

Nov.

political affairs

JULY 1951 • 25 CENTS

NATIONAL COMMITTEE
C.P.U.S.A.

ALEXANDER BITTELMAN

JACOB A. MALIN

JOHN S. SMITH

GUS HALL

PETTIS PERDY

G. ALEXANDROV

GEORGE STEWART

JOHN ELDER

- [1] America's Hour of Peril—Unite!
Save Democracy and Peace!
- [9] Who Are the Conspirators?
- [22] An Historic Call for Peace
- [28] For a Five-Power Pact of Peace
- [43] On Collective Leadership
- [50] The Farm Question in
California
- [65] A New Outstanding Contribution
to the Treasury of
Leninism
- [74] The Chicago Group of
Finance Capital
- [90] A Fascist War Incendiary
Unmasked (*Book Review*)

ANNOUNCEMENT —

As foretold by the National Committee of the Communist Party, the Supreme Court decision, destroying the Bill of Rights, was quickly followed up by a new series of indictments and arrests. As an additional blow to freedom of the press, the editor of this magazine, V. J. Jerome, was among those indicted and arrested on June 20th. This issue consequently was prepared without the participation of the editor.

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

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

York, N.
New Conn
payments &
nths; fore

Volume

A

Nat

Fer

T

uphe

Com

yers,

in th

TI

160-

Amc

of s

long

In

by

thou

bor-

the

N

mun

the

gro

F

Sup

•

the

the

1951

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

Editor: V. J. JEROME

America's Hour of Peril—Unite! Save Democracy and Peace!*

National Committee, C.P.U.S.A.

FELLOW AMERICANS:

The 6-2 Supreme Court decision, upholding the conviction of the 11 Communist leaders and their lawyers, affects every man and woman in the United States.

The Vinson decision nullifies the 160-year-old Bill of Rights. The First Amendment's guarantee of freedom of speech, press and assembly no longer means what it used to mean.

Instead of free speech as conceived by Thomas Jefferson, we now have thought control fashioned by the labor-hating polltaxer who authored the Smith Act.

Not just thought control for Communists. But for everybody, and in the first place for labor and the Negro people.

For the first time in history, the Supreme Court has illegally decreed

that an American political party — the Communist Party—shall be deprived of its legal rights and constitutional liberties. By judicial edict a working class party has been virtually outlawed and declared a "criminal conspiracy." The judicial decree also deprives the American people of their inalienable right to listen to all shades of political opinion, and to choose freely from among the programs of a variety of political parties.

In the last five years, there have been many serious attacks on the traditional liberties of the American people. *But this decision makes a fundamental change in the "American way of life."* The process of creeping fascism, initiated by Big Business after Roosevelt's death, has gathered new speed. Truman's reactionary and warmongering course has led to a victory for McCarthy, McCarran and MacArthur. Our country now stands on the edge of the precipice. *Only a new tempo of united*

* Statement on the Supreme Court decision and the imprisonment of Communist leaders issued by the National Committee, C.P.U.S.A., June 15, 1951.

action, of popular resistance, can save us from full-fledged fascism and a third world war.

Some say we Communists exaggerate. Some even say that the Vinson decision leaves the right of free speech intact, and that the Communist leaders are being punished for a "conspiracy to overthrow the government by force and violence."

But the facts show this just isn't true.

Even Justice Jackson, in his concurring opinion, says Communists recognize that "an established government . . . cannot be overthrown by force until it is about ready to fall of its own weight." Such governments, which have lost the confidence of the people, resort to force as a means of retaining power. Communists have always opposed the force and violence of capitalism and all reaction, of imperialist aggression, of strikebreaking and lynch terror. The Communist Party advocates social progress, and teaches that fundamental social change can only be achieved by democratic processes in accord with the Declaration of Independence. It opposes putsches, palace revolutions, and the adventures of minority cliques.

The Communist Party declares that fundamental social change can only be the product of the clearly expressed will of a majority of the people, led by the working class.

Justice Black, in his dissent, notes that the eleven Communist leaders

"were not charged with an attempt to overthrow the government. . . . They were not even charged with saying anything or writing anything designed to overthrow the government."

In his dissent, Justice Douglas put it even more bluntly: "I repeat that we deal here with speech alone, not with speech plus acts of sabotage or unlawful conduct. Not a single seditious act is charged in the indictment."

Some say the Vinson decision does "only a little" damage to the right of free speech. They say that if "only" Communists are jailed for their ideas things will not be too bad. But even Justice Frankfurter, in his concurring opinion, admits that "it is self-delusion to think that we can punish them for their advocacy without adding to the risks run by loyal citizens who honestly believe in some of the reforms these defendants advance."

Surely everybody knows now that more than a little damage was done to all labor when this same court upheld the "anti-Communist" section of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Surely Hitler, Mussolini and Tojo left no ground for self-delusion. Their "anti-Communist" and "dangerous thoughts" laws not only outlawed the Communist Party but also "legalized" a reign of terror, struck down the trade unions, all but annihilated the Jewish people, wiped out the organizations of the Social Democrats, liberals and Catholics—and proved

to be
Hitl
an a
not
but a
nation

Ad
camp
strict
muni

A
St. I
York
Cour
the I
been
the si
Act I
U.S.

The
this d
tailm
was r
repres
decide
years
a "po

The
wealth
lution
next v
decad
munis
ment

But
much
ple's g
are af
pose t
an en

to be the prelude to World War II. Hitler's Anti-Communist Axis was an aggressive war alliance directed not "only" against the Soviet Union, but also against all other peoples and nations—including the United States.

Admission to the concentration camps and gas ovens was not restricted "only" to card-carrying Communists.

A few newspapers, including the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, the *New York Post*, the *Louisville Times and Courier*, the *Amsterdam News* and the *Madison Capitol Times* have been honest enough to admit that the six judges who upheld the Smith Act have cut the heart out of the U.S. Constitution.

The people were not asked to ratify this drastic and unconstitutional curtailment of civil liberty. The decision was made by six men. Six men who represent the ruling Sixty Families decided that for the first time in 160 years the Bill of Rights had become a "poor security risk."

The Sixty Families of corporate wealth are not really afraid that revolution will break out in our country next week, next year, or in the next decade. That isn't why they jail Communists, and scrap the First Amendment as dangerous.

But the Sixty Families are very much afraid of the American people's growing peace sentiment. They are afraid that the people will impose this popular will for peace, put an end to the orgy of war profiteer-

ing and thwart Wall Street's ambition to rule the world.

The Sixty Families are afraid of the American people because, after a whole year of war in Korea and war hysteria in Washington, the people have not been stampeded. On the contrary, they show more and more determination to speak out unitedly against all war programs, whether put forward by MacArthur, Truman, or the so-called "isolationists."

For the warmongers, free speech is a "bad risk," because the people are speaking for peace.

The Sixty Families fear the American people because they are robbing the people blind. And because their \$50 billion 1951 war profits are stained with the blood of over 150,000 American casualties and more than three million Korean and Chinese dead.

The Sixty Families are afraid of the American people because their war policy has suffered setbacks and defeats at every turn, while their greed for profits and conquest drives them on to ever more reckless adventures.

The Sixty Families are afraid the American people will call them to account for the repeated international crises provoked by the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, the North Atlantic War Pact, and the Anglo-American moves to complete the rearmament of western Germany and Japan. They are afraid the people will realize that America's allies are not the shaky Marshall Plan govern-

ments, but the mighty people's peace forces that cannot be intimidated by threats or bribed by Wall Street's billions.

The Sixty Families are afraid the American people will insist that the only way out of the impasse in Korea is to end the war through peaceful negotiations, to recognize the Chinese People's Republic.

The Sixty Families are afraid of the American people because they fear peaceful co-existence and peaceful competition with the Socialist system. They are afraid that increasing numbers of Americans will learn the truth about the Soviet Union, about its working class democracy, and what it is like to enjoy the fruits of an ever-expanding economy of abundance in a land rid of monopolists and free from fear of economic crisis. They are especially afraid that the American workers and the Negro people will wake up to the fact that the countries of Socialism and People's Democracy are invincible and steadfast defenders of world peace.

The economic royalists turned to the weapon of the Smith Act because they are weak—not because they are strong. Weakness and desperation drive them now toward open forms of police state rule.

This is why the most powerful capitalist state, which professes to lead the "free nations," is the first to declare free speech a "bad risk"—and eggs on its satellites to take similar "security measures."

And this is why the Vinson decision has sharpened the danger of fascism and world war, and would be used by the men of the trusts to speed the drive to an atomic holocaust.

How could these desperate men of Wall Street get away with this nullification of the Bill of Rights?

The Vinson decision was not made in a day. It has been creeping up on us for a long time. The monopolists began chipping away at the Bill of Rights, as well as the United Nations Charter, when they set out to junk Roosevelt's "Grand Design" for a durable peace based on American-Soviet cooperation.

Like a true disciple of Pendergast and a loyal Wall Street servant, President Truman didn't hinder them, he helped them. He has collaborated at every step of the way—with Forrestal, Wilson and Dulles, with the Dixiecrats, with McCarthy and McCarran, with the Taft-Hartleyites, with Hoover and MacArthur. Old New Dealers have been driven out of public life, to make way for more bankers and generals.

Defying the wishes of the rank and file, most of labor's top officialdom has rejected all appeals for united resistance to the drive toward war and fascism. Un-American witch-hunts in the ranks of labor and the Negro people helped pave the way for this decision which threatens the very existence of the trade unions.

The First Amendment would be safe if more Americans had de-

man
the
of th
13th,
the C
The
feren
indu
Hart
other
more
fense
tively
ium.
to see
the M
throu
sition
mined
The
not be
people
nized
far ou
stigma
you a
or wor
peace.
Am
high c
munis
taken
ards a
freedom
tional s
The
84-year
indicted
he wor
like Co

mandated that the Administration and the Supreme Court secure the rights of the Negro people by enforcing the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments to the Constitution.

The Vinson decision would be different, if more labor leaders had not indulged in dreams that the Taft-Hartley Act would hurt only some other union, not their own. Or if more citizens had rallied to the defense of the foreign-born and effectively opposed the deportation delirium. Or if the millions who began to see the sinister fascist design when the McCarran law was being pushed through had reinforced their opposition with more militant and determined unity.

The right to speak for peace would not be so gravely threatened, if more people who want peace had recognized that the danger of atomic war far outweighs the danger of being stigmatized as a Communist because you associate with some American or world-wide people's movement for peace.

Americans have been paying the high cost of Wall Street's anti-Communist crusade in many ways. It has taken a heavy toll, in living standards and human life, in individual freedom and human dignity, in national security and honor.

The great scientist and historian, 84-year-old Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois is indicted as a "foreign agent" because he works for peace. But gangsters like Costello go scot free.

A *New York Times* survey reveals that college students and professors are paralyzed by fear of the thought police. But the dope peddlers who prey on America's youth are bold as brass.

J. Edgar Hoover spreads an F.B.I. dragnet for "450,000 subversives." But the big-time crime syndicates are not worried.

Jail for the 11 Communist leaders will put no meat on the table for common folk, nor will it reduce the armament tax load. The high cost of living is part of the high cost of anti-Communism.

The reactionary bipartisan Truman Administration delivered the goods when it secured the frameup conviction of the Communist leaders.

But many Americans hoped the Supreme Court would refuse to uphold the Smith Act. They kept on hoping, even after Truman's court upheld the Taft-Hartley Act—even after this same court sanctioned the legal lynching of the Martinsville Seven and Willie McGee.

Now the Vinson decision has been handed down.

All Americans—not just the Communists—face a wholly new situation.

The Vinson decision is a major victory for the pro-fascists. They are trigger-happy with their new weapon, and eager to close in for the kill.

Attorney General McGrath claims, with tongue in cheek, that the Communist Party has not been outlawed, although deprived of its constitu-

tional liberties. At the same time the Justice Department promises a wave of new persecutions to deprive the Party of its threadbare legal status, imprison more of its leaders, and drive it underground.

The court edict declaring the Communist Party a "conspiracy" threatens to bring back the days when courts held the trade unions to be "conspiracies to raise wages," and when trade union leaders were imprisoned for organizing the unorganized and trade unionists driven underground. Indeed, Justice Jackson in his concurring opinion, already warns that "Any workman may quit his work for any reason, but concerted actions to the same end are in some circumstances forbidden." The Vinson decision is thus a new threat to the hard-won right to strike.

It is also a new and very grave threat to the Negro people, to Negro-white unity, and to every man and woman in the United States who wants to work with his fellows in defense of world peace.

Its victims will also be the self-styled liberals, the so-called "left" supporters of the Truman Administration whom the McCarthys seek to drive out of public life and into concentration camps together with the Communists.

Thus, we have come to a turning point in the life of our nation. The danger of fascism has been greatly increased, and with it the danger of a third world war.

But World War III is not inevitable, and even at this late hour the plot to speed and complete the already advanced process of fascization can still be thwarted. Disaster can even now be averted—but only if the tens of millions throw their weight into the balance, only if the resistance of labor and all democratic forces becomes far bolder and more united, only if tens of millions of people of people act quickly and in unison.

Everything now depends on what is done by each of us, and by all of us together.

We Communists are going to stand firm. We are going to fight for our own rights, and for the rights of all the people—Negro and white.

We will maintain our place in the ranks of the working class which gave our Party birth, championing the interests, welfare and future of the American workers and common people.

We Communists will fight to keep our leaders out of jail, and to free them if they are imprisoned. We will make full use of every opportunity to function as a legal political party, and strive to regain the rights of which we and the people have been deprived.

We are going to resist the attempt to drive us underground. But we are also going to protect our members and our organization. We are going to guard the integrity and working class principles of our Party, and preserve its ability to function under

any
W
burn
and
of so
ism,
our c
We
the v
rally
strug
cont
both
war
sprea
Europ
the F
Union
racy
gethe
tinue
Five
way t
the c
and a
intere
people
We
cialism
the n
ageme
people
the w
believe
jority
ple wi
organi
an en
countr
But

any and all circumstances.

We will not capitulate to the book-burners. We will continue to study and teach the working class science of social progress, of Marxism-Leninism, and to apply it in the interest of our class, our people, our country.

We Communists will not yield to the warmakers. We will continue to rally millions of people to effective struggle for world peace. We will continue to join with all who combat both the Truman and the MacArthur war program, and strive to halt the spread of war, whether in Asia or in Europe. We will continue to expose the Hitlerite Big Lie that the Soviet Union, the land of workers' democracy, threatens the United States. Together with millions, we will continue to advocate and work for a Five Power Pact of Peace, as the only way to end international tensions, lift the crushing burden of armaments, and achieve a lasting peace in the interests of our own and all other peoples.

We will continue to advocate Socialism, the common ownership of the nation's economy and its management for the benefit of the whole people by a government headed by the working class. We Communists believe that some day, when the majority so decides, the American people will bring about the Socialist reorganization of society and thus put an end to the evils that beset our country today.

But every thinking person knows

that Socialism is not the immediate issue in our country now. *The issue today is peace or war. The issue is democracy or fascism.*

The Communist Party has said many times, especially since 1945, what it says again now: "*The task which confronts the American people in this and the coming period is the establishment, by democratic means, of a government of peace, a democratic government, an anti-Wall Street government.*"

Millions of Americans, workers and farmers, Negro and white, intellectuals, women and youth, already share this aim. Through their common struggle, and led by the working class, they will win a majority of the people for a government of peace. *The Communist Party stands ready to support a government committed to the maintenance of peace and democratic liberties for all.*

Fellow Americans! We dare not wait for the fulfillment of Justice Black's prediction that some future generation will regain the rights of which we have all now been deprived. *This challenge has come to our generation. It must be met by us—now!*

The Communist Party appeals to all working people, Negro and white, to all peace advocates and all democratic organizations.

Remember that tens of millions of Americans, adding their voices to the world-wide cry of protest, have checked those who repeatedly threat-

ened to use atomic bombs against the peoples of Korea and China.

Remember that we are all descendants of those who surmounted every difference of opinion to unite under the leadership of Jefferson and Madison, and thus nullified the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798.

Remember that our forebears rallied around Lincoln and Douglass, put down the slaveowners' rebellion, and repudiated the Fugitive Slave Law and the Dred Scott decision.

Remember that united labor action cracked the open shop fortress, and reversed the courts that sought to outlaw trade unionism.

The right of free speech is reaffirmed every time an American exercises that inalienable right! United

action cannot be punished as "conspiracy" when millions act together!

Demand that the high court reconsider its decision, and restore the First Amendment! Keep the eleven Communist leaders out of jail! Oppose any further indictments under the fascist Smith or McCarran Acts!

Speak out together in defense of the Constitution and its Bill of Rights!

Americans, working people! Unite to impose your will for democracy and peace!

**NATIONAL COMMITTEE
OF THE COMMUNIST
PARTY**

**WILLIAM Z. FOSTER, Chairman
EUGENE DENNIS, General Sec'y**

By A

Who
the t
plied
and
consp
welfa
of al
nopo
their
labor
Trum
which
to ho
to w

Is
drag
worl
this
prese
But
and i
in th
spirac
and i
preme
in ja
doing
this c
ican p
to wa
Wh
threat
peace,

Who Are the Conspirators?

By Alexander Bittelman

WHO ARE THE CONSPIRATORS? Who are the traitors? History has already supplied the answer to these questions, and the answer is irrefutable. The conspirators against the peace and welfare of the American people and of all peoples are the capitalist monopolies, their two major parties, their government, their agents in the labor movement. And this includes Truman's Supreme Court majority which is discarding the Bill of Rights to help promote Wall Street's drive to war and fascism.

Is there a conspiracy on foot to drag the American people into a new world war? There certainly is. Does this conspiracy present a clear and present danger? It certainly does. But it isn't the Communist Party and its leadership that are engaged in this dastardly and criminal conspiracy. On the contrary, the Party, and its eleven leaders whom the Supreme Court majority wants to put in jail, are doing, and have been doing all in their power to expose this conspiracy and to help the American people defeat this conspiracy and to ward off this danger.

What is it more specifically that is threatening at the present time the peace, security and welfare of the

American people? It is Wall Street's war against Korea and aggression against the Chinese people. It is Truman's North Atlantic war pact. It is the atom bomb diplomacy of the American government and its mad armament race. It is the war bases—ground, naval and air—of the United States in all parts of the world and almost at the very doorsteps of the Soviet Union, the People's Democracies of Europe and of the People's Republic of China. It is the refusal of the Truman government, controlled by the American monopolies, to accept the peaceful co-existence and competition of the capitalist and Socialist systems and to settle differences with the Soviet Union peacefully, by mutual understanding. It is the systematic attack of the monopolies and their government upon the living standards of the American people, upon its democratic liberties and civil rights. It is the growing terrorization and oppression of the Negro people. It is the remilitarization of western Germany and Japan and the building up of Nazi and other fascist forces in west Germany, Italy and France. It is the drive to fascism in the United States and wherever Wall Street has a foothold.

These are the things that threaten the peace and welfare of the American people. These are the clear and present dangers facing them. And those responsible for these dangers—the real conspirators and traitors—are the well-known exploiters and oppressors of the people. They are the capitalist monopolies, their two major parties, their government, their labor lieutenants. They are the political spokesmen and representatives of these monopolies: Truman, Dulles, Dewey, Eisenhower, Taft, MacArthur, Hoover, etc. While these monopolies and their spokesmen fight among themselves for the division of the spoils, for larger shares of profits and political power, they each separately and all together drive the American people and the United States toward bankruptcy and national disaster.

Here are the enemies of the people, the conspirators and traitors. They are traitors to the democratic and revolutionary traditions of the American people. They are traitors to everything that is humane and progressive in the history of the United States. By upholding the frame-up verdict against the leaders of the Communist Party and the constitutionality of the infamous Smith Act, Truman's Supreme Court majority discarded the Bill of Rights and thus made its own "contribution" to the betrayal of America's democratic heritage.

FROM DEMOCRACY AND PROGRESS TO REACTION, VIOLENCE AND FASCISM

On this July 4, 1951, the day of celebration of the 175th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, and in the crucial weeks and months ahead, we must help the American people, and especially the working class, realize what the ruling class of this country has done to the revolutionary and democratic traditions of America. We must help the masses understand that the American ruling class is leading the country further and further from its historic path of democracy and progress to reaction, violence and fascism. We must also help them understand that it is the historic mission of the American working class, in alliance with the Negro people, the working farmers and city middle classes, to save our democratic heritage and traditions from destruction by pro-fascist reaction, to defend stubbornly every democratic right and civil liberty, to fight militantly for the expansion of these rights and liberties. We must inspire the masses with the determination to carry forward the revolutionary and democratic traditions of the American people, to carry them into the new, the present era, the era of struggle for higher forms of democracy, for people's democracy, for Socialism.

America was born in revolution. It came into existence as an inde

pen
"tru
Rev
It w
ciple
peno
Am
ship
sent
time
bour
Am
a cla
certa
tiona
Thos
most
prog
can b
sister
mocr
in a
again
tiona
Th
tradit
As
strug
tiona
can b
and a
upon
ruling
and
masse
tant r
Right
is anc
and tr
ple, o

pendent nation in one of the great "truly liberating" wars of history, the Revolutionary War of Independence. It was a war in defense of the principles of the Declaration of Independence, waged heroically by the American people under the leadership of the most progressive representatives of the ruling class of that time. This was the young American bourgeoisie, the capitalist class of America. It was then progressive as a class, even revolutionary, though certain of its upper strata were reactionary and counter-revolutionary. Thomas Jefferson was one of the most gifted representatives of the progressive and revolutionary American bourgeoisie, one of the most consistent ideologists of bourgeois democracy. The United States was born in a bourgeois revolution directed against feudal subjection and national oppression.

