deeply ponder over:

Peace will be preserved and consolidated if the peoples will take the cause of preserving peace into their own hands and defend it to the end. War may become inevitable if the warmongers succeed in enmeshing the masses of the people in lies, in deceiving them and drawing them into a new world war.

That is why a widespread campaign for the maintenance of peace, as a means of exposing the criminal machinations of the warmongers, is now of primary importance.

We can have full confidence that peace can be preserved; but that confidence is based on the full realization that this is possible today only if the forces for peace continue to grow, if they consolidate their strength and broaden their ranks.

The forces for peace in the United States have taken big steps forward. But this correct estimation requires full appreciation of the fact that as yet we have not been able to change the course of our ruling class from its present disastrous path of war and fascism.

Much more must be done to counteract the warmongering ideology and propaganda in our country. The war lies must be exposed and debunked daily and hourly. We must more effectively undermine the two main pillars of the war propagandists by exposing the lie that the danger to our nation arises from the "aggressive" plans of the Soviet Union and that the Wall Street policy of aggression is a policy of defense.

There must be a greater organizational consolidation of the peace movement. The peace forces will flounder, will miss the bus, will not be able to take and hold the initiative unless they have at least one national organized directing center.

The peace movement needs to master the art of popular mass agitation, agitation that explains the developments of the day in a vivid, popular and understandable manner.

The peace movement needs to de-

velop more actions, such as meetings of all types and descriptions, more picket lines, more petitions, more conferences, dinners, forums, etc.

Our Party must greatly improve its leadership in the mass struggles for peace. We must begin to check how the clubs and sections are carrying out this central task concretely, as set forth by our 15th National Convention. Besides giving leadership to the mass movement, our Party, in its own name, must

increase the issuance of materials and the planning of actions for peace.

The present moment is pregnant with great dangers of involving additional sections of the world in war, but also offers greater possibilities for setting back the warmakers' plans to light the flames of World War III. The key to this lies in exposing the demagogy of the warmakers and in building the broad mass peace movement.

By I

THE  
reco  
has  
abili  
strug  
New  
lutio  
grea  
initia  
mass  
basie  
polit  
tion  
trol,  
For  
cont  
in t  
gene  
W  
and  
deve  
part  
gani  
shar  
of th  
criti  
tion  
effo  
guar  
izat  
ing  
arou

# A Means to Activate the Clubs

By Henry Winston

THE 15TH NATIONAL CONVENTION recorded the fact that "Our Party has shown an improvement in our ability to give leadership to the mass struggles and mass movements." Nevertheless, the Convention Resolution pointed out that "our single greatest weakness is the weakness in initiating, organizing and leading of mass movements and struggles." This basic conclusion should guide our political and organizational preparations for the first quarterly dues control, which will take place in April. For it is the purpose of this dues control to help achieve a real change in the mass work of our Party in general, and of the club in particular.

While on a national, state, county and section scale, movements are developing in which Communists participate, which they help to organize, and in whose leadership they share, this is not yet true on the level of the club. Thus, serious heed to the critical observations of the Convention Resolution requires that every effort be made by the leadership to guarantee that the basic Party organizations become a vital force in building the united front of struggle around the issues affecting the masses.

This especially applies to the fight for peace, which is the most pressing necessity for the working class and the people of the United States.

While world humanity presses for a Pact of Peace between the Big Five, U.S. imperialism undertakes to break up in advance the Big Four Conference of Foreign Ministers and to make certain that no peace agreement is reached. While additional tens of millions of Americans press for withdrawal of troops from Korea, MacArthur, with the support of Truman, presses for crossing the 38th Parallel and spreading the war to China.

Yet, while the war danger has increased since the Convention, greater possibilities have at the same time arisen for the building of a grass roots peace movement, involving millions. This is best indicated by the recent Peace Pilgrimage to Washington, which announced a call for a Congress for Peace to be held at Chicago in June. The growing possibilities for building a mass peace movement are also seen in the various peace polls, whether it be the Gallup poll, the Considine poll, or the individual polls taken by local

newspapers, which overwhelmingly demonstrate the peace desires of the American people.

In the light of this, every democrat, every anti-fascist and non-fascist, and certainly every Communist, has the responsibility to help give organized expression to the mounting peace sentiments of the people. Only the conscious organization and struggle of the millions can stay the hands of the would-be atom-bomb throwers.

Our Communist Party must set an example to the entire working class, to the people as a whole, in making clear the issues involved in the struggle for peace. It must bring clarity, zeal, and courage to the masses in the struggle. It must learn to work out such tactics as will guarantee the mass participation of the millions in the struggle to prevent world war.

The April dues control, then, has as an objective the maximum participation of individual Communists in mass activities. Party control requires that all Communists draw the full lessons from our Party's Convention Resolution on the need to master the tactic of the united front in the areas in which Party clubs work. This also means, of course, that individual comrades must find their place within the united front and must be helped to make the maximum contribution toward the unity of the workers in the struggle for peace.

The quarterly control, in addition

to the collection of dues, must be viewed as beginning the process of integrating individual members into their clubs on the basis of a definite and concrete program of action involving each member in the struggle for peace, against the economic consequences of the war program which places untold burdens upon the masses in the economic field, and in respect to civil rights generally, and in particular as they affect the Negro people.

How to select from among the many issues those specific questions that concern the broadest masses, is an immediate task which should be raised in all the clubs as part of the April dues control.

Secondly, the struggle to transform the peace desires of the millions into positive and constructive forms of action in the shops, rural communities, campuses, community organizations, blocks and apartment houses, necessitates a most concrete knowledge of the conditions and problems of the people among whom we are working, as well as flexible forms of struggle which correspond to the level of understanding of those masses. Help to the clubs on how to approach this problem should be an integral part of the April Dues Control.

Thirdly, systematic assistance to each club, and to the individual member, on how to combat the vile chauvinist propaganda which accompanies the war program, which is opposed to the fundamental interests

of t  
cons  
Our  
exp  
abo  
adv  
mak  
cult  
coll  
A  
plai  
ran  
war

of the American people, should be considered a task of key importance. Our members should be equipped to expose as war propaganda the lies about "Soviet aggression," cynically advanced by the Wall Street war-makers in order to make more difficult, if not impossible, U.S.-Soviet collaboration for peace.

And with this, it is urgent to explain again and again, in our own ranks and among the masses, that war is not inevitable, that war can

be prevented by the united mass action of the people.

The April Dues Control must be regarded as an all-out struggle to strengthen and consolidate the club politically and organizationally, and to lay the basis for the fullest participation of the membership in a continuing struggle for peace.

Let our objective be:

Every member in good standing!  
Every member an effective fighter  
for peace!

## Concerning Practice

*On the Connection between Cognition and practice—the Connection between Knowledge and Deeds.\**

By Mao Tse-tung

*The following is from the editorial note to the Chinese original, published in July, 1937:*

*"There were at one time devotees of dogmatism in the Communist Party of China who rejected the experience of the Chinese Revolution, denied the truth that 'Marxism is not a dogma but a guide to action,' and scared people with isolated words and phrases torn out of the text of Marxist books. On the other hand, there were followers of empiricism who clung to their own limited experience, did not understand the importance of theory for revolutionary practice, did not see the situation as a whole, although they worked zealously but blindly. The ideological mistakes, in particular the views of the dogmatists who clothed themselves in the toga of Marxism-Leninism, did tremendous harm to the Chinese Revolution in 1931-34. It was precisely to expose, from the position of the Marxist theory of cognition, the subjectivist mistakes of the supporters of dogmatism and empiricism—that Mao Tse-tung's work was*

*empiricism—in the first place of dogmatism—written."*

PRE-MARXIST materialism considered questions of cognition divorced from human society, divorced from the historical development of mankind and hence could not understand the inter-dependent connection of knowledge with social practice, *i.e.*, the inter-dependent connection of knowledge with production and the class struggle.

Above all, Marxists consider that productive activity is the most fundamental practical activity, determining every other activity.

People are in the main dependent for their knowledge on material productive activity, gradually gain understanding of the phenomena of nature, the character of nature, the laws of nature and the relations between man and nature; at the same time, it is through productive activity that they also gradually come to understand to varying extents definite mutual relations between people. All this knowledge cannot be gained divorced from productive activity.

In classless society, in the joint ef-

\* English translation from the Russian text in the *Bolshevik* (No. 23), December, 1950, as published in the *Labour Monthly*, London, issues of February and March, 1951.

forts of each person, acting as a member of society, together with the remaining members of the society, definite production relations were established and productive activity was carried out directed toward solving the problems of the material life of people. In various class societies, definite production relations are also established in various forms between the members of the various class societies, and productive activity is carried out directed toward solving the problems of the material life of people. This is the basic source of the development of human cognition.

The social practice of people is not limited to productive activity alone, but has also many other forms: the class struggle, political life, activity in the spheres of science and art, in brief, people take part in all spheres of social practical life.

Hence in the process of their cognition human beings get to understand, besides material life, various relations between people in the process of political and cultural life (closely connected with material life). An especially profound influence on the development of human cognition is exerted by various forms of the class struggle. In class society each person occupies a definite class position and every ideology has a class stamp.

Marxists consider that productive activity in human society develops step by step from the lowest stages to the highest, hence human knowledge in turn develops step by step,

both as regards the world of nature and as regards society, from the lowest stages to the highest, *i.e.*, from the simple to the complex, from the one-sided to the many-sided. During a very prolonged historical period people could only understand the history of society one-sidedly; this arose, on the one hand, from the egoistic views of the exploiting classes, which constantly distorted the history of society and, on the other hand, from the narrow scale of production, which limited people's horizons. A comprehensive historical understanding by people of the evolutionary history of society and the transformation of knowledge about society into a science (which is possible only at a high level of development of the productive forces, when together with big industry the modern proletariat makes its appearance)—this is Marxist science.

Marxists consider that only the social practice of people can be the true criterion of human knowledge of the world surrounding us. The practical situation is such that only in the process of social practice (in the process of material production, class struggle, scientific experiments) can human knowledge be confirmed by obtaining the results expected from it. If people endeavor to achieve successes in work, *i.e.*, to obtain the expected results, then they must without fail bring their ideas into correspondence with the laws of the objective world surrounding us, otherwise they will suffer defeat in

practice. After a defeat people draw lessons from the failure itself, alter their ideas and bring them into correspondence with the laws of the world surrounding us, thus converting defeat into victory; so that it is said "defeat is the mother of success" and "one failure—one science," which also expresses this truth.

The theory of knowledge of dialectical materialism puts practice in the first place, considering that people's cognition must not in the least degree be divorced from practice, waging a struggle against all erroneous theories which deny the importance of practice and permit a divorce between knowledge and practice. Lenin said: "Practice is higher than (theoretical) cognition, for it has the merit not only of universality but also of immediate reality."\*

Marxist philosophy—dialectical materialism—has two most outstanding features. The first is its class character, the open recognition that dialectical materialism serves the proletariat; the second is its practice, the assertion of the inter-dependence of theory and practice and also that the basis of theory is practice and that in its turn theory serves practice. The truth of knowledge or theories is not determined in dependence on the kind of subjective sensations but in dependence on what are the results of objective social practice. The criterion of truth can be only social practice. The viewpoint of practice

must be the first and basic viewpoint of the theory of cognition of dialectical materialism.

\* \* \*

In what way does human knowledge arise from practice and serve practice anew? To understand this it suffices to become acquainted with the process of development of cognition.

Originally people in the process of practice saw at first merely separate aspects of the phenomena of individual things in the process of their development, they saw separate aspects of things, they saw the external connection between separate things. For instance, persons who travelled to Yenan for investigation in the first day or two saw the locality, the streets and houses, made contact with a number of persons, took part in receptions, soirées and meetings, listened to various utterances and read various documents—all these are the phenomena of things, separate aspects of things and the external connection between these things.

This is called the emotional stage of knowledge, *i.e.*, the stage of sensations and impressions. It means that the various things in Yenan acted on the sense organs of the members of the investigating group evoked sensations in them and gave rise in their consciousness to a series of impressions and a general external connection between these impressions—such is the first stage of cognition

\* V. L. Lenin, *Philosophical Notebooks*, Russian edition, p. 185.

At this stage people are not yet able to create profound concepts and to draw conclusions in accordance with logic.

The continuation of social practice evokes in the practice of people a manifold repetition of things which are sensed by them and which produce an impression on them, hence a leap takes place in the human mind, a concept arises in the process of cognition. The concept in itself reflects already not only the appearance of things, separate aspects of things, their external connection, but constitutes mastery of the essence of things, the common character of things, the internal connection of things.

Concept and sensation are not only quantitatively but also qualitatively different. Further development in this direction, the application of the methods of judgment and deduction, can lead to conclusions in accordance with logic.

That which is described in the *Tale of Three Kingdoms*, "You contract your brows and thoughts arise in the heart," or, as we frequently say, "let me think"—that is just the moment of man's application of concepts in the mind for judgment and conclusions. This is the second stage of knowledge. The members of the investigating group who have travelled to us, having gathered various materials and having "reflected" on them, could pronounce such a judgment as the following: "The policy of the anti-Japanese, national united front,

pursued by the Communist Party, is consistent, sincere and real." If, after pronouncing this judgment, they also actually stand for solidarity and national salvation, then they could further draw the following conclusion: "The anti-Japanese national united front can be crowned with success."

This stage of concept, judgment and inference, constitutes in the general process of human knowledge of things a still more important stage, the stage of rational knowledge. The real task of cognition consists in reaching by thought through sensation a gradual elucidation of the internal contradictions of objectively existing things, an elucidation of their laws, of the internal connection between this or that process, *i.e.*, in reaching logical cognition. We repeat: logical cognition is distinguished from sensuous (emotional) cognition in that the latter grasps separate aspects of a phenomenon, the external connection between things, whereas logical cognition, which is a tremendous step forward, grasps the universality, the essence and inner connection between things, leads to the discovery of the inner contradictions of the surrounding world and hence can master the development of the surrounding world in its totality and with its many-sided inner connections.

\* \* \*

Such a dialectical-materialist theory of the process of development of cog-

niton, based on practice and on the movement from the simple to the complex, was not put forward by anyone prior to Marxism. Marxist materialism for the first time correctly solved this question, demonstrated materialistically and dialectically the movement of the deepening of cognition, demonstrated the progressive movement from sense impressions to rational cognition of people in their complex and continually repeated practice of production and the class struggle. Lenin said: "The abstraction of matter, of a law of nature, the abstraction of *value*, etc., in a word, all scientific (correct, serious, not nonsensical) abstractions reflect nature more deeply, more truly, more *fully*."\*

Marxism-Leninism considers that the specific feature of the two stages in the process of cognition is that at the lower stage cognition is expressed in sensation, whereas at the higher stage cognition is expressed in logic, each stage, however, being a stage in the single process of cognition. Sensation (emotionality) and rationality are different in character, but they are mutually inseparable and are united on the basis of practice.

Our practice testifies that things sensed cannot be immediately understood by us and that only things which are understood can be still more profoundly sensed. Sensation can decide only the question of phenomena, but the question of essence

is decided only by the understanding. The solution of these questions cannot in the slightest degree be divorced from practice.

The knowledge of anything by anyone is impossible without contact with that thing, *i.e.*, without his life (practice) in the circumstances of that thing. It is impossible to be cognizant in advance of the laws of capitalist society while one is living in feudal society, since capitalism has not yet appeared and the corresponding practice does not yet exist. Marxism could appear as the product only of capitalist society. In the epoch of "free" capitalism Marx could not in advance and concretely be cognizant of certain peculiar laws of the epoch of imperialism, since imperialism, as the highest stage of capitalism, had not yet arrived and there did not yet exist the corresponding practice; only Lenin and Stalin could undertake this task.

Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin could advance their theory, chiefly because, leaving their genius out of account, they participated personally in their time in the class struggle and the practice of scientific experiments; without this latter condition no genius could have led to success. The saying: "Sutsais\*, without crossing the threshold, can know about everything under the sun," was an empty phrase in technologically undeveloped ancient times, while in our technologically developed epoch, al-

\* Lenin, *Philosophical Notebooks*, p. 146.

\* Sutsais—first degree of learning in ancient China.

though realizable, yet the genuine experts are the people connected with practice under the sun; these people in their practice acquire "knowledge," which by means of writing and technology falls into the hands of the "Sutsais," after which the latter indirectly "knows about everything under the sun." For the direct cognition of any things, personal participation in the practical struggle connected with change in reality, with a change in the things, is essential; only this can lead to contact with the phenomena of the things, only personal participation in the practical struggle connected with change in reality makes it possible to reveal and understand the essence of the things.

Such is the path of cognition along which each person actually proceeds; there are people, however, who, deliberately striving for distortion, oppose this. The most ridiculous role is played here by so-called "knowalls" who, having heard something from passers-by and not having understood half of what they have heard, pretend to be something "unique under the sun." It is just this that testifies to the incapacity of these people to define their knowledge. The question of knowledge is a question of science, which does not tolerate the slightest falsity or conceit and decisively demands exactly the opposite—an honest and modest attitude.

If you are trying to obtain knowledge you must take part in practice,

in changing reality. If you want to know the taste of a pear you must take it into your mouth and chew it well. If you want to understand the organization and nature of the atom you must make physical and chemical experiments, change the atomic environment. If you want to know the theory and methods of revolution you should take part in a revolution.

All genuine knowledge is derived from direct experience. One cannot, however, directly experience all things; in fact a large part of knowledge is a product of indirect experience. Such is all the knowledge of ancient epochs and foreign countries. This knowledge is a product of the direct experience of ancient peoples and foreigners; if the direct experience of ancient peoples and foreigners is in accordance with the conditions of which Lenin spoke—of scientific abstraction, and is a scientific reflection of what objectively existed, then this knowledge is reliable, in the opposite case it may be unreliable.

Hence a person's knowledge is composed of two parts: direct and indirect experience. At the same time, that which is indirect experience for me remains direct experience for others. Consequently, when speaking of the totality of knowledge, it may be said that no kind of knowledge can be divorced from immediate experience. The source of all knowledge lies in the sensations of man's physical sense organs of the objectively existing world; he who

denies this sensation, denies immediate experience, denies personal participation in the practice of changing reality, he is not a Marxist. This is the reason why the "know-alls" are so ludicrous. The Chinese have an old saying: "How can one capture tigers without going into the tiger's lair?" This saying is true for the practice of people, just as it is true for the theory of cognition. Cognition, divorced from practice, is unthinkable.