This is one of the great liberating traditions of the American people.

As a result of their hard and bitter struggles, directed against the reactionary sections of the young American bourgeoisie and of the planters, and also exerting powerful pressure upon the democratic sections of the ruling class which were wavering and inconsistent, the democratic masses of the people forced a reluctant ruling class to make the Bill of Rights part of the Constitution. This is another great democratic heritage and tradition of the American people, one which begins by declaring:

Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

But with the growth and development of American capitalism, with the consequent rise of an American working class and the sharpening class struggle in the United States, the capitalist class began to move farther and farther away from the revolutionary, democratic and progressive traditions of America. With the expansion of capitalism and the rise of a large modern proletariat, the ruling class not only began to abandon these traditions but also to betray them. To intensify the exploitation of the masses of the people, to keep them in subjection and to prevent the working class from becoming a power in the land, the American bourgeoisie, with the sharpening of the class struggle, became ever more reactionary and its rule ever more violent and oppressive. And when the capitalist monopolies became consolidated as the dominant power in the economic and political life of the United States, that is, with the opening of the imperialist era at the beginning of this century, the bourgeoisie as a class emerged as thoroughly imperialist and reactionary. It had moved from democracy and progress to reaction and national oppression. Its dominating forces—the monopolies—are moving to fas-

cism.

Who then are the traitors to the democratic traditions of the American people? Who are the betrayers of the progressive and revolutionary heritage of America?

At the birth of America, the people carried the banner of national freedom and independence. Today, the American ruling class is holding Puerto Rico and the Philippines in subjection, is forcing semi-colonial oppression upon the peoples of Latin America and the Middle East, is turning into dependencies the Marshallized countries of western Europe, is turning West Germany and Japan into Wall Street colonies, is beginning to enslave Africa, is waging war to enslave the Korean nation, is attacking China and preparing a war to destroy the Chinese People's Republic and to enslave the peoples of China. It is preparing and organizing a *world war* to enslave the *whole world*.

What has been the historic path of the bourgeoisie of the United States? From a revolutionary war of national independence to imperialism, national oppression and counter-revolutionary wars for the enslavement of other peoples and nations. Who is besmirching and betraying one of the brightest and liberating chapters of American history? The ruling class, the capitalist monopolies, their government, their political parties, their labor lieutenants.

At the birth of America, and in

the decades following, the masses of the American people won certain fundamental civil rights and democratic liberties embodied in the Bill of Rights as part of the Constitution of the United States. Today, the ruling class is curtailing these rights step by step with the purpose of destroying them. It is discarding and destroying the Bill of Rights. It is building up a police state dominated by a more and more open wartime dictatorship of the Wall Street monopolies. It is driving to fascism in the United States and is promoting fascism abroad wherever it secures a foothold.

The historic path of the American ruling class leads from Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln to Truman, Hoover, Dewey, MacArthur, McCarthy and McCarran.

All this came about in the process of capitalist development in the United States, with the opening of the imperialist era and especially with the beginning of the general crisis of the world system of capitalism following World War 1 (1914-1918) and the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution in 1917.

Imperialism, the present stage of capitalism, is the monopoly stage of capitalism, its highest and last stage. It is the eve of the Socialist revolution. It is forcing the masses in the capitalist countries to wage a revolutionary struggle for the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism. Imperialism does that "... by

shar
imm
cond
nom
livin
milit
react
sion
nial

He
appl
to A
is th
the v
tion
grow
capit
finan
ated
the
can
camp
the v
of th
cour
the c
rialis
war
tion

Fa
action
of th
meth
fasci
the d
geois
majo
the s

• v
Publis

sharpening class antagonisms to an immense degree, by worsening the conditions of the masses both economically—trusts and high cost of living, and politically — growth of militarism, frequent wars, increase of reaction, strengthening and extension of national oppression and colonial plunder.”*

Here is a brilliant analysis which applies at the present time especially to American imperialism, because it is the dominant force and leader of the world camp of imperialism, reaction and war. For, with the rise and growth of imperialism — monopoly capitalism generally — “international finance capital has everywhere created a reactionary bourgeoisie.” But due to the dominant role of American imperialism in the imperialist camp, the United States has become the very center of world reaction and of the threat of fascism. This of course is inseparably bound up with the central fact that American imperialism is organizing a new world war to establish the world domination of the American monopolies.

Fascism arises from imperialist reaction. It arises from the tendencies of the monopolies to pass over to methods of terroristic dictatorship, to fascist rule, tendencies expressing the disintegration and crisis of bourgeois democracy and representing a major feature of the general crisis of the system of world capitalism. That

is why we have now in the United States a *process of fascization of bourgeois rule*, a process in which the democratic rights and civil liberties of the masses of the people are being curtailed and destroyed bit by bit, in which the Bill of Rights is being discarded and a police state is coming into existence dominated by an increasingly open wartime dictatorship of the monopolies. That is why we have the decision of Truman's Supreme Court majority upholding the constitutionality of the fascist Smith Act and the frame-up conviction of the 11 leaders of the Communist Party.

THE MEANING AND CONSEQUENCES OF THE SUPREME COURT DECISION

Built on the fraudulent charge, the frame-up charge, that the Communist Party is a conspiracy to advocate the overthrow of the government by force and violence, this decision marks a new and major step in the direction of fascism and the unleashing of a new world war. This decision, which smacks so much of Hitler's Reichstag fire trial, marks an accelerated and more open process of fascization of monopoly rule in the United States. It is imperative to arouse the widest masses of the American people, especially the working class, to a realization of this new and major fact in American life today.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, International Publishers, Vol. XIX, p. 47.

It is clear that this decision, which represents a resounding triumph of McCarthyism, McCarranism and MacArthurism, is the fruit of Truman's Hitler-like anti-Communist "crusade" at home and abroad. It is not only that the majority of the Supreme Court which made the decision is Truman-appointed. His entire political course, reaction and war-mongering made possible and is responsible for this decision.

There can be no doubt that this brazen violation and undermining of the Bill of Rights, this open flaunting of fascist methods of rule, will embolden every extreme reactionary and fascist in the land. It will activate every anti-labor, anti-Negro, anti-Semitic, anti-liberal and anti-foreign-born element in the country. It will be used to intimidate and terrorize the labor movement, and to persecute and suppress every expression of progressive thought and action.

As for the Communists and the Communist Party, the Supreme Court decision is clearly designed to behead the Party, to make impossible its open and legal existence. For the first time in the history of the United States the Supreme Court renders a decision which undertakes to put legal sanction upon an unconstitutional and illegal attempt by the government to outlaw an American political party. The evil and dangerous potentialities of this decision for the well-being and progress of the American

people are limitless and incalculable.

This is the fascist danger. This decision represents the accelerated process of fascization of monopoly rule in the United States. This is the victory of the war-mongers and war profiteers.

At the present time, this decision constitutes the gravest menace to the growing peace movements and struggles of the American people. It is designed to stifle and suppress—to outlaw—the fight for peace and the spreading opposition to the aggressive foreign policies of American imperialism. *It is a measure of war preparation* to be used against the people at home, to dragoon them into the horrors of a new world war for the greater profits and glory of the Morgans, Rockefellers, Kuhn-Loebs, DuPonts, Mellons, etc., etc.

The decision is directed primarily against the Communist Party because it is the vanguard party of peace, the most consistent opponent of imperialism and of the war-mongering drive of the monopolies in the United States. And why is the Communist Party of America the vanguard party of peace? Why does it fight for a peaceful understanding and settlement of all differences between the United States and the Soviet Union? Why does it fight for an end to the Korean war by negotiation? Why does it fight for a Peace Pact between the United States, France, England, the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Un-

ion
Pa
pea
ist a
it i
dom
poli
of t
dina
plan
the
nat
Am
Soci
The
gua
dem
ards
cons
of t
whi
nati

It
heig
sign
and
war

T
arch
of th
hold
Smi
victi
is tr
publ
serti
"onl
mor
the

ion? Why does the Communist Party believe in the co-existence and peaceful competition of the capitalist and Socialist systems? Is it because it is "a conspiracy" and "foreign dominated"? This is the lie of the police state and of fascist reaction, of the J. Edgar Hoovers, the Medinas, Vinsons, etc. The true explanation lies in the very nature of the Communist Party, *in its class nature*, as the advanced party of the American working class, the party of Socialism and of Marxism-Leninism. The Communist Party is the vanguard party of peace because it is the most consistent defender of the democratic liberties and living standards of the American people, the most consistent champion of the rights of the Negro people and of Negro-white unity in support of the Negro national liberation struggles.

It is, therefore, a decision that heightens the war danger. It is designed to speed up the preparations and organization of a new world war.

The Truman Administration, the architects of the fascist-like decision of the Supreme Court majority to uphold the constitutionality of the Smith Act and the frame-up conviction of the 11 Communist leaders, is trying frantically to calm rising public anxiety by the fraudulent assertion that the decision is directed "only against the Communists." No more fatal error could be made by the non-Communist labor and pro-

gressive forces of the country than to believe this swindle. Justice Black and Justice Douglas say plainly in their dissenting opinions that the decision violates the Bill of Rights, the First Amendment to the Constitution. Justice Black says of the majority decision that, "No matter how it is worded, this is a virulent form of prior censorship of speech and press, which I believe the First Amendment forbids. I would hold Section 3 of the Smith Act authorizing this prior restraint unconstitutional on its face and as applied."

It is clear, therefore, that this undermining and discarding of the Bill of Rights menaces not only the Communists but all labor and progressive forces, the whole American people. This decision will be used by the MacArthurs, McCarrans and McCarthy even against the so-called "liberal" and "left" supporters of the Democratic party. It will be used to drive out of public life whatever remains of the so-called New Deal wing of Truman's and Vinson's own party. It will be used against the Democratic party itself. In fact, McCarthy is already charging, in a letter to all members of the House and Senate, that such reactionary warmongers as Secretaries Marshall and Acheson are heading *a conspiracy*, which he calls "a conspiracy so immense and an infamy so black as to dwarf any previous such ventures in the history of man."*

* New York World-Telegram and Sun, June 12, 1951.

Another error to be avoided is the idea that this Supreme Court decision and the general increasing fascization of monopoly rule in the United States are signs that the camp of imperialism, war, reaction and fascism is growing stronger. The truth is that the present accelerated fascization process results not only from the divisions and weaknesses in the camp of peace, labor and progress in the United States, but also from the weakening position of the warmongers, imperialists, and fascists.

The Hitler-like decision of the Supreme Court majority and the accelerated fascization process originate in the continuing and deepening crisis of the aggressive foreign policies of Wall Street imperialism. The ruling class of the United States is becoming increasingly more fearful of the growing peace movements of the people and of the vanguard role, actual and potential, of the Communist Party in the fight for peace. We must add to this the growing contradictions of the war economy, of war production and mobilization, which is unfolding much more slowly than the warmongers have planned or desire. Inflationary forces are gathering momentum. Signs of stagnation and elements of overproduction are appearing in durable consumer industries together with multiplying sectors of unemployment. The material condition of the masses, as distinct from the aristocracy and bu-

reaucracy of labor, is steadily worsening while monopoly profits continue to mount. The fraud and failure of the so-called price controls of the Truman Administration are arousing wide mass resentment. There is a stiffening of labor's wage movements and of general working class resistance to the economic war policies of the monopolies. There is also growing opposition to certain aspects of these policies among wide masses of farmers and smaller businessmen, while the rivalries within the monopolies themselves are also becoming sharper. Consequently, the American ruling class is becoming increasingly more fearful of the sharpening class struggle and maturing mass movements of opposition to the economic war policies of the monopolies and to the emerging wartime dictatorship of the Wall Street monopolies. It is therefore becoming more fearful of the actual and potential vanguard role of the Communist Party in the struggle of the masses for the defense of the people's living standards and against the war policies of the monopolies.

The warmongers in the United States are speeding up the drive to complete war mobilization in all fields—industrial, military, and political—making ready to precipitate a new world war. This increases the dangers of war and fascism. It also deepens the crisis in the aggressive foreign policies of imperialism at home and abroad, intensifies the

contradictions of the war economy and sharpens the struggle between the war camp of the monopolies and the peace camp of the people.

Due to these factors the ruling class is also becoming increasingly more fearful of the maturing mass struggles for the equal rights of the Negro people, of its growing national liberation movements, and of the vanguard role of the Communist Party in these historic struggles. Most particularly, the ruling class of the United States is fearful of the growing and maturing elements of an emerging peace front and of the rise of a peace coalition which may play a significant part in the 1952 national elections.

It is no secret that ideas are ripening among the American workers for a new political and party alignment, for independent political action in alliance with the Negro people, the toiling farmers and city middle classes. There is, therefore, the possibility that these developments may advance far enough to seriously undermine Truman's hold upon decisive sectors of the labor movement and its allies when 1952 arrives and to interfere with the operations of the two-party system in the coming national elections by bringing forth an independent working class political force. This being the perspective, the Truman Administration and the Republican Party leadership are obviously growing more fearful of the role of the Left

and progressive forces in this maturing political realignment and of the vanguard role of the Communist Party.

Nor can we overlook the sharpening rivalries and contradictions in the camp of world imperialism. These contradictions are not mitigated but greatly aggravated by the increasing dominance of American imperialism in that camp. We must take note of the rise of special new contradictions — economic, military, political—in the sphere of rearming the Marshallized countries and in the implementation of the North Atlantic war pact. Most particularly, and of decisive importance here, are the sharpening contradictions between the American imperialists and their European satellites, on the one hand, and the peoples of the Marshallized countries, on the other (Italy, France, England, etc.). Wall Street is in deadly fear of the peoples of these lands who are headed by the working class and led by the Communist Parties. This is especially so in Italy and France, but also in the other Marshallized countries, where Wall Street is building up the fascist and Nazi forces and seeks to outlaw the Communist Parties.

These are some of the main factors in the present political situation from which arose the fascist-like Supreme Court decision and which stimulate the process of fascization in the United States. And these are signs of weakness of the war-

mongers and fascists as well as of weakness of the camp of peace and progress in the United States.

It is indisputable that the fascization process in the United States could have been and can still be materially retarded by the struggles of the masses of the people against the reactionary offensive. The fact is that there was no united and sustained mass resistance to the reactionary offensives since the end of World War II. There was no such united and sustained resistance to the fascist activities of the un-American Committee, to Truman's "loyalty"-oath persecutions, to Taft-Hartley, to the McCarthy escapades, to the fascist McCarran Act and to the deportation mania. There were some magnificent and heroic progressive actions in all these fields in which Communists played an important part, but no large scale mass struggles capable of retarding the reactionary offensive. This is true in the fight to defend the 11 Communist leaders and the constitutional rights of the Communist Party as a legal political party. This is also true in the mass struggle for the defense of Negro rights, and equal rights in general.

It cannot be denied, then, that pro-fascist reaction was encouraged and emboldened by the existing disunity and division in the ranks of the working class and its allies—a division brought about primarily by the reactionary and divisive policies of

the trade union bureaucrats, Right-wing Social-Democratic leaders and phony liberals (Murray, Reuther, Dubinsky, Green, etc.). It cannot be denied that the path of reaction was made smoother and easier by the capitulation of many progressive, former New Deal circles within and around the Democratic Party, to *Trumanism*, which has become almost indistinguishable from McCarthyism.

Finally, account must be taken of the existing weaknesses among the Left and progressive forces themselves, especially in the trade union field, which Communists have not always and everywhere fought against effectively because of Right opportunist and Leftist sectarian tendencies. These were vital weaknesses in developing among the masses a sustained and daily struggle *against every specific move of the reactionary offensive*, against every concrete advance of the fascization drive. For life has demonstrated more than once, and the Supreme Court decision is one more demonstration, that to combat the fascist danger and prevent the victory of fascism, the masses must fight every day of the year against every attempt of the monopolies to curtail the democratic rights and civil liberties of the people.

This lesson the American working class and its allies must now put to full use. By this kind of a struggle, the American working

class, heading the masses of the people, will not only check the fascistization process in the United States but will administer a complete defeat to monopoly reaction and warmongering. It will curb the power of the monopolies and lead to higher forms of democracy, real democracy for the masses of the people. The victory of fascism in the United States is not inevitable because the people have it in their power to stop its advance.

THE STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE

The Statement of the National Committee on the Supreme Court Decision* analyzes the meaning and consequences of the decision and outlines our immediate tasks in the present new situation. It shows the way to the American working class and its allies to united action against the intensified offensive of the warmongers and pro-fascist reactionaries. It shows to the Communist Party membership and organizations how to meet the new difficulties and make full use of the new opportunities in the maturing and unfolding struggles for peace, democracy, the defense of the people's living standards and rights.

The Statement issues the following slogans of action:

Demand that the high court reconsider its decision and restore the

* Published elsewhere in this issue.

First Amendment. Keep the eleven Communist leaders out of jail. Oppose any further indictments under the fascist Smith and McCarran Acts. Speak out together in defense of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Americans, working people, unite to impose your will for democracy and peace.

These are the immediate practical tasks. These are the main lines of mass struggle in the present situation. And the Communist Party membership and organizations are called upon to fulfill to the utmost *their vanguard role among the masses*. They are called upon to adopt and develop such forms and methods of work as will enable the Party to function most effectively as the vanguard party of the American working class and its allies and as will provide the maximum protection to its membership and organizations from the attacks and persecutions of reaction.

The Statement declares:

We will make full use of every opportunity to function as a legal political party, and strive to regain the rights of which we and the people have been deprived.

We are going to resist the attempt to drive us underground. But we are also going to protect our members and our organizations. We are going to guard the integrity and working class principles of our Party, and preserve its ability to function under any and all circumstances.

We will not capitulate to the book-

burners. We will continue to study and teach the working class science of social progress, of Marxism-Leninism, and to apply it in the interests of our class, our people, our country.

The Party will increase manifold its activities in behalf of peace, for a pact of peace between the United States, England, France, the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union. The Party, says the Statement, "stands ready to support a government committed to the maintenance of peace and democratic liberties for all."

Declaring that the issue today in the United States is not the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism but the maintenance of peace and democratic liberties, the statement says that "we will continue to advocate Socialism, the common ownership of the nation's economy and its management for the benefit of the whole people by a government headed by the working class." Rejecting and condemning once more the frame-up charge that our Party advocates force and violence, the Statement says that the Party "opposes putsches, palace revolutions, and adventures of minority cliques. The Communist Party declares that fundamental social change can only be the product of the clearly expressed will of a majority of the people, led by the working class."

The American working class is

destined by history to become the leader of the people for the transformation of American society from capitalism to Socialism. But in order to advance toward this ultimate goal, *the American working class has the immediate task and duty to become the backbone and driving force of the people's fight for peace and democracy.* On the 175th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence the American ruling class stands fully exposed as the betrayer and worst enemy of the democratic and revolutionary ideas which inspired the bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1776 and which created an independent American nation. It is the sacred duty of the American working class to rescue these democratic and revolutionary traditions of our people, to make them live in the present historic struggle against the dangers of fascism and war and for peace and democracy, to defend to the last every democratic right and civil liberty, and to advance ultimately to higher forms of democracy, to true people's democracy, to Socialism.

Communists must be aware of and guard against, the following two main dangers in the present situation. One is the Right opportunist tendency to capitulate to the enemy's attacks. It is the tendency to legalism and liquidation of the Party as a Marxist-Leninist party and vanguard of the American working class and its allies. The

other is the Leftist, sectarian tendency to self-isolation, to give up the fight for the rights and opportunity to function as a legal political party. Both tendencies present grave dangers and must be consistently resisted.

It will also be necessary to combat all tendencies to minimize the new dangers of fascism and war resulting from the Supreme Court decision as well as all fatalistic tendencies to assume that fascism has already triumphed or is inevitable. The fascist danger, as analyzed by the Statement of the National Committee, has increased and so have the difficulties facing the Communist Party and all labor, progressive and peace forces. But the opportunities for

arousing the masses of the working class and its allies against the dangers of war and fascism have also increased and will continue to increase daily. The outlook is for increasing mass struggles against reaction, war, the economic war-policies of the monopolies, the intensified attacks upon the Negro people. The perspective is for an accelerated movement of the American working class and its allies to an American peace front, to a powerful peace coalition, to a people's anti-monopoly party of peace and democracy.

Confident of the ultimate victory of the people, the Communists will fulfill their role and duties as the vanguard fighters for peace, democracy and Socialism.

Malik's Historic Statement*

By Jacob A. Malik

IT IS PERFECTLY OBVIOUS that radio broadcasts on the subject of "the price of peace" should serve the cause of strengthening peace and assisting the forces which stand for peace in their noble struggle to prevent war. All the nations of the world realize the supreme value of peace to mankind.

It is not yet six years since the conclusion of the second World War, in which millions of persons lost their lives, but peace, for which such a high price was paid, is once again threatened.

The ruling circles in the United States of America, the United Kingdom and France are endeavoring to convince their peoples that, in order to maintain peace, it is necessary to arm, to create a so-called "position of strength" which will supposedly make the outbreak of a new war impossible.

It should, however, be clear to all that whoever desires peace should seek to resolve by peaceful means the problems arising out of mutual relations with other countries.

The Government of the Soviet Un-

ion has repeatedly declared that the policy which is being pursued by the United States, the United Kingdom, France and a number of other countries is profoundly vicious, will inevitably lead to fresh international conflicts, and contains within itself the seeds of a new world war. It is precisely this policy of the Western powers which has brought about the present serious international tension.

The chief reason for the deterioration in relations between the U.S.S.R. and the three Western powers was the establishment of the North Atlantic Military Alliance. The political leaders of the countries participating in this bloc make no secret of the fact that this military alliance is directed against the U.S.S.R. and the peoples' democratic republics. It is sufficient to point out that American newspapers and magazines are daily publishing maps and diagrams showing a ring of United States military bases in Europe and the Near East surrounding the Soviet Union, and indicating the air routes of United States bombers from those bases to the industrial centers of the U.S.S.R.

It is well known that at the preliminary conference of the deputy

* We publish herewith the text of the statement made by Deputy Foreign Minister Jacob A. Malik, chief Soviet delegate to the United Nations, in a radio broadcast on June 23, 1951.

foreign ministers of the four powers in Paris, the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and France offered every resistance to the adoption of the Soviet proposal that the urgent question of American military bases and the Atlantic pact should be placed on the agenda of the council of ministers whose task it is to consider all the more important questions concerning the safeguarding of peace. This policy of the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and France cannot be regarded otherwise than as an endeavor to maintain the existing international tension.

The conclusion of the North Atlantic pact, the establishment of American military bases abroad, the remilitarization of Western Germany and the creation of West German armed forces, the encouragement of a revival of Japanese militarism, the mad armaments race and the expansion of armed forces in the countries of the North Atlantic pact and especially in the United States—these are all current features of the aggressive policy of the Western powers.

The most flagrant manifestation of this policy is the armed intervention in Korea of the United States and a number of other countries dependent upon the United States. The Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and a number of other states have repeatedly submitted proposals for the peaceful settlement of the Korean

dispute, and the only reason why the war still continues in Korea is that the United States has prevented the adoption of these peace proposals.

The seizure of the Chinese island of Taiwan (or Formosa) and the bombing of Chinese territory provide irrefutable evidence of the United States endeavor to extend the war in the Far East. As we know by experience, however, this can only have the effect of drawing more closely together the peoples of Asia who justly regard this policy of the ruling circles in the United States as a threat to their security and independence.

* * *

The peoples of the countries which are members of the North Atlantic bloc are themselves suffering all the consequences of the policy of an armaments race and preparations for a new war. Whereas in 1938-39, before the second World War, the per capita military expenditure of the American Government was about \$8, in 1950 the per capita expenditure of the American Government on war preparations rose to \$147 and in 1951 it will rise to \$307.

The only people to benefit from the armaments race are those who make enormous profits from military contracts. The National City Bank letter, a publication of American capitalists, has admitted that the American economy "is moving every month at an ever-faster rate toward

making armaments its chief business and subordinating to armaments all civilian activities and the peacetime way of life."

In order to mask this policy of an armaments race and the creation of centers of aggression, the ruling circles of the Western powers are trying to represent as aggressive the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Hungary and Bulgaria, while declaring that their own policy of actual aggression is a policy of peace. Both these assertions, however, are refuted by the facts, which cannot be concealed.

The Soviet Union has consistently defended, and is defending, the cause of peace, and is pursuing a policy of collaboration with all countries desiring such collaboration. The Soviet Union threatens no one; it has not, and cannot have, any aggressive plans whatsoever. The peaceful policy of the Soviet Union is based on the fundamental principles which underlie the Soviet social structure and the interests of the Soviet people.

* * *

The efforts of the Soviet peoples are directed toward peaceful construction. The Soviet state is engaged in expanding civilian industry, in bringing into being the giant hydroelectric power stations and irrigation systems on the Volga, the Dnieper

and the Amur-Darya, and in carrying out its plan to transform nature in order to secure abundant and stable harvests. The peaceful constructive labor of the Soviet people in the postwar years has led to a considerable rise in the population's standard of living.

As a result of rising wages, of the systematic reduction of prices and of increased state expenditure on social and cultural objects, the total income of workers, employes and peasants rose by 62 per cent in 1950, as compared with the pre-war total for 1940. Obviously, the development of civilian construction on such a scale and the considerable rise in the population's standard of living would have been impossible if the Soviet Government had pursued not a policy of peace and construction but a policy of competition in armaments and armed forces.

In contravention of the United Nations resolution concerning prohibition of war propaganda, hundreds of newspapers and journals in the United States are daily and openly calling for an attack on the Soviet Union. At the same time, no one can name a single U.S.S.R. newspaper which called for an attack on the United States or any other country whatsoever. In the U.S.S.R. a special law has been passed punishing as penal offenders any who might try to conduct war propaganda.

The Soviet Union bases its policy on the possibility of the peaceful co-

exi
is
pu
loy
sta
no
pri
and
spe

V
the
Sta
to
can
"co
pec
con
sho
tak

N
the
har
ann
que
alw
no
of t
wit
19
Un
fron
(to
Fra
sion
A
it s
ther
peo

existence of the two system, Socialism and capitalism, and steadfastly pursues the course of maintaining loyal and peaceful relations with all states which show a desire for economic cooperation, provided that the principles of reciprocity and observance of accepted obligations are respected.

* * *

With regard to relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, as long ago as 1932, in reply to the question asked by the American journalist, Ralph V. Barnes, "could not the Soviet and American peoples be convinced that an armed conflict between their two countries should never under any circumstances take place?" Stalin replied as follows:

Nothing is easier than to convince the peoples of both countries of the harmfulness and criminality of mutual annihilation. Unfortunately, however, questions of peace and war are not always settled by the peoples. I have no doubt that the masses of the people of the United States did not want a war with the peoples of the U.S.S.R. in 1918-1919. That did not prevent the United States Government, however, from attacking the U.S.S.R. in 1918 (together with Japan, England and France) and continuing armed aggression against the U.S.S.R. until 1919.

As far as the U.S.S.R. is concerned, it seems hardly necessary to supply further proof of the fact that both the people of the U.S.S.R. and the Govern-

ment of the U.S.S.R., are anxious that "an armed conflict between their two countries should never under any circumstances arise."

The Soviet Government has defended and continues to defend the program of strengthening peace and international security. That program includes the co-operation of the great powers, which has been expressed in the proposal for the conclusion of a pact to strengthen peace. It provides for the reduction of armaments, the absolute prohibition of atomic weapons, with the establishment of international control to implement that prohibition, and also the strict implementation of the Potsdam decisions on the German problem, a peace settlement with Germany and Japan and the expansion of commercial and economic ties between all countries.

If this program is not being carried out, it is only because it does not suit the forces of aggression in a number of countries, which are afraid that the carrying out of such a program would undermine their aggressive measures, would make an armaments race impossible and would thus deprive them of an opportunity to obtain further billions in excess profits from war orders.

* * *

The Soviet Union took an active part in the establishment of the United Nations. The Soviet Union took this action in the belief that the

strength of this international organization lies in the fact that it is based on the principle of the unanimity of the five great powers, on the inadmissibility of isolating any of those powers and on the fact that its action will be effective only if the great powers respect that principle. Nevertheless, mainly through the fault of the United States, this principle is continually being violated, and three of the five great powers, the United States, the United Kingdom and France, are systematically pursuing the policy of isolating the other two great powers, the U.S.S.R. and the People's Republic of China.

In setting up the United Nations, the peoples of the world hoped that the organization would become a reliable instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security and would fulfill the obligation of saving "succeeding generations from the scourge of war" which it assumed under the charter.

During the whole existence of the United Nations, the Soviet Union has been taking steps to strengthen that organization and has resisted any and every attempt made by certain states, especially the United States, to bypass the Security Council, which was given the main responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security, and to turn this international organization into a tool of one or more states.

* * *

By the efforts of the ruling circles

in the United States, however, the United Nations is being transformed more and more into an instrument of war, into a means for unleashing a new world war; and at the same time it is ceasing to be a world-wide organization of nations endowed with equal rights. The United Nations adopted the illegal decision sanctioning, post factum, the American aggression in Korea and China. The United Nations branded as an "aggressor" the People's Republic of China, which is defending its own frontiers and endeavoring to secure the return of the island of Taiwan, which had been seized by the American forces. This is also borne out by the illegal decision to declare an embargo against China and by the fact that 400 millions of Chinese people are still not represented in the United Nations.

The Soviet Union will continue its struggle to strengthen peace and avert a new world war. The peoples of the Soviet Union believe that it is possible to defend the cause of peace.

The Soviet peoples further believe that the most acute problem of the present day — the problem of the armed conflict in Korea—could also be settled.

This would require the readiness of the parties to enter on the path of a peaceful settlement of the Korean question. The Soviet peoples believe that as a first step discussions should be started between the belligerents

for a cease-fire and an armistice providing for the mutual withdrawal of forces from the Thirty-eighth Parallel.

Can such a step be taken? I think it can, provided there is a sincere de-

sire to put an end to the bloody fighting in Korea.

I think that, surely, is not too great a price to pay in order to achieve peace in Korea.

For a Five-Power Pact of Peace

By John S. Smith

"THE PEACE MOVEMENT," said Martin Andersen Nexö, the great Danish novelist and world literary figure, "has become the most sweeping movement of all times."

The author of *Pelle, the Conqueror* and *Ditte, Child of Man*, made this statement to the Congress of Hungarian Writers last May. Since then, another hundred million people throughout the world have signed petitions calling for a Pact of Peace between the five great powers, the United States of America, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, the Chinese People's Republic, and France. Early in June, the total of signatures for this pact had passed the 300 million mark. According to the World Peace Council, a breakdown of incomplete returns as of June 14 was as follows:

Albania	865,885
Bulgaria	5,620,000
Czechoslovakia	5,270,194
China	259,000,000
Korea	6,500,000
Hungary	7,097,000
Mongolia	602,891
Poland	18,053,315
Rumania	10,025,000
Viet Nam	1,400,000
German Democratic Republic	13,034,477

Argentina	100,000
Belgium	119,383
Cyprus	79,762
Denmark	90,100
Finland	250,000
Holland	153,000
Indonesia	260,000
Iraq	12,000
Iran	893,909
Italy (seven provinces)	1,200,000
Lebanon	25,000
Canada	75,000
Cuba	300,000
Austria	700,000
Syria	60,000
Sweden (Youth)	25,000
Uruguay	60,000
Guatemala	33,770

Hundreds of thousands in Britain, Scotland, France, West Germany, Brazil, Mexico and other Latin American countries, Japan and India, as well as many other countries from which no official figures were obtainable, had also signed the appeal for a five-power pact.

Thus, in 15 weeks—from the end of February when the movement for the five-power pact was launched in earnest, until the middle of June—the world referendum on the Pact of Peace had obtained more than three-fifths of the number of signatures (500 million) which the campaign

around the Stockholm Appeal for outlawing the atomic bomb had obtained in the course of more than a year of activity. Moreover, on the basis of this rate of development, the perspective for this Pact of Peace campaign fully justifies Andersen Nexø's description. Despite the greater obstacles placed in the way of this world referendum by the pro-war forces, it is confidently believed that from one-third to one-half of the population of our planet will register their desire for the five-power pact!

The speed and scope of this "most sweeping movement of all times" varies, of course, from country to country. In the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic, Viet Nam, the German Democratic Republic and the countries of people's democracy in Eastern Europe, the state power and the organs of communication are placed at the service of the peace movement. There, nationwide plebiscites can be held in relatively short periods of time. The people are not afraid to express their opinion freely. In these countries, no one fears violence, imprisonment or the loss of employment or social position if he speaks out for peace.

All the more noteworthy, therefore, is the rapid progress of the campaign in the capitalist countries and the colonial and semi-colonial countries. In these countries the state apparatus and the reactionary pro-war elements combine to suppress the

peace sentiment of the people. In these countries the penalties for speaking out in behalf of peace vary from economic and social reprisals to imprisonment and even death. Yet, precisely in such countries as France, Italy, West Germany, Japan, certain of the Latin American countries, and even in South Africa, Spain, Turkey and Greece, the movement for a five-power peace pact is registering a broader and more rapid growth than that of the campaign for the Stockholm Appeal.

THE "DECISIVE PHASE" OF THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

In explanation of this phenomenal growth of the movement for a five-power peace pact, a number of opinions have been advanced. Certain well-intentioned liberal observers attribute it to an increased willingness on the part of the capitalist governments to tolerate peace efforts in their countries. But this hardly accords with the facts. On the contrary, the opposition of capitalist governments on the whole has increased. Violence against peace advocates has become more frequent. The illegalization of peace activity has become the norm in most of the countries of the so-called Atlantic Alliance.

A second opinion is that the campaign for the Stockholm Appeal "broke the ice," established the organization for peace activity, and that the current campaign for the

five-power peace pact is the heir to this rich legacy of work and sacrifice. This view undoubtedly has some merit.

More to the point, however, are three other features of the current movement for a Pact of Peace by the five Great Powers. The first of these is the realization among the peoples, as the Bureau of the World Peace Council, meeting in Copenhagen May 7-11 expressed it, that the "fight against war has entered its decisive phase." Asked to explain this during a press interview, Madame Isabelle Blume, Belgian deputy and member of the Bureau, answered as follows:

"Everyone is able to follow the events in the press and everyone is able to read the explanation made by General MacArthur in the Senate Committee hearings, which shows that he obeyed the orders given to him and that there are no fundamental differences between his policy and that of his government. Besides, in many countries such as Korea, war is not only being threatened, but is already in progress. The situation now is such that it is essential to reach a clear and decisive solution.

"The Four Power meeting in Paris is not progressing very well. It is now necessary to ask frankly whether the governments will conduct a peaceful policy or whether they will continue along the path which will inevitably lead to war." And she

added: "When we say that the fight has entered a decisive phase, we do not say how long it will last—six months, a year, or two years. We are no prophets. But the forces of war and the forces of peace are now at grips."

This new "decisive phase" in the struggle for peace had been foreseen in February by Stalin, in his replies to questions of a correspondent of the newspaper *Pravda*. To the question, "Do you consider a new world war inevitable?" Stalin had answered as follows:

"No. At least at the present time it cannot be considered inevitable. . . . 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 entangling the masses of the people in lies, in deceiving them and drawing them into a new world war."

The World Peace Council's Bureau registered the fact that "the peoples see that the frantic propaganda aimed at preventing any serious negotiations and at securing a solution of problems by force of arms, the growing war budgets and the armaments drive, may make war inevitable."

FOUR KINDS OF LIES OF PRO-WAR PROPAGANDISTS

What "frantic propaganda" did the

Bureau mean?

First, propaganda to smother the people's hopes for peace, to sow despair and defeatism, to convince them of war's inevitability. For this purpose, the pro-war propagandists use numerous outright lies, among which are the following:

1. The lie that the Soviet Union is "imperialistic," embarked on "aggressive expansion" toward the goal of "world domination." This misrepresents the facts of history, stands on its head the entire record of the Soviet solution of the national question, and tries to conceal from the masses the fact that a Socialist state cannot be imperialistic.

2. The lie that the Soviet Union is a "totalitarian" country, and the attempt to equate Communism with fascism. This tries to conceal the class essence of Socialism, fascism and capitalist democracy. It is the big lie of our time. Its central idea is the crude and vulgar notion that the existence of real democracy in a country is determined by the number of political parties; that a one-party government is a dictatorship, whereas a multiple-party government is a democracy. This idea glosses over the fact that capitalist so-called democracies are in fact dictatorships of the capitalists, who buy up and control the major political parties and the state apparatus, as in the United States, Great Britain. It conceals the fact that fascism is in reality the extension of the violence and terrorism

of the most reactionary big capitalists, and their openly dictatorial rule, as in Spain, Greece, Turkey, the Union of South Africa, a number of Latin American countries. It conceals the fact that Socialism, the dictatorship of the working class in alliance with the peasantry, is the rule of the overwhelming majority of the population, and hence realizes the true democratic ideal of government of, for and by the people.

3. The lie that the Soviet Union is continuously increasing its armed forces. This, as Stalin pointed out, not only falsifies the facts, but seeks to minimize the miracles of peacetime construction being performed in the Soviet Union, miracles which would be impossible if the Soviet Union were actually spending its resources in war preparations.

4. The lie that the Soviet Union—"without using a single Russian soldier"—is inciting "its satellites" and its "fifth columns" in other countries to wage aggression. This is a compound, complex fabrication consisting of several subordinate lies. It ascribes Soviet intervention to every popular demand or movement. The warmongers would have us believe that tenants' strikes against exorbitant rents or a protest against floggings and forced labor by the inhabitants of a colonial village are responses to Moscow "directives," or that a struggle for peace is really a move to make war, et cetera. With these lies, they strive to absolve im-

perialist super-exploitation and oppression of the blame for conditions which compel the peoples to protest and to revolt. Such lies afford a pretext for the use of greater force and violence to maintain the status quo in the colonial countries, and to launch witch-hunts and carry out fascist measures of repression against the workers, farmers and middle classes of the capitalist countries. This is the lie presently employed to conceal the aggression of the imperialists in Korea, Iran, Indo-China, Malaya and dictation to Western European countries. It is a device for destroying the national independence of countries. This is the lie at the bottom of an entire series of falsehoods about the Communist Parties, and is the central theme of the infamous Truman Doctrine.

5. The lie that the Soviet Union does not desire to reach agreement through negotiations, hence cannot be dealt with except by force. This lie is bolstered by calculated maneuvers, such as the delaying, stalling tactics of U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Philip Jessup at the Paris meeting of deputy foreign ministers of the Big Four powers called to prepare an agenda for the Big Four foreign ministers' meeting. Jessup crowned these tactics by abruptly breaking up the meeting at a moment when agreement seemed likely. At the same time, the Soviet Union was blamed for the stalling and the breakup of the meeting, and an ef-

fort was made to ascribe to Moscow the motives of the imperialists, namely, the determination not to come to any agreement. This lie, of course, also falsifies the entire record of Soviet foreign policy since establishment of the Soviet Union.

6. The lie that the great people's peace movement is a "Soviet peace offensive," designed to disarm the peoples and soften them up for Soviet "aggression." Here the pro-war propagandist's wheel comes full circle.

They brand the word "peace" itself as dangerous and "subversive." A move for peace becomes a step to war, and the peaceful thoughts of millions of mothers and wives are represented as being for war.

Second, by "frantic propaganda" the Bureau meant propaganda which tries to dress the war-bent imperialist wolf in the clothing of a peaceful lamb, which seeks to represent war moves as their opposite, and thus to beguile the peoples into submitting to the leadership of the war-makers. Among the lies which make up this propaganda are the following:

1. The lie that the U.S. Government, which seized the Chinese island of Taiwan (Formosa) and invaded Korea up to the borders of Chinese Manchuria, is really defending its frontiers which lie 5,000 miles across the Pacific, while the Korean People's Army and the Chinese People's Republic whose volunteers are aiding the Korean People's Army

are the aggressors.

2. The lie that the system of military alliances being built and armed by the Truman Government are "defensive" only. This lie is intended to justify the remilitarization of Germany and Japan, the acquisition of U.S. air, sea and military bases around the perimeter of the Soviet Union, China and the countries of People's Democracy, the arming and training of the armies of Franco Spain, Tito's fascist clique in Yugoslavia, Greece, Turkey, Thailand, and the stateless Kuomintang clique, and the attempt to organize a Western European army of 60 divisions. All of these war preparations are represented as measures to "defend" the United States.

3. The lie that the United Nations, which has been converted into a branch of the U.S. State Department, and under whose auspices the invasion of Korea and the despoliation of smaller nations and colonial countries is being carried out, is a democratic world organization of nations enjoying equal rights. This lie is intended to conceal the domination of U.N. agencies by the Truman Government, and to give "international sanction" to the unilateral arbitrary acts of Wall Street imperialism.

4. The lie that the tens of billions of dollars dispensed through the Marshall Plan, the E.C.A. and the Point Four project of the Truman Administration, are for the purpose

of "assisting the recovery" and peaceful development of these other countries, and for the "defense" of the so-called "free world." The real purpose of this lie is to justify Wall Street's dominant control over the economies of all the countries of the capitalist world, and the directing of these economies on the path of war.

A third kind of "frantic propaganda" currently employed by the pro-war forces is the chauvinistic, racist idea that the United States and Britain, the "Anglo-Saxons," are the "moral leaders" of the world, the "champions" of so-called "Western civilization," the bulwark of Christianity.

This propaganda is designed to breed in the peoples of the United States and Great Britain a conviction that they have a moral right, even an obligation to subject other peoples, to steal their resources and labor "in the interests of world security." The blatant manifestations of this propaganda refer to the Soviet and Asian peoples as "barbarians," "savage hordes."

A fourth kind of "frantic propaganda" is the idea that a war against the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and the People's Democracies will result in a certain victory for the United States Government and its allies.

Thus, dispatches from Korea passed by the U.S. Army censor stress so-called human sea tactics of the Koreans and Chinese, the supe-

riority of U.S. tactics and equipment, the higher casualties inflicted on the Koreans and Chinese. Even a retreat by U. S. forces is made to look like a victory.

Of key importance in this type of propaganda is the concept of the superiority of air power and atomic weapons. Thus Wall Street and its Washington two-party government hopes to convince the peoples of the United States and other countries that the war which it is striving to ignite will be a cheap and easy war, an "atomic blitzkrieg," a "walk-away" by "technically superior" land forces. Thus, as with the Hitlerites, the idea of the invincibility of the United States military forces is emphasized.

Another variant of this type of propaganda is the continuous deluge of lies about conditions of "forced labor" and "guerrilla warfare" and "potential revolution" inside the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies. These lies seek to convince people that an army invading these countries will find millions of allies, ready to rise up to restore the "freedom" of "free enterprise." These lies also were propagated by Goebbels, but they are repeated even to detail by the propagandists for Wall Street.