\* \* \*

We shall cite some concrete examples to make clear the movement of dialectical-materialist cognition, arising on the basis of the practice of change in reality—the movement of the gradual deepening of knowledge.

In the early period of practice—the period of the smashing of machines and spontaneous struggle—the proletariat is, in its knowledge of capitalist society, only at the initial stage of cognition and cognizes only separate aspects and the external connection of the various phenomena of capitalism. At that time the proletariat remains a so-called "class in itself."

When, however, the second period of the practice of the proletariat came—the period of conscious and organized economic struggle and of political struggle—when, with the help of the scientific methods of Marx and Engels, the varied experience gained

in the prolonged struggle was summed up, when the Marxist theory which educated the proletariat was created and thus led the proletariat to an understanding of the essence of capitalist society, an understanding of the relations of exploitation of the social classes, an understanding of the historical tasks of the proletariat, then the proletariat became a "class for itself."

Similarly with the Chinese people's knowledge of imperialism. The first stage is that of external knowledge, manifested in the general struggle against foreigners at the time of the Taiping movement and at the time of the Boxer movement. Only the second stage was the stage of rational knowledge, when the various kinds of internal and external contradictions of imperialism were revealed, when the essence of the exploitation of the broad masses of China by imperialism in alliance with the Chinese compradores was revealed; this knowledge began only in the period of the "movement of May 4"\* in 1919.

Let us glance now at war. If the leaders of a war are people without adequate military experience, then at the initial stage they will not understand the deep guiding laws of a concrete war (e.g., our 10-year war in the period of agrarian revolution). At the initial stage they merely acquired personal experience in a number of

\* "Movement of May 4" — an anti-imperialist and primarily an anti-Japanese movement, initiated by the student demonstration of May 4, 1919, in Peking.—Ed.

battles, many of which ended in defeat for them. Nevertheless, this experience (the experience of victories and especially of defeats) made them understand things of an internal order, inherent in the war as a whole, *i.e.*, the laws of this concrete war made them understand strategy and tactics, and thus made it possible for them to lead the war with confidence. If a man without experience was put in a position of command he could understand the actual laws of the war only after certain defeats (after acquiring experience).

One often has occasion to hear how certain comrades, without deciding to undertake some work or other, declare that they cannot cope with it. Why cannot they cope with it? Because they do not possess a coordinated conception of the content and conditions of the work; either they have never encountered such work, or they have encountered it, but not much, consequently they cannot speak of the laws of this kind of work. After the circumstances and conditions of the work have been carefully analyzed for them, they feel that, maybe, they can cope with it and show a desire to take it up. If these people, during a certain period of time, acquire experience in this work, and if they diligently investigate the circumstances, and do not regard things subjectively, one-sidedly, superficially, then they will be able themselves to draw a conclusion as to how the work should be conducted and their confidence in it

will be enhanced to a considerable degree. Only those persons who regard things subjectively, one-sidedly, and superficially, who, on arriving in a new place, do not interest themselves in their surroundings, do not study matters as a whole (the history of the matter and the present state as a whole), do not touch the essence of the matter (the internal connection of the various aspects of the matter itself and the internal connection of the given matter with other matters), complacently giving orders and instructions—are bound to make mistakes.

Hence the first step in the process of cognition is the initial contact with the external environment—the stage of sensations. The second step is the summing-up of the materials of sense perception, setting in order and re-arrangement—the stage of concepts, judgments and inferences. Only in the presence of fully adequate materials of sense perception (not fragmentary and incomplete) and their correspondence to the actual position (not erroneous perception) is it possible on the basis of these materials to elaborate a correct conception and logic.

\* \* \*

There are two factors here which must be especially emphasized. The first has already been spoken of above, but it must once again be repeated here—this is the question of the dependence of rational knowledge

on sense perception. He who considers that rational knowledge does not originate from sense perception is an idealist.

In the history of philosophy there existed so-called "rationalists," who recognized only the reality of reason and denied the reality of experience, who considered that only reason was reliable, but that the experience of sense perception was unreliable; the mistakes of this tendency consisted in an attempt being made to put the facts upside down.

Yet the reliability of the rational basis stems precisely from sense perception, in the opposite case the rational basis would turn into water without a source, into a tree without roots, would turn into something only subjectively arising and unreliable. From the viewpoint of the consistency of the process of cognition sense experience stands in the first place, and we emphasize the importance of social practice in the process of cognition; only social practice can lead to the beginning of the emergence of human knowledge, the beginning of obtaining experience of sense perception from the objectively existing external world.

For a person with closed eyes and ears, completely divorced from the objectively existing external world, knowledge is quite impossible. Knowledge begins with experience—this is the materialism of the theory of knowledge.

The second factor is the deepening of knowledge, the necessity of the

transition from the emotional stage of knowledge to the rational stage—that is precisely the dialectics of the theory of knowledge. If one considers that knowledge can remain at the lower stage—the emotional stage—assuming that only sense perceptions are reliable, but that rational knowledge is unreliable, then that means repeating the mistakes, well known from history, of "empiricism."

The mistakes of this theory consist in ignorance of the fact that the materials of sense perception are undoubtedly a reflection of the reality of the objectively existing external world (I do not say here that empiricism is only idealistic empiricism with its experience of internal reflection), but these materials are only one-sided and superficial, and the reflection obtained is incomplete; it does not reflect the essence of things. For the complete reflection of all things, the reflection of the essence of things, the reflection of the internal laws of things, the function of thought is indispensable, the working over of the rich material of sense perception, which consists in sifting the chaff from the wheat, the elimination of the false and the preservation of the real, the transition from one to another, from the external to the internal; for the construction of a system of concepts and theories the leap is indispensable from sensation (emotional knowledge) to rational knowledge.

This worked-over knowledge is not emptier and less reliable cogni-

tion  
say  
mor  
istin  
the  
uct i  
basis  
T  
entl  
peri  
sequ  
the  
lack  
grea  
enjo  
narr  
the  
into  
eōg  
tion  
kno  
tion  
of k  
ism.

"E  
phil  
histo  
kno  
thes  
trut  
ist  
of i  
cism  
kno  
The  
lecti  
judg  
the

tion; on the contrary it is, as Lenin says, still deeper, still truer and still more fully reflects the objectively existing thing, provided only that it is the scientifically worked-over product in the process of cognition on the basis of practice.

The vulgar philistines act differently. They bow down before experience and despise theory, as a consequence of which they cannot grasp the objective process as a whole, they lack a clear direction, they lack a great perspective and complacently enjoy their isolated successes and narrow horizon. If these people led the revolution they would lead it into a blind alley. Rational knowledge depends on sensation, on emotional knowledge, but emotional knowledge must develop into rational knowledge—that is the theory of knowledge of dialectical materialism.

\* \* \*

"Rationalism" and "empiricism" in philosophy do not understand the historical and dialectical nature of knowledge and although each of these tendencies contains one-sided truths (it is a question of materialist rationalism and empiricism, not of idealist rationalism and empiricism) nevertheless their theory of knowledge as a whole is erroneous. The movement of knowledge of dialectical materialism from sensation to judgment remains the same both in the small process of cognition (for

example the cognition of one or another thing or one or another work) and in the large process of cognition (for example the cognition of society or revolution).

However, this does not complete the movement of knowledge. If the movement of knowledge of dialectical materialism were to halt at rational knowledge, that would be only half the problem. More than that, from the viewpoint of Marxist philosophy it would be by no means the more important half.

Marxist philosophy considers that the most important question is not whether it is possible, having understood the laws of the objective world, thereby to explain the world, but in using this knowledge of objective laws for active transformation of the world. Marxism recognizes the active nature of theory and its importance has found full expression in the following proposition of Lenin: "without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement." But Marxism recognizes the serious significance of theory precisely and only because it can guide action. A theory which is kept under a bushel and not applied in practice, such a theory, no matter how good it may be, cannot have significance.

Knowledge begins with practice: through practice theoretical knowledge is acquired, which must then turn anew to practice. The active role of knowledge is expressed not only in the active leap from emotional knowledge to rational knowl-

edge; it is even more important that it should find expression in the leap from rational knowledge to revolutionary practice. Knowledge, having mastered the laws of the world, must be re-directed to the practice of transforming the world, used in the practice of production, in the practice of the revolutionary class struggle and national struggle, as well as in the practice of scientific experiments. Such is the process of testing and developing theory, a process which is a continuation of the single process of cognition.

The question whether a theoretical position corresponds to objective reality, as said above, is not fully decided, and cannot be fully decided, in the movement of cognition from sense perception to judgment. For the complete solution of this question it is necessary that rational knowledge should be turned again to social practice, that theory should be applied in practice, observing whether it can lead to the expected goal. Many theories of natural science are called truths precisely because these theories were not only discovered by natural scientists but were also confirmed in the subsequent practice of science. The reason why Marxism-Leninism is called a truth consists not only in the fact that this teaching was created scientifically by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin but also in the fact that it has been confirmed by the subsequent practice of the revolutionary class struggle and the national struggle. Dialectical

materialism has become a universal truth because the practice of any person cannot go beyond its limits.

The history of human knowledge tells us that many theories were insufficiently trustworthy, but as the result of testing in practice their inadequacies were removed. Many theories were erroneous, but as the result of testing in practice their errors were corrected. Precisely for this reason practice is the criterion of truth, "the viewpoint of life, of practice, must be the first and basic viewpoint of the theory of knowledge."\*

On this we have the notable words of Stalin: "Of course, theory becomes aimless if it is not connected with revolutionary practice, just as practice gropes in the dark if its path is not illumined by revolutionary theory."\*\*

Does this complete the movement of cognition? We answer: It is completed and at the same time it is not completed. The knowledge of people who have participated in the practice of change occurring in some definite objective process at some definite stage of development (it is a matter of indifference whether it is the practice of change of some process of nature or the practice of change of some social process), as a result of the reflection of the objective process and of the active subjective function, moves from the sensuous basis to judgment and creates ideas, theories, plans or projects, correspond-

\* Lenin, *Collected Works*, Russian edition, Vol. XIII, p. 116.

\*\* Stalin, *Foundations of Leninism*, International Publishers, 1939, p. 28.

ing as a whole to the laws of the given objective process. These ideas, theories, plans or projects are then applied in the practice of the same objective process and, if one succeeds in attaining the expected goal, *i.e.*, in transforming pre-determined ideas, theories, plans and projects into reality, in the practice of the above-mentioned process or, if one succeeds in achieving their accomplishment in general outlines, then the movement of the cognition of this concrete process may be considered completed. For example, the realization of any construction plan, the confirmation of any scientific hypothesis, the creation of any mechanism, the harvesting of any agricultural crop—in the process of transforming nature, or the success of any strike, the victory of any war, the fulfillment of any educational plan—in the process of transforming society, all this is considered as the attainment of the expected goal.

However, generally speaking, it rarely happens in the practice of transforming nature or society that the ideas, theories, plans or projects predetermined by people are realized without the slightest alteration. This occurs because people frequently suffer from many limitations in accomplishing a transformation of reality; they are not only bound by scientific and technological conditions, but also by the development of the objective process and the degree of its expression (all aspects and the essence of the objective process are still not

completely revealed).

In such a situation, owing to the appearance in practice of circumstances not postulated in advance, cases frequently occur of partial change of ideas, theories, plans or projects, but cases also occur of their complete alteration. This means that there are instances when pre-determined ideas, theories, plans and projects wholly or partially fail to correspond with reality, are wholly or partially erroneous. In a number of instances it is only after failures have been repeated many times that one succeeds in correcting erroneous knowledge, succeeds in achieving conformity with the laws of the objective process, and hence succeeds in converting a subjective thing into an objective one, that is to say, in achieving in practice the expected results. Thus, when this moment arrives, the movement of human cognition of some definite, objective process at some definite stage of development is considered to be completed.

From the viewpoint of the development of the process, however, the movement of cognition of people is not completed. Every process, whether it relates to nature or society, in consequence of internal contradictions and struggle, moves and develops in a forward direction, and the movement of human cognition follows and develops after it.

If one speaks of social movement, then truly revolutionary leaders must not only skillfully correct mis-

takes in their ideas, theories, plans or projects, as mentioned above, but must also, at the time of the transition of some definite objective process from some certain definite stage of development to another definite stage of development, skillfully in their own subjective knowledge join in that transition together with all the participants of the revolution, that is to say, strive so that the proposed new revolutionary tasks and new projects of work correspond to the changes in the new situation. Changes in the situation of the revolutionary period take place impetuously and if the knowledge of the revolutionaries does not, corresponding with this, change impetuously, then it will be impossible to lead the revolution to victory.

It often happens however, that ideas lag behind reality; this arises for the reason that human knowledge is limited by many social conditions.

We are struggling against conservatives in our revolutionary ranks, because their ideology cannot develop in accordance with the changing objective situation, and this has manifested itself historically in the form of Right opportunism. These people do not see that the struggle of contradictions has led to a development of the objective process and their knowledge remains at the same stage as before. These features are characteristic of the ideology of all conservatives. Their ideology is divorced from social practice, they can-

not advance at the head of the movement of society and fulfill the role of a guide, they only drag along in the rear and complain about the too rapid advance of society, trying to drag it back and reverse its course.

We also struggle against "Leftist" phrasemongering. The ideas of its representatives run ahead of the stage of definite development of the objective process; some of the phrasemongers take illusions for reality and others try forcibly to realize at the present time ideals which are only realizable in the future; their ideas are divorced from the contemporary practice of the majority of people, divorced from contemporary reality, and lead in action to adventurism.

The characteristics of idealism and mechanistic materialism, opportunism and adventurism are the break between the subjective and the objective and the divorce between knowledge and practice. The Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge, the distinguishing feature of which is scientific social practice, struggles determinedly against these erroneous ideologies. Marxists recognize that in the absolute universal process of the development of the universe the development of separate concrete processes is relative; in so far as the knowledge of absolute truth is expressed in the knowledge of concrete processes at a definite stage of development, to that extent at any moment knowledge consists of relative truths only. Absolute truth is

made up of an infinite number of relative truths.\* The development of the objective process is a development full of contradictions and struggle.

\* \* \*

Every dialectical movement in the objective world can sooner or later find its reflection in human knowledge. The process of coming into being, development and dying away in social practice is infinite, just as the process of coming into being, development and dying away in human knowledge is infinite.

Practice, directed toward changing objective reality and based on definite ideas, theories, plans and projects, constantly moves forward and human knowledge of objective reality constantly becomes more profound. The movement of change does not cease, just as human cognition of truth in practice never ceases. Marxism-Leninism in no way puts an end to the discovery of truth, on the contrary it constantly opens up paths for cognition of truth in practice. Our conclusion: we are for a concrete historical unity of the subjective and the objective, of theory and practice, of knowledge and action; against all "Left" or Right erroneous ideologies divorced from concrete history.

In the present epoch of social development responsibility for correct knowledge and transformation of the

world has been placed by history on the shoulders of the proletariat and its political party. Throughout the world and in China the process of the practice of transforming the world, determined on the basis of scientific knowledge, has reached a historic moment, a moment of tremendous importance, unprecedented in the entire history of human existence.

This consists in the complete overthrow of darkness throughout the world, and in China also, and its transformation into an as yet unprecedented world of light. The struggle of the proletariat and of the revolutionary people for the transformation of the world includes the fulfillment of the following tasks: transformation of the objective world, as well as of our subjective world—the transformation of our capacity for cognition, the transformation of the connection between the subjective world and the objective world. In one part of the globe—in the Soviet Union—these transformations are already being carried out. And the Soviet people are at present speeding up this process of transformation. The Chinese people and the peoples of the rest of the world in their turn are at present passing, or will pass in the near future, through the process of these transformations.

The so-called transformed objective world includes also the opponents of transformation, hence their transformation has to pass through a stage of compulsion, only after

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works, Russian edition*, Vol. XIII, p. 110.

which will they be able to pass to the stage of being conscious for themselves. The time when mankind throughout the world arrives at conscious transformation of itself and the world will also be the epoch of Communism throughout the world.

Through practice to discover truth and through practice to confirm and develop truth. To pass actively from sensations, from sense perceptions to rational knowledge, from rational knowledge to active leadership of

revolutionary practice, to the transformation of the subjective and objective world. Practice — knowledge, then again practice and again knowledge—this form is infinite in its cyclic repetition, but the content of each cycle of practice and knowledge becomes raised relatively to a higher level. Such as a whole is the theory of knowledge of dialectical materialism, such is the view of dialectical materialism about the unity of knowledge and deeds.

## Developing Peace Actions

By Fred M. Fine

A STRONG and growing peace sentiment has been long apparent in our country. We have in mind not only the traditional peace-loving attitudes of the great mass of ordinary Americans. We are referring specifically to the *articulate yearning* for peace that is thrusting aside the artificially created fog of war incitement and hysteria, and which increasingly, as it organizes itself, is coming into active clash with the imperialist war drive.

An extremely important forward step in the struggle for peace was the emergence of the American Peace Crusade in recent weeks. The drum beaters for war were quick to sense this. Within twenty-four hours after the press carried announcement of the formation of the A.P.C., the Hearst New York *Mirror* featured an editorial demanding the deportation of Thomas Mann, one of the original sponsors of the Crusade, and soon thereafter all the war-hounds were in full cry determined to tear this new organization apart.

Why did the millionaire philanthropists on college boards, deacon boards, boards of trustees and boards of regents of various schools, churches and agencies demand of

their professors, doctors, ministers and others who had signed the Crusade call, that they withdraw their names or be discharged from their jobs? What stirred the blood of every witch-hunter and professional informer? Why did the Un-American Committee rush into print with a new list of 804 allegedly subversive organizations, listing the A.P.C. before even a single action had been undertaken by the Crusade other than the announcement of some future activities?

The answer is plain. This was a new type of peace center. Its credo was action for peace; its appeal was directed mainly to the rank-and-file American; it barred no one and refused to be sidetracked or weakened by internal witch-hunts. On the contrary, it stated in its official call:

It is time for Americans to lay aside their differences—political, religious, social—for the supreme objective of saving America from the catastrophe of wars with the people of Europe and Asia. . . . Our objective is simple and conforms to our most urgent national interest—Peace.

A.P.C. sought cooperation from trade unions, churches and other people's organizations; but it also di-

rected its organizational efforts to stimulating the formation of independent, rank-and-file peace committees in urban and rural communities.