Such are a number of the lies making up the "frantic propaganda" of which the Bureau of the World Peace Council took note. The "frantic" quality of these lies is reflected

in the almost hysterical manner in which they are presented, the measures employed to force them down the throats of the peoples, the numerous tricks, schemes and maneuvers to gain their acceptance by the peoples. Thus the enormous propaganda apparatus, the vast sums spent for "psychological warfare," the open and veiled co-ordination of all information media in the imperialist countries; the interference with peace movements and the reprisals against peace spokesmen; the gagging of the anti-war press; the increasing witch-hunts; the ouster by the French satellite government of the four great pro-peace international federations; the spy-scares, air raid "precautions," civilian "defense" mobilizations; the McCarran concentration camp act, anti-foreign born drive and deportation proceedings, and the Supreme Court's nullification of the First Amendment of the Constitution in the Foley Square frame-up against the Communists—all these developments are part and parcel of the liberate drive to entangle the peoples in lies and draw them into war.

Perhaps the most revealing recent maneuver of this kind was the so-called MacArthur hearings in Washington. Both sides in these hearings posed as champions of peace—the Truman Administration forces contending their policy would prevent a world war and bring victory in Korea for the imperialists, the MacArthur forces making the same claim.

The
Stat
thes
mili
testi
que
grat
been
and
to l
bate
eral
spee
by
whi
mer
"de
the
F
ing
Th
(L
pre
"It
a d
is a
It
ma
glo
pre
Ko
wh
as
Sta
rea
to
wh
the
of
the

The real peace forces in the United States were conspicuously absent at these hearings. Neither the parade of militarists and banker-politicians who testified, nor the politicians who questioned them presented any program for peace. Every lie which has been listed above was repeated again and again by the participants. And to bolster this hoax of a "peace debate," President Truman and General MacArthur made additional speeches which were reported in full by newspapers and radio, and in which both posed as peace-loving men, with no purpose other than the "defense" of the United States and the so-called "West."

Fortunately, the MacArthur hearings deceived few people overseas. The *New Statesman and Nation* (London) on May 19 summed up the prevailing opinion in West Europe: "It is not a debate about principle or a debate about the terms of peace. It is a debate about tactics and timing." It was a debate not about how to make peace, but how to wage war, global war. It was a debate about precisely when to expand the war in Korea into other areas of Asia, for which at the time of the hearings, as General Bradley said, the United States armed forces were "not yet ready." It was a debate about where to strike the main blow, and against what country, for General Bradley, the head of the United States Chiefs of Staff, declared that expansion of the Korean war to the Chinese main-

land at this time would be "the wrong war, wrong place, wrong time, wrong enemy."

Yet, despite the crude, blatant falsity of this pro-war propaganda, despite its preposterous, fantastic "big lie" character, its power to confuse and deceive the masses of people was not underestimated by the World Peace Council Bureau. Perhaps recalling how similar propaganda was used to mislead the German people, the Bureau recognized the danger of an endless repetition of such lies through every medium of information and cultural expression, especially when their refutation is forbidden. The Bureau's warning said in effect: "*Permit not one of these lies, permit not the least credible lie, to go unchallenged and unrefuted!*"

INCREASED CONFIDENCE OF ABILITY TO IMPOSE PEACE

Another feature of the phenomenal growth of the world movement for a Pact of Peace among the five Great Powers is the increased confidence among the peoples that they are able to impose peace. The World Peace Council Bureau statement said: "The worldwide campaign for the conclusion of a Pact of Peace between the five Great Powers, open to all countries, can tip the scales in favor of peace."

In part, this increased confidence flows from the fact, which is generally recognized, that the campaign

for the Stockholm Appeal succeeded in stopping Wall Street imperialism thus far from using the atomic bomb. Together with the fact of the Soviet Union's possession of the bomb, this great campaign can be said to have attained its objective to date. For, since the beginning of the United States invasion of Korea, President Truman has twice threatened to drop the bomb. And during the MacArthur hearings, the idea of using the bomb was again projected. But the 500 million signatures to the Stockholm Appeal have been an effective deterrent. Every person who signed that great plea for outlawing atomic weapons thereby made a contribution to the prevention of atomic war.

Another cause for increased confidence is the calm, clear peace policy of the Soviet Union, based on its magnificent strides in peaceful production, its rapid construction of the conditions for a Communist society. Numerous delegations visiting the Soviet Union in recent months all attest to the serenity, the total absence of war jitteriness and hysteria, the happiness of the people in building their society of abundance. Such reports come to the people of a frenzied capitalist world like refreshing breeze, purifying the atmosphere of its pollution of fear and hatred. And along with this knowledge that the might of Socialism is steadily growing is, of course, the knowledge that the countries of People's Democracy, which are moving on the road to

Socialism, are also scoring new high records in production, are improving the living standards of the peoples and consolidating their independence.

A third cause of the increased confidence is the understanding by millions of people that the frantic nature of the war camp's propaganda is a reflection of its growing weakness, of its desperation. The peoples see the war camp suffering reverse after reverse. They understand that the mounting war budgets and financial skulduggery, in addition to increasing the taxation and price-gouges which enormously add to their own hardships, are at the same time promoting a galloping inflation which has gripped the whole of the capitalist world. They see the signs accumulating of a mass revolt against the dollar. They observe the rifts and strains within the war camp, the resurgence of acute rivalry between the British and Wall Street billionaires.

The recent elections in Italy and France created new obstacles to the plans of Wall Street to drag these two peoples into war. The West German and Japanese workers' resistance to remilitarization prevents the Adenauer and Yoshida satellite regimes from becoming reliable allies. The ramshackle, chaotic fascist rule in Spain, Greece, Turkey, Yugoslavia, attended by unbridled corruption, also provide unreliable "allies" for the Wall Street "master race." Moreover, everywhere the colonial peoples are in motion, fighting for indepen-

dence and the right to determine their own destinies which imperialism has so long denied them. The heroic Koreans and their Chinese volunteer allies have annihilated the myth of United States military invincibility. The Iranians have asserted their right to control their own resources. The Vietminh, Burmese and Malayan forces of national liberation continue to resist the imperialists' efforts to re-enslave them. The working classes and rising bourgeoisie of the African peoples are asserting their right to national liberation. And throughout Latin America, the sacrosanct hinterland of Wall Street, the regimes of corrupt, subservient politicians sit atop live mountains of revolutionary lava, seething in preparation to erupt.

Observing all these manifestations of crisis in the camp of Wall Street imperialism, the peoples begin to share the feeling expressed by Mao Tse-tung, that Wall Street imperialism is indeed a paper tiger, frightening to behold, but quick to dissolve when the rains come.

For these and many other reasons, the peoples are becoming confident that the further rapid development of the movement for a Pact of Peace between the five Great Powers can impose peace on the war camp. Such a rapid development of the peace movement, it is believed, can reduce to impotence the "allies" of Wall Street imperialism and contain Wall Street's war drive far short of another global conflict. It can rule out de-

cisively the possibility of Wall Street's mobilization of a West European army. It can force Wall Street imperialism, which is already painfully conscious of the fact that atomic weapons can cause destruction, but cannot win a war, to face the stark reality that if it insists on launching a world war, this war will have to be fought mainly by the men and women of the United States and that it will reach U.S. cities and farms. It can help the people of the United States, whom Wall Street propagandists have attempted to delude with promises that the people of other countries will do the heavy fighting, to understand the realities that confront them. It can completely destroy the initiative and time schedule of Wall Street imperialism, and can impose its own. Such is the new increased confidence of the movement for a Pact of Peace.

NEW POSSIBILITIES FOR PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

But the peoples are impelled to develop speedily the movement for a Pact of Peace not only because they recognize the danger of the war camp's frantic propaganda and have a new increased confidence in their own power to impose peace; there is a third aspect of the rapid growth of this movement. It is the growing awareness and desire of the peoples for the lasting peace and security of life which would accrue to them

from the peaceful co-existence of the systems of capitalism and Socialism. And it is the growing conviction that new possibilities for achieving this relationship now exist.

This feeling is especially strong among the colonial and semi-colonial peoples. For these peoples see that peaceful co-existence is the most favorable condition for their struggles for freedom and independence. Indeed, as Paul Robeson, a great leader of the peace forces in the United States told the Security Council of the United Nations, the fight for peace and the fight for freedom are indivisible. Robeson's statement, made in behalf of the World Peace Council, pointed out how the drive to war was intensifying the exploitation and oppression of the peoples of Africa, Asia, Latin America as well as the peoples of the metropolitan industrial countries. It won welcome response among the Negro people, the Puerto Ricans, Filipinos, West Indians, and other peoples under the heel of Wall Street imperialism.

Perhaps one of the most important causes of this belief in the possibilities of peaceful co-existence is the knowledge that the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe have established a new world, inhabited by more than one-third of the population of the earth, in which the perspective is one of the continuously advancing material well-being and cultural progress of all

the inhabitants. The existence of this new world was brought sharply to the attention of world public opinion by two recent events. The U.N. Economic Commission for Europe surveyed the economic progress of the Soviet Union and Eastern European People's Democracies and found steadily expanding production and rising living standards. A little later, President Truman, in demagogically objecting to a Congressional restriction on "assistance" to countries which shipped goods to the Soviet Union and its allies, admitted that Wall Street's satellites found trade with the new world indispensable. This point was later elaborated by a Soviet spokesman, who pointed out that no boycotts or embargoes imposed by the war camp could seriously affect the economic development of the countries of Socialism and People's Democracy; such actions would only boomerang against the economies of the capitalist countries. In other words, the advantages of peaceful trade relations with the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies are apparent to millions of the people in the capitalist countries and have a powerful effect on sections of the middle bourgeoisie.

As a liberal, non-Communist spokesman, Pierre Cot, the former French aviation minister, expressed it: "Let us suppose for a moment that this co-existence of two systems were recognized, through the Five Power Pact, to be the golden rule of

international life. Immediately there could be set up between the two systems, a sort of chivalrous and peaceful competition and emulation of the greatest benefit to mankind as a whole . . . even in the fields of industrial organization and technique the capitalist countries have something to learn from the East. Exchanges, not only commercial but technical, would be beneficial to all countries, irrespective of their regimes. What is true in the economic field is even more true in social, cultural and political life."

The readiness of the Soviet Union to enter into an agreement implementing the peaceful co-existence of Socialism and capitalism is a matter of record. In his report to the 15th Plenary Session of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Stalin declared as follows:

"The maintenance of peaceful relations with capitalist countries is for us an imperious task. The basis for our relations with capitalist countries is the admission of the co-existence of two opposing systems." In the same year, replying to a question by a member of a United States workers' delegation, Stalin said: "I consider that the presence of two opposing systems—the Capitalist system and the Socialist system—does not exclude the possibility of such agreements. I think these agreements are possible and adequate in conditions of peaceful development. Exports and imports are the most suit-

able ground for such agreements . . . and the same can be said of the diplomatic field. We pursue a policy of peace, and are ready to conclude non-aggression agreements with the bourgeois states. We pursue a policy of peace, and are ready to sign agreements in matters of disarmament, going to the extent of doing away with regular armies, as we proclaimed in the face of the world at the Geneva Conference."

It was this firm conviction of the possibility of securing conditions of peaceful co-existence of the two systems which lay behind the June 25 proposal of Soviet U.N. representative Jacob Malik. This proposal for discussions to end the war in Korea lifted the spirits of the peoples all over the world. Even a number of governments, party to the United States aggression against the Koreans, hailed it as a way to end the fighting and restore peace. Coming a few days after the United States representative had broken up the Paris deputy foreign ministers' conference, it showed that the Soviet Union was determined to use every diplomatic way to prevent the spread of the war.

There is another important source of the growing conviction that peaceful co-existence is the sole way out of the present impasse. This is the belief held by many persons in Europe, who have lived through two world wars, that a third world war would totally destroy their countries

and lives. In the United States, this view was presented by Walter Lippmann in his last three columns in the New York *Herald-Tribune*, June 18-21. Lippmann expressed confidence in an eventual United States military victory over the Soviet Union, a feeling which will hardly be shared with him by most Europeans, especially Germans and Japanese, and by a great many realistic Americans. However, Lippmann saw the whole of Europe destroyed in such a war, and the entire world returned to what he considers a period of desolation and anarchy. To avoid this gloomy future, he advocated a brand of "military" co-existence between the United States and the Soviet Union, based on a military truce-before-the-fighting, setting off one part of the world from the other and guarding the "boundaries" of each system with armed might. But this concept of "co-existence," armed to the teeth, is no solution to the problems of disarmament and peaceful trade relations for which the peoples are clamoring.

Nor is the idea of peaceful co-existence a tactical demagogic device to make time, as the war camp propagandists say. It is a principle which accords with the most profound needs of society and humanity. Its champions and advocates lead not from weakness, but from strength, from confidence in their ability to meet every challenge under conditions of peaceful competition. This

idea is implicit in the United Nations Charter, in establishment by President Roosevelt's initiative, of the principle of unanimity in the Security Council of the United Nations. It was an idea tried and proven in the victorious coalition which defeated the Hitler Axis. Hence, the validity of the argument that if co-existence was possible for war, its possibilities for peace are infinitely greater, more rewarding.

Such are the convictions of the majority of mankind, the peoples now engaged in the world movement for a Pact of Peace between the five Great Powers.

POSSIBILITIES FOR MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

The foregoing review of the scope and speed of this movement throughout the world has important lessons for the peace forces in the United States. The objective of these forces is to bring about a change in foreign policy which, the MacArthur hearings showed, is in a state of crisis. The development of the movement for a Pact of Peace abroad will further sharpen the present crisis of United States foreign policy. It can, as we pointed out above, limit the possibilities for Wall Street imperialism to expand the Korean conflict and other war provocations and local conflicts into a global conflict. It can cause Wall Street imperialism to engage in new tactical maneuvers

and to re-write its time table. But the overseas movement for peace alone cannot be decisive in changing United States foreign policy into a policy of peaceful co-existence. For this, the overseas movement must be supported by a powerful struggle of the people of the United States to change the foreign policy of their government.

This truth was clearly shown by the initial response of Wall Street imperialism to the Malik proposal for discussions to end the Korea fighting. When Wall Street registered its disappointment at this proposal by a flurry of activity on the stock exchange, selling the "war babies" and sending share prices down, War Mobilizer Charles Wilson hastened to assure the billionaires that if the fighting stopped in Korea, "in Iran, Malaya, Indo-China and other parts of the world, danger points exist that could set the whole world aflame." There was no need to worry, said Wilson in effect, about the \$46 billions in war orders and the coming \$1 billion a week that would provide the billionaires with more profits.

Hence, although the overseas peace movement alone might check the spread of the war, it could not be the decisive force in preventing Wall Street imperialism from inciting new wars and breaches of the peace. For this, the will of the people of the United States, expressed in action on their government, could be really

decisive.

The new political situation in the United States caused by the Supreme Court's nullification of the Constitution's First Amendment has undoubtedly increased the difficulties of the peace forces here. Along with the attempt to outlaw the Communist Party, this decision was aimed at the peace movement. Yet, although this action carried the country a long way in the direction of fascism and instituted the legal framework for fascist thought control, it could not and will not outlaw the movement for peace. It cannot stifle the peace aspirations of the working men and women of the United States, of the Negro people. As the Negro scholar and leader, Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, declared after the Truman government moved to imprison him and his associates of the Peace Information Center following its dissolution, "it is not treason to talk peace."

Indeed, the realistic perspective in the United States is one of a growth in the conditions favorable for increased peace activity. The increasingly rapid deterioration of the living standards of the people, caused by the war taxes and war prices and the other economic measures of the Truman war program, will result in many struggles on the economic front which both objectively and subjectively will coincide with the peace movement. So also will be the struggles by the Negro people and the workers for their civil rights. The

struggles to revive the Bill of Rights, to restore the Constitution, to stop the witch-hunts and free the Communist leaders and other political prisoners will become increasingly inseparable from the fight for peace.

The immense popularity of Senator Johnson's Resolution for a cease-fire in Korea showed that it is becoming clearer to millions of the

people of the United States that peace can be imposed. As more and more millions come to understand that only the sixty billionaire families and their corrupt politicians in the government stand between them and peace, these people will increasingly join the active movement to change the foreign policy of their government.

By
Ti
tio
par
in
a f
as
ber
spe
sam
ing
lea
erat
bas
the
V
som
up.
ship
riod
like
driv
ty
pow
in r
is a
of o
this
on s
up i
N
weal

* B
Ohio.

On Collective Leadership*

By Gus Hall

THE LEADERSHIP OF the State or Section or Club (or a committee or department) is like a first string team in football. It must be as close to a flawless, harmonious perfect team as is humanly possible—each member of the team carrying on his own specific responsibilities while at the same time helping and strengthening other members of the team. A leading body must at all times generate enthusiasm and confidence based on our Party's program and theory.

When a team is under pressure, some of its weaknesses begin to show up. This is also true of our leadership. But it is also true that in periods of sharp struggles, in periods like today, in the face of a reactionary drive to destroy our Party, our Party shows strength, initiative and power above anything experienced in relatively peaceful periods. This is actually the outstanding feature of our Party in this period, but in this memo we prefer to concentrate on some of the weaknesses that show up in our cadres.

Not only does pressure disclose weaknesses that would go unnoticed

under other conditions as far as individuals are concerned, but especially do the weaknesses in working as a collective body become noticeable.

In periods of sharp class struggle, the membership and the masses generally will place confidence only in a leadership that can and does work as a collective body. Leadership that works collectively produces results—a leadership that does not can very quickly destroy its own effectiveness and become a road-block to all further progress in our work.

The first step in the correction of these weaknesses is for us to take note of them. In most cases we are not aware of our individual responsibilities in the making of a collective team, that is, for working collectively, until they are brought to our attention. In this memorandum we will not go into the question in full, but only point out a few of the habits and practices that show these weaknesses.

To begin with, it is very important for all of us to be fully aware that although many of our weaknesses appear as strictly "personal" traits, actually they flow from the basic weakness of not being able fully to grasp the political science of

* Based on a speech delivered at Cleveland, Ohio.

Marxism-Leninism. Therefore our weaknesses show the influence of the ideology of the enemy class. Obviously, therefore, the basic solution of all of our weaknesses is the further study and mastery of this science of sciences.

The most effective way for all of us in the leadership to further master this science is to do so as a collective body—to grow politically together. A very important weapon in growing politically as a collective is the proper use of the Leninist principle of self-criticism. Through this intercourse, the ideas, thoughts and studies of every individual in the collective become the property of the whole body. Comrade Kalinin was very correct when he stated that the best way of mastering Marxism is in the midst of heated and sharp, but comradely discussions. The method of self-criticism is our way of fighting for the fulfillment of our Party's policies and decisions in our daily activities.

Most of our comrades, however, are very busy and, even under the best conditions, have difficulties in finding the time to read everything they should. But if the method of work of the collective leadership is good, then the whole body can get the benefit of everyone's individual study and reading and thereby raise the political level for everybody. This can come about only if the political discussions are both organized and planned and integrated into the

discussions of the every-day tasks of the Party.

Therefore, it is important to plan the work of all committees in such a way that through their work they constantly deepen their understanding, grow politically, and broaden their political horizons.

THE ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITY OF EACH INDIVIDUAL FOR THE FUNCTIONING OF A COLLECTIVE LEADERSHIP

As in everything else, so with our bodies of leadership. They are as strong and as effective as their weakest link. So if one member of the body does not measure up to the tasks, it drastically cuts down the effectiveness and lowers the standard of leadership of the whole collective. Very often one "pessimist," one "griper," destroys the effectiveness of the whole club executive or section committee for months on end. Most of these comrades mean well, or are not conscious of playing a disruptive role, but among other things, such a comrade makes it more difficult to detect a conscious disrupter.

Or take the member of a committee or leading body who continually accepts assignments and work and who either does not carry them out at all, or does the work sloppily and haphazardly. It takes the full time and work of the rest of the committee to prod, discuss and to finish the

task, when they could be doing other work. So here again, the net result of this weakness of one member is responsible for destroying the effectiveness of the whole body.

And then we have the situation where comrades become "specialists" in special fields of work. It is true that we should each become most closely acquainted with that phase of our activities for which we are chiefly responsible, but this should not be done at the expense of doing or interesting one's self in the other phases of work. Such comrades usually tend to become one-sided and tend to lose sight of the general problems. *We cannot lead the working class in struggle no matter how hard we work, if we do it as "specialists" by way of departments in isolation or separation from the whole problem.* The sum total of "specialists" working separately does not make one collective leadership.

THE MEANING AND HARM OF "MOODS"

Here is a disease which is very harmful to collective work whether it takes on the form of pouting like a schoolboy or going off to be "alone" like Garbo; both are damaging. What the individuals usually do not realize is the effect such behavior has on the whole Party. These moods also take on the form of swinging from extreme enthusiasm to extreme pessimism, for no appar-

ent reason. It moves from periods of *effective* work to periods of *no* work.

These are all signs of a lack of political maturity and stability. These moods reflect and go up and down either with momentary victories or temporary setbacks. They appear as a result of the influence of the enemy class, which is in the direction of under-estimating the power, ability and potential of the working class and a false over-estimation of the stability and abilities of the capitalist class. To avoid such weaknesses, all leading bodies should conduct systematic educational activities and especially systematic political discussions based on current events. This will help these comrades to see the local and immediate problems in proper relationship to the whole class struggle.

In some cases, these "moods" appear when an individual allows some personal problems to become all-important and to overshadow the main problem—the class struggle. And often what is forgotten is that these so-called "personal problems" arise and flow out of the very system of society that we are fighting to change. What is needed is a Marxist approach to problems of this nature.