It announced several dramatic and nationally co-ordinated campaigns, and spotlighted what it thought were the most popular and important peace demands of the American people. At the same time, its printed material and its spokesmen showed a keen realization of the identity of interests between the fight against Jim Crow and white supremacy, and the fight for peace. They spelled out the relation between the attacks on labor's living standards and the drive toward war.

A.P.C. spokesmen told of their conviction that solidarity and fellowship should exist between the peace movements throughout the world, and defended the rights of all to organize and speak for peace.

\* \* \*

This development seemed in particular to unnerve Mr. Acheson and the State Department. Apparently the corporation lawyers in striped trousers not only operate in the field of foreign affairs to sharpen tensions, and generally to pursue an active policy of war incitement and military aggression, but these gentlemen of the State Department also seem to find time to concern themselves with the peace movement at home. Apparently the witch-hunting Un-American Committee, the F.B.I., the

Department of Justice and other agencies of intimidation are not enough. Of late the Secretary of State himself has been sounding off in ill-tempered attacks, and the State Department has been very active in fighting each new effort of peace advocates to improve the effective organization of the grass-roots peace sentiment at home. The record is quite revealing and suggests that the efforts of the Truman-Dulles gang to whip up a jingoist, pro-war fever has run into major difficulties. Washington apparently feels compelled to step up its campaign to confuse, divide, intimidate and silence those millions of Americans who are striving for peace.

The government's reception of the A.P.C. was a repetition of its violent reaction last summer to the Stockholm Peace Pledge campaign in the United States. The highest dignitaries of the Truman Administration felt impelled personally to attack the Stockholm petition campaign, having only one hackneyed and slanderous argument which they repeated with monotonous desperation. The signature campaign against use of the atom bomb, they shrieked, was a treasonable, subversive act, sponsored by a foreign power. Acheson's tirades meshed with the full power of the Big-Business propaganda machine, and petition collectors were beaten, discharged from their jobs and jailed. In spite of this, almost three million Americans signed their names to the petitions against use of

the A-bomb, which, together with 800 million other signatures, stayed the hand of those who would have dropped the atom bomb on Korea.

This was followed by efforts of the Justice Department to compel the Peace Information Center—which disbanded last year—to register as an agent of a foreign principal because it had been identified with the Stockholm Pledge campaign. The crowning act of infamy, inspired by the Justice and State Departments, was the indictment of the eminent world figure and Negro people's leader, W. E. B. DuBois and four others who were associated with him in the work of the Peace Information Center.

The scene in a Washington court, where Dr. DuBois—world-renowned scholar, teacher, poet, novelist, anthropologist, historian, editor, and organizer—was frisked, finger-printed, manacled and treated as a common criminal came as a shock to every decent American. The world, though long accustomed to reports of Wall Street "justice" and lynch law, cried out in protest at this base and hysterical act of a war-maddened imperialism.

Mr. Acheson was outraged—not by the jailing of Dr. DuBois, but by the wide response to the appeal of the Stockholm peace pledge. In an open letter to Congressman A. S. J. Carnahan (Missouri) on February 16, Secretary Acheson commented bitterly and with unmitigated cynicism, "I know it was as shocking to you as it is to me" that three million Amer-

ican citizens "would sign their names to a petition which by its very nature had as its objective the weakening, if not the destruction, of the bonds which unite the free world."

Apparently, public statements by themselves were not having the desired effect. And so with the skill and grace learned in such diplomatic training schools as Tammany Hall, the Prendergast machine and other similar institutions we find some activities going on "behind the barn," to borrow a phrase from Fulton Lewis, Jr. These activities deserve closer scrutiny, particularly because they directly tie in with the American Peace Crusade.

\* \* \*

On February 2, sixty-five nationally prominent public figures from church, labor and the academic world issued a call for an American People's Crusade for peace. In their call they urged support for three actions: a pilgrimage to Washington, a polling of the United States on a number of peace proposals—the result of this poll to be forwarded to Washington—and, finally, as a consequence of these two activities, the convening of a people's peace congress in the late spring.

To the best of our knowledge, when a press release containing the call was issued by these sixty-five public-spirited citizens they had little organization or organized following, and no real resources in terms of staff or funds. Despite this rather

modest beginning of the A.P.C., within two weeks the State Department held an "off-the-record" caucus with some fifty leaders of what were described as "labor, veterans and other patriotic" organizations, at which Assistant Secretary of State, Francis Russell, briefed the assembled.

Fulton Lewis, Jr., notorious pro-fascist N.A.M. propagandist, in a broadcast over the M.B.S. Network said on February 14:

Secretary Russell is the regular liaison officer between the State Department and various organizations and holds periodic conferences with them to discuss security problems. But this meeting today was a special one to consider the peace march and in it he asks the organizations to alert their members to the real nature of the movement in advance. . . . It was, of course, a closed meeting. . . . The Department will ask the veterans organizations, the labor organizations, patriotic organizations of all kinds to do the job behind the barn, so to speak. . . .

In spite of this type of campaign by the war-gang, the response as seen and reported at the Pilgrimage in Washington last March 15 was tremendous. Considering that there was no previous organization, this was a remarkable action—the largest single peace action seen in the nation's capital since the advent of the cold war.

The March 29 issue of *The Witness*, published by the Episcopal Church Publishing Company, wrote of the Pilgrimage as follows:

This was really a notable occasion, profoundly significant of how and what the rank and file of the American people were thinking and feeling. Twenty-five hundred people, delegates from thirty-six different states, gathered in the nation's Capital, on the Ides of March, to insist emphatically that world peace is more important to the peoples of the world than all other things combined. If we are not permitted to live in peace, differences in ideologies, conflicting theories of economic and social life will no longer even be worth arguing about. . . . Representatives of these thousands visited Senators, Congressmen and each of the principal departments of the government, where they were, for the most part, received coldly and publicly branded as merely the tools of Russian Communism. Nothing new in all this, of course. Any voice raised loudly for peace today is declared at once to be "subversive." Any militant criticism of the Satanic policy of piling up armaments and dragooning other peoples to arm to the teeth is damned as the utterance of a traitor to his country. No, there is nothing new and nothing surprising in any of this.

*The Witness* is, of course, entirely correct. The 2,500 pilgrims could hardly be disposed of by tagging them as Russian sympathizers. It was to be expected that Left-wingers would be present—as they must and will always be present in any such assemblage of workers and farmers, Negro and white, brought together to wage a militant campaign for world peace. But it could not escape anyone's notice that many conservative-minded defenders of peace were

also there and that the central slogans projected by the Pilgrimage have millions of supporters in this country.

Not only the first returns of almost a million ballots that are being circulated in the country in co-operation with the American Peace Crusade, but other tests of public opinion like the Gallup Poll, are proving that decisive majorities are for "getting out of Korea" and for making peace with China.

In this lies the potential strength of a great rank-and-file peace movement. This grass-roots peace movement gives promise that, as it grows and learns to rely on the power of the people, "eminent" personalities will, in larger numbers, cast their lot with it.

The growing network of rank-and-file peace committees holds forth great promise as the organizational expression of the growing peace sentiment. Such pioneering peace groups as the National Labor Conference for Peace, American Women for Peace and the United Negro People's Committee for Peace and Freedom were present in Washington as vigorous allies of the Crusade, and in fact made the most notable contribution to the size of the delegations and the character of the action. Groups like these, particularly the American Women for Peace, and also many local unaffiliated groups have reputedly been making impressive headway in organizing rank-and-file peace committees in the larger cities. Prob-

ably half of the Pilgrimage were women and represented the most vigorous peace groupings in the country.

More and more honest people are getting fed up with retreating and ducking and apologizing for their desire for world peace. They are ready to face the "consequences" of a courageous struggle for peace. They are beginning to see that if enough people do this, the *main consequence* will be the defeat of the warmongers. More and more their mood is: let the witch hunters and terrorists be damned, we must save the peace!

\* \* \*

One aspect of the Pilgrimage that proved of particular interest was its concern with the problems of labor as they are affected by the war drive. The Call to the Pilgrimage stated, "Here at home, we must call a halt to the 'emergency' mobilization which is provoking widespread dislocation, has frozen wages and is threatening living standards." The State Department, which found itself compelled on the day of the Pilgrimage to issue a 1,500 word, point by point "polemic" against the call of the Peace Crusade, could find nothing to say about this section of the Pilgrimage program.

Over 500 representatives of organized labor, coming directly from shops and local unions, as well as from rank-and-file labor peace committees responded to the call for the Pilgrimage. Labor spokesmen **were**

prominent on all delegations to government officials, including a 50-man delegation to the Office of Defense Mobilization, and figured quite prominently in all Pilgrimage activities. However, the relative weakness of the organized peace movement in the ranks of labor was still in evidence. The bulk of those in attendance came from independent unions under Left leadership. Although there were some signs of new stirrings in the labor movement, expressed in part by the message brought to the Pilgrimage by Rev. Hill from an executive officer of Ford Local No. 600 of the United Automobile Workers, and in the speech delivered by a local union president of the C.I.O. Packinghouse Workers Union, the Pilgrimage only began to reflect these new developments.

In the weeks leading up to the Pilgrimage there were many indications of a growing feeling on the part of new sections of organized labor that the war drive did not deserve working class support. This was expressed in growing refusal by labor unions to make the sacrifices demanded by the war-fattened monopolies, and instead demanding wage increases. Separate from the Pilgrimage, and having no connection with it, were delegations of packinghouse workers who came to Washington to press their wage demands on Eric Johnston, Director of Stabilization.

The recent strikes of the railroad

and textile workers, and the militant moods of the packinghouse workers suggest growing labor resistance to the economic burdens of the war drive which are getting more onerous daily. These actions take place also because workers more and more question the justness of Truman's military intervention in Korea and the moves to spread the war. There can be little spirit for more and more sacrifice to the war profiteers when there is distrust as to the objectives and character of the war drive.

True, this is not always evident in the form of resolutions for advanced peace demands by new large sections of the labor movement. But that the workers are looking with a jaundiced eye and mounting indignation at the consequences of the war drive is a fact that is not lost either on Washington or on the misleaders of labor who are compelled to gyrate and maneuver in new ways to keep the anti-war sentiment from welling up.

This accounts for the State Department meetings with leaders of the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. to enlist their support against the Peace Crusade. It further results in the maneuvers with respect to membership in the Wage Stabilization Board and other mobilization agencies on the part of these gentlemen.

Walter Reuther, one of the more astute labor fakery, feels compelled to go further with his demagoguery than his colleagues.

In  
conve  
Auto  
sectio  
Peace  
Left-  
and  
speak  
Of co  
this p  
ple o  
Un  
for E  
again  
to se  
gram  
dema  
signi  
thes  
cont  
the  
cand  
tions  
who  
the v  
forth  
drive  
It  
as c  
is b  
of t  
of t  
of t  
are  
aban  
the  
push  
men  
O  
up  
file

In his draft report to the U.A.W. convention, as printed in the *United Automobile Worker*, he heads one section of his report "The Fight for Peace." It was not so long ago when Left-wing workers were ridiculed and persecuted by Reutherites for speaking of "the fight for peace." Of course, with Reuther the use of this phrase is simply another example of his unprincipled knavery.

Under the heading of the "Fight for Peace" his report incites to war against the Soviet Union and tries to sell Wall Street's military program of aggression and war with a demagogic "peace" label. What is of significance is that Reuther finds these maneuvers necessary as he contemplates the gains scored and the huge votes rolled up by those candidates in the local union elections in the River Rouge Ford plant who linked their vigorous fight for the workers economic demands with forthright opposition to the war drive.

It is becoming more obvious that as constant and increasing pressure is brought to bear on the officials of the Right-wing unions in behalf of the economic and peace demands of the workers, these labor leaders are presented with the choice of abandoning their slavish support to the Wall Street drive or being pushed aside by their rank-and-file membership.

Opportunities are swiftly shaping up for organizing large rank-and-file sections of the working class

into the peace movement and for considerable sections of organized labor to play a leading role in the emerging peace movement.

\* \* \*

Another outstandingly significant aspect of the Pilgrimage was the degree of Negro-white unity and the developing understanding of the more advanced sections of the peace movement of the relationship between the Negro liberation movement and the fight for peace.

The large participation of Negro people in the Pilgrimage as a whole, and the prominent part they played in the leadership of the Washington activities, showed once again that no section of the population is more strongly opposed to the imperialist war than the Negro people.

This is true, first, because the continuing general upsurge of the Negro liberation movement is objectively directed against the imperialist war makers and for peace. Secondly, millions of the Negro people, in the most direct way, are aroused by the danger of atomic war, and find also that the system of Jim Crow and lynch-law gets more vicious as the war drive and direct military intervention becomes intensified. The Negro people are carrying the heaviest burdens and suffer the worst blows as the war danger grows. Ever greater sections of the Negro people are beginning to identify their struggle

for freedom with the struggles for colonial liberation.

Millions are drawing the lessons of the Lt. Gilbert case, of the mass victimization of the Negro troops in Korea, the murder of the Martinsville Seven and of the police murder of Negro veterans like John Derrick.

Negro workers and professionals, men, women and youth are among the most important leaders and central figures of many of the peace organizations.

Unfortunately, all too many white leaders of peace organizations, influenced still by the white ruling-class chauvinism of the warmakers, fail to grasp the magnitude and significance of this entire development. They thus deprive the peace movement of one of its greatest strengths. The ability of the American people to enforce their will for peace upon the monopoly war-plotters depends in great measure on the degree of Negro-white unity not only around the general demands for peace, for peaceful co-existence but also for the right of all peoples to determine their own destinies. It also requires that the white adherents of peace understand that the fight on their part for the freedom of Lieutenant Gilbert, against the mass frame-ups of Negro soldiers in army courts-martial, against the lynch-mentality of the big brass who earmark tens of thousands of Negro troops for slaughter as cannon fodder in Korea, etc., is an integral and decisive

part of the struggle for peace.

The illegal suppression of the rights of Paul Robeson to travel abroad and the indicement of W. E. B. DuBois, two of the greatest leaders of the peace movement of world stature, suggests some of the fear that grips the atom-bomb brandishers as they feel the rising tide of struggle for Negro liberation and for peace and as they view the growing solidarity in this struggle of Negro and white. The fight for the right of Paul Robeson to his passport and for the quashing of the indictment against DuBois and his associates is part of the fight for peace.

This understanding was reflected only in part by the Pilgrimage. For, while the Pilgrimage as a whole, in its dominant expressions (at the public rally, in its Call and in its documents and delegations), was characterized by the bonds of Negro-white unity, and while specific action was taken on many of the above issues, still in a number of instances there were weaknesses that disturbed many in attendance. One example widely commented on was the fact that during the plenary session of the Pilgrimage none of the Negro leaders of the Pilgrimage were among the main speakers, and that the speeches delivered failed to treat with many of the issues of special discrimination and persecution of the Negro people as products of the war drive. Another example was the formal and belated reaction by

the Pilgrimage itself to the shameful arrest by Capitol police of the Negro clergyman, Bishop H. M. Hooper of the R. H. Nazarene Church, Chicago.

There is every reason to believe that as the American Peace Crusade develops its program and movement that one of its greatest sources of strength will be the growing unity of Negro and white fighters for peace.

\* \* \*

One of the significant actions of the Peace Pilgrimage was its determination to mount its main campaigns via a balloting of millions and through other activities around two main issues: 1) bring our boys home from Korea and make peace with China now; and 2) for continuous negotiations between the main powers until a lasting agreement is reached on all major areas of tension. This is becoming increasingly typical of the program of many other peace organizations and gives promise of a growing fusion of effort in these two main directions.

Out of the thousands of scattered actions and slogans for peace there is emerging greater clarity of purpose. This, too, bespeaks the growing maturity of the peace forces in the U.S.A.

The Friends Committee on National Legislation (Quakers) in their Washington *Newsletter* of March

19, 1951, writing critically of President Truman, stated: "The President did not promise that the United States would take now any new or major initiative for disarmament in the Foreign Ministers Conference or otherwise, as many have been urging the President and the Department of State to do."

The Committee for Peaceful Alternatives declared in a Statement of Policy issued in December:

We are convinced that one of the solutions to world peace is in negotiations between the heads of the governments of the United States and the Soviet Union, aimed at honorable and genuine settlement of the major outstanding disputes. *Every offer of a peaceful settlement should be fully explored.* The continued failure to undertake such negotiations means that with every day that passes, the world moves closer to the "last war" (C.P.A. emphasis).

The Commission on World Peace of the Methodist Church has been circulating thousands of folders with the proposals of their Executive Secretary, Reverend Charles F. Boss. These proposals, sent to officials of the United Nations and of the United States read in part:

We propose that an early date be set for a conference of top level ministers of foreign affairs and other representatives of the large powers to consider negotiation for the ending of the issues involved in the "cold war," and for strengthening bases and procedures of a continuing peace, including:

(1) Agreement upon a modus vivendi for the peaceful co-existence in the same world of the different ideologies and forms of government. . . .

It proposed further:

To reduce the current war fever, a three to five year non-war pact as proposed by the Soviet Union, provided that non-aggression pacts are agreed to by all, etc. . . .

This same refrain rang out at the Peace Pilgrimage of the American Peace Crusade, which announced that it is placing in the forefront of its activities, leading toward a national peace congress in late Spring, a campaign for negotiations by the big powers of a long-term settlement of outstanding differences.

There is every reason to believe that millions of Americans will join hundreds of millions throughout the world in supporting the proposal for

a five power peace pact as proposed in the stirring Appeal of the World Peace Council, which reads:

To fulfill the hopes cherished by millions of people throughout the world, irrespective of their views as to the reasons giving rise to the danger of world war:

To strengthen peace and safeguard international security:

We demand the conclusion of a Pact of Peace among the five great Powers—United States of America, Soviet Union, Chinese People's Republic, Great Britain and France.

We shall regard refusal by the Government of any great Power to meet for the purpose of concluding a Pact of Peace as evidence of aggressive designs on the part of the given Government.

We call upon all peace-loving nations to support this demand for the conclusion of a Pact of Peace, which should be open to all countries.

By A

THE

sition

outlin

Com

Resol

temp

litica

mont

lines

the C

Se

Reso

In

alter

dom

polit

of a

coali

vent

whic

takin

by

ther

brea

alth

gro

part

T

luti

•

Nati

•

Be

15th

28-3

# Notes on the Electoral Outlook for '52\*

By Albert E. Blumberg

THE MAIN FEATURES of our Party position on perspectives for '52 were outlined in the Convention Report of Comrade Hall and the Convention Resolution.\*\* This article is an attempt to evaluate some of the political developments of the past two months, and to discuss some of the lines of action which can help realize the Convention objectives.

Section V of the Convention Resolution states:

In the last analysis, any decisive alteration of the nation's foreign and domestic policy must come through a political realignment and the formation of a people's peace and anti-fascist coalition. . . . The 14th National Convention estimate of the tempo with which such a political realignment was taking place has not been borne out by events. . . . In fact, at this date there are no visible signs of a mass breakaway from the two old parties, although there are ample signs of a growing disgust with both major parties.

This situation, continues the Resolution, arises primarily from the

demagogy of the Truman Administration and the role of the Right-wing labor and reformist Negro leaders in preventing the masses from seeing through this demagogy. It is this which brought about a reactionary victory in the 1950 elections. But this situation is only temporary.

The growing struggles against the increased war drive and militarization program and the onslaught on the living standards of the workers, farmers and lower middle-classes will unmask the liberal and welfare demagogy of the Truman Administration.

The Resolution warns against both the Right-opportunist tendency of giving up the fight for a basic political realignment and a third party, and the sectarian idea that the Progressive Party already provides an adequate base for a mass third party. It sets a tactical course of exposing the two old parties, building the Progressive Party where it has amassed strength, of developing movements on concrete issues and seeking out the independent political forms which will encourage mass breakaways from the old parties, and finally of working closely with the masses who still follow the old par-

\* Based on a report made to a meeting of the National Committee, C.P.U.S.A., March 5, 1951.

\*\* For the Convention Report, see *Peace Can Be Won!*, by Gus Hall; for the Resolution of the 15th National Convention, C.P.U.S.A., December 28-30, 1950, see *Political Affairs*, January 1951.

ties, particularly in the labor movement and among the Negro people, and influencing the unions' P.A.C. and L.E.P.L. "to put forward progressive candidates from the ranks of the workers and the Negro people, including instances where the workers are prepared only to express themselves within the major party primaries."

An excellent opportunity is provided in legislative struggles, 1951 municipal elections and the 1952 primaries and finals, to "advance the cause of independent political action, to broaden the movement for a third party and lay the basis for realizing the objective of a united front peace ticket in the 1952 elections."

The Party perspective, continues the Resolution, must be geared to the possibility of a more rapid political realignment in the period ahead. The struggle over the peace issue will affect everything. Struggles on wages and living conditions, on Negro rights, against the Smith, McCarran and Taft-Hartley Acts will, if properly linked up, fuse with the struggle to prevent World War III.

Finally the Resolution stresses, as the big lesson that must be learned by our Party, that "the working-class, and particularly the organized labor movement, is the decisive force that will decide the issue of whether a political regrouping takes place and how swiftly it becomes a major force in the country."

#### SOME RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

Developments during the past two months not only confirm this outlook but offer new possibilities for more rapidly implementing the Convention policies. This period has been one of increasing opposition to American imperialism's program of general war and fascism. A rising tide of struggle for peace, against the effects of the war economy, for Negro rights, etc., has begun to influence the attitude of the labor, farm and Negro masses toward the two parties, and to have serious repercussions within the two parties.

The Convention already emphasized the new situation arising out of the mass upsurge in peace sentiment which followed MacArthur's defeats in Korea last November. Now this sentiment has begun to be reflected, although unevenly, in organization, and this in such diverse forms as the enthusiastic response to the American Peace Crusade and the March 15 Pilgrimage to Washington, the continued growth of Women-for-Peace committees and youth peace groups, the launching of the Harlem Council for Peace and Democracy, the response to Paul Robeson's recent visits to Philadelphia and Chicago, the veritable mushrooming of neighborhood and state Peace Round Tables, Peace Assemblies, Committees for Peaceful Alternatives and the like—as well as in a number of trade-union peace

polls, t  
the inc  
Dr. D  
A fa  
new s  
strugg  
the pr  
Trum  
road s  
for th  
and p  
and o  
action  
pro-w  
to wi  
the g  
cies.  
being  
bosses  
break  
runaw  
draw  
Fir  
ment  
The  
Sever  
victim  
new  
and  
the  
broa  
men  
elect  
and  
victim  
Was  
Nat  
in t  
M  
oth  
Yor

polls, the Ford plant union elections, the indignation at the indictment of Dr. Dubois for peace advocacy, etc.

A factor of prime importance is the new stage now reached in labor's struggle against the wage freeze and the price-tax squeeze. Uncowed by Truman's action in breaking the railroad strike, the workers are striking for their wage demands in textile, and preparing to do so in packing and other industries. These militant actions and moods have forced the pro-war Right-wing labor leadership to withdraw from the moment from the government war economy agencies. The entire labor movement is being given a chance to see what a bosses' war-drive means in record-breaking profits, frozen wages and runaway prices, and to begin to draw some political conclusions.

Finally, the Negro liberation movement is reaching new high levels. The struggle for the Martinsville Seven, though it failed to save these victims of the lynch system, involved new sections of the Negro people and their white allies. This has laid the basis not only for an even broader and more effective movement to save Willie McGee from electrocution March 20, and national and local movements to save other victims—but also for a challenge in Washington and before the United Nations of the entire lynch-system in the United States.

Mention should also be made of other major actions such as New York's rent lobby to Albany, etc.

Clearly we are in a period of increasing mass struggle, and the outlook is for a speedy broadening and sharpening of these struggles in which more and more the economic and civil rights issues are seen in relation to the central question of peace.

As to the repercussions within the two parties, two points are to be noted: first, the situation in the Democratic Party arising from the sharp drop in Truman's popularity; and second, the "great debate" and the split in the Republican Party.

Until recently, it was taken for granted that Truman would seek and obtain the renomination. Today, it is scarcely necessary to document his loss of strength. Back in January, the Gallup Poll showed that only 36 percent of the voters felt Truman was doing a good job;\* 43 percent of all Democrats had already concluded that their party would lose in '52. In trial Presidential heats in January, not only did Eisenhower defeat Truman, but so did Taft, 44 percent to 41 percent. As late as the last week of February only 35 percent of all voters said they would like to see the Democrats win, 41 percent favored the Republicans, 2 percent other parties, and, significantly, 22 percent were undecided.

In addition, the sudden rush of

\* Since this was written, a new Gallup Poll, published March 14, showed that Truman's popularity had reached an all-time low, with only 26 per cent of the voters expressing approval.

Democratic State Legislatures to enact the Presidential two-term amendment during the past few days has generally been interpreted as a move to discourage Truman's renomination, although he is not in fact covered by the amendment. The withdrawal of the labor leaders from the war agencies has been widely heralded as a break with Truman. Finally, an A.D.A.-Social Democratic-inspired Presidential boomlet was launched March 1 by columnists Thomas Stokes and Doris Fleeson for the "liberal" senator from Illinois, Paul Douglas (whose administrative assistant Frank McCulloh spoke publicly that very day in support of the concentration camp provisions of the McCarran Act.)

Thus, with the growing conviction that Truman cannot repeat his demagogic performance of 1948, the pro-war leadership of the Democratic Party is at the moment testing out two main alternatives. On the one hand, the Truman and machine forces, while talking Vinson, are beginning to plump for Eisenhower for the Democratic nomination (thus, in effect, joining the Dixiecrats, who have long yearned for an electoral alliance with an Eisenhower on the Republican ticket). On the other hand, the A.D.A.-Social Democrats are sending up trial balloons for a "new Truman" in the person of a Senator Douglas, prepared to put him forward as a "lesser evil" to a Taft or Eisenhower.

There is a new and increasingly

fluid situation in the Democratic Party, reflecting the basic fact that the labor, farm and Negro masses who followed Truman in 1948, are now in considerable numbers leaving Truman. It does not follow, of course, that these masses are at the same time leaving the Democratic Party, though a number are, some to the Republicans, a handful to the Progressive Party, many to a state of indecision. By and large, local Democratic Party strength as yet is not heavily affected and the labor and Negro masses in the great industrial centers still tend to look to the local Democratic Parties for liberal policies and candidates.

Nonetheless, in this fluid situation, real possibilities exist for the emergence of pro-peace elements in the Democratic Party, especially on a local and state level. To the extent that the peace movement grows and there takes shape a growing independent political action movement of the labor, farm and Negro masses, such pro-peace elements will tend to come forth, organize, begin to challenge in some measure the war policies of the Administration, and perhaps do battle even in the Presidential primaries in the spring of '52 and in the summer nominating convention.

Next, as to the "great debate" between the Truman-Dewey-Eisenhower and the Taft-Hoover forces, and the situation within the Republican Party. It is obvious that the so-called "debate" is not on the issue

of peace and war, but centers around tactical alternatives within the pro-war monopoly camp. But as Comrade Foster wrote to the Convention, "these inner-capitalist quarrels, even if they are only over secondary questions, nevertheless are very important, and we must pay close attention to them." Further, it is clear that the debate does reflect the powerful mass peace sentiment; in particular, the Taft-Hoover demagogic attempt to exploit that sentiment is dictated not only by the desire to win new support, but, more important, by the imperative need of holding the Republican rural and small town areas where such peace sentiment is especially strong.

The "great debate" went into its second round with the hearings, just concluded, on the Wherry resolution on troops to Europe. Here the following should be noted:

a) The attempt a month ago to impose cloture on the debate, by staging a triumphant return of Eisenhower after his European trip, failed not only in Washington but also throughout the nation, where the masses found his reports no answer to the problem of peace and war.

b) The attempt to narrow the issue has succeeded only to some degree. While troop deployment and constitutional issues of Presidential power are the substance of much of the discussions, more and more, as in Hoover's last appearance, the debate reveals the war-intention

of both groups, and their fear of the anti-war demands of the peoples of Europe and America.

c) The lines within the Republican high command have become more firmly drawn, with Warren and Duff joining the Dewey-Eisenhower-Stassen bi-partisan allies of Truman and some 118 Republican Congressmen announcing for the Taft-Hoover grouping.

d) Outstanding is Truman's reliance upon Dewey (and Eisenhower) to carry the fight for the bi-partisan Administration line.

e) Lastly, the debate more and more is being referred to as defining the issue for '52.

Thus, there is now shaping up a bitter intra-party battle leading up to the Republican convention, while at the same time in the Democratic Party moves are being made to prepare a new edition of Truman or to give Eisenhower the Democratic nomination, whether or not he is also nominated by the Republicans.

It is therefore clear that the masses will be confronted with refurbished "lesser evils," inner-capitalist fights or bi-partisan "Ja" elections on the national level unless there is promptly projected in a mass way a genuine peace policy and a peace electoral alternative. At the same time, to the extent that such a projection takes place there can arise a parallel development of important genuine pro-peace movements in the two major parties—in the farm and small town areas of Republican strength, as

well as in the great industrial areas of Democratic Party strength.

### MAIN LINES OF ACTION

In the light of these recent developments, a few comments are in order on several of the main lines of action indicated in the Convention Resolution:

1) The exposure of the two old parties in the course of the growing mass struggle on concrete issues;

2) The projection of labor, Negro, farm and independent peace candidates in the 1951 municipal and state elections, by-elections, and the '52 Congressional races;

3) The organization of specific measures to advance the third-party movement and an independent national peace ticket in 1952.

First, while there are growing mass struggles, it cannot be said that these struggles are sufficiently directed toward a *political* fight on the key issues. As Comrade Gus Hall emphasized in his Convention Report, mass struggles do not automatically produce a political realignment. Such struggles must be politically oriented and must definitely lead to independent political forms. This today is a key link in the immediate situation.

Take for example the peace movement. As we have seen, the press of the nation has centered attention on the "great debate" and its implications for '52. Clearly the fledgling peace movement faces as a key task

the question of projecting a real peace policy into the state and national political arena, and requiring all political forces to define their position with respect to such a policy now and for '52. This is not an easy matter, especially at this early stage in the organizational life of such movements. Nonetheless, opportunities do exist, and are not by any means fully utilized.

For instance, the hearings on the Wherry resolution, after some pressure initiated by the Progressive Party, were opened to the public. The Progressive Party itself presented testimony rejecting both the Truman - Dewey - Eisenhower and Taft-Hoover war policies, and proposing a 5-power peace conference. The Women-for-Peace and the Maryland Peace Committee appeared also, and some organizations submitted statements. But no trade unions testified, nor any farm or Negro organizations so far as I know.

To take another example, the tremendous mass sentiment for bringing the troops back from Korea and negotiating a settlement with China, for stopping the rearmament of Germany, etc., have not been adequately focussed upon the Congress. As yet no Congressmen have been persuaded to introduce resolutions and put up a fight on these questions. In the State Legislatures, (apart from the North Dakota Senate resolution on bringing the troops back from Korea), New York State

has pro  
progress  
foreign  
the Mo  
morial  
against

Nov  
ernme  
unpar  
late th  
gles t  
expect  
comm  
ions,  
selves  
will o  
prog  
ampl  
fight  
camp  
dem  
gress  
State  
figh

Si  
the  
the  
Mc  
rect  
and  
C  
por  
str  
act  
lat  
inc  
m  
fa  
gu  
m  
st

has provided the only example of progressive initiative on a matter of foreign policy—the introduction of the Morrit-Banningan resolution memorializing Congress to protest against clemency to Nazis.

Now, with the crisis in the government's wage freeze policies, an unparalleled opportunity arises to relate the basic strike and shop struggles to the political scene. It can be expected that P.A.C. and L.E.P.L. committees, in packing and other unions, will not simply confine themselves to election-time activities, but will conduct energetic political action programs between elections, for example in support of the workers' fight against the bi-partisan war-camp and the wage freeze. Certainly, demands can be made upon Congress, as well as City Councils and State Legislatures, for support in this fight.

Similar considerations apply to the struggle for Negro rights, where the fight for the freedom of Willie McGee is clearly and correctly directed primarily toward Truman and the bi-partisan ruling camp.

Only with such emphasis on the political and legislative aspects of struggle, and the development and activization of P.A.C., L.E.P.L., legislative committees in Left-led unions, independent political action instrumentalities of the Negro people, farmers, youth, etc., can there be guarantees that the rising tide of mass struggle will contribute to a speedier political realignment.

Second, as to the question of progressive labor, Negro, and farm candidates in the current municipal campaigns, as well as the preparations on a *concentration* basis for such candidacies in the 1952 Congressional races.

Thus far the municipal elections this year, as in Chicago, have found progressives unable to cope successfully with the difficult problem of developing city-wide coalitions on good government and welfare issues in relation to the question of peace. However, the numerous fall municipal elections, from San Francisco to New York, do provide additional opportunities to meet these problems, if work is begun at once.

The aspect of the electoral scene which today shows most activity is the question of Negro candidates, reflecting the ever-heightening political consciousness of the Negro people and the rising demand for representation in all types of elective office. While this movement will remain limited without a corresponding development of labor's independent political action nevertheless it is showing ever increasing vitality.

In this connection, movements are arising to establish city-wide (and possibly even state-wide) Committees for Representation, which would unite the overwhelming bulk of the Negro community in an all-inclusive, non-partisan organization. Such committees, initiated under the broadest of auspices—political, church, fraternal, trade union, etc.—would seek to

enlist a mass membership at a nominal fee, and establish a network of district, ward and precinct committees. As a political arm of the Negro people, with the support of its white allies, such committees would adopt a concrete program embracing such key points as: 1) enrollment and registration; 2) the fight for more favorable Congressional reapportionment in relation to the possibilities of the election of Negroes to Congress (it should be noted that in accordance with the 1950 census, such states as New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, California, Washington, etc., must be redistricted due to the gain or loss of seats in Congress); 3) actual election campaigns to City Councils, city-wide offices and Congress, in which all electoral channels—major party primaries as well as independent candidacies—would be utilized.

There has been less activity around labor candidates, due to the generally passive role of the Right-wing leadership in its alliance with the Democrats in the major centers. But the adverse results of the 1950 elections have aroused a growing rank-and-file demand for better candidates, especially candidates from the ranks of labor itself. The present strike and other labor struggles are daily underscoring the need for political action programs and progressive candidates to support these struggles. Therefore, more effective campaigns, along the lines indicated above for Negro candidates, can now be waged for labor

candidates for city, state and national offices.

Finally, there are real possibilities for the election of farm candidates to the 1952 Congress, not only in the middle-west but in other states as well.

While major stress for the present is laid upon the municipal elections, and such by-elections as may arise through the vacating of Congressional seats, it is necessary to begin now to develop movements leading up to similar campaigns in '52 in a series of key concentration Congressional districts.

#### OUTLOOK FOR A PEACE TICKET IN '52

Possibilities are increasingly favorable for developing political struggles on the issues and flexibly applying an electoral policy of fighting for progressive labor, Negro, farm, etc., candidates. But these possibilities will be seriously limited unless there is a correct orientation with regard to the '52 Presidential campaign.

This is a key question. It is clear that genuine peace advocates will not be able to support either the Truman-Dewey-Eisenhower or the Taft-Hoover camp. It follows that an independent peace electoral alternative in '52 is urgently necessary, and must be worked for beginning now.

In theory, such an independent alternative may take any one of three

forms:  
based  
farmer  
identia  
the ex  
gressiv  
pende  
advoc  
who  
peace  
partie  
Fir  
third  
The  
all in  
creas  
this  
Bu  
is a  
third  
the  
ing  
the  
the  
freed  
dev  
two  
a  
in  
to  
wh  
wi  
L.  
ste  
di  
th  
le  
T  
n  
a  
r

forms: 1) a new mass third party based on labor, the Negro people, farmers, middle class, etc.; 2) a Presidential candidacy put forward by the existing third party, the Progressive Party; 3) a broad, independent peace ticket, uniting all peace advocates, including eventually those who may as yet hope to secure a peace ticket from one of the major parties.

First, it is clear that a new mass third party is not in prospect for '52. The tempo of realignment, above all in the labor movement, while increasing, is not such as to warrant this outlook.

But what is very much in prospect is a great new forward surge of the third-party movements, even without the perspective of such a party coming into existence in time to enter the '52 elections. Specifically, with the present struggle around the wage freeze as a point of departure, broad developments can be expected along two related lines:

a) the launching of a movement, in the Right-led unions especially, to demand a re-examination of labor's whole political policy. Such a move will tend to arise in P.A.C. and L.E.P.L. bodies of packing, auto, steel or textile locals, and spread into district and city bodies. The line of this re-examination would be to challenge the blind alley of reliance on Truman (or a new edition of Truman), to warn against Eisenhower as well as Taft, and to demand a new and independent political policy;

b) the initiation, in local and district unions, of resolutions and discussions on the need for a labor or farmer-labor party. Instrumentalities for disseminating information on this question can take various forms—local union committees, area farmer-labor committees and the like.