Then we have the comrade who "blows his or her top." Such tendencies are not builders of harmonious collective work. It takes days to undo the harm one does within minutes, when he is "blowing his top." This problem can largely be eliminated

by everybody practicing self-control and recognizing that it doesn't help to solve any problems under any circumstances. And secondly, for us to recognize that one "blows his top" when he or she runs short of logical arguments or doesn't have the ground to stand on.

Just as "blowing one's top" is harmful for the best collective effort, so is the habit of those who silently file away in the back of their heads all the so-called injustices and wrong things and stubbornly brood over them. This type of behavior leads to the small insignificant problem being built up into a mountain.

Most of these shortcomings can be eliminated by a practice of open, frank, comradely self-criticism and discussion. This must become the method of work for all collective bodies.

Then we have the "lone-wolf" type of worker. Of course, even this designation doesn't fit because even wolves fight in collective packs. But we do have individuals who feel they just cannot make their "maximum contribution" as part of a collective team. This of course is unrealistic and an illusion. It is an attempt to side-step self-criticism and to avoid facing one's own weaknesses and correcting them. This outlook has its source in a petty bourgeois individualistic approach to the class struggle. Lone wolves cannot be very successful in a fight where unity and collective effort is the great-

est and the most basic of our weapons.

And then we have those who harm the collective body, who consciously or unconsciously attempt to "dominate" the work and thinking. This of course stifles the rest of the collective and cuts down its effectiveness. Usually this flows from a basic lack of confidence in the other members or from an unrealistic over-estimation of one's own abilities. This becomes a real obstacle to learning from each other as a part of our daily activities.

HOW TO SEE OUR WEAKNESSES

In relation to destructive criticism the old saying that the operation was successful but the patient died, holds true. But it is also true that the doctor can cover up and hide the ailment until it is too late, and this also may kill the patient. In self-criticism, we don't want either of these two alternatives. We must correct our weaknesses in such a manner that it strengthens our work and the Party. If it results in anything else, it is not Leninist self-criticism.

So what are some of the approaches to our weaknesses that we often see and that tend to destroy and not build?

First, we have those who have one answer for all the weaknesses—that is, "There is something basically—fundamentally wrong." This, of course, explains nothing, but it does

raise doubts about the basic line and policy of our Party. It does breed undue pessimism and tends to weaken the confidence in our work. And of course such statements are not profound in themselves, and especially when so often these comrades do not follow with any explanation as to what they think is so "fundamentally" wrong. To these comrades we must answer that "it ain't necessarily so" just because they make a statement. *All problems must be discussed without exaggerating or minimizing, and not in isolation from their surroundings.* We cannot properly discuss today's problems by using last year's conditions and environment.

Then there are those of us who seem to live and exist only to make a collection of errors and shortcomings of other people. Comrades with this weakness usually take very insignificant incidents and blow them up to what they consider world-shaking events.

Then we have the "whispering" critics—people who spend hours and hours spreading stories about weaknesses and shortcomings—some true, most not true; although it makes really no difference, because even if the "whisperings" were true, it would not correct anything, but on the other hand, do a world of harm.

Criticisms must be made openly, if they are to result in a correction.

Vigilance does not mean to pick on every and all incidents and blow

them up. *Political vigilance and alertness is to see weaknesses, yes, but especially to see trends—the line of development of wrong policy.* The first step in helping to make a correction is to discuss *policy*. The first step in helping to make a correction is to discuss such problems with the individual involved. When raised in a committee it must be done firmly, factually and in constructive and comradely fashion.

Then we have the "long-winded politicalizer on the subject." We mean comrades who take a very simple problem that requires a simple and direct solution and proceed to build around it theories and propositions so that it usually takes hours to unravel the "politicalizing" to find the simple solution necessary. This type of speech usually kills the meeting, discourages those who want to work. This type of speech is usually full of phrase-mongering and convinces no one, and only has a reverse effect to that intended.

All remnants of white chauvinism are very detrimental to molding a collective leadership. Such tendencies, *often undetected*, completely *destroy the possibilities of drawing into the leadership our Negro comrades.* There must be an open, frank discussion that will burn out all remnants of this bourgeois influence. *In leadership we must not allow even the faintest expressions of white chauvinism to go unchallenged.*

The same applies to feelings of

male superiority. Women will not grow into leadership where male superiority exists. We should use the discussion opened by the article by Comrade Foster to examine and correct this weakness.

COLLECTIVE WORK AND POLITICAL INITIATIVE

A committee or an executive body can develop its work fully only if all members think and use their own personal political initiative. Very often one or two do most of the thinking, and the rest pass judgment on the thoughts proposed. This is equivalent to a 6-cylinder motor running on two. All comrades must feel that they have been elected to committees or posts because the membership expects from them political leadership. And one of the very elementary requirements of leadership is to boldly project ideas, plans, thoughts that can move the working class further in its struggle. This can best be done if every member of a collective does so.

Another enemy of the best collective leadership is the lack of a personal, helping, comradely attitude toward new, relatively inexperienced comrades in our leadership. We must have a policy of constantly and boldly promoting and then helping new fresh personnel in our Party.

In times of sharp class struggles the membership expects more and a higher standard of leadership. This

we can give only as a united collective body. But on the other hand, the membership because of its knowledge about events, expects that we place greater demands on the whole membership. Leadership must not set its sights and tasks based on the outlook and readiness of the least politically developed—but rather keep in mind what the situation demands and what can be achieved only as a result of full political mobilization and fight. Therefore, it is important that the leadership in this period in a very consistent and energetic fashion use the methods of constant political mobilization, check-up on decisions, and generally demand higher standards of work from everybody.

The times demand higher standards from all leadership. We must organize our time and work better. Those who work full-time must exercise self-discipline and not tolerate any habits like starting to work late in the day, or wasting time generally. While at meetings, *we must remember that the shop workers must get up early and need every minute possible to rest—so, shorter meetings, that start on time.*

Once in a while we meet the "rationer" in our Party leadership. Such comrades either have a system of "rations" of time and effort, or what is worse, spend months doing nothing and excusing it by pouting and griping about some one else not doing enough. We have one club that

has been in this condition for a long time. In a voluntary organization in a class struggle, each does the maximum, based on one's political conviction, regardless of what anyone else does or doesn't do.

The points raised in this memo are not new or surprising to anyone, but it is necessary at this time to set them down so that all of us can individually and collectively be-

gin to improve our work by conducting a persistent struggle against any habits or methods that are detrimental to the best collective effort we can give.

We can and must make these corrections in our stride. We do not need any special periods set aside for this, but do so as a part of improving our daily work as a leadership.

The Farm Question in California

By Pettis Perry

THE 15TH NATIONAL CONVENTION of our Party raised sharply the question of a quick turn to winning the rural poor, especially the poor farmers and agricultural workers. Our Convention proposed that all approaches and all movements among the farmers must have as their center the major question confronting mankind today, namely, the fight for peace and against the increasing fascist danger.

The resolution of our Convention noted the two things that especially characterized the period between 1948 and 1950: a) the increasing speeding up of Wall Street's drive to war, and a consequent growing acuteness of the war danger, and b) the great strengthening of the world peace forces, headed by the Soviet Union and a corresponding weakening of the world capitalist system.

Since the Convention, however, some major developments have taken place on an international scale. The first of these is the move of Washington to re-Nazify and re-arm Germany. This denotes the further strengthening of the military alliance between the United States and the so-called North Atlantic Pact countries, and the Marshallized countries, climaxed by the sending of Eisenhower to Europe as the force that

will realize this reactionary war-making coalition. Secondly, the American military forces have again crossed the 38th parallel, and are once again threatening to spread the present war in the Pacific to China and all over Asia. Thirdly, the demand of President Truman for an increase in taxation and greater appropriations for military purposes, sharpens the impoverishment of the people, creating new conditions for mass resistance. And fourthly, the inflationary crisis is raging over the capitalist world, and combines with the crisis of United States foreign policy, reflected and sharpened by the dismissal of Operation-Killer General MacArthur.

The dismissal of MacArthur in the first place highlights the tremendous possibilities for the peace forces scoring a major victory. This is particularly possible if the present peace movement in our country moves quickly enough, broadly enough, and militantly enough on every issue related to preserving the peace.

TURN TO THE RURAL POOR

It is in this framework that we have to examine the question of the rural poor. But over and above this consideration, which is the major question before us in the immediate

period, the American working class cannot ultimately march toward Socialism without winning its natural allies in the battle against capitalism. As experience has shown, the allies of the working class in all capitalist countries are at all times the poor and middle farmers. Whatever course this alliance may take, whether it takes the form of immediate winning over the middle farmer, or moving to win the poor section of the farmers, and neutralizing the middle farmers in any situation, these are the allies of the working class. However, the starting point in the struggle to win these allies must always be the agricultural workers and the poor farmers. This is what our resolution meant when it stated:

If the working class is to fulfill its historic role of ending capitalist exploitation and establishing Socialism, it must have the support of its allies, the masses of the impoverished farmers. This is an axiom of Marxism-Leninism. Today's main objective—blocking the outbreak of the war—can only be accomplished if labor and its allies mobilize their strength to preserve the peace. The labor-farmer alliance, together with the Negro liberation movement, can be welded into a solid coalition capable not only of preventing another war, but of defeating reaction and leading the United States along the path of social progress. The decisiveness of the farming masses as an ally of the working class has not been adequately understood by our Party.*

* Resolution, 15th Convention, C.P.U.S.A., *Political Affairs*, January 1951, p. 25.

Viewed in this light, California has a most important role to play because it is the biggest agrarian state. It is the richest in mineral resources and in farm products of any state. California also is growing in importance in its working class composition. Therefore the question of winning the rural masses in California to the side of peace and progress is of decisive importance. And here it should be stated that Farmer-Labor unity exists today on a wider scale in California than anywhere else in the country. Though there are weaknesses in this alliance, suffice it to say at this point that no one should underestimate the importance of developing the present relationship between the workers and farmers. This is particularly true with respect to the relationships that have been built up in a number of counties between the labor movement and the Grange, which is the second largest national farm organization in the country, whose national leadership is reactionary. And what is of extreme importance here is that an alliance exists between the A.F. of L. and the Grange. This is true also of some C.I.O. unions; and I am sure that if the Left-led unions are not participating as fully as some of these others, it is due in no small part to their underestimation of the farm question.

The 1945 census shows 138,917 farms in California. In 1950 this had dropped to 137,137.

This decline is much smaller than

in other states. For example in the state of Minnesota in the last three or four years 29,000 farms have gone out of existence. In Iowa, 1,000; Wisconsin, 10,000; North Dakota, 7,000 farms. The number of farms in the state of Arizona in 1945 was 13,142; in 1950, 10,369. For Oregon, 63,125 in 1945; in 1950, 59,802. And for the state of Washington, in 1945, 79,887; in 1950, 69,810.

Some of the reasons for this disparity is to be found in the fact that there are tremendous variations in crops in California. The result is that if certain crops fail, the value of other products rises. Secondly, California is more of a national and international outlet for farm products than other states. Third is the tremendous home market that exists in California for agricultural products; and of course, the increased mechanization of California agriculture, which has taken place over the past 20 years, has increased immensely the value of farm products. These are some of the factors that explain the disparity in farm decline between California and other states. There should be no illusions, however, that the still developing agrarian crisis will not affect California.

According to a bulletin put out by the United States Department of Agriculture called *The Agrarian Situation*, for March 1951, the net farm income realized by farm operators in 1950 was lowest of the postwar period. According to preliminary estimates the total of 13 billion dollars

was down 8 per cent from 1949, and 27 per cent below the 1947 figure. The bulletin also stated that the United States export of farm products totalled 2.9 billion—one-fifth less than 1949 and more than one-fourth less than the 1947 record. The bulletin asserts that all of the decline is accounted for by food which made up slightly less than half of total export of 1950, compared with 4/5 of total export in 1947. And here it can be seen that this coincides with the deterioration of America's foreign policy. This also coincides with the disappearance of China once and for all from the sphere of imperialism, where it can no longer use China as a dumping ground for its excess products. This coincides also with the decline in trade with the Soviet Union and the Eastern Democracies. This coincides with the constant impoverishment of the Marshallized countries of Europe, and above all it coincides with the growing war economy in the United States which means guns instead of butter.

From this it can be seen what the foreign policy of the rulers of this country, what its developing war economy and war drive is bringing to the farming masses of America.

GROWING IMPOVERISHMENT OF FARMERS

As Wall Street drives toward war and fascism, the impoverishment of the workers and farmers of this country increases. The farming population

in California, for instance, is faced with growing indebtedness as are the farmers all over the country. This indebtedness is due to increasing of taxes, the increase of consumers goods prices, and a widening gap between what the farmer receives and what he has to pay for goods he must buy. To return to the cited *Bulletin of the Department of Agriculture*, we find there the following facts: the cotton in a sheet which sells for some \$3.50 to \$4.00, probably did not bring the farmer more than 30c. A 16c can of tomatoes represents about 3c of gross income to the farmer. The corn in a can retailing for 19c brought less than 2 $\frac{3}{4}$ c to the producer. Onions, which were selling in stores in November for 5.7c a pound, had been sold by the farmer for a little over 1c. When milk leaves the farm, it immediately goes into a distribution and processing system that almost doubles the price in a few hours. The wheat in a loaf of bread that sells for 15 to 16c brings the farmer only 2 $\frac{1}{3}$ of a cent. This shows in graphic form the degree to which the gap is widened between the prices of the commodities the farmer raised and the prices of the things he must purchase.

On January 1, 1950, farm mortgage debts in California were \$419,340,000 as compared with \$407,585,000 at the beginning of 1940, or a difference of \$11,755,000. And if we deal not with farmers in general, but with poor farmers, then it is clear that the poor and middle farmer is more and more

being ruined by the war economy. And our Party and the Left movement must address themselves to this question in a vigorous and unrelenting manner. We must convince labor to support this fight against impoverishment because only in this way will it be possible to win the farming masses.

Mechanization of agriculture in California has reached a very high level, but it is not as complete as some people think. In California there are literally thousands upon thousands of poor farmers who have small farms and few implements. These poor farmers face special problems to increase the struggle against the big power trusts, and for putting at the disposal of the small farmers water and power, at the lowest possible rates, so that they can exist and prosper as independent producers. This will require, among other things, an all-out fight against the California water and power monopolists. These are the main enemies of the poor and middle farmers, as well as of the workers of California. They are the big financiers; they are part of the monopoly set-up; they can be beaten only by the combined efforts of the workers, both agricultural and industrial workers, in alliance with the farmers and city middle classes.

FAILURE TO COMBAT CHAUVINISM

It is not generally known that de-

spite the progressive tendencies in the California Grange, the fact still remains that in most chapters, Chinese, Filipinos, Mexican-Americans and Negroes are excluded from membership. What kind of a fight do we have on this question? In examining the many articles in the Farm-Labor brochures, articles in the *People's World*, etc., just nowhere have I been able to see a sufficient all-out fight against this. And what does that mean? It means a capitulation to chauvinism. We meet in this situation with a condoning of chauvinism because in the fight against one of the most pernicious weapons of the fascists and pro-fascist forces in this country, we are silent and ineffective.

One of the Left forces, active in the California farm movement, once said, in reference to this question, "You can't change people just like that. These people work with us on all kinds of issues—they are progressive — so what can you do with them?" Well, one thing we can do is fight unrelentingly on this question. Without it there can never be basic unity between the workers and farmers and among the farmers themselves, nor can there be unity of the working class itself. As Marxists, at all times our outlook must be that of proletarian internationalism, never that of national chauvinism, bourgeois nationalism, or of capitulators to chauvinism or bourgeois nationalism. Only in this way can the Left help to weld together all that is healthy in the life of our country in

the struggle against the enemies of all the people.

Now while this is not a separate and exclusive California question, a few things are specifically true:

1. It was in this state that the question of the exclusions, which I will deal with later in more detail, reached its highest peak, and left its mark upon the people.

2. The racial or national composition of this state is more diversified than any other state in the country, and I know that the ruling class is as vicious toward the Puerto Rican people as it is toward the Mexican-Americans. Then there are Negroes, Chinese, Filipinos, Japanese, etc.

And this is especially alarming to me, since it is reported that in no town in North Dakota could Indians eat in restaurants and this is becoming increasingly the case with respect to Negroes and Mexican-American workers. It is said in North and South Dakota and Minnesota: "An Indian comes into town, even if it is 50 below zero, he must bring his own lunch," and in none of those states has there been an organized movement against this. To let this go unchallenged means simply to leave the seed of fascism which could enable it to sprout more rapidly into a mass phenomenon in this state. This vile racism *must* be challenged.

Now it may be that the Grange cannot be convinced to take in any of these groups. This however must not lead to any inaction on our part; and if it becomes impossible to convince

the Grange then it is my opinion that rank and file farm committees made up of these various discriminated groupings to challenge all forms of discrimination in these rural communities are worthy of our support. In addition to this I would say that under these conditions, the question may arise whether or not it is advisable to put up a strong fight to develop the Farmers Union in here, or something else. Now it is true that Farmers Union nationally is also led by Social-Democratic elements. It is also true that of all farm organizations in the country, that is, between the Grange, Farm Bureau and Farmers Union, the Farmers Union is most progressive. In addition, there is enough autonomy in regional and local set-ups of Farmers Union that enables them to conduct a fight of this sort on a local basis without any interference from the national office, which may not be exactly true with the Grange.

ORGANIZATION OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

To me the most important question is the lack of sufficient attention to the organization of the agricultural workers. Now that is a major question, particularly for California. However, when this question is raised, we are told that we cannot organize the agricultural workers because they are migratory. We are told we must stick to the canneries and not go beyond that, except of

course for the sheds and other so-called stable forms of employment. I have been able to study two government reports, "Migratory Farm Workers in 1949," Agricultural Information Bulletin No. 25, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, as well as a report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor in American Agriculture, issued in 1951, and here is what they show:

There are now roughly $4\frac{1}{2}$ million wage earners who depend principally upon farm employment for their income. Most of these will find employment in September when farm work is at its peak. When farm work slackens in December and January less than one million are employed as hired workers who get year-round employment; there are 600,000 farm workers who are employed for 250 or more days. Regular workers of 150 to 200 days employment number 400,000. Seasonal migratory workers under 150 days employment run to $2\frac{1}{2}$ million. Migratory workers number one million. The facts establish that only one million out of $4\frac{1}{2}$ million agricultural workers are migratory.

These workers not only receive extremely low wages, but the housing conditions in communities of agricultural laborers are so frightful that even the President's Committee had to condemn them as "deplorable," which of course is an understatement. Where houses do exist for agricultural workers, too often they

are the worst type of slums; but in many cases, especially those involving Negro, Puerto Rican, West Indian and Mexican workers, etc., the barn, or chicken coops are the most common accommodations. In addition to this in many parts of the country, especially in California, workers sleep on ditch banks, or under a tree, and in some cases in so-called "hash hill" houses, which are simply 4 posts stuck in the ground, and the walls consist of weeds wired to the posts. The roof consists either of burlap, or a piece of tent thrown on top of these four posts. This condition makes it understandable why death rates are highest of all among this section of the population.

Police terror against Mexican, Negro, Filipino and other workers, mainly agricultural, is part and parcel of the whole system of discrimination and oppression prevalent in so many rural towns. Any serious movement among this section of the population must take these things into account and depart from the path of dogmatism, from seeing wages and hours as the sum and substance, the beginning and the end of the problems that confront the workers.

If the proper approach is taken by the whole labor movement and if the Left movement actually spearheads the drive in organizing this section of the population to fight for their well-being, this will have a powerful effect upon changing the relationship between the working class of Cali-

fornia and of the country generally, and the Mexican workers and indeed the workers all over Latin America.

Leninism teaches that we must base ourselves on the poorest-paid sections of the working class. Are the migratory workers the poorest paid or not? They are. If we compare the real earnings of farm laborers and factory workers during the period from 1910 to 1914, the period designated by Congress as the basis for farm parity prices, farm wages were $2/3$ of factory wages. Today they are little more than $1/3$. The average hourly earnings of farm workers in 1950 was 50c an hour, and those of factory workers was \$1.45. In 1910 to 1914, comparative figures would show 14c and 20c an hour—that is 14c for the farm laborers and 20c an hour for factory workers. The average cash income for factory workers in 1949 was \$2,600. For farm workers, both migratory and non-migratory, it was only slightly more than \$500.00.* But for women farm workers, earnings were as low as \$220. Here we have the most depressed section of the population and at the same time the most unorganized section of the population. That being the case, there must be other reasons why the farm workers are not being organized.

Let us take the question what is the main grouping of agricultural labor in the United States? In the country as a whole they are mainly Negroes,

* *New York Times*, April 8, 1951, p. 38.

Mexicans, West Indians, principally from the Bahamas (a British possession) and Puerto Ricans. This gets us closer to the real and concrete reasons as to why no organization is taking place. First, white chauvinism in the labor movement, especially among the official leaders and labor aristocrats—this is the central thing which is responsible for the lack of organization. It is therefore understandable why the former Food, Tobacco and Agricultural Workers has been taking a licking from the Farm Labor Union — the Social Democratic organization headed by Mitchell.

We in California should have realized this especially in 1946 and 1947, when we discovered white chauvinism in the F.T.A. We should have vigorously taken action against it, and proceeded to fight resolutely for reorganization in the fields among agricultural workers. We should have seen this clearly when in Salt River Valley, during the great strike, when separate soup kitchens were set up for Mexican and Negro workers, while the "Anglos" had their special table, because they were the favored white workers, the highly skilled workers. They were the workers with whom the union was concerned. Nor was it accidental when one of these Mexican workers when reproached by one of our Mexican comrades for scabbing, replied:

I am a scab and a proud scab. These Anglos have denied us Mexican work-

ers and Negro workers the right to be part of the skilled craft, and they worry only about organizing the Anglos, and concern themselves with us only when there is labor trouble.