The development of new movements or instrumentalities of this type, as well as the Committees for Negro Representation, would be of decisive importance in laying the basis for an eventual mass third party, as well as in helping to create a more favorable atmosphere for a united peace ticket in '52.

Second, as to a Progressive Party ticket: It should be clear that the Progressive Party, while it has a very important role to play, is not now an adequate base for a third party. Moreover, its future role and growth will be determined not only by how effectively it advances its independent position on the key issue of peace, but primarily by its ability to operate a coalition policy locally and nationally, and to cooperate with all peace advocates, regardless of party, in working out a broad peace electoral alternative for 1952.

Unfortunately, this point is by no means fully understood. A number of third-party forces seem to subscribe to a policy of go-it-alone, and consider the problem of a '52 electoral alternative as having already been solved in the form of a Progressive Party ticket. Such a view at this time can be a serious obstacle

to the effort to realize a broader electoral alternative.

It is urgently necessary that this issue be fully discussed and clarified. Obviously, unity of the existing third party forces is an essential element for the '52 picture, and while this unity can not be based on a liquidationist attitude toward the Progressive Party (of which there are some signs), neither can a sectarian anti-coalition position provide the proper basis.

Third and last is the electoral form favored by an increasing number of independent progressive political forces and indicated at our Convention—a united, independent peace Presidential ticket.

What is meant is a peace ticket, not a party—an independent Presidential ticket which allows its supporters full freedom of action on the state and congressional level.

Such a peace ticket, obviously, can come about only as the result of a growing mass movement for peace and a peace electoral alternative in '52. It could arise only in response to an urgent demand over the next months on the part of independent peace forces extending far beyond the present Third Party or Progressive Party. Nor will its fate be determined by technical problems of getting on the ballot. Such a ticket could utilize the fruits of the successful fight waged to place the Progressive Party on the ballot in such states as California.

A broad discussion of such a ticket

is now beginning. As the peace movement grows, such a discussion will tend to spread and to enter the stage of more specific moves to initiate concrete exploration of the project. But election law time-tables in a number of states require that by the end of 1951 a definite national crystallization take place.

Meanwhile, the broad independent labor and Negro people's political action currents could be expected to supply an ever greater number of adherents to such a movement.

A final phase could well be the merging of this independent peace ticket movement with the pro-peace elements in the Democratic and Republican parties, many of whom will have continued their fight for a peace ticket within their parties through the '52 spring Presidential primaries and summer nominating conventions.

There can of course be no guarantees in advance that such an electoral perspective will be realized. But the need is clear, and if the broad mass of peace advocates understand this need in time they will take the necessary steps.

\* \* \*

Our Party, working under constant attack and harassment, faces an enormous responsibility in this complex electoral field. Comrade Gus Hall, in his Convention Summary, sounded a strong note of alarm. He pointed out that the Convention had

heard very little discussion on political action, and warned sharply against continuing the policy of waiting until a few weeks before election day before considering these problems. Recent experiences in city elections and state legislative struggles give added emphasis to his words.

In the light of the new situation—the new level of the peace movement, of the struggle of labor against the

effects of the war-economy, of the struggle for Negro liberation—our Party must overcome the lag of the past year. It must move quickly and fully into the political picture.

If this is done, if our Party plunges into a many-sided campaign of clarification, struggle and organization, we can make a major contribution toward realizing the growing possibilities of political realignment.

# Washington's "Constitution" For Puerto Rico

By Theodore R. Bassett

THE STRUGGLE for the freedom and national independence of Puerto Rico at present pivots around the fight for the rejection of the proposal for a U.S. sponsored colonial "constitution" for Puerto Rico. The proposed constitution, as prescribed in the enabling act signed by President Truman on July 3, 1950, would sanctify the colonial status of Puerto Rico by the seeming consent of the Puerto Rican people.

Wall Street and Washington are exerting the greatest political and economic pressure to force such a constitution upon the Puerto Rican people. To this end they are fostering a brazen campaign of intimidation characterized by provocations, police terror, frame-ups and persecutions. Acting as the abject agents of Wall Street in carrying through this campaign are Munoz Marin, Governor of Puerto Rico, and his colleagues.

This campaign is aimed specifically at throttling the expression of the Puerto Rican people's deep aspirations for national independence, freedom and peace, and preventing the rejection of the colonial constitution in the national referendum set for June 4.

This effort of U.S. imperialism to impose a colonial constitution upon Puerto Rico is an inseparable part of its plans for strengthening its domination of Latin America in its drive toward world domination and for unleashing a new world war. The outcome of this struggle will have an important bearing not only upon the struggle of the Puerto Rican people for their liberation from Yankee imperialist oppression, but also upon the American people's struggle for peace and against growing fascization, and upon the whole hemispheric struggle for peace.

## PROVISIONS OF THE ENABLING ACT

The enabling act, the full title of which is "An Act to Provide for the Organization of a Constitutional Government by the People of Puerto Rico," was passed unanimously by the U.S. Senate on June 8, and by the House on June 30, 1950, with the lone opposition of the American Labor Party Congressman, Vito Marcantonio.

In brief, the Act provides for the following:

1. The proposal for the adoption of a "constitution" must be approved by a majority of qualified Puerto Rican voters in a nation-wide referendum.

2. Upon ratification of the proposal for a constitution, the Legislature of Puerto Rico shall convene a constitutional convention for the purpose of drafting a constitution.

3. The government provided for by that constitution must be republican in form and must include a bill of rights.

4. The constitution must be approved by the President and the Congress of the United States. Specifically, section 3 of the Act states, "Upon adoption of the constitution by the people of Puerto Rico the President of the United States is authorized to transmit such constitution to the Congress of the United States if he finds that such constitution conforms with the applicable provision of the Act and of the Constitution of the United States. Upon approval by the Congress the Constitution shall become effective in accordance with its terms."

5. The sections of the present Organic Act providing for U.S. *sovereignty* over Puerto Rico, shall not be changed but shall be continued in force under the title of "Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act." Only the sections dealing with local administrative questions would be repealed with the going into effect of the constitution.

## A COLONIAL CONSTITUTION

At the Senate hearing on the Puerto Rican constitution bill, then known as S. 3336, held on May 17, 1950, the Communist Party of the United States correctly characterized the proposed constitution as a *fake*, as a brazen and ill-disguised attempt to perpetuate and intensify the barbarous, national and social oppression of the Puerto Rican people. This is borne out by the provisions of the enabling act.

Under these provisions the so-called constitution would not change by one iota the distressing colonial status imposed upon Puerto Rico for the last 52 years by American imperialism. It would in fact be a colonial constitution.

It would not end the *sovereignty* of the United States over Puerto Rico, acquired under the Treaty of Paris. At the Senate hearings on the bill, both American speakers and representatives of the Munoz Marin government went to great pains to make it clear that the bill allowed no change in the *present fundamental relationship* existing between the United States and Puerto Rico. Assistant Secretary of State Jack R. McFall, clearly indicating the purpose of the bill, declared:

The Department of State believes it to be of the greatest importance that the Puerto Rican people be authorized to frame their own constitution as provided in S. 3336, in order that formal consent of the Puerto Ricans

may be given to their present *relationship to the United States*.\* (Our emphasis—T.R.B.)

"The bill under consideration," Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, said, "would not change Puerto Rico's *political, social and economic relationship to the United States*. Those sections of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico pertaining to . . . *United States laws, customs, internal revenue, Federal judicial jurisdiction in Puerto Rico, etc.*, would remain in force and effect. . . ."\*\* (Our emphasis—T.R.B.)

This view was emphasized also by Ferns-Isern, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico and Popular Democratic Party stalwart, who assured the U.S. Senate Committee that the bill "would not alter the powers of *sovereignty* acquired by the United States over Puerto Rico under the terms of the Treaty of Paris."\*\*\*

Thus, it is clear that the so-called constitution would not loosen Wall Street's stranglehold.

#### FEATURES OF U.S. SOVEREIGNTY

The unaltered power of sovereignty maintained in the amended Organic Act would enable the United States to maintain the colonial status of Puerto Rico in the following fundamental ways:

1. The United States would retain all the political power necessary to keep Puerto Rico in subjugation.

Decisive political power would, as is now the case, rest in Washington rather than in San Juan. The U.S. Congress would still have the power to amend the Organic Act at any time according to its own whims. U.S. Federal laws would continue to determine all basic political, economic and social activities of the Puerto Rican people. The Governor and all departments in the national government of Puerto Rico would still have to report to the President of the United States through the Federal Agency he designates for jurisdiction over Puerto Rico. Authority of the national legislature is definitely restricted under Section 37, which provides that it could only pass laws which are not in conflict with U.S. Federal laws. The U.S. Supreme Court would retain the power to overrule decisions of the Puerto Rican courts and to nullify any law passed by the Puerto Rican legislature.

2. The U.S. would still use Puerto Rico as a military, naval and strategic atom bomb base and would retain the properties acquired under the Treaty of Paris.

The United States Government would be able to continue its conversion of Puerto Rico into a gigantic military base callously making her a major target in the world war it is striving to unleash. Washington would as now be able to seize all lands, buildings, and other properties

\* U.S. Senate, Subcommittee of Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Hearing on S3336, May 17, 1950, p. 14.

\*\* *Ibid.*, p. 27.

\*\*\* *Ibid.*, p. 3.

necessary to its war program, regardless of the suffering caused to the Puerto Rican people. It would continue to have the power to draft Puerto Rican youth to fight in its predatory imperialist adventures as in Korea.

3. All the measures necessary for maintaining the economic yoke of Wall Street upon Puerto Rico would remain in effect.

Puerto Rico would remain a "free market" for U.S. exports; it would continue to be flooded with U.S. goods with crushing effects upon its infant national industry. The Government of Puerto Rico as now could neither impose protectionist duties upon imports, nor negotiate commercial treaties as a sovereign nation, nor diversify her economy. Likewise remaining in force would be the coastwise shipping laws, the restriction on the production and refining of sugar, and all the other measures necessary for retaining brutal super-exploitation and growing pauperization of a colonial economy.

4. The policy of destruction of the national culture and historical traditions of the Puerto Rican people would be maintained.

Efforts to impose English, an alien tongue, upon the Puerto Rican people at the expense of the Spanish language, the medium of their national culture, and the playing up of the national heroes and national traditions of the United States at the expense of the national heroes and national traditions of the Puerto

Rican people would continue. The American bourgeoisie regards the destruction of national consciousness as a principal factor in the subjugation of peoples.

Although temporarily compelled to retreat and make concessions on the imposition of English, Wall Street will neither relent on this, nor on its whole policy of destruction of the national culture and traditions of the Puerto Rican nation. There should be no illusions on this score. Wall Street will merely seek new forms to accomplish this purpose. The means would still be at hand for carrying out this policy. The means lie in the subordination of the Puerto Rican government to Wall Street and Washington.

It is for these reasons that the projected constitution for Puerto Rico could in no way benefit the Puerto Rican people and would only serve to screen its subjugation by Wall Street.

#### UNDER THE IRON HEEL OF WALL STREET

Supporters of the Act, seeking to obscure its anti-democratic, imperialist character, argue that it represents a policy of according ever greater autonomy and self-government to the Puerto Rican people.

Some imperialist apologists even have the brass to declare, as does A. Cecil Snyder, American Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico, that "The United States

is not an imperialistic nation. It has not treated Puerto Rico as a colony."

The falsity of these assertions is patently obvious. Since the adoption in 1900 of the Foraker Act, the first Organic Act, a number of changes have been effected in the organic law, or colonial charter; but all of these changes were hedged in with restrictions which preserved the basic sovereignty of the United States over Puerto Rico and thus secured her colonial status.

For, the question of sovereignty is the crux of the matter of ending the colonial regime of Wall Street in Puerto Rico.

It is this United States sovereignty, *i.e.*, colonial domination, which enabled the American bourgeoisie to impose upon the Puerto Rican people its brutal regime of national and social oppression and the shameless super-exploitation of the people with its accompanying hunger and misery. Let us glance briefly at the record of U.S. rule in Puerto Rico.

Launching upon its imperialist career, the United States, under the slogans of "democracy" and "freedom," seized Puerto Rico in 1898.

The American invaders liquidated the high degree of autonomy but shortly before wrested by the Puerto Rican people from Spain, and took power for Wall Street and Washington. They devalued the peso by 35 percent, passed the coast-wide shipping and tariff act and through a whole series of related measures succeeded in seizing the most fertile

lands. They destroyed the flourishing small individually-owned farm economy. They converted Puerto Rico into a one crop country. They drove the masses of peasants off the land, which was absorbed into huge sugar plantations, reducing the mass of its people into landless peons slaving at starvation wages. Four big companies, the South Puerto Rican Sugar Co., the Central Aguirre Associated, Eastern Sugar Association and Fajardo Sugar Company—all Wall Street-owned sugar corporations—dominate the economic life of Puerto Rico.

Thus, the American bourgeoisie, entering at the turn of the century into the period of monopoly capitalism, fastened in classic imperialist fashion the yoke of national-colonial oppression upon the Puerto Rican people.

National oppression [says Stalin] is that system of exploitation and plunder of subject peoples, those measures of forcible restriction of the political rights of subject peoples, which are resorted to by imperialist circles. These, taken together, present the policy generally known as a policy of national oppression.\*

The extent of the "exploitation and plunder" of the Puerto Rican people by U.S. imperialism compares with the worst examples of colonial subjugation.

The annual per capita income of Puerto Rico was \$306 in 1947. This

\* Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, International Publishers, p. 62.

was less than one-fourth that of the United States, which was \$1,323, and less than one-half the \$659 per capita income of Mississippi, the lowest among the states.\* Mass unemployment is chronic. Approximately 17 per cent of the 686,000 persons above the age of 14 are permanently unemployed.\*\* The 125,000 workers in the sugar industry are employed less than six months per year, slaving during the short sugar season for wages ranging between \$5 and \$8 per week.

The living standards of the Puerto Rican people are reaching a new low level. Thanks to the Truman wage freeze, the prevailing hunger wages are being frozen while prices, already 25 percent higher than in the United States, continue to zoom further upwards. Almost one-fourth of the nation, 84,110 families, is condemned to live in the most frightful slums. The infant death rate is two and one-half that of the United States.

Such are the fruits of U.S. sovereignty over Puerto Rico, which would be preserved by the colonial constitution.

#### FAKE ARGUMENTS OF SUPPORTERS OF THE ACT

The advocates of the so-called constitution argue that the people of Puerto Rico should support it because it would guarantee them a demo-

cratic government and the enjoyment of civil liberties.

What kind of "democratic government" would it be if its powers would be restricted to minor questions, and the most vital issues affecting the life of the Puerto Rican people would remain outside its jurisdiction? What kind of "civil liberties" can be expected from a regime dominated by the Wall Street-Washington government which is fostering growing fascization in the United States, which is tearing the heart out of the Bill of Rights? What can be expected of the powers that are responsible for the Taft-Hartley slave labor law, the nefarious Smith Act, the pro-fascist McCarran-Kilgore Act? Can we not anticipate the nature of the promised "civil liberties" by the vicious sentences that are now meted out at the behest of Wall Street and Washington by Munoz Marin against the leaders of the Nationalist Party; or by the frameup and persecution of other truly patriotic forces and champions of peace, as exemplified in the case of the youth Deusedit Marrero, held under \$25,000 bail? Or perhaps the "civil liberties" they promise Puerto Rico would be the further imposition of the ideology of regal James Crow which, with the growing fascization of our country, is more and more filling the content of our monopolized thought production, both domestic and exported?

Wall Street and Washington have inspired or fostered, if not directly

\* Federal Security Agency Report on Needs of Children in Puerto Rico.

\*\* *Bulletin*, Puerto Rico, May 1949.

organized through their agents, Munoz Marin and Co., a whole series of anti-democratic acts against the Puerto Rican people: to wit, the provocation of the October 30 revolt of the Nationalists as part of the drive to put over the fake constitution; mass violations of civil liberties through the arrest and jailing of thousands on the 3rd and 4th of November, during the height of the registration for the national referendum on the proposed constitution; a continuous campaign of frame-ups and persecutions designed to break all opposition to the U.S. imperialist war program; and the passage of local Smith and McCarran-Kilgore Acts, and the setting up of "loyalty" boards and investigating committees.

At the behest of Wall Street and Washington, the Nationalists, held as a result of the October 30 events, are being railroaded to long prison terms in mock, stoopigeon trials, carried out in a lynch atmosphere. In the "trial" of Albizu Campos, now sentenced to from 17 years and 9 months to 32 years and 9 months on charges of assault with intent to kill, and illegal possession of arms and explosives, and facing 120 years on all counts, the public was virtually excluded. The jury was hand-picked, containing former policemen; intimidation ruled out defense witnesses, while the government paraded a whole corps of police and detectives.

Arguing against independence for Puerto Rico and for the colonial con-

stitution, the *New York Times* declares:

One might ask why we do not give Puerto Rico freedom . . . the reason is to be found in the sphere of economics. Puerto Rico simply could not exist outside American tariff walls and without American government subsidies.\*

What Yankee imperialist arrogance after 52 years of strangulation of the Puerto Rican nation!

What demagoguery it is to argue that the economic hardships of the Puerto Rican people will be alleviated because the proposed constitution would guarantee them access to the "richest market in the world"! What shall the Puerto Rican people bring to the market—the appalling hunger that the Wall Street colonial regime has produced, and which the colonial constitution would continue? A typical example of how the "free market" operates can be seen in the beer industry. During the fiscal year 1948-49 the consumption of American beer more than doubled at the expense of both the Puerto Rican beer and bottle industries, thus swelling the ranks of the unemployed.

In the fiscal year 1948-9, Puerto Rican imports from the United States amounted to \$326,295,000, of which \$105,238,000 was for food. Puerto Rican sales to the U.S. amounted only to \$194,903,000, leaving a trade deficit of \$131,392,000.\*\*

\* *Bulletin*, Puerto Rico, October, 1949

\*\* *New York Times*, July 7, 1950.

As to U.S. government subsidies, that is, for hospitals, medical centers, education in industrial techniques, aid to social welfare, etc., the facts refute the *New York Times*. While Puerto Rico purchased \$337,000,000 worth of goods in the U.S. in the 1947-48 fiscal year, the Federal aid was \$7,306,699, or less than 3 per cent of Puerto Rican purchases in the U.S.\*

#### THE "CONSTITUTION" AND THE WAR DRIVE

The unbridled demagoguery Munoz Marin and Co. are compelled to resort to is at the same time an indication of the deep sentiments of the Puerto Rican people for their national independence and freedom and of the desperation of the American bourgeoisie in their effort to halt the upsurge of the national liberation movement. This desperation on the part of U.S. imperialism is not fortuitous. It arises from the high stakes involved for Wall Street in continued subjugation of Puerto Rico.

The feverish efforts of Yankee imperialism to fasten its colonial constitution upon the Puerto Rican people is not isolated from world events. It is of a piece with the whole political, economic, military and cultural offensive of the American bourgeoisie in the postwar period, designed to realize its feverish war preparations and in the process to oust Great Britain from her position in Latin America. This many-sided offensive

has been carried through in a whole series of conferences, from Chapultapec in 1945, to the Washington conference with the Foreign Ministers of the American states which began on March 26.

The Chapultapec Conference laid down the line of subjugation of the armed forces of Latin America to the Yankee General Staff. In the Rio de Janeiro Inter-American Conference of 1947, the Truman proposal made to Congress in 1946 for unification of arms and the command of all Western-Hemisphere nations was adopted in the form of a Western Hemisphere Treaty of Mutual Defense, signed on September 7, 1947, by members of the Conference. This constituted an equivalent for Latin America of the North Atlantic Pact.

On the political front, Wall Street and Washington, in the 1948 Bogota Conference, dictated an anti-Communist pact aimed at smashing the forces of national liberation, progress and peace of the peoples of Latin America. Following this, a whole campaign of terror was unleashed against the working-class leaders, against the Communist Parties and other progressive organizations.

The aim of the March 26 Washington conference of the Foreign Ministers of the American States is to further concretize the steps already taken in the previous conferences, to guarantee greater utilization of the resources and manpower of these countries for the Wall Street drive to war.

\* *Bulletin*, Puerto Rico, May, 1949.

The mailed fist of Yankee imperialism is seen in the veiled threat of the *New York Times* in its comment on this conference. The *Times* declared:

In times of danger it is prudent to count one's friends and "grapple them to thy soul with hoops of steel." . . . Destiny is calling upon all nations and all peoples to stand up and be counted.\*

In putting forward the colonial constitution for Puerto Rico, Wall Street and Washington are concerned with more than Puerto Rico alone. They are concerned also with utilizing the historic ties of common origin, language and cultural background of Puerto Rico with most of Latin America as an instrument for strengthening their domination of these countries. The utilization of Puerto Rico as a military, naval and air base is designed to guarantee U.S. imperialist domination of the Carribeans, the Panama Canal, as well as the Central and South Atlantic sea and air lines, the Mediterranean and Africa. Puerto Rico is in addition, a center for training armed forces for use in all Latin America, on the basis of the unification and standardization of arms under United States officers and leadership.

"Puerto Rico," states Edward G. Miller, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, referring to the so-called constitution, "is an area of the United States, a community that has a particular interest

in Latin America, and for which the Latin Americans have a very particular interest. I think it will help our prestige."\*

The same view was expressed by the *Washington Evening Star* a year prior to the passing of the enabling act, when it declared:

A separate constitution . . . could have profound repercussions upon our relations with the whole of Latin America. It would symbolize what forward-looking Puerto Ricans visualize as their role—that of an ideological bridge between the United States and our Southern neighbors. Such a role would be highly fruitful for us.\*\*

Puerto Rico is a small nation. But the significance of her struggle for freedom and independence must be judged neither by her size nor by her population of 2,240,000, but by the role designed for her as a colony of Wall Street in their blueprint for world conquest, by the role she will play in the struggle between the camp of peace and the camp of war.

Puerto Rico's struggle for freedom and independence is, at the same time, part of the international movement in defense of world peace. It is integrally linked with the worldwide national liberation struggles of the colonial, semi-colonial and dependent countries, weakening and undermining the aggressive moves of Wall Street and Washington toward

\* U.S. Senate, Subcommittee of Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Hearing on S. 3536, May 17, 1950, p. 15.

\*\* *Washington Evening Star*, July 8, 1949.

\* *New York Times*, December 19, 1950.

a new world war. The cause of the liberation of Puerto Rico from U.S. imperialist national and social oppression, from brutal Wall Street super-exploitation and colonial servitude is our cause, the cause of American labor. It is most intimately tied up with the struggles of labor and the people for peace and against growing fascism; it is intimately linked with our fight for peace, democracy and Socialism.

The fight to render effective support to the workers of Puerto Rico and Latin America is indissolubly connected with the struggle against the war-minded labor misleaders of the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. for a class struggle policy for American workingmen and women. While top leaders of labor, such as Ryan of the A. F. of L. and Potofsky of the C.I.O., are actively intervening in Puerto Rico on behalf of Wall Street and Washington, little or no attention, it must be regrettably said, is paid by U.S. Left-progressive trade unionists to the labor, progressive, national liberation and peace movements of Puerto Rico.

#### TASKS OF LABOR AND PEACE FORCES

The fight to defeat the colonial constitution is the paramount question confronting the Puerto Rican liberation movement at this time.

Speaking at the 15th National Convention of our Party, Fraternal Delegate Cesar Andreu, Chairman of the

Communist Party of Puerto Rico, declared: "A broad coalition of democratic forces, non-partisan in character, can bring the defeat of the constitution, and pave the way for the defeat of the Munoz Marin forces in the 1952 elections."\*

The most elementary principle of international working-class solidarity demands that the Communists and all progressives in the United States render effective support to the struggle for freedom and national independence for Puerto Rico. Our approach must be from the point of view of proletarian internationalism, from the point of view of the working class of the oppressor nation. Ours is the duty to win the working masses and all the progressive forces to a mighty struggle for the full, immediate independence of Puerto Rico with economic guarantees as the concrete form of exercise of the right of self-determination, bearing in mind the basic tenet of Marxism-Leninism that no nation which oppresses other nations can itself be free.

An effective way for the American workers and peace forces to express their solidarity with and aid the cause of Puerto Rican freedom, is to render adequate support to the defense of the Puerto Rican political prisoners, embracing the nationalists and all champions of national independence and peace now persecuted by U.S. imperialism and its agents in Puerto Rico.

\* *Political Affairs*, February 1951, p. 225.

In winning the workers, the progressive and peace forces to mass support of the fight for Puerto Rican independence, and of the partial demands linked integrally with this

basic question, our Party will be making a major contribution to the American people's fight against fascism and war, and to the whole cause of peace, progress and Socialism.

By

(A  
Fren

I do  
mak  
and  
tari  
hav  
M  
aga  
acti  
peo  
I in  
mea  
ran  
goe  
con  
actu  
tho  
sion  
nec  
felt  
hig  
mo  
tra  
the  
dir  
sol  
bri  
wh

\*  
mem  
ions

will be  
to the  
inst fas-  
e cause  
ism.

## Sectarianism Must Go!\*

By Henri Martel

*(President of the Miners' Trade Unions International, Secretary of the French National Federation of Miners.)*

I DO NOT intend, in this article, to make a theoretical demonstration and to lay down the law on sectarianism. Better writers than I have already done this.

My contribution to the fight against this important obstacle to action by the broad masses of the people will be a more modest one. I intend to illustrate this article by means of examples taken from the rank and file, as I think that what goes for those who are in permanent contact with the workers in their actual workplaces—that is to say in those places where capitalist oppression hits hardest and where the necessity for unity is most strongly felt—is all the more true at the higher levels of the working-class movement, in those places where trade unionists are often, against their wish, too far away from the direct application of the slogans, resolutions and decisions which can bring into action the masses for whom they are meant.

\* Reprinted from *World Trade Union Movement*, organ of the World Federation of Trade Unions, February 5, 1951.

If, basing ourselves on the universally known slogan: "Workers of all lands, unite," we conclude on the correctness of another old and battle-tried slogan: "To fight efficiently, we must all unite," this leads us at once to condemn sectarianism in general and every sectarian in particular, because they are an obstacle to action and a defeatist element. For, as far back as I can remember, I have never seen a sectarian rally around himself the majority of the population of his district, or of the workers in his place of work.

Sectarianism can be nothing but a hindrance in the present grave situation, when, because of the war policy followed in all capitalist countries by government rulers subservient to Big Business, the working class and all working people are suffering increasingly difficult conditions, brutal police dictatorship and savage repression, when they can see the danger of war and are seeking a means of dispelling it, of breaking their chains and of preventing war.

### CAN SECTARIANISM BE DEFEATED?

Taking into consideration the example of the miners, I am certain that sectarianism can be defeated.

I shall mention first of all an example of a general nature. After the heroic miners' strike of 1948 in France, we had to struggle against a very powerful tendency toward sectarianism. This strike, which lasted eight weeks, was one of the toughest in mining history. After five weeks of 100 per cent united action, extreme poverty, the division-mongers' maneuvers, and the tremendous repressive apparatus set up by the government and the employers succeeded in making a breach in the miners' front. During the sixth and seventh weeks, most starving miners went back to work. They were mainly men with families, who would not have yielded an inch before the armed special police or the tanks; but they yielded when the government stopped paying them family allowances for their children.

Instead of taking this fact into account, a great number of those who remained on strike until the end harbored resentment against those who had gone back to work before them and accused them of being responsible for the failure. Socialist workers who had been on strike for five to seven weeks were accused of being responsible for the anti-working class actions of Jules

Moch, the notorious "Socialist" Minister of the Interior. There were cases of brothers refusing to speak to each other because one of them had gone back to work before the other. For weeks, the hardest fighters, those who had stayed out until the end, would not have anything to do with the others. This attitude was prevalent in all pits and services of all coalfields in France.

### "ALL OUT AGAINST SECTARIANISM"

This was the title of an article by Auguste Lecoecur, president of the North and Pas-de-Calais Regional Federation of Miners, which was published as a leaflet and distributed in 200,000 copies. This article explained that the strike did not end in defeat and exposed the people really responsible for the blows struck against the miners by the capitalist repressive apparatus. It demonstrated that our cause was just and that united action was more than ever necessary to win satisfaction for our demands.

Auguste Lecoecur demonstrated to our valiant strikers, who had held out for eight weeks, that the "enemy is not within the working-class," that "sectarianism is the weapon of the weak, and we are strong," adding "you must hold out your hand to your Force Ouvrière\* or

\* Force Ouvrière—A small split-off from the General Confederation of Labor organized and engineered as a so-called Third Force by Right-Wing Social-Democrats, at the instigation and with the financial assistance of the United States State Department and labor agents.

C.F.T.C.\* comrades. If they spit on it, wipe it and hold it out again."

This was hard to accept for thousands of rank-and-file workers and leaders of the C.G.T.,\*\* but this courageous and far-sighted article enabled us to open a discussion, to intensify the fight against sectarianism all over France, and to bring about many struggles for the miners' demands in which united action swept aside all rancour and false conceit. Those who had declared that they would never again shake hands with the miners who had first gone back to work and that they would not allow them "to spit on them" were the first to hold out their hands and were happy to inform us that reconciliation had taken place in action.

#### SOME EXAMPLES TAKEN ON THE SPOT

1. At No. 7 pit in Auchel, in the North of France (where the miners went on strike against the closing down of the pit), on the very first day of the stay-down strike, C.G.T., Force Ouvrière, Christian and unorganized workers organized unity groups. A few days later, it was impossible to distinguish between the workers. When the miners came up to the surface, their hearts were beat-

ing in unison, and they were fraternally united in the joy of a magnificent fight waged together, as proud soldiers of a just cause who are certain that, hand in hand, they will be victorious.

2. In the other Auchel pits, this example had failed to convince the sectarians, especially in those places where solidarity had not been well organized. A C.G.T. branch secretary said to me, a week after the end of the strike in No. 7 pit: "I won't meet the Force Ouvrière Secretary or the others; they're bastards." Two weeks later, the so-called "bastards," who together with our C.G.T. friends had been transferred to another pit, 25 miles distant from their homes, marched down to the Regional headquarters of the C.G.T. in Lens, behind the red flag and with their bugles, singing the "International" at the top of their voices. They had united and come out on strike together against persecutions in their new pit. Together they were expressing their confidence in the C.G.T.

3. A miners' delegate from Auchel. At a meeting of miners' delegates held in November, when we were discussing the subject of unity of action to win wage increases and after several miners' delegates had declared that this unity was impossible, still on account of the "rotten bastards," with whom nothing could ever be done, the Auchel delegate told the assembly that he also, two weeks earlier,

\* C.F.T.C.—A minor trade-union center under the control and influence of the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

\*\* C.G.T.—The General Confederation of Labor of France, the trade-union center embracing and uniting the overwhelming majority of the French working class.

thought similarly of the Force Ouvrière Secretary in his pit.

He could not bear the idea of speaking to him about united action, as this Force Ouvrière man had denounced him to the police during the strike and even threatened to have him beaten up.

Nevertheless, [said the delegate] one day I decided to go and see him. I had no sooner left home than I felt I could not go any further—I could not bring myself to do it. A few days later I reasoned with myself and decided that *I must go and see him!* But still I came back without having done so. I was so certain that I was not doing my duty that I could no longer sleep. Then after a few days, I thought of the miners, of their poverty and their general conditions—and I went to see the man I considered to be my enemy. We talked and we agreed on a common struggle for our demands. I am now very happy to have put the miners' interests above my pride and my personal rancor.

This delegate received much applause.

4. The Secretary of a haulage branch in Aniche, at the other extremity of the coalfield said on the same day:

I had also sworn never again to hold out my hand to the Force Ouvrière and Christian leaders in my section. For on February 17, 1950, after we had succeeded in organizing a 100 per cent strike, the police came in, and these leaders were in the first to climb onto the engines, thus smashing the strike movement. Nevertheless I decided to contact them. I also had to

make the decision several times before I finally went to see them. Then one day, I said to myself, "Go on, do it," and I had a talk with them. We agreed and we presented a common list of demands. Our unity defeated the employer—we won satisfaction of our demands. The miners are satisfied and I am proud of having won a victory over myself.

At a recent cadres meeting in Lens, in the North of France, a surface workers' delegate explained to us, in his own way, how he also conquered his own sectarianism, went to see the Force Ouvrière and Christian trade unionists, on the basis of the determination of the workers to take action. This worker, who obviously was not used to public speaking, was listened to with greater attention than the other speakers, and received more applause than they when he ended after declaring: "For several days I said to myself, 'I'm going to speak to them,' then 'No, I'm not.' Finally I did go, and I'm glad that I did, because we're going to win satisfaction of our demands." This proved to be correct, and to-day Milan (this was the delegate's name) can point to a whole list of demands which have been satisfied, although the management had refused to grant them before the workers achieved unity of action.

I could quote dozens of similar examples. I shall quote only one more, that of Decazeville, a small community in the Aveyron district

in the center of France, the Mayor of which is the Right-wing "Socialist" Ramadier. In this locality, C.G.T. workers are in the minority, and our comrades considered every Force Ouvrière worker as another Ramadier. We were losing ground, and the miners' conditions were steadily worsening. Our comrades were conducting an endless polemical discussion with the Force Ouvrière men in the local press. When we advised united action, our local comrades replied: "It is not possible ever to reach an agreement with such people."

And yet, in December, the Force Ouvrière trade unionists denounced vigorously the State machine which is their employer, as well as its anti-working class methods, and they proposed united action to the C.G.T. of their own accord.

A program of common demands was drawn up and presented to the management, and supported by a strike which had been organized by the C.G.T. and Force Ouvrière leaders who visited together every department to announce the strike. The result was that the strike was unanimous.

On January 12, elections were held to name delegates to the Pit Committees. A joint list of candidates had been set up, including candidates belonging to the C.G.T., Force Ouvrière and the C.F.T.C. (Christian). This joint list was published together with a point declaration mentioning all the demands made

by our National Federation of Miners, exposing the State employer and appealing for united action.

The declaration reads as follows:

The C.G.T., Force Ouvrière and C.F.T.C. trade unions point out that these elections will take place at a time when the workers of Decazeville and the whole of France are victims of the wrong social policy of our rulers and of growing hostility on the part of the increasingly reactionary employers, at a time when the workers are living in poverty-stricken conditions and receiving low wages, when workers are being down-graded, super-exploited and dismissed to cut down the number of personnel employed, while this gives rise to the risk of accidents such as the one which occurred on December 19.

The declaration then states:

This situation cannot go on, there must be a change. Only unity of all workers can defeat this policy and these methods of work.

And the declaration concludes:

The fulfillment of this program does not depend on the members of the Pit Committees alone, but on united action by all the workers.

This declaration was signed by Guibert for the C.G.T., Vabre for Force Ouvrière, and Lafarie for the C.F.T.C.

Our sectarians no longer say now that nothing can be done, on the contrary they are enthusiastic. This has been a wonderful lesson for them, and they are now sorry for

having delayed these results by their sectarianism.

Thousands of similar events have occurred in all the coalfields in the capitalist countries. Our Belgian comrades are now satisfied, although they had doubts about unity. Agreements have been concluded—against the lengthening of the conscription period, in Braquignies and Seraing; against the closing down of pits, as a result of the Schuman Plan, in the Borinage district, against poverty-stricken conditions in several coalfields: Liège, Limburg, Borinage; and in numerous pits against King Leopold's return and against the murderers of the Communist member of parliament, Lahaut.

There have been examples of united action also in Scotland, Luxembourg, Chile, Mexico, Africa and North America.

Is it permissible for trade unionists, some of them in high places in the world trade-union movement, to continue to think that all the working-class leaders whose point of view is different from theirs are definitely incapable of accepting the idea of united action and even organizational unity? Leaders who hold this view are indeed out of touch with the workers. Sometimes such leaders are conceited people whose smugness prevents them from seeing the truth, from seeing that the workers *want* unity, that they are clamoring for it so loudly that even the most deaf among the division-mongering leaders will have

to listen to them or be swept out. And sometimes these sectarians are incapable leaders who cannot keep up with the mass movement and with events, and who conceal their own weakness and incapacity behind their sectarian reasoning. Instead of leading and organizing the movement, they act as a brake and prevent action. They are dried-up bureaucrats, capable of cooling down the warmest flush of enthusiasm.