Take California. What is the make-up of the agricultural laborers in California? The make-up here varies a little from what it is nationally. Here it is mainly Mexican, native and foreign-born, Negro, Japanese, Hindus, Filipinos and Chinese. What must we say about the political connotation of a failure to devote one's self to organizing the field workers? We must say it is a question of national and great power chauvinism that is militating against this. This is the first main political reason. The second reason is that of Right opportunism, which expresses itself by concern only with the highest skill and ignoring the lower skilled industry, clearly an anti-Leninist approach to the question of the proletariat.

UNITY OF NATIVE AND FOREIGN LABOR

There is still another argument. That argument is that we must fight against the importation of Mexican nationals as agricultural laborers. And the argument is based, ostensibly, on the idea that we must protect the living standards of the American people; and this is a laudable objective for which we Communists have always fought and will continue to fight. Further,

the argument is based on the idea that the labor movement is fighting such imported labor and we therefore must support that fight. The support of the labor movement and its battle for better wages is certainly a laudable objective to which we subscribe, and of which we are the greatest proponents. But in saying all of this we must distinguish ourselves from a white-chauvinist position and base our approach on the principle of internationalism.

Now, how many Mexican nationals were brought in during the war period? Something like 200,000 or so. Is this the thing that is destroying the living standards of the American people? Is this the thing that is keeping the agricultural workers at the low minimum standard of \$500 a year? This is not the reason. The main reason for this is not the 219,500 that have migrated here, but the failure to organize the field workers and fight for a higher standard of living.

In the years 1942 through 1947 the Government brought some 219,500 Mexican agricultural workers to the United States. In addition to Mexicans it imported farm workers from other sources. We imported 5,598 Jamaicans, 18,423 Canadians, 15,241 Bahamians, etc. This in itself could not prove that these are the people that are lowering the standard of living of the American workers. We have never, in the history of this country, had the violent outcries by the labor movement against Euro-

pean entrants to the country as we are having now against Mexicans. And examine it if you will, and see if it means anything except demagoguery and national chauvinism. The starting point in the improvement of the conditions of agricultural workers or indeed of the workers generally, must be an all-out fight to organize the unorganized. And in this case it would include almost *all* the agricultural workers in the country. The starting point must be to fight to raise the standard of living of all of these national groupings to that of the white workers in this country. If this policy is followed, then we would have not only the support of the Mexican people who come here, but of the whole labor movement. The A.F. of L. bureaucrats, the Right-wing C.I.O. leaders, are not only sabotaging and preventing through every imaginable device the organizing of the Mexican workers here, but they are carrying on the most disruptive type of activities in the whole labor movement of Latin America, with organizers, with money, with bribes, with pressure. They are acting as the most humble servants of Wall Street in its movement toward world domination, and we cannot remain uncritical of this. So while fighting resolutely to improve the living standards of the workers of this country, it cannot effectively be done without an all-out struggle on these day-to-day questions here at home.

It is true that the large growers

and industrialists hope to use these imported workers to lower the living standards of the American workers. It is also true that the Federal Government is the main instrument for the realization of this scheme. We should not expect anything else from the employers or the government. With whom do we expect the government to side, if not with the employers? Our sharpest criticism and struggle must be against this government slave-driving and strike-breaking. At the same time we have to be very critical of the labor bureaucrats and reformists, who do nothing but condone this role of the government and strategy of the employers.

If we look over the history of the Socialist Party in this country, if we even examine the question of the A.F. of L. in its early days, we will see that the California labor movement played no small part in supporting the Exclusion Act against the Chinese and other Asian peoples—and that is what they are aiming at with this kind of outcry against the Mexican-American workers. When a Left-wing person from California claims that the A.F. of L. has a good economic position on this question despite its chauvinism, then the question in my mind is: how can that be? How can one express or support chauvinist nationalism, which leads to a continued split in the ranks of the working class, and at the same time be a real fighter on economic issues confronting another section of the working class?

Let me quote some excerpts from various conventions of the Socialist Party, especially during the 1910 and 1912 conventions. A special committee composed of such people as Untermann and Stitt Wilson (who incidentally at one time was the Mayor of Berkeley), speaking in support of the Exclusion Act, reported as follows to the 1910 convention:

As far as Asia is concerned, Asia has immense opportunity for developing an outlet. They need not come over here. Japan has Manchuria and Korea. China has vast districts which it can conquer. Let the Chinese capitalists develop Chinese society, just as the American capitalists have developed American society. Let them find room for their unemployed over there and employ them there and develop their own society. Let the Socialists of those countries organize their cooperative commonwealth themselves first, and then, when they have that organization, when they have their strong Socialist and labor organizations, *then let them talk to us about international solidarity. . . .* The Aryan race will always occupy a certain geographical territory, and what the Asiatics will do in the coming years does not concern us at present.*

How is this for the language of people who call themselves Socialist, who regard themselves as Marxists? But this has nothing in common with Marxism. This is an imperialist attitude, an imperialist outlook, despite its Socialist Party label. The fact that

* William E. Willing, *Progressivism—and After*, Macmillan, N. Y., 1914, p. 380.

United States, British, French, Japanese and German imperialism was already robbing and attempting to enslave China did not concern these "heroes" of the Second International. They just could not make up their minds even to remotely consider the possibilities of putting yellow and white people together into one country, and into one Socialist International, as the battering ram against imperialism.

Now let us examine the convention report (Indianapolis, 1912) which was supposed to be a compromise on the question of the Exclusion Act. The report said:

Continued study and the developments of the Pacific Coast during the last two years convinced the majority of this committee more than ever before that the existing exclusion laws against Asiatic laborers should be enforced and be amended in such a way that they can be more effectively enforced.

Then it goes on to state further that "where races struggle for the means of life racial animosities cannot be avoided. Where working people struggle for jobs, self-preservation enforces its decrees. Economic and political considerations lead to racial fights and to legislation restricting the invasion of the white man's domain by other races."

It goes on to say:

The exclusion of the Asiatics from the shores of this country will at least give to the American laborer the advantage of fighting the Asiatic compe-

tion at long range and wholly through international commerce, instead of having to struggle with the Asiatic laborer upon American soil.*

Thus, according to the party of the Second International, the task is not to struggle against the international capitalist enemy of the international working class, but to struggle against international labor. This is the perspective that we would set for ourselves if we adopted the position that we must maintain the economic well being of America by excluding foreign workers from our shores.

On the one hand we must see to it that the question of international solidarity and proletarian internationalism is consistently kept in mind. Therefore we must see that we have a special responsibility with regard to the working class of Mexico and the whole of Latin America.

Mexico is a semi-colonial country in its relationship to American imperialism. We therefore have the Communist and working class responsibility to fight against all indignities inflicted upon the Mexican people in our country, and we have the responsibility to fight to bring about real working class, international solidarity between the working class of this country and that of Mexico. We must be in the forefront of the struggle against all encroachments of American imperialism upon Mexico. We must be most vigorous in our sup-

* *Ibid.*, p. 2.

port to the progressive forces all over Latin America and indeed all over the world.

When Mexican nationals were brought here through inter-government agreement, the Mexican government more than once protested against the violation of this agreement by the various growers and employers in this country. Where was the top leadership of the A.F. of L. and C.I.O.? Were they on the side of the Mexican government, fighting unrelentingly with them to maintain the high living standard of this country, precisely through their efforts to see that these nationals received the same wages and working conditions that the American workers received? They were as quiet as church mice. Where were these scoundrels all during this period when the Mexican nationals themselves became so disgusted that more than 20 per cent of them could not endure the horrible conditions under which they were living and the arrogant violations of all of these agreements.

IMMEDIATE ISSUES OF STRUGGLE

We must, in my opinion, support and participate actively in organization and struggle for the following demands:

1. Organization of the agricultural workers, raising the question of \$1.00 an hour minimum. Equal pay for equal work. The labor movement

taking responsibility to fight for these conditions, and to fight in unison with the Mexican people.

2. Immediate struggles in all rural districts for slum clearance, for better housing and health conditions for all agricultural workers.

3. Examine the possibilities of creating mobile schools or classes for the children of all migratory workers.

4. Rapidly enforce the proposition of compulsory education with adequate provision for the education of children of Mexican-American workers.

5. A fight for vigorous enforcement of the child labor law in this state.

6. A fight for supplementary unemployment insurance for all workers who are not provided for by year-round employment. This is particularly important for agricultural workers.

For the poor and middle farmers we should support demands:

For a guaranteed price from the wholesalers and monopolists, not at the expense of the consuming masses, adequate to enable them to earn a decent income. Such prices must be guaranteed by the State and Federal governments.

An adequate roll-back in consumer prices. This would benefit not only the workers and middle class section of the population, but also the farmers by increasing consumption of agricultural products and reducing industrial prices for farmers.

Lower interest rates with a mora-

torium on mortgages, which in many cases will mean a cancellation of debts to the large power trusts, financiers, etc., and relieve the increased debt burden on the small and middle farmers.

An intensified struggle against the militarization of the youth which deprives masses of farmers of the labor power of their sons and forces into bankruptcy those too poor to hire labor power.

WIN FARM WOMEN IN THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

Our experience shows that throughout the country the readiest response to the peace movement comes from the women.

This is equally true in rural communities. In our opinion it is necessary that the peace movement turn its immediate attention to developing the broadest type of movements for peace among the rural women. The Left has special responsibility in combatting male superiority, which is rife in the rural communities if we are to help involve millions of farm women in the struggle for peace. Many farmers, including some Left and Communist forces, still think that women are backward, that the women's place is in the home, that the women can only cook and bear children. That this is a vile lie that smacks of fascism is made fully clear by the tremendous progress that women have made in the mighty Soviet Union,

where they are the equal of man in every sphere. The question of Socialism and its meaning generally to the population, both women and men, farmers and workers, is today of the greatest importance.

MASTERING THEORY OF NATIONAL AND AGRARIAN QUESTION

The single most outstanding weakness of our whole Party and in California as well, in my opinion, is the failure adequately to master the tactic of the united front.

How to develop the united front from below as well as from above, how to work flexibly yet firmly with our allies. On this question we consistently have to fight either Right opportunism or Left deviation—both springing from the same thing, that is, a lack of confidence in the working class and masses as a whole. A thorough study must be made of the proceedings of our last National Convention. We must master these proceedings, the reports and resolutions coming out of that Convention. Without a mastery of the tactics of the united front, we cannot win over the warmakers. To win we need the masses. To set in motion the masses in the people's movement means the most flexible type of application of the united front tactic. We must know how to unleash struggle on partial issues and how to develop them more fully on a number of issues. This is not an easy task, but it is a

task that must be fulfilled if we are to succeed in this battle.

The greatest over-all weakness in all of our work is the lack of building our Party rapidly and increasingly among the poor farmers and agricultural workers. This must be overcome. We must build the Party by recruiting new members, by building up Party clubs in rural communities, the *main* base to be the agricultural workers and the poor farmers.

We must base our approach, 1) on the agricultural workers, both men and women, and 2) on the poorer strata of the farmers. This is the only thing that will guarantee a class outlook and a class approach. What we should keep in mind is the Leninist approach to this question, which teaches us that the most immediate link between the city workers and the farming population are the agricultural laborers, and the part-time farmers—that section of the farming population which work partly on their own land and partly on somebody else's land or in a factory. Of that type we have plenty through the length and breadth of this country. But only if there is a radical and drastic change in this direction can we succeed; only then will the whole peace movement go forward. If we do this, we can succeed in developing broad political action. The question of independent political action in the rural areas, where the great mass of the farmers are set in motion around issues is of great importance to us.

Along with the question of building the Party, we must build all of the Left and Marxist press. In California there is the *Farm Reporter*. This should be built into a mass publication. It would be most helpful in advancing the work among the farmers if this were done. Then there is *Facts for Farmers*, a national publication put out by Farm Research, to which serious attention should be given. And above all there is the *People's World* that must be built in every phase of our work. There should be no campaign without the *People's World* as part of our thinking and action. People in the farm field should give every attention to supplying the *People's World* with material so it can become a weapon in helping to organize and stimulate a movement among the farmers.

The great peace movement of 2,500 delegates that met in Washington in March has tremendous possibilities. This movement must be given breadth. Here we can play a tremendous role, if attention is given to the question of development of people's movements and peace committees in the heavy farming communities in this state—taking, of course, some of the main farming areas as the main base of concentration.

Two things are paramount conditions for our work in the farm field:

1. A basic understanding of the agrarian question and its relation to the working class movement, as well as an understanding of the impera-

tive necessity of the working class winning over the poor farmers.

2. An understanding of the national question. It is difficult, I think, if not impossible, to have a basic understanding of the agrarian question without at the same time understanding the national question, or vice versa.

From what point of view should we study these two questions which are related, and yet are subjects in themselves? We have to understand the relationship between the agrarian movement in the West and the whole national liberation movement of the Negro nation in the Black Belt, and the relationship between the liberation movement of the Negro nation and the national groups and national minorities in the State of California.

Concretely, what is the relationship between this national liberation movement of the Negro people and our responsibility to the national minority groups such as Mexican, Korean, Filipino and Japanese? All of these groups, to be sure, have different degrees of importance to us, but we

must see that the national question is part and parcel of the whole worldwide movement of colonial liberation. Only then can we understand that we, in this country, have special responsibilities with respect to the people of Mexico and the people of Latin America, because of the colonial and semi-colonial or dependent status of all of these nations with respect to United States imperialism.

Because of the national composition of these groups and their relationship to the agrarian question in this country, a deeper understanding of the national question will strengthen the ability of our comrades to combat all forms of chauvinism, to release and give direction to the great anti-imperialist traditions and potentialities of the most oppressed and most exploited sections of the American proletariat, to imbue the working class with class consciousness, to defeat the forces of reaction, fascism and war, to consolidate the conditions for further advance toward Socialism.

A New Outstanding Contribution to the Treasury of Leninism*

By G. Alexandrov

J. V. STALIN has once more pointed out that the laws of Marxist dialectics cannot be regarded dogmatically as a kind of master-key with the help of which any phenomenon can be understood without making a profound and all-round study of it. Of tremendous importance for the further development of Marxism are J. V. Stalin's wise theses requiring that Marxists delve creatively into the essence of problems, that they take a strict and comprehensive account of the historical conditions in which the theses and conclusions of Marxism are elaborated, that they combat the vulgarizers, dogmatists and talmudists who fail to comprehend the living and creative revolutionary content of Marxism. Marxism does not recognize immutable conclusions and formulae, obligatory for all epochs and periods. Marxism is the enemy of all dogmatism, says J. V. Stalin. He has dealt a blow at dogmatism and scholasticism in the study of the dialectical process of the development of society, and has given a new and remarkable example of the crea-

tive application and advancement of Marxist dialectics.

In his works concerning Marxism in linguistics, J. V. Stalin elucidates profoundly the correlation and connection between evolution and revolution in the history of society, thereby greatly advancing the development of Marxist dialectics in this problem too, deepening and enriching the Marxist-Leninist conception of the transition from an old quality to a new quality.

Already in his remarkable work *Anarchism or Socialism?* J. V. Stalin utterly routed the anti-scientific views of the anarchists, who had a dogmatic and vulgar comprehension of dialectical development as a catastrophic development, by means of which first the past is completely destroyed and then the future is established quite separately. Moreover, the anarchists accused the Marxists of adhering to Cuvier. J. V. Stalin proved at the time that Cuvier's theory of cataclysms has nothing in common with the dialectical method of Marx, that from the standpoint of the dialectical method evolution and revolution, quantitative and qualita-

* This installment concludes the article begun, under the same title, in the June issue.—Ed.

tive changes, are two necessary forms of one and the same movement.

In his new works, J. V. Stalin concretizes and develops further these outstanding theoretical generalizations. He points out that transformations in the sphere of the foundation, and, following them, transformations in the sphere of the superstructure, constitute a revolutionary leap which changes the appearance of the whole of society. If the foundation changes or is eliminated, its superstructure changes or is eliminated in its wake; if a new foundation comes into being, a superstructure corresponding to it arises in its wake, its development taking place by way of the destruction of the existing superstructure and the building of a new one.

But such a social phenomenon as language retains its fundamentals throughout all changes, and is enriched in the course of development by new vocabulary. Only vulgarizers of Marxism can come out with the demand to eliminate, "explode" and discard a language which required many hundreds of years to take shape.

This is the first time that the evolutionary development of such phenomena of social life as language has been so comprehensively elucidated in Marxist literature. J. V. Stalin points out that in certain phenomena, for example in language, the transition from one quality to another does not take "the form of an explosion,

nor of the destruction at one blow of the old and the creation of the new, but of the gradual and prolonged accumulation of the elements of the new quality, of the new language structure, and the gradual dying away of the elements of the old quality."

J. V. Stalin subjects to devastating scientific criticism the theory of "phasic development of languages," which recognizes the necessity of sudden explosions as a condition for the transition of a language from an old quality to a new. He demonstrates that this theory is at complete variance with the facts, with the actual history of language, and hence is false from beginning to end; he lays bare the metaphysical and dogmatic character of this theory, which rests on an artificial scheme and does not encompass the real dialectics of the historical development of language. This theory, idealistic in content, divorces the history of a language from the concrete history of the society, and proceeds from identifying language now with the superstructure, now with the instruments of production.

Thus, J. V. Stalin discloses the decisive law of the historical process in accordance with which the changing of foundations and superstructures in the development of society takes place through leaps, through breaks in gradualness, through the revolutionary transformation of one social system into another; at the

same time, he points to the connection and continuity in history, in the development of science, technology, culture and language. J. V. Stalin's works devoted to Marxism in linguistics have opened up a new glorious page in the Marxist elaboration of the problem of revolution and evolution in the development of society.

* * *

Of tremendous theoretical and political significance is J. V. Stalin's development of the law of the unity and struggle of opposites—the nucleus of Marxist dialectics. A profound analysis of this law and its application to the practical activities of the Communist Party is given, as we know, in the work *Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, in which J. V. Stalin points out that internal contradictions are inherent in the phenomena of the objective world, that the struggle of opposites—between the old and the new, between that which is dying away and that which is developing—constitutes the internal content of the process of development. He illuminates the process of development from the lower to the higher, proving that this development takes place not as a harmonious unfolding of phenomena, but as a disclosure of the contradictions inherent in things, as a struggle of opposite tendencies which operate on the basis of these contradictions. From this he draws the conclusion that the

class struggle of the proletariat is an entirely natural and inevitable phenomenon. We must not cover up the contradictions of the capitalist system, J. V. Stalin says, but disclose and unravel them; we must not try to check the class struggle but carry it to its conclusion.

In his new works, J. V. Stalin continues and enlarges on this scientific definition of one of the cardinal laws of Marxist dialectics—the law of the unity and struggle of opposites.

Disclosing the dialectics of the class struggle and of the unfolding of contradictions in an antagonistic society, J. V. Stalin, in his work *Concerning Marxism in Linguistics*, at the same time criticizes the primitive-anarchist view of the development of these contradictions in society. Exposing the vulgarizers of dialectical and historical materialism, he defends and develops further the Marxist view of the unity and struggle of opposites, of the struggle of opposite social classes.

J. V. Stalin proceeds here from the theses and discoveries of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Lenin described the law of the unity and struggle of opposites as the essence, the nucleus of dialectics; he pointed out that, whereas the unity of opposites is conditional, temporary, transitory, the struggle of opposites is absolute, since movement, change and development are absolute. Lenin came to this conclusion on the basis of a generalization of a vast amount of mate-

rial on development in nature, society and thought. But the metaphysicists are not in the least able to understand how unity and connection, even though they be relative, can exist where there exists a direct and fundamental opposite, an antagonism of classes and an irreconcilable struggle between them. According to the primitive-anarchist understanding of class antagonism and class struggle, there can be no connection between the hostile classes of an antagonistic society.

J. V. Stalin exposes the primitive-anarchist views on society, the class struggle and the development of language, and cogently demonstrates the falsity of their assertions that because of the existence of a fierce class struggle, society disintegrates into classes that are not connected with one another economically. On the contrary, J. V. Stalin says, as long as capitalism exists, the bourgeoisie and the proletarians will be bound together by every economic thread as parts of one capitalist society. The bourgeoisie cannot live and enrich themselves unless they have wage laborers at their command; the proletarians cannot exist unless they hire themselves to the capitalists. "The cessation of all economic connections between them means the cessation of all production, and the cessation of all production leads to the doom of society, the doom of the classes themselves. Naturally, no class wants to incur self-destruction. Consequently, however

sharp the class struggle may be, it cannot lead to the disintegration of society."

These ideas of J. V. Stalin's have exceptional theoretical and political significance. They are directed against the vulgarization of Marxism, against ignorance in problems of Marxist theory. At the same time they deliver a mortal blow at all the pseudo-scientific theories of bourgeois sociologists and Right-wing "Socialists" who deny the existence of a class struggle in bourgeois society. These menials of imperialism, consciously distorting Marxism, allege that the Marxists, by their theory of the class struggle and by organizing the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, are bringing about the collapse, doom and disintegration of the whole of society; whereas they, the Right-wing "Socialists," come out, so they say, not in defense of exploitation and exploiters, not for the imperialist policy of the instigators of a new war, not for the extermination of mankind, but for the defense of "the whole" of society, for the preservation of its civilization, etc. J. V. Stalin's new works expose these swindling methods used by the bourgeois ideologists.