I hope that the few examples which I have quoted from the rank and file, from living reality, may help them to note, when they have thought them over, that whenever sectarianism is throttled, the working class fights and wins.

Let them say to themselves, as miner Milan said: "Am I going to do it, or am I not?" and let them, like Milan, get to work with confidence. The results will be their reward, and the working masses will follow them.

To act in any other way is almost a betrayal, since unity brings victory in action. UNITY and SECTARIANISM are two eternal enemies.

Let us not forget that in our song, the International, although the first line is "Arise, ye starvelings, from your slumbers," the words which the workers sing with the most gusto are "Comrades, come rally."

In order to rally, we must be in close contact with the workers, and *therefore sectarianism must go.*

# A Non-Historical Treatment of Democracy

By Betty Gannett

AT THE 15th National Convention, in discussing certain ideological tasks,\* I proposed that we undertake a critical examination of the theoretical works published in our movement since the Emergency Convention of the Party in 1945. The proposal calls for an elaboration which the scope of the Convention report did not make possible, and which I now present in this article.

The repudiation of Browderism and the re-establishment of Marxism-Leninism as the theoretical foundation for Communist policy have engendered a greater consciousness of the need resolutely to combat all deviations from Marxism-Leninism in our practice and in our theoretical work. This has created within the Party a new awareness of the partisan, revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism as the science of the working class and its vanguard detachment, and the need to combat the penetration of enemy ideology.

It is an established fact that only a few of the books and booklets produced in these last years have been subjected to an authoritative criticism by our theoretical organ, *Political*

*Affairs*. Many of these books were written either during the period of revisionism or soon thereafter. It is inconceivable that the Browderite distortions of Marxism have not penetrated these writings, whether they be on history, political economy, the labor movement, etc., in one or another way. These books contain much valuable material, but many of them have serious shortcomings, distortions, and even some alien class theories. Allow me to elaborate on this question by referring to several writings published since the Party's Emergency Convention. Let me begin by discussing the book, *Marxism and the Democratic Tradition*, written by A. Landy.

*Marxism and the Democratic Tradition* was published by International Publishers in 1946. Many comrades individually have on numerous occasions raised serious criticisms of the book. But there have been no organized discussions with the author. These critical views were not presented publicly, so that the Party, and the author, might reap the benefit. Furthermore, Landy himself has never re-evaluated this book.

While, of course, it is not my present purpose to review this book, any

\* See: Betty Gannett, "Some Ideological Tasks in the Struggle for Peace," February issue.—Ed.

Marxist analysis of such a work which discusses the bourgeois revolutions in England, France and the United States must examine whether the author develops the historical data from a consistent historical materialist point of view. It must determine whether the author unfolds the true character of the class struggle which was the driving force of these revolutions, and of the ensuing events. It is incumbent upon Marxists to "enlighten the masses on the past of their people," as the great Dimitrov stated, "in a genuinely Marxist, a Leninist-Marxist, a Leninist-Stalinist spirit" in order to "link up the present struggle with the people's revolutionary traditions and past."

This is an extremely important task for our Party working in a country where the imperialist ruling class seeks to cover its whole mad drive toward world domination and fascism with the mantle of the progressive tradition of the people and our nation, even while it cynically throws overboard these traditions.

I want to concentrate primarily on the central theme of the book, given in the title, the relation of Marxism to the democratic tradition.

#### A NON-CLASS CONCEPT OF DEMOCRACY

In his foreword, Landy explains that his book is limited in scope and "reviews the chief historical milestones in the development of *modern*

*democracy* beginning with the British Revolution of 1648 and ending with the *democratic movement* which gave rise to Marxism." He says that the book "deals with only one aspect of this vast and many-sided question, *the historical origin of Marxism within the general democratic current.*" His objective, he indicates, is to show that the "very origin and history of modern democracy and communism testify to *the organic relationship between the two.*" (My emphases—B.G.)

What is this "modern democracy," this "democratic current"?

Landy opens his first chapter with the words: "Modern democracy had its origin in the historic struggle to overthrow the feudal system in Europe and to establish instead, the new capitalist system of production which had matured within the old feudal order."

He then unfolds the events of the bourgeois revolutions to prove his thesis and throughout treats democracy as follows:

It was in colonial America that the idea of one great democratic republic was first revived. It was here, in the eighteenth century, that the first declaration of the rights of man was issued and the democratic trend, which seemed to have been extinguished with the British Republic, was again resumed (p. 25).

The great American and French Revolutions opened a new era of democracy . . . (p. 75).

The transformation of England into the leading industrial country in the world and the capitalist development of Europe were thus creating the conditions not only for the *irresistible advance of democracy* but also for the simultaneous sharpening of the social question which political liberty alone obviously could not solve (p. 91).

Thus the *democratic tradition* associated with the rise and growth of *modern democracy* is identified exclusively with the progressive tendencies, material, social and intellectual, in the historical process of which it is a part (p. 158).

The democratic tradition is pre-eminently a *tradition of humanism*. The value of the human being is its cardinal tenet (p. 185). (My emphases—B.G.)

Here, as throughout the entire work, Landy unfolds a concept of "modern democracy" completely independent of the material conditions of life of the very capitalist society which gave it birth. In fact, he conceives of "modern democracy" as having a development of its own, transcending the capitalist mode of production, evolving as an uninterrupted process to its higher form under Socialism.

Can a Marxist speak of "modern democracy" in general, or is he called upon to speak of the specific class essence of this "modern democracy"?

There is no non-class, non-historical "modern democracy" or "democratic tradition" existing outside of, and above, specific historical formations. There is no "modern democracy"

which develops as a continuous "democratic trend or current" carried by Marxism to "its logical conclusion," to "its most consistent and advanced manifestation" (p. 186). The world knows no such "modern democracy." It knows only bourgeois democracy arising on the basis of the capitalist mode of production, and proletarian or Socialist democracy.

What is this but the ghost of old Hegel's "absolute idea" moving mystically through history toward its "highest fulfillment"? In this case the Absolute Idea takes on the guise of an independently existing, and independently evolving "principle" of democracy, detached from the material foundation and class interests. A most crass example of Hegelianizing Marxism, of distorting historical materialism into idealism!

The concept of "modern democracy" treated in an absolute sense, *i.e.*, apart from its class qualifications—bourgeois democracy or Socialist democracy—is a non-Marxist, non-dialectical, metaphysical concept.

The so-called premises of democracy, to which Landy constantly refers, are not static concepts, remaining the same as formulated by the bourgeois thinkers, which Marxism merely repeats, resurrects, or perhaps, implements. The "premises" of democracy developed by the bourgeois thinkers, while an important historical advance over the despotism of medievalism, were, however, historically conditioned by the tasks confronting the rising capitalist class

in its efforts to destroy the feudal restrictions to capitalist development, and limited by the class interests of the bourgeoisie as an exploiting class. They cannot be identical with those of the modern revolutionary class — the working class. In fact, the ideas of democracy of the modern revolutionary class are ideas which come into direct conflict with the bourgeoisie, for they can be realized only with the elimination of the bourgeoisie.

How does Engels treat the ideas of democracy advanced by the great men, the great thinkers who heralded the oncoming of the bourgeois revolution which replaced feudalism? Addressing himself to their claims that history was now to usher in the reign of reason, eternal truth, and the inalienable rights of man, Engels wrote:

We know today that this kingdom of reason was nothing more than the idealized kingdom of the bourgeoisie; that eternal justice found its realization in bourgeois justice; that equality reduced itself to bourgeois equality before the law; that bourgeois property was proclaimed as one of the essential rights of man; and that the government of reason, the Social Contract of Rousseau, came into existence and could only come into existence as a bourgeois-democratic republic. No more than their predecessors could the great thinkers of the eighteenth century pass beyond the limits imposed on them by their own epoch.\*

\* F. Engels: *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, International Publishers, 1935, p. 32.

The concept of democracy changes with every historical social formation, and these changes are not only quantitative—more and more democracy against less and less democracy—but *qualitative*, giving rise to an entirely new type of democracy, determined by the new type of state rising on the new economic basis. Landy, in dealing with the concept of democracy as an “absolute” category, has, as Lenin stated of Kautsky, “thrown overboard the ‘class struggle’ as applied to democracy.”

#### THE CLASS ESSENCE OF BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY

Underlying Landy's non-historical treatment of democracy is the distortion of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state. Marxism-Leninism teaches that bourgeois democracy, the classic form of rule of the capitalist class, is the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie in a concealed form and is, therefore, “organized violence” against the exploited working people. That is why Marxism-Leninism has determinedly rejected all talk of “democracy in general,” or of “modern democracy,” etc. It has instead always shown that democracy under capitalism is limited and one-sided, democracy only for those who own the means of production, not democracy for the mass of the propertyless, and, at that, a democracy that is tenuous and diminishing—not expanding.

In fact, Lenin has pointed out that

from the beginning the bourgeoisie employs two methods of rule to maintain itself in power—the method of violence and that of concessions. Thus he states:

... The bourgeoisie in all countries in practice inevitably elaborates two systems of governing, two methods of struggle for its interests and for the defense of its domination, and these two methods now replace one another and now interlace in different combinations. These are, first, the method of violence, the method of refusing all concessions to the labor movement, the method of supporting all ancient and dying institutions, the method of uncompromising rejection of reforms. . . . The second method is the method of "liberalism," of steps towards the development of political rights, of reforms, of concessions, etc.

The bourgeoisie passes from one method to another not through the malicious design of individuals and not by accident, but by force of the basic contradictoriness of its own position. . . .\*

But this question has another vital aspect. For while the Leninist proposition applies to capitalism generally, it is of special significance in the period of capitalism's general crisis in reference to the question of the relationship of bourgeois democracy to fascism. To the extent that Landy's book does not emphasize that capitalist democracy is the *veiled* dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, it obscures the class essence of fascism, as the

*open*, terrorist dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Bourgeois democracy and fascism are both forms of rule through which the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie is manifested. The failure to operate with Marxist-Leninist analysis in this respect, of necessity contributes to the notions of bourgeois liberals, Social Democrats and the fascist ideologists themselves, that fascism is a "social revolution," the revolt of the middle class, a new social system.

There is no unbridgeable gulf between bourgeois democracy and fascism. Historically fascism is nurtured in the womb of bourgeois democracy in the stage of the decay of capitalism, when the bourgeoisie constantly and systematically destroys the democratic and civil rights of the people. In the period of the general crisis of capitalism, the bourgeoisie, no longer able to maintain its rule by means of bourgeois democracy, more and more resorts to the fascist form of rule unless checked by the struggle of the people, led by the working class and its vanguard Party.

Certainly it is the task of the Marxist historian to show the true dialectical relation between bourgeois democracy and fascism. And if, on the contrary, a work on history serves to blur these truths and to disarm the people with false notions of democracy as a non-class, absolute concept, then clearly such writing has to be characterized as non-Marxian, indeed as anti-Marxian.

The historically progressive essence

\* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. XI, International Publishers, p. 741.

of the bourgeois revolutions of 1776 in the United States, and 1789-93 in France, was not that they ushered in a "new era of democracy," but that they established the rule of the bourgeoisie which opened the road for the full unfolding of the new, capitalist productive forces and production relations. The democracy introduced by the bourgeoisie was a class democracy, necessarily curtailed and narrow in scope, reflecting the objectives and demands of the bourgeoisie. And this democracy tends to become ever narrower as the bourgeoisie consolidates its rule over the exploited masses, and democratic gains are achieved only under the constant hammer blows of the mass struggles.

The working class utilizes and fights for bourgeois democratic rights in order more effectively to organize themselves and expand their struggle for emancipation, in order to establish the political rule of the working class, to create the new Socialist society.

The relation of bourgeois democracy to Socialist democracy, therefore, is the relation of the bourgeois state to the proletarian state. The "organic connection" between the bourgeois state (bourgeois democracy) and the proletarian state (Socialist democracy) is not that one evolves into the other in a metaphysical "democratic process." The only connection one can speak about is that capitalism, where the bourgeoisie holds political sway, develops the productive forces

of society, creating thereby the material conditions for the Socialist society. But capitalism only creates the conditions for Socialism, it does not itself evolve into Socialism. The establishment of Socialism requires the replacement of the bourgeois state, regardless of its form of rule, by the proletarian state, by the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Socialist state, brought into being by the working class, is qualitatively different from the bourgeois state. Similarly, Socialist democracy is a new type of democracy, qualitatively different from, and immeasurably higher than, bourgeois democracy; it is democracy for the formerly exploited and now liberated millions.

In aligning themselves with all democratic movements, past and present, Marxists have not sought to perpetuate bourgeois democracy but to help facilitate the conditions of the ultimate struggle for the abolition of wage slavery, and with it all class and national oppression. The democratic revolutions of the 19th century, having had for their historic purpose the elimination of the remnants of feudal relationships and absolutism, facilitated the development of the higher productive forces of capitalism, made possible the rise and advancing movement of the modern working class, and created the material pre-conditions for Socialism. Thus, in Lenin's words:

The more complete, determined and consistent the bourgeois revolution is,

the more  
struggle  
Socialist

That  
ported  
olution  
in 184  
in 186

The  
advan  
dition  
demo

bourg  
more

its str  
culmi

the M  
epoch  
demo

pand  
peop

bour  
prom

is wh  
foref

tion:  
the c  
dete

Com  
gle

the  
out  
ple,

It  
und

It  
to s  
racy

\*  
natio

the more secure will the proletarian struggle against the bourgeoisie and for Socialism become.\*

That is why Marx and Engels supported the bourgeois democratic revolutions on the European continent in 1848, and the American Civil War in 1861-1864.

The working class required for the advance of its class struggle the conditions for an expanded bourgeois democracy — not to help entrench bourgeois democracy, but to create a more favorable basis for furthering its struggle, which must historically culminate in Socialism. That is why the Marxists, in the pre-imperialist epoch, in supporting the bourgeois-democratic revolutions, fought to expand the democratic rights of the people against the vacillations of the bourgeoisie and its readiness to compromise with the Old Order. That is why Communists today are in the forefront of the struggle against national and colonial oppression, for the democratic right of national self-determination. That is why, too, Communists today lead in the struggle on all fronts against the efforts of the imperialist bourgeoisie to blot out all democratic gains of the people, to foist fascism upon the people.

It is in this sense that we must understand Lenin's words:

It would be a fundamental mistake to suppose that the struggle for democracy can divert the proletariat from

the socialist revolution, or obscure, or overshadow it. On the contrary, just as socialism cannot be victorious unless it introduces complete democracy, so the proletariat will be unable to prepare for victory over the bourgeoisie unless it wages a many-sided consistent and revolutionary struggle for democracy (V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. V., p. 268).

The use by Landy of this quotation from Lenin within the context of his treatment of democracy as a self-evolving independent entity, actually distorts this essential meaning of the quotation. Landy makes it appear that Lenin develops here "the historical and theoretical relation," *i.e.*, the continuity between democracy (*i.e.*, bourgeois democratic rights) and the dictatorship of the proletariat which introduces Socialist democracy. For Landy sees nothing but continuity. In his above-class treatment of the "sovereignty of the people," the dictatorship of the proletariat becomes nothing more than "the fulfillment of this central concept of democracy" (p. 183).

#### THE MATERIAL BASE OF POLITICAL FREEDOM

In Landy's work we also get a topsy-turvy presentation of the relation of political superstructure to economic foundation. Contrary to Marxist teaching, we get a presentation of the superstructure as arising, not on a specific economic base, but as completely independent of the

\* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. III, International Publishers, p. 75.

specific mode of production. As we shall see, Landy often deals with the concept "democracy" as though political power and political ideas were the structure and economic relations the superstructure.

Making "democracy," or "political rights for the people," as the starting point, Landy develops the idea that the people "therefore strove to enlarge the concept of democracy to include social, as well as political rights" (p. 156).

Conceiving political liberty as inherent in his concept of democracy, Landy tends to treat this question as though political liberty had been achieved by the people under bourgeois democracy, and that what remained was the solution of the social question "which political liberty alone obviously could not solve" (p. 91). And by the social question Landy obviously must mean social and economic emancipation.

From all this one can derive only the following conclusion, namely, that what remains to be done is to bring economic democracy up to the level of the political democracy. And this, no doubt, is the task set for the Communists.

It should be obvious to Marxists that all such concepts as "sovereignty of the people," "all power derives from the people," etc., which were necessary for the ideology of the bourgeoisie in its ascendancy, are not propositions having objective validity in class society. As historical materialists we know that political power has its

basis in the economic structure of society, in the specific mode of production.

All talk of democracy under capitalism as the "rule of the people" are words which fly in the face of reality, for the political power of the bourgeoisie is derived not from the people, but from its ownership of the means of production, its control and domination of the economy of capitalist society. If bourgeois apologists speak of the democratic republic "deriving its power from the people," this is aimed to deceive the people, to keep them tied to the bourgeois state. Only the replacement of the capitalist by the Socialist mode of production creates the material foundation for a political superstructure which for the first time represents and becomes the rule of the majority, the rule of the people.

What grist such writing as Landy's is to the mill of the Wall Street propagandists who strive to "convince" the European and Asian masses not to give up their "political freedom" for the "vague" Communist promises of economic equality.

In view of the fact, especially, that Landy develops his non-class thesis of the "democratic process" to a considerable extent in terms of United States history, accepting uncritically "Jeffersonian democracy," "Jacksonian democracy," "American democracy," etc., the false essence of that thesis cannot but feed the spurious theory of "American exceptionalism." It cannot but give credence to the ly-

ing propaganda of the ruling class that Wall Street-ruled United States is the best of all democratic worlds; it cannot but feed the illusory notions of the non-class character of U.S. capitalist society. Furthermore, this false thesis blurs, indeed denies, the fundamental essence of Socialist democracy brought into being through the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is precisely the imperialists and their Social-Democratic lackeys who identify U.S. capitalism with democracy, and Socialism with "totalitarianism."

Landy's passing reference in his Foreword that "democracy and capitalism are far from synonymous" by no means negates this non-class treatment of democracy in the book. For even here, democracy becomes some absolute, deified category. There is many an outspoken bourgeois historian or sociologist who would agree that "democracy and capitalism are far from synonymous." Is it the hallmark of a Marxist to speak so haltingly of capitalism and democracy in postwar imperialist United States?

#### MARXISM—THE SCIENCE OF THE PROLETARIAT

It is this treatment of "modern democracy" without the class struggle that makes it possible for Landy to speak of an "organic connection" between Marxism and "modern democracy," tracing the origin of Marxism within the "democratic current," which can only mean the bourgeois-democratic current.