* * *

J. V. Stalin's new works, amazingly rich in theoretical content, advance also the Marxist theory of knowledge. Lenin directed attention in his *Philosophical Notebooks* to the im-

portance of the study of language and its history for the elaboration of Marxist dialectics as a theory of knowledge. J. V. Stalin elaborates Lenin's theses, disclosing the inseparable connection and interaction between man's speech and thought.

Marr and his disciples divorced language from thinking, and held that intercourse among people can be maintained even without language, by means of thinking itself, free of the "natural matter" of language, of "the standards of nature." This landed them in the swamp of idealism, as J. V. Stalin has shown. Developing the theses of Marx and Engels on the unity of thought and language, J. V. Stalin exposes the idealist views that thoughts can manage without a language integument; he substantiates the thesis that thoughts arise and exist only on the basis of the language material. J. V. Stalin's thesis on the immediate connection between language and production, between language and social practice as a whole, is of vast importance for the Marxist theory of knowledge.

The theoretical theses concerning language which J. V. Stalin has worked out open up a new page in the development of Marxist dialectics and deal a decisive blow at all manner of contemporary scholastics, dogmatists and pedants who, in analyzing the social phenomena of our day, are incapable of understanding historically, concretely, the laws of ma-

terialist dialectics and of developing them creatively. In his new works, J. V. Stalin discloses the great harm of scholasticism, of the vulgarization of Marxism; he criticizes those who quote Marx formally, not as Marxists, but as dogmatists, without delving into the essence of the matter.

Exposing the dogmatists and scholastics, J. V. Stalin reveals their approach to theory as being hostile to Marxism: they regard the various conclusions and formulae of Marxism as a collection of dogmas, which "never" change, despite changes in the conditions of the development of society. These people think that "if they learn these conclusions and formulae by heart and begin to quote them without rhyme or reason, they will be able to solve any problems whatever, reckoning that the memorized conclusions and formulae will serve them for every period and country, for every possible contingency."

J. V. Stalin points out that this idea can be entertained only by people who see the letter of Marxism, but not its essence.

It is precisely because the talmudists and dogmatists are incapable of creatively applying the theses of Marxism that they are constantly landing in a "hopeless situation," in a blind alley. Yet Marxism is a science which provides a clear answer to the most complex and most vitally important questions. Therein lies the great power of Marxism.

In his work *Reply to Comrades* (letter to A. Kholopov), J. V. Stalin gives a classical definition of Marxism as a revolutionary science. "Marxism is the science of the laws governing the development of nature and society, the science of the revolution of the oppressed and exploited masses, the science of the victory of Socialism in all countries, the science of building a Communist society."

Stalin's profound definition of Marxism as a science generalizes with tremendous force, with exceptional depth, the new processes and phenomena of the life of modern society, points out the general line of the historical development of society in the modern era, and presents a scientific substantiation of the inevitable victory of Communism.

J. V. Stalin's new works are of paramount importance for the Marxist substantiation of the place science occupies in social life, of its relation to production, to the foundation and to the superstructure; they make possible a deep understanding of the laws of development of science. Most important in science, J. V. Stalin points out, are the specific peculiarities of the phenomena it studies.

Marxism has disclosed and established the unity of and the distinction between the sciences concerned with nature and those concerned with society. The sciences of nature, such as mechanics, physics, chemistry, biology, physiology, etc., ascertain the laws of nature. Science de-

velops on the basis of the development of the material production of society, its productive forces and its relations of production. The philosophical basis for the development of science is materialism. Science is the direct opposite of religion; it is by its very nature hostile to idealism and clericalism. "If objective truth exists (as the materialists think)," Lenin says, "if natural science, reflecting the outer world in human 'experience,' is alone capable of giving us objective truth, then all fideism is absolutely refuted."

The positive content of science—facts and laws confirmed by practice—is the result of man's vast experience in observing the phenomena of nature, in fighting the elemental forces of nature; it is an indication of his tremendous successes in harnessing the forces of nature.

In a class society, science develops in the conditions of fierce class struggle and is most strongly influenced by this struggle. In bourgeois society science is utilized as an instrument for making profits for the bourgeoisie; it serves the selfish interests of the bourgeoisie. In the interests of the capitalists, bourgeois scientists distort the true meaning of great scientific discoveries. Under the influence and pressure of reaction, scientists in bourgeois countries preach idealism and clericalism. If natural science starts trying to prove that there is no objective truth, Lenin remarks, "then this in itself is an

admission of the fundamental premise of clericalism, the door is thrown open for it, and a place is cleared for the 'organizing forms' of religious experience."

Here we directly approach the question of the link between science and the world outlook of definite social classes, between science and philosophy.

The pressure of competition compels the bourgeoisie willy-nilly to develop natural science, for without it there can be no development of production, of technology. However, attempting to hold the masses in spiritual slavery, the bourgeoisie forces its natural scientists to preach idealism, to support religion and obscurantism, thus leading to the degradation of science and philosophy.

Idealism and religion are the irreconcilable enemies of true science; they impede its development in every way. Examples of this are the Malthusian ideas in biology, the recognition of the finite universe in cosmology, the negation of causality in physics, and Weismannism and Morganism in biology. Only materialism relies on science, generalizes the data of science, and advances it. What great attainments are made by the natural scientists who consciously stand on the positions of materialism is shown by the outstanding discoveries of such great scientists of our country as Timiryazev, Pavlov, Michurin and Williams.

Dialectical materialism created by

Marx and Engels, by Lenin and Stalin—such is the ideological and theoretical foundation of the development and efflorescence of science in Socialist society. Science may be utilized to one or another degree by various classes, but the only true friend of science in our day is the working class, for it alone is capable of creating a society which is being built on the basis of scientific data, which ensures the flourishing of science and places it at the service of the working masses, the people—wherein lies its true calling. In building Communist society the working class utilizes all the achievements of science, all the knowledge that has been accumulated by man under the yoke of capitalism. It is only the bourgeois distortions of science that are discarded. Lenin and Stalin provide us with a clear and classically precise presentation and solution of this problem. Speaking to Soviet youth, Lenin said: "... You would be committing a great mistake if you attempted to draw the conclusion that one can become a Communist without acquiring what human knowledge has accumulated." He said that "Marx took his stand on the firm foundation of human knowledge which has been gained under capitalism."

Criticizing the arrogant, boastful tone, alien to Marxism, which Marr and his disciples introduced into linguistics, a tone tending toward a bald and offhand negation of every-

thing hitherto accumulated by science, J. V. Stalin says: "Marx and Engels were much more modest: they held that their dialectical materialism was a product of the development of the sciences, including philosophy, in earlier periods."

As distinguished from language, science, as a result of the accumulation of knowledge and new great discoveries, experiences revolutions. Such a revolution, for example, was the overthrow of the Ptolemaic system by Copernicus and Galileo, and the establishment of new, scientific views on nature. Lenin disclosed the revolution which took place in physics at the beginning of the 20th century. But science, just as language, does not discard the accumulated positive knowledge, it merely corrects it, makes it more precise and deepens it. Science, just as language, is used by various classes, it is not abolished with the elimination of one foundation of society and the formation of another foundation.

In the work *Concerning Marxism in Linguistics* it is shown that there is not the slightest necessity for or value in a linguistic upheaval during a social revolution, since it has been proved that the existing language is perfectly suited for meeting the needs of the new system. This precept of J. V. Stalin's may be applied also to the scientific knowledge of natural phenomena: is there any necessity of changing the first four rules of arithmetic or the laws of mechanics with

each change in the social foundation? There is no such necessity.

But in the history of science, its content is always connected with the world outlook of definite social classes. And from this angle, science, especially the science of society, is connected with the development of the superstructure of society; it operates as a weapon in the struggle of the social classes. Lenin made a special note of precaution about this. Of bourgeois professors he said that "not a single one of these professors, who are capable of making very valuable contributions in the special fields of chemistry, history, or physics, can be trusted one iota when it comes to philosophy." Still less can we believe the "learned" salesmen of the bourgeoisie in the sphere of the social sciences, since these sciences in bourgeois society are even more closely tied up with the world outlook and the class interests of the bourgeoisie, with the development of the foundation and the superstructure of bourgeois society, than are the sciences that deal with nature. The task of Marxists in all spheres of science, Lenin pointed out, is to be able to master and revise the achievements of these "salesmen," and at the same time "to be able to lop off their reactionary tendency, to pursue *one's own* line and to combat the *whole alignment* of forces and classes hostile to us."

The distortions which the exploiting classes introduce into science

must be and are being cast aside in the course of the development of science in the Socialist society.

Dialectical materialism is the inviolable theoretical foundation of modern natural science because this teaching is a true science, and its theoretical principles reflect faithfully and accurately the laws of development of nature, society and thought.

J. V. Stalin's works mobilize Soviet scientists to combat the reactionary bourgeois ideology.

Socialist society and its science are living in the conditions of a struggle between two camps: the camp of peace, democracy and Socialism led by the U.S.S.R., and the imperialist camp led by the U.S.A. Therefore, Soviet science has developed and is now developing in an irreconcilable and merciless struggle against bourgeois pseudo-science, against idealism, mysticism, superstitions and obscurantism, against imperialist reaction which distorts the very essence of science.

J. V. Stalin's works not only arm Soviet scientists with the Marxist method of studying the phenomena of the objective world and of man's

thinking, but also reveal and substantiate the law of development of Soviet science through the struggle of opinions, through freedom of criticism. These Stalin theses express one of the cardinal features of the development of Socialist society.

In the course of the struggle of opinions in the various fields of science, all manner of incorrect, erroneous views are disclosed and cast aside; the influence of bourgeois ideology on Soviet men is overcome and eliminated, and the survivals of capitalism in the minds of men are brought to light and done away with. The struggle of opinions in science clears the path for the victory and development of the most advanced views; it sets aside obsolete and moribund views which hamper the progress of science; it makes possible a true appraisal of the achievements of scientists; it enriches and advances the attainments of science.

J. V. Stalin's works, developing the Marxist viewpoint on the role and place of science in the advance of society, open up to Soviet scientists a grand vista for fruitful work in the cause of Communism.

The Chicago Group of Finance Capital*

By George Stewart

Editor's Foreword

THE AUTHOR of the following article declares that it aims to "see if we can find a distinctive Chicago group within American finance capital as a whole whose interests may at times appear to clash with those of the dominant sections of the American financial oligarchy" and ". . . to attempt to find an economic basis at the bottom of these important tactical differences of political opinion [on foreign policy] and if possible to identify the dissidents."

Thus, the article clearly represents a significant attempt at unravelling the sectional differences within the ruling class of the United States and therefore stimulates thinking and theoretical discussion of the question, which can only be commended. It further provides a wealth of material in the effort to concretize, in relation to Chicago, the study of the ramifications of finance capital. From this point of view, the attention devoted by the comrades to this question can only be welcomed and further encouraged.

* This article is based on the collective work of the Theory Commission of the Illinois State Committee of the Communist Party.

Despite the above merits, however, this article cannot be regarded as conclusive or definitive, but rather as a draft and basis for further discussion and study, chiefly for the following reasons:

1. There is no doubt that sectional economic differences within the ruling class, as well as conflicts of opinion or policy on foreign as well as domestic questions are inevitable phenomena of capitalism, particularly in the period of its general crisis. But such differences cannot be explained solely, or in many cases even primarily, by differences of economic or financial interest, basic as these are. There is not, and cannot be at all times a direct relationship between concrete financial or economic interests and political differences among the rulers of a social system which is characterized by extreme unevenness of development, anarchy, acute dislocations and crises.

2. The article tends to seek an oversimplified one-to-one correspondence between economics and politics and overlooks the most important questions namely, the sharpening general crisis of capitalism and the deep crisis

of U.S. foreign policy, in the attempt to explain the tactical differences in the application of the common program of the whole of monopoly capital, for world war and world domination. Every difference in economic interest does not necessarily lead to a corresponding difference in politics, in political policy. On the basis of that simplified assumption there should be a myriad of different and conflicting policies within the capitalist class, considering that the sectional interests are so many and so varied.

3. With regard to the existence of an independent Chicago grouping of finance capital the article itself says:

THE HISTORY of the last 10 or 12 years discloses certain differences of opinion within American finance capital on important questions of policy of the period. Just prior to World War II, for example, there was the America First movement, which fought against participation in the war on the side of Britain, advocated friendly relations with Nazi Germany, campaigned against conscription and resorted quite freely to anti-Semitism and labor-baiting in its propaganda.

Since the end of World War II, and the subsequent feverish drive of American capitalism for world domination, again we find certain differences of opinion within American finance-capital as to how to accomplish this aim. While there is

"The further conclusion we wish to draw, this time very tentatively, is that *the great Chicago banks have developed a certain degree of independence of the dominant American banking trust. The evidence is difficult to determine and quite indecisive.*"

It is apparent from the above that the question of the composition, and interrelations as well as the sectional divergence of interest within monopoly capital in the United States today requires further analysis and study. This article, without doubt however, helps stimulate such a study.

THE EDITOR

general agreement as to over-all objectives of American foreign and domestic policy, which are to destroy the Soviet Union and the peoples' governments in Eastern Europe and China, and to crush all genuine progressive movements wherever they may rise, whether at home or abroad, American capital is not united on the tactical course for accomplishing these goals. With reference to the rest of the capitalist world the dominant sections of the American financial oligarchy appear to be committed at present to a kind of "carrot and club" policy. They offer the "carrot" of financial and military assistance to any government that will follow an anti-Soviet and anti-popular policy, and at the same time use

their enormous financial and military power to tie these countries to the American war-machine and exploit them economically as well.

On the other hand, there are certain powerful financial and industrial groupings—not the decisive ones, as we shall see—who regard the “carrot” as a waste of time and good money, and wish to brandish the “club” alone. This group opposes the Marshall Plan as “pouring money down a rat-hole,” regards the European junior partners of American capitalism as very doubtful allies, and see no percentage in propping up tottering capitalist governments elsewhere.

Especially since U.S. military reverses in Korea and the obvious lack of enthusiasm among Western European powers for further adventures in the Far East, these differences of opinion have flared up into the current “great debate” over foreign policy now taking place in Congress and in the press. The removal of MacArthur, the recent speeches of Hoover and Taft, as well as those of such leading Senatorial Republicans as Wherry and Bridges, have been mainly concerned of late with military strategy. They oppose further commitments for military aid to Western Europe; they argue that the attempt to use Europe as a battleground against the Soviet Union will simply produce new Koreas; they profess to believe that expansion of the Air Force and Navy rather than

greatly increased ground forces is the best and most economical method of militarization of the country; they call for increased military support of Chiang Kai-shek and military intervention against the Chinese People's Republic. MacArthur rather than Eisenhower is their military hero. Asia and the Near East are their preferred theatre of operations. Many Middle West newspapers, notably McCormick's *Chicago Tribune*, are pounding the drums for this policy, demagogically appealing to the peace aspirations of the American people by seeming to oppose an aggressive war policy and a large standing army.

The purpose of this study is to attempt to find an economic basis at the bottom of these important tactical differences of political opinion, and, if possible, to identify the dissidents. Since so much of the Big Business opposition to the Marshall Plan emanates from the Middle West and particularly from Chicago, and because the America First movement itself started in Chicago and was strongest in this area, we propose to start this search with a detailed examination of the structure of Chicago finance capital. Our aim is, of course, to see if we can find a distinctive “Chicago Group” within American finance-capital as a whole, whose interests may, at times, appear to clash with those of the dominant sections of the American financial oligarchy. Although the financial overlords of Chicago are by no means

ide
(C
por
not
of
the
way

TH

A

a c
fin
ist
to
Ru
ick
Fa
con
imp

R

cus
Roc
oth
list
Ku
Bro
Sto
Gol
cife
cag
dir
gan
Pub
A.T
arie
Chi

—
*
bas
entit
obtai
Rand

identical with Midwest capitalism (Cleveland and Detroit are also important centers of financial power, not to mention the over-all control of Wall Street), an examination of the Chicago area will start us on our way.*

THE "CHICAGO GROUP"

Apparently there is no mention of a distinctive Chicago grouping of finance capital in either the Marxist or the bourgeois literature prior to 1939. Reading Anna Rochester's *Rulers of America* (1936) or Frederick Lundberg's *America's Sixty Families* will not lead one even to conjecture a Chicago group of any importance.

Rochester's fundamental study focuses on the Morgan, Mellon and Rockefeller groups and considers all others as distinctly secondary. Her list of secondary groups includes Kuhn-Loeb, a Boston grouping, Brown Brothers Harriman, Hayden Stone & Co., and the Lehman Bros.-Goldman Sachs grouping. She specifically regards the very large Chicago banks as strongly even if indirectly under the influence of Morgan, through their connections with Pullman, International Harvester, A.T.&T., the railroads and subsidiaries of U.S. Steel. The powerful Chicago First National Bank was

regarded as linked with Rockefeller through the Standard Oil Company of Indiana.

The first mention of a distinctive Chicago Group is found in the monograph entitled "Structure of the American Economy," published by the National Resources Committee in 1939. A section on control of big industry was written by Paul Sweezy. Starting with the 200 largest non-financial firms and the 50 largest banks, Sweezy lists the interlocking directors, and from a study of this, and from certain information about the corporations' financial arrangements, he concludes that there are eight important centers of financial control. These eight are the Morgan, Mellon, Rockefeller, Kuhn Loeb, Du Pont groups, plus three groupings by area: Boston, Cleveland and Chicago.

Since this study was published (it was based on financial data as of 1935), there has been a great and quite uneven expansion of big industry under the impact of World War II, as well as some shifts in control among the big interest groups. These ten years have also seen some sharp differences of political opinion. Our purpose is to examine the economic basis of the alleged Chicago Group in considerable detail.

THE CHICAGO ECONOMY

In order to gain an idea of what

* Those interested in the factual detail at the basis of this article are referred to a monograph entitled *Who Owns Chicago?*, which may be obtained from the Modern Bookstore, 64 W. Randolph, Chicago, Ill., for the price of \$1.00.

kind of economic base the Chicago Group may be presumed to have, we first present a brief general survey of the economy of the "Chicago Industrial Area." We follow a study of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago in defining the Chicago industrial area as five counties in Illinois (Cook, Du Page, Kane, Lake and Will), plus Lake County in Indiana.

The 1940 Census found 4½ million people in this area, with a recent estimate pushing the number up to 5½ millions. In 1940, 74.2 per cent were listed as "native white," 7.2 per cent as Negro and 18.5 per cent as foreign-born. Since World War II, there has been a great increase in population, particularly among the Negroes, by migration from other parts of the country.

In 1940, 45.7 per cent of Chicago's population were reported as working or seeking work, approximately two million people. By 1948, the working force increased to about two and one-half millions. About one million or 40 per cent of all Chicago area workers were in manufacturing firms, 490,000 in commerce, 270,000 in "service" industries, 207,000 in transport and utilities, 165,000 in government employ (including the "city-owned" Chicago Transportation Authority), 125,000 in finance, and 71,000 in the construction industries. Chicago is thus seen to be an "industrial" city, although like any other metropolitan area, it also bulks

large as a trading and financial center.

It is important to see which manufacturing industries predominate. Of the million employees of manufacturing industries in 1948 there were:

207,000	in iron and steel
123,000	in non-electrical machinery
120,000	in electrical machinery
113,000	in food and food processing
84,000	in printing and publishing
65,000	in textile and apparel

Within the iron and steel group, the greatest recent growth has taken place in steel fabrication. Radio and communication firms show the greatest growth in the electrical machinery group. Agricultural equipment and engines and turbines have increased most rapidly in the non-electrical machinery section. It is important to note that these latter industries have been growing more rapidly in Chicago than in the country as a whole. In 1947, Illinois accounted for half of the tractor industry, and was by far the leading state in the manufacture of farm equipment generally. Of Chicago's workers employed in machinery manufacturing, more than half (69,000) were working on farm implements.

Two other aspects of Chicago's economic complexion will be of importance to us. First, Illinois (mainly Chicago), leads the U.S. in food processing. 10.7 per cent of the entire food processing industry is lo-

cated in Illinois. New York, with twice the population, has only 10.2 per cent of the workers in this industry. The state of California has 7.5 per cent but Cook County alone has 7.5 per cent. Second, Chicago is the center of the mail-order business. As of 1947, 40 per cent of all the workers in this business were located in Illinois (as compared to 9 per cent in Pennsylvania and 3.6 per cent in New York). This fact is closely related to Chicago's other ties with agriculture, for the mail-order business got its start and most rapid growth with the establishment by the U.S. Post Office of rural free delivery (R.F.D.). Though direct retailing is of growing importance to such firms as Sears and Wards, the rural link is still very important.

Summing up this outline picture of the Chicago economy, we see that although the Chicago Industrial Area is one of the most diversified in the U.S., there seems to be no question that it is far more closely tied to agriculture than any other major industrial area. Meat-packing, but also other food processing, food wholesaling, agricultural implements and tractors, and mail-order, are all much more concentrated in Chicago than anywhere else. The accumulative effect of these industries, plus the financial needs of the farmers themselves, are decisive elements in the activities of the Chicago banks. (It may be noted that neither cotton nor tobacco, among the great export

crops, are handled or processed in Chicago.)

A remaining question is the importance of foreign markets and investments for the Chicago Group as compared with the dominant financial groupings of the country. Swift, Armour, Cudahy, Wrigley and International Harvester are known to have extensive foreign investments. Sears is expanding in Latin America. But other Chicago firms seem to have little interest abroad except for Canada, and any attempt to work back to the U.S. from a list of American foreign investment leads one overwhelmingly to the other groups. The evidence is incomplete, and very difficult to obtain at best, but there seems to be no possibility of the Chicago group having foreign interests equivalent to those of Rockefeller or Morgan, even relative to the total assets of these groups.