Thus, Landy writes:

The process of becoming a Marxist was for Marx a process of becoming a more profound and consistent democrat (p. 143).

Scientific communism, or Marxism . . . originated within the bourgeois democratic movement in response to the social problems which this movement had no interest in solving. Arising on the basis of the most advanced thought of Western Europe and America, Marxism was the historical continuation of the democratic efforts represented by the seventeenth and eighteenth century revolutions, the struggles of the Levellers within the British Revolution of 1648 and of the Babeuvists in the French Revolution of 1789. It was the continuation, on a more advanced level, of the humanitarian efforts of the great utopian socialists and communists after 1815, during the unfolding of the Industrial Revolution, and of the stream of scientific knowledge embodied in French eighteenth century materialism, British political economy, and of German classical philosophy. It was the historical continuation of the democratic struggle of the proletarian communist movements of England, France and America after 1830. From the day of its birth as a scientific viewpoint of social development and as a practical party, Marxism therefore inscribed democracy on its banner and allied itself with the democratic movements of Europe and the United States (p. 157-8).

Here Landy treats Marx and Marxism primarily as an "evolutionary" development, a quantitative extension of the "democratic current"

within the political framework of the capitalist system. Marxism, for him, is the continuation of the earlier Communist sects and of utopian socialism, "on a more advanced level." Nowhere does Landy deal with Marxism as a qualitatively new revolutionary science, historically conditioned, based on the rising new class within the capitalist society — the working class. Thus, Marxism, the new proletarian world outlook becomes here watered-down to something reformist in essence, a mere quantitative accumulation of the theories of Marx's precursors, and Marx himself, we are told, arrives at Marxism not by basing himself upon the new modern working class, but by becoming a more "consistent democrat"!

Of course, Marx had to base himself on the accumulated knowledge and experience of his day, but as Lenin emphasized:

Everything that human thought created he examined anew and subjected to criticism, testing it by the experience of the labor movement, and he drew conclusions which persons circumscribed by bourgeois limitations or fettered by bourgeois prejudices could not draw.

To treat Marx as a mere continuator and successor, as a mere compiler and editor of antecedent ideas, is to deny to the founder of Marxism the role of revolutionary genius of the working class whose world-transforming discoveries brought about a revolution in human thought and human history. For Marxism is a

break from, a qualitative leap beyond, the ideas of all past thinkers, creating an entirely new scientific world outlook, dialectical and historical materialism.

Furthermore, to speak of the "organic connection" between Marxism and "modern democracy" or to trace its historical origin in some "general democratic movement" is nothing short of an idealist treatment of the origin of diverse ideas. Historical materialism teaches, as Stalin explains in the *Short History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, that different material conditions give rise to different social ideas. How then can Landy trace such diverse social ideas, as the ideas of the rising capitalist class and the ideas of the rising working class to the same historical origin?

Marxism has its origin not "within the bourgeois democratic movement in response to the social problems which this movement had no interest [!] in solving." Marxism has its origin in the rise of the working class within capitalist society as the specific class created and developed by large-scale capitalist production, the class which has the historic destiny of eliminating capitalism and building the new Socialist society. The socialist ideas which existed prior to Marx remained vague socialist strivings, impossible of realization, until the social force was discovered within capitalist society which alone could realize the ideas of Socialism. It was only when capitalist production had

developed to the point where the working class began to separate itself from the bourgeoisie and to act as an independent social force, that the material conditions had ripened for the formulation of Marxism. Thus, rooted in the material conditions of social life, Marxism thereby gave to the ideas of Socialism a scientific foundation.

The process of Marx becoming a Marxist is not the evolution from a "less consistent democrat" to a "more consistent democrat," but from a "more consistent democrat" to a proletarian revolutionary.

Of course, Marx did become a more consistent democrat, but not in the bourgeois sense of the term. As the theoretician of the working class, he represented that class in capitalist society which alone can be consistently democratic, fighting to abolish the inequalities arising from capitalism, from the exploitation of man by man. If Marxism inscribed democracy on its banner, it inscribed, in the profound sense, not bourgeois but proletarian democracy.

Landy's strenuous effort to prove the origin of Marxism within the bourgeois "democratic current" may also explain why the vague communist ideas arising at the time of the bourgeois revolutions in England and France, the ideas of the Levellers and Babeuvists, and later the utopian socialists, are not presented as arising under conditions where the modern working class had not yet arisen, or when it was still in its infancy, and

therefore when these ideas could not be scientifically grounded. Too often we get a picture of these ideas as though they had already included all the basic elements of scientific Socialism. Nor are the secret societies which arose around these still immature communist ideas treated as sects.

Thus the book does not help the reader to understand the meaning of Marx' words that "so long as the sects are (historically) justified, the working class is not yet ripe for an independent movement." But more than that, Landy's whole manner of treating the ideas of the early Communists must logically lead one to ask the question: If all this is true, what is so world-shaking in the ideas of Marxism that has not already been stated before?

It is therefore not accidental that the great discoveries of Marxism should be referred to by Landy in such dull and uninspiring words as,

In this respect, therefore, Marxism was merely [!] the theoretical expression of the position of the proletariat in the class struggle and the theoretical summary of the conditions of the emancipation of the working class (p. 179).

Merely indeed!

Thus we have a belittlement of the contributions of Marx and Engels in Landy's book. For anyone who tries to reduce Marxism to the elements which precursors may have advanced or conjectured, but which of necessity fall short of being on a scientific Socialist level, do a grave

injustice to the founders of Marxism, and a disservice to the cause of the working class.

Marx and Engels pay due tribute to their precursors. But it is one thing to show heritage; it is quite another to show the revolutionary leap rendered historically necessary and possible by the emergence of the new social class, the modern proletariat, whose outlook, interests, and capacity for revolutionary struggle and victory Marx and Engels embodied in their works.

#### IDEALIZATION OF BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY

One could proceed at greater length with the discussion of this central thesis as well as other aspects of Landy's book. From the analysis here developed the conclusion is unavoidable that the work contains an anti-Marxist idealization of bourgeois democracy. In essence it does not differ from the Browderite approach to bourgeois democracy and the democratic heritage.

One final point about the book:

Quite in keeping with this idealization of bourgeois democracy, there is in this book of two-hundred pages a total omission of the Negro people. Can one speak of the democratic struggles of the people in our country without pointing to the struggles of the Negro people to abolish slavery, without a mention of the slave revolts that helped lay the conditions for abolition which was finally

achieved in the Civil War? How can one discuss all the bourgeois democrats with which the book deals, and not mention a single Negro fighter for freedom? Where in the book are the Negro democrats, whose number is legion, who made such an indelible impact on the struggle for democracy? Where is William Wells Brown of the early 19th century; and the great Frederick Douglass of the middle of that century, who enjoyed national as well as international renown?

Can one speak of democracy in general without showing that the American bourgeoisie from the beginning introduced and defended slavery; that after the Civil War it joined with the defeated Southern slave owners to betray the democratic achievements of Reconstruction? What approach to democracy is this which takes no note of the long and valiant struggles of the most oppressed and suffering sector of American society?

We Communists are the inheritors of all that is progressive, of all that has advanced social progress in the history of our people, and we will preserve and cherish these traditions. But in saying this, we do not forget the historically conditioned limits of these past struggles and the inevitably narrow bourgeois horizons of the advanced thinkers of those days. Because we are champions of Socialist democracy, the highest form of democracy, we all the more value the revolutionary-democratic traditions

of the whole American people, the working class, and the Negro people.

### MARXISM AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE

How necessary it is for us to elaborate an authoritative scientific Marxist-Leninist evaluation of the history of our people, is seen further in an article published in the *Daily Worker* by Max Gordon, entitled "Founding Fathers Knew All About the Class Struggle." It is necessary to make reference to this article because it contains many similar misconceptions prevalent in Landy's book.

Gordon contends that the "18th century bourgeois democratic revolutionaries . . . were Marx's forerunners." Where in Marxist literature has this been stated? The bourgeois democrats were the advanced leaders and thinkers of the American bourgeois revolution, of the rising capitalist class, which played a historically progressive role in overthrowing the domination of British rule and thus made possible the development of capitalism. But they sought to perpetuate capitalism. How could they be the forerunners of Marxism, the ideology of the working class?

Forerunners of Marxism were the utopian socialists, who sought an explanation for the mass privation and misery which the victorious bourgeoisie brought in its wake. They developed utopian socialist schemes of an ideal society without exploitation and hoped to convince the enlight-

ened of that day to bring such a society into being. They were unable to recognize in the infant working class the historical social force which alone could bring about the new society. To speak of the forerunners of Marx in any other way is to reject the fact that Marxism transforms utopian into scientific Socialism.

For Gordon, the realization by the bourgeois democrats of 1776 of the existence in society of different groupings and group interests is tantamount to knowing "all about the class struggle," and thereby, making it possible to equate the Marxist understanding of the class struggle with that of the bourgeois democrats. When Marx said in his letter of 1852 to Weydemeyer that he had not discovered the class struggle, he did not thereby mean that the scientific theory of the class struggle was not developed by Marxism. For Marx added:

What I did that was new was to prove: 1) that the *existence of classes* is only bound up with *particular, historic phases in the development of production*; 2) that the class struggle necessarily leads to the *dictatorship of the proletariat*; 3) that this dictatorship itself only constitutes the transition to the *abolition of all classes* and to a classless society.\*

Only Marxism gave substance to the theory of the class struggle signified in the words of the *Communist Manifesto*: "The history of all hith-

\* Marx-Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, International Publishers, p. 57.

erto existing society (*i.e.*, as Engels subsequently noted, all class society), is the history of class struggles." Only Marxism transformed the concept "class" into a truly scientific concept when it showed that classes are determined by their relation to the means of production. And, only Marxism viewed the concept *class struggle* to mean the recognition of the necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat. That is a far cry from the bourgeois understanding of James Madison who says in the paragraph quoted by Gordon:

A landed interest, a manufacturing interest, a mercantile interest, a moneyed interest, with many lesser interests, grow up of necessity in civilized nations and divide them into separate classes, actuated by different sentiments and views.

The limitations of Madison's thinking was inevitable because at his time, as Engels points out in explaining the ideas prevalent in the 18th and early 19th century:

. . . the old idealist conception of history, which was not yet displaced, knew nothing of class struggle based on material interests, in fact knew nothing at all of material interests; production and all economic relations appeared in it only as incidental, subordinate elements in the "history of civilization."<sup>\*</sup>

The fact that we point out, as we must, that Madison as an advanced

bourgeois democrat of his day recognized conflicting group and class interests cannot be equated to Marx' development of the class struggle, as the driving force of history. For if the bourgeois democrats "knew all about the class struggle," what did Marx contribute to an understanding of the class struggle?

It is such faulty thinking which also leads Gordon to equate the Marxist theory of the state as the product of irreconcilable class antagonisms, the political organ of the dominant class in society, with Madison's statement:

The regulation of these various and interfering interests form the principal task of modern legislation, and involves the spirit of party and faction in the necessary and ordinary operation of government.

There is a valuable glimpse of the truth in Madison's words which link the origin of parties with different interests and groupings, an idea scientifically developed by Marxism in the concept that parties defend the interests of special classes, representing the most advanced elements of those classes. But that is not to say, as Gordon does, that the Marxists and the bourgeois democrats both recognized that the state arises "out of the class struggle" and that both held that the state is the political instrument of the "most powerful, economically dominant class." All the more is it strange to read in Gordon's article that it is precisely the concept of the state of the bourgeois demo-

<sup>\*</sup> Engels: *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, Karl Marx: *Selected Works*, Vol. I, p. 163.

crats which forms the basis of the Marxist-Leninist writings on the state. Then what was historically new in the contributions of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on the theory of the state, as an instrument of class domination?

Finally, Gordon maintains that since Madison stated that the day would come when "our Republic will be an impossibility because wealth will be concentrated in the hands of a few," and concluded that "a republic cannot stand on bayonets," that therefore Madison foresaw the inevitable need for the reorganization of society. Gordon then continues to say further that Madison, of course, could not "foresee that this reorganization would take place under the leadership of a working class which would grow as a result of the development of capitalism, and that it would be a Socialist reorganization. This, as Marx said, was the special contribution of Marxism."

Is Gordon here seeking to attribute to Madison, the bourgeois democrat, the theory of the transitory nature of capitalist society? That Madison, Jefferson, Lincoln and other bourgeois revolutionary figures warned against the danger of reaction, of tyranny, and the need to prevent the government from falling into the hands of the men of wealth, does not mean that this is the same as foreseeing the need for a radical reorganization of society, of creating a new society. It was Marx' greatest discovery, historical materialism (to-

gether with the theory of surplus value which exposed the movement of capitalist production) that revealed the laws of capitalist development, showed its historical transitory nature, and proved the inevitability of Socialism.

No doubt Gordon had the intention of bringing forward the historically progressive ideas of the bourgeois democrats, ideas which remain part of the progressive knowledge of mankind. That is commendable. But when in doing so he tends to equate Marxism with the ideas of Madison and others, one cannot help but conclude that this is a capitulation to enemy ideological influences, an attempt to make Marxism "respectable."

The universality of Marxist-Leninist teachings is grounded in the universality of the exploitation of the working class under capitalism, in the universality of the laws of capitalist development. This is what makes Marxism-Leninism as inherently American as it is Russian, German, French, and Chinese—a world science cutting across boundaries and oceans. We Communists must never forget that while the working class of our country still in the main follows bourgeois ideology, is imbued with many backward prejudices and ideas, and does not yet accept Marxism-Leninism, it will embrace it tomorrow. In that sense Marxism will become acceptable. And that is the only type of respectability Marxism seeks.

### TO THE EDITOR:

I have never written a letter to a Communist editor before—but then I have never been so impressed before by what one article in a magazine can do. I refer to Comrade Mao Tse-tung's article, "Oppose Liberalism in the Party," published in your September 1950 issue.

A young woman comrade who volunteered to read the article aloud had felt so broke because of many expenditures of a personal nature that she had failed to contribute to the Party fund drive.

Mao Tse-tung in his short, sharp article gave eleven examples of the forms that liberalism takes in the Party. Long before our reader reached number eleven, most of us were beginning to squirm uneasily on behalf of many comrades we knew, some of whom were in the room, and ourselves. Our reader reached the point where Mao Tse-tung observes that liberalism arises from the selfishness of the petty bourgeoisie, which places individual interests above the welfare of mankind.

It was here that our reader, who had already cleared her throat several times of a phlegm of guilt, stopped and remarked that she refused to be a mere liberal any longer and that she would find some money somehow for the fund drive. She added that she thought she could

improve her activities along the lines that the article mentioned. When she finished the final paragraph of the article, things began to pop all over the room. It was almost as if Mao Tse-tung had set off some Chinese firecrackers.

A comrade declared that the article provided an excellent mirror for himself. He had accepted Marxism in theory, but was not carrying it out in deeds. He said he was practically isolated from the people of our community—and how about some of the rest of us? I said I had failed to criticize friends in the Party when I should have spoken up about bad practices. This was a liberal attitude of maintaining a "peaceful" atmosphere. A third said he was aware of his own lack of discipline. A fourth proposed that our group re-organize its activities in a more planned fashion. We certainly needed to do this, and at the next meeting we set about it.

Our small group has been functioning much better since its exposure to the Mao Tse-tung article. We have thrown off a lot of the passiveness that heretofore existed, our self-criticism is on the up, and some of us who were really only commentators on the local scene have become a part of it.

E. B.

# ication

the lines  
When she  
ph of the  
o all over  
s if Mao  
e Chinese

the article  
r for him-  
arxism in  
ng it out  
practically  
our com-  
me of the  
failed in  
y when I  
bout bad  
al attitude  
l" atmos-  
aware of  
A fourth  
e-organize  
anned fash-  
o do this,  
g we set

een func-  
its expo-  
g article  
ot of the  
e existed,  
e up, and  
eally only  
cal scene

E. B.



## In the fight for PEACE

---

- PEACE—AND PRICE CUTS, TOO! 5¢  
*by Felix Baran*
- BONUS FOR MURDER: WASHINGTON'S PLOT  
TO REARM WESTERN GERMANY 10¢  
*by A. D. Kahn*
- PEACE CAN BE WON! 25¢  
*by Gus Hall*
- THE NEGRO PEOPLE IN THE STRUGGLE  
FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM 5¢  
*by Benjamin J. Davis*
- ON GUARD AGAINST BROWDERISM, TITOISM,  
TROTSKYISM 5¢  
*by John Gates*
- WHAT IT MEANS TO BE A COMMUNIST 3¢  
*by Henry Winston*
- AN AMERICAN LOOKS AT RUSSIA 5¢  
*by Claude Lightfoot*
- PEOPLE'S CHINA STANDS FOR PEACE 10¢  
*by Wu Hsiu-chuan*
- WHAT'S HAPPENING IN KOREA 5¢  
*by Richard Morris*
- 

### THE NEGRO IN HOLLYWOOD FILMS

*by V. J. JEROME*

"V. J. Jerome's essay, *The Negro In Hollywood Films*, is a brilliant exposure of how Wall Street perverts the most popular mass cultural form—the film—to buttress its jingoist and chauvinist oppression and exploitation of the Negro people. It is also a challenging exposition of the road to a true people's culture in which the great epic themes of the Negro people's democratic and national struggles will find their highest expression."—JIM JACKSON

*Price 25 cents*

---

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3

# IRON CITY

a new novel by  
**LLOYD L. BROWN**

**HENRY WINSTON:** "This is the dramatic story of our times—people in action against lynch law and Medina law. And here is a book that can rally thousands more for that struggle. Let us organize a mass sale of *Iron City*."

**HOWARD FAST:** "A fine and original production of working-class American literature. I applaud *Masses & Mainstream's* determination to publish books which otherwise, in today's situation, could never see the light of day."

**MILTON HOWARD:** "Brown writes about the victims of suffering . . . with a sense of identification and with unwavering knowledge that these victims are destined to be the victors in the end. . . . He has put our literature on the right path."

## **ORDER YOUR COPY TODAY!**

*Iron City* is scheduled for June publication by *Masses & Mainstream*. Popular edition, \$1.50; Cloth, \$3.00. You can help make possible the publication of this major novel by sending your advance order to:

**MASSES & MAINSTREAM • 832 Broadway, New York City 3**

LIBRARY  
APR 29 1951

PARK  
1951