In spite of the dominance of New York as the financial center, Chicago is still one of the greatest financial centers of the capitalist world. Chicago, with 4 per cent of the total has the second largest concentration of commercial bank capital in the country, and is surpassed only by New York and London in the world scene.

Six of the capitalist world's 150 largest banks are located in Chicago. Sixteen of the 300 largest banks in the U.S.A. are in Chicago. In order to investigate the structure of Chicago finance-capital, the boards of

directors of the 16 largest Chicago banks were analyzed, as were those of 4 smaller but important banks, out of a total of 69 banks in the Chicago area.

This investigation of the Chicago banks discloses the following facts.

First, it is overwhelmingly clear that the major Chicago banks are directed, in the main, by men whose interests are the industrial main-springs of Chicago and the Middle West. Very few "outsiders" (men whose corporate interests are largely elsewhere) sit as directors of the major Chicago banks. For example, of the 18 directors of Continental Illinois, 14 at least are directly associated with important Chicago and Midwest firms, as contrasted with such outsiders as Lawrence P. Fisher of General Motors or A. W. Peake of Standard Oil of Indiana. Again, of the 25 directors of Chicago First National, all except 2 or 3 are basically rooted in the Chicago area. The same holds true of the rest of the banks considered. In a later section of this article, we will present a summary of who these men are and what firms and industries they control.

The second basic fact to emerge is that very important sections of Chicago industry are not represented on the Chicago banks but are financially controlled from elsewhere in the country. For example, virtually the entire railroad and railroad equipment industry—a major industry in Chicago—is controlled by the

great New York banking and investment houses. Again, almost the entire Chicago steel and iron industry—the area's largest single employer—remains out of the sphere of influence of Chicago finance-capital, with New York (Morgan) and Cleveland (the Hanna-Mather interests) dominating the scene.

Thirdly, Chicago is the financial capital of a very large part of the Middle West. Directly, the directors of the Chicago banks also sit as directors on 14 non-Chicago banks, including the Wilmette State Bank, the Moline National Bank, the National Bank of Omaha, and the First National Bank of Kalamazoo. A Canadian bank, the Canadian Bank of Commerce, has a Chicago director on its board. Indirectly, almost all of the Midwest's smaller banks have correspondent relations with one or more of the Chicago Loop banks. These Chicago down-town banks are known as "bankers' banks." Just prior to World War II, for example, 23 per cent of all the deposits of the down-town banks were from outlying and outstate banks. According to a noted bourgeois banking authority, James, (*Growth of the Chicago Banks*, p. 1105), "Continental Illinois and the First National Bank [are] two of the greatest Bankers' Banks in the whole United States. Few New York banks can equal them in the network of correspondent relationships they still possess, and no other bank in the country has as

complete a financial hegemony within its own economic area."

Fourth, in addition to the segments of Chicago industry directly controlled by Chicago finance-capitalists (see below), a study of the cross-directorships of the Chicago bank directors suggests that the Chicago Group is strong enough to share in the control of basic industries owned primarily by other (and more powerful) financial groupings. Although it is clear, for example, that the Chicago banks do not control the country's railroads, they are represented strongly on several of the main lines that operate in the Chicago area. The Chicago group has four directorships on the Illinois Central, six on the Santa Fe and three on the Burlington. Again, two Chicago bank directors are to be found on the board of the huge Texas Oil Company, two on the boards of Western Union, U.S. Steel and Allis-Chalmers, and one each on those of Goodyear Tire & Rubber, New York Life, and Cleveland Cliffs Iron—all firms whose decisive financial control rests elsewhere.

In appraising the power and influence of the Chicago banks, let us first look at the aspect of relative growth. In a 1949 survey, the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago stated:

Chicago's financial institutions on the whole have shown as great or greater relative growth in many financial measures during the last ten years as their New York counterparts. Since 1939,

Chicago central reserve city banks, for example, have experienced larger relative gains than comparable New York banks in total loans and investments, commercial and industrial loans, real estate loans, total deposits, demand deposits of other banks . . . and total assets.

The survey further stated:

A broad comparison of the type and scope of financial activities in Chicago with those in New York reveals considerable evidence that Chicago financial institutions in recent years have achieved sufficient growth and maturity to pursue a more independent course of action on loan and investment policies than before the war when precedents established in New York tended to be followed more closely.

In this veiled bankers' language we see some recognition of unevenness of development within the banking trust. More direct signs are the recent organization of the Midwest Stock Exchange over Wall Street opposition, as well as the recent bitter proxy fight within Montgomery Ward which ended in the ousting of Morgan partners. Another sign of increasing strength was the purchase of the Chicago Rock Island and Pacific R.R. in 1948 by a group of Chicago capitalists.

Lest one gain the impression that the Chicago bankers are suddenly sweeping all before them, we hasten to add that Wall Street has the decisive say on all really crucial mat-

ters. When, in January 1950, a Chicago First National-Halsey Stuart bond syndicate outbid both Morgan and Kuhn-Loeb on a \$100,000,000 World Bank issue, the outcome was that the successful syndicate had to be dissolved with 35 per cent of the bonds remaining unsold. Wall Street had apparently killed the market for the Chicago group. Again, in the banking connected with the Marshall Plan, the Chicago banks have been largely by-passed, with New York getting 93 per cent of the business.

Palyi, a conservative economist, in a 1938 work on the Chicago banks, paints a picture which, by and large, still holds today:

An enormous banking apparatus without an open market of its own, a reserve bank which is rather a branch than a policy directing central institution, a vast accumulation of liquid funds without specialized savings institutions, so to speak; an enormous distributive apparatus for securities, the original and primary marketing of which largely belongs elsewhere—such was and still is roughly the offhand picture of the local financial setup.

He goes on to add:

Chicago is one of the few exceptions to the general rule that local money and capital markets tend to submerge in the financial center of each individual country. The amount of independence achieved and maintained here cannot be measured in purely quantitative terms.

Thus, the Chicago banks present us with a complex picture. Under capitalism, money talks—and vast sums have accumulated in the Chicago area. Strong enough to struggle against the domination of the leading financial combines which control the country—and even occasionally to win—their degree of independence is relative at best. But apparently enough relative independence exists to provide part of the background for the frictions and conflicts of policy we have been discussing.

THE MAJOR CHICAGO FIRMS

Following up the industrial and commercial ties of the directors of the major Chicago banks, we find approximately 40 firms which are the core of the economic power of the Chicago Group. These firms have been picked as Chicago Group corporations on the basis of the following criteria: (1) they have financial ties and interlocking directorates with Chicago's major banks; (2) they have their home offices and major sales- or production units in Chicago or Illinois; (3) their chief directors interlock to at least some extent, and also are important in Chicago's educational, social and cultural institutions, and they or their stooges play a role in local politics; (4) their boards of directors are free (or relatively free) of representatives of the other great American financial groupings;

their history is closely linked with the industrial and financial development of the Chicago area. Contrariwise, we regarded as "non-Chicago-controlled," those firms which do not meet the above criteria.

Of the 200 largest non-financial corporations listed by the *Structure of the American Economy*, only 15 appear to be truly Chicago companies. These giants among giants are the following:

Armour & Co.
Commonwealth Edison
Cudahy Packing Co.
General American Transportation Corp.
Inland Steel Co.
International Harvester
John Deere & Co.
Marshall Field & Co.
Montgomery Ward
Peoples Gas, Light & Coke
Public Service of Northern Illinois
Pure Oil Co.
Sears Roebuck
Swift & Co.
Wilson & Co.

It will be seen that four of the 15 firms are meat-packing companies (Armour, Cudahy, Swift and Wilson); two are farm-implement manufacturers (International Harvester and John Deere); two are giant mail-order houses (Montgomery Ward and Sears). The remainder of the firms—in retail merchandising, railroad equipment, oil, steel, and utilities—represent types that are not pe-

culiar to Chicago and are not always the major firms in their respective fields.

Together, these 15 giants, plus 25 other Chicago firms of somewhat smaller magnitude, directly control some six and one-half billion dollars of assets and employ three-quarters of a million people (773,500 in 1949). Of course, not all of this property nor all of these people are located in the Chicago area. Some of the giant firms, such as International Harvester, own plants in many parts of the United States, and in Europe and Latin America as well. But in all cases, their home plants and their financial base are in the Chicago area.

In examining these firms, which we believe to be the major base of the Chicago Group, it is important to remember two things. First, the list itself is not exhaustive; there are many other Chicago firms, employing many thousands of workers, which we do not include. The reasons for exclusion have a lot to do with the way in which this research was carried on. It will be remembered that we were seeking a group which has close connections with the major Chicago banks, thus attempting to disclose a group which has the dominant character of modern finance-capital. Where firms do not appear on our list, it is either because their boards do not display close ties to the major banks or where these same boards do not contain any

significant number of important Chicago capitalists.

The second important thing to remember is that in concentrating our attention on the "Chicago-controlled" firms it is easy to get a very one-sided picture of the Chicago economy as a whole. If we look only at the "Chicago" firms we may get the impression that the entire Chicago working class is directly exploited by local finance-capital. Actually, this is not true at all. Unfortunately, available sources of statistics do not permit the breakdown of the Chicago working class into those exploited by the local group of finance-capitalists and those controlled by other-than-Chicago financial interests. Enough information is at hand, however, to indicate that Chicago workers employed in such basic industries as railroad and primary metals are controlled from elsewhere, as contrasted with the bulk of those working in food-processing, non-electrical machinery and merchandising, who appear to be exploited more directly by Chicago finance-capital. At any rate, the "Chicago Group" by no means controls the whole of the Chicago economy. Wall Street plays its role in Chicago too, and La Salle Street is pretty much of a junior partner even in its own bailiwick.

THE RULERS OF CHICAGO

Approximately 50 men can be said

to occupy the inmost circle of Chicago finance-capital. They are the board chairmen, presidents, or major directors of the largest corporations and banks. They will be found listed among the sponsors and trustees of the charitable institutions, the hospitals, the social agencies, and the universities. They, and the members of their families, are found among the large contributors to the slush funds of the two major political parties. In a very real sense of the term, if these 50 men met in a Loop Hotel, they could make decisions materially affecting the fate and livelihood of literally millions of people.

Within recent years, however, a new group of individuals appears to be taking shape which, by reason of its activities and power, but particularly its public struggles and disagreements with Eastern financial groups, appears to be coming forward as a distinctive "core" of a Chicago group. For want of a better term, we call it the "Avery Group," since its effective leader appears to be Sewell Avery of Montgomery Ward. Associated with Avery in numerous enterprises are several men: Philip R. Clarke of the City National Bank, active in Montgomery Ward and the Pure Oil Co.; Henry M. Dawes, also of City National, whose only other public corporate connection is Pure Oil; Paul H. Davis, head of Borg-Warner and involved in a number of other industrials; Percy B. Eckhart of the Chicago Title & Trust, active in

real estate; Solomon A. Smith of the Northern Trust, whose name appears in a number of Avery-led firms; Merle J. Trees of Chicago Bridge & Iron (a subsidiary of U.S. Steel), also associated with Avery in a number of firms; Rawleigh Warner of Pure Oil, who sits with Avery as a director of the City National Bank and the *Chicago Daily News*; John and R. Douglas Stuart of Quaker Oats, also apparently close to Avery. Closely interwoven with the affairs of this group, we find two important Chicago banks (Northern Trust and City National), a large building materials firm (U.S. Gypsum), a giant mail-order house (Montgomery Ward), and a number of other lesser industrial and financial institutions that, all together, make up a formidable empire. It is interesting that a number of the men in this group have been prominently identified in the past both with "Midwest isolationism" and with certain proxy fights against the Morgan empire.

An important slant on the Chicago Group is afforded by a breakdown of the major industrial or financial affiliation of our 50 rulers of Chicago. Despite the fact that these men can all be listed as "corporation executives" and that their financial activities are as important as their industrial connections—taken together, they are all finance-capitalists—it is still true that there is some division of labor among them. A summary of the main activity of each of them fol-

lows, by type of industry and the number of men in each type:

Food and allied	13
Machinery, all types	13
Banking and finance	11
Merchandising	7
Metal Products	3
Steel	2
Utilities	2
Printing	2
Publishing (mainly newspaper)	2
Corporation Law	2
Chemicals	1
Petroleum	1

It will be seen that food-processing and machinery manufacture take up the major attention of almost half our group with merchandising (retail and wholesale) another large area. On the other hand, such basic industries as steel, railroad, utilities, mining, chemicals and oil play a minor role, pointing up an important contrast between the Chicago Group and the dominant finance-capital interest groups of the country. The prominence of banking, investment and financial activities should surprise no one who is at all familiar with the dominating role of financial institutions in present-day monopoly capital.

CHICAGO FINANCE-CAPITAL: AN APPRAISAL

What does all this add up to? Are we in a position to give some kind of answer to the questions raised at the outset of the study? Is there a

Chicago Group of finance-capitalists which is more or less independent of the dominant sections of American monopoly capital? Do certain economic relations play a role in Chicago and the Middle West which provide a different base for the Chicago Group and therefore lead to certain tactical differences of political opinion?

Let us first try to summarize what we have found. We can put together four general conclusions from our study of the Chicago economy.

Our first conclusion involves the *intimate connection between Chicago capital and agriculture*. This connection has, of course, its historical background. The development of the meat-packing and farm implement industries were major factors in Chicago's feverish industrial growth after the Civil War. Even Chicago's steel industry got its start in terms of the needs of farming (wire fencing, metal for farm equipment, etc.), although by now the production of agricultural steel is probably only a small part of Chicago's total steel production. Similarly, a very large part of Chicago's financial and commercial capital must be tied to the farmers' market, of which the huge mail-order business is an example. In stressing the importance of the connection to agriculture, we must avoid being one-sided. But if we are looking for the distinctive features of the Chicago economy, as compared to those of other industrial

areas (Pittsburgh; coal and steel; Detroit: automobiles; New York: commerce and light industry), the great importance of agriculture and the agricultural market for Chicago at once becomes clear.

The second important conclusion we can draw may be summarized as follows: *although powerful, Chicago finance capital is not really entrenched in the most basic industries*. Chicago capital does not seem to have much influence or any decisive share in the ownership of such really basic industries as mining, steel, aluminum, oil, railroads, automobiles, heavy electrical machinery, shipbuilding, or aircraft production. Also generally absent from the Chicago scene are those modern financial giants, the great life insurance companies. If the holders of capital in these industries can be said to hold the key positions in American capitalism, then the financial overlords of Chicago, as wealthy as they may be, must be compelled to play a relatively subordinate role.

The third conclusion is: *Chicago capital plays a negligible role in the export of capital, particularly to Europe*. Very few of the 17 billions of American dollars invested abroad send tribute to Chicago capitalists. It is true that a few of Chicago's firms maintain extensive trading and even manufacturing organizations abroad (International Harvester, Armour's and Swift's are the chief examples). It is true also that certain

Chicago firms have considerable investments in Canada (The *Chicago Tribune*, Fairbanks Morse, Crane & Co., and others). There are some ties also to Latin America, through the packing companies, Sears Roebuck and International Harvester. But as compared with the vast sums invested abroad by the great New York banks and investment houses and by the oil interests, the Chicago share of foreign investment, especially in Europe and the Near East, appears to be little more than a few drops in the bucket. Currently, it has been reported in the press that the Chicago banks have had a very small share of the financial operations in connection with the Marshall Plan, with Wall Street banks grabbing 93 per cent of the business. It would appear that the older and more powerful investment institutions (Morgan, Rockefeller, Kuhn Loeb, etc.) have the right of way and the established connections when it comes to exploitation of the European capital market.

The fourth conclusion we wish to draw, this time very tentatively, is that *the great Chicago banks have developed a certain degree of independence of the dominant American banking trust*. The evidence here is difficult to determine and quite indecisive. It is no doubt quite true that the over-all tendency of the development of American finance-capital is toward centralization and concentration. The great New York

banks and life insurance companies—controlled largely by Morgan and Rockefeller interests—overwhelmingly dominate the financial life of the country. But the leading Chicago banks—Chicago First National and the Continental Illinois—have grown large and powerful and have developed an elaborate network of relationships with a large number of banking institutions scattered all over the Middle West. Furthermore, the major directors of these banks also sit on the boards of the dominant Chicago industrial and commercial firms. Again, while the leading New York banks are heavily involved in financial manipulations relating to foreign trade and capital export, this does not seem to be true of the Chicago banks.

Thus, whatever evidence we have been able to gather points to a positive answer to the questions we raised at the outset of the study. The reactionary politicians of the Hoover and Taft type who today oppose Truman's foreign policy no doubt do so for a variety of political motives. Some of these motives are merely partisan; they attempt to play upon the deep peace aspirations of the American people in an effort to unseat the party in power. But our findings suggest that deeper economic motives play a part as well. It certainly appears to be true that the Chicago, and generally Middle Western, financial groupings have less of a stake in Europe, and there-

fore more of a tendency to object all the more strenuously to tax burdens for "aid" to Western Europe, which produce profits not for themselves but for other sections of finance-capital. If Chicago capital sees no great opportunity for capital export to a Europe already dominated by Wall Street, will they not press all the more strenuously for an "Asia First" rather than a "Europe First" policy? While there certainly doesn't appear much to choose between an imperialist who wishes to swallow Europe first and one who wishes on the contrary to swallow China first, it is nevertheless true that the existence of these tactical differences in the ruling class provides an opportunity for the genuine peace forces of the people to come forward more boldly than has hitherto been the case.

One political fact, however, emerges as certain. Whatever differences in tactics exist within the ranks of American Big Business, there can be no doubt as to the impossibility of the working class forging an alliance with one or another monopoly grouping. Although certain elements of the "Chicago Group" oppose the Marshall Plan, this does not make them any less reactionary than the dominant sections of monopoly capital who espouse the "Plan." On the contrary, this grouping is rabidly anti-Soviet in its foreign policy, and violently anti-labor and pro-fascist in its domestic orientation. It is im-

portant to know that differences exist within the ruling class, and that they have their economic base. Much that appears politically mysterious thereby becomes clearer. But we would be repeating the suicidal class-collaborationist mistake of Browderism if we did not realize that monopoly capital *as a whole* tends toward reaction and fascism, whatever the momentary policy of a given grouping of the class.

In noting the existence of these tactical differences within the ruling class, we observe also that they are by no means as sharp in the present postwar period as they were during the war, or even as sharp as they were at various times during the New Deal period prior to the war. Both the Marshall Planners and the *Chicago Tribune* "isolationists" are in full agreement as to who is the main enemy and they are both doing everything they can to prepare the nation for war to the death against "communism." Both sides dream of conquering and dominating the entire world. But whereas one side is conscious of the leftward movement of the peoples of the world, including the U.S., as a consequence of World War II, and therefore seeks to conceal its predatory aims by all kinds of social demagoguery (the "Fair Deal," "aid to Europe," "defense of democracy against totalitarianism"), the other side makes no secret of its contempt for everyone who is not an American capitalist. One side strives

to win the support of the workers and the more progressive-minded sections of the people, who strive for the right to organize, for civil rights, and for other measures of social reform; the other directs its appeal to the most backward elements of the population. This situation presents the advanced sections of the workers with a problem: it must expose the

reactionary aims which the social demagogy of the Trumans covers up, and at the same time it must conduct a struggle against the open reactionaries and pro-fascists. Knowledge of the reasons for these tactical differences and the basic agreements hidden behind them should contribute to a solution of the problem.

Book Review

A FASCIST WAR INCENDIARY UNMASKED

By John Elder

Tito and Goliath. By Hamilton Fish Armstrong. Macmillan, New York. 312 pp. \$3.50.

In seeming disregard of any contradiction, the U.S. State Department and the Wall Street-controlled press simultaneously describe Tito-Yugoslavia as an "independent Marxist" state and boast that the same government is moving lock, stock and barrel into the imperialist camp. The need for this contradiction is inherent in the world situation in which American imperialism finds itself. On the one hand, there is the frantic search for allies and the necessity to hail the acquisition of every scabrous fascist with an extravagance loud enough to drown out the fact that the war forces are opposed by hundreds of millions of people. But while the imperialists are forced to report their successes with Tito, they are loathe to give up the expected disruptive benefits to be derived from the myth that his is an "anti-Soviet but Communist state."

In his book, *Tito and Goliath*, Hamilton Fish Armstrong cynically acknowledges that the prime propaganda value of Tito to American imperialism has been and continues to be in the disruption of the world peace movement. One need only recall the

divisive tactics of O. John Rogge, paid Tito agent, at the Warsaw Peace Congress. But Mr. Armstrong confirms the tactic as an instrument of official United States policy when he writes:

"Wherever the facts of the Tito-Stalin struggle are known, the Soviet dove—whether Picasso's or another's—looks bogus."

The wish, to say nothing of the plot, is father to the thought.

Tito and Goliath is a trite catalogue of pro-Tito slanders against the Soviet Union. Its interest lies in the fact that its author is a semi-official spokesman for State Department policy. The editor of the influential *Foreign Affairs*, Mr. Armstrong earlier served as U.S. military attaché in Belgrade in 1918 and 1919; he was a special adviser to Secretary of State Cordell Hull in 1942 and 43, Minister in London in 1944, and a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations Conference in San Francisco in 1945.

In *Tito and Goliath* Mr. Armstrong strains mightily to give vitality to the now ludicrous claims of "independent Marxist" status for a Yugoslav regime which has been forced by life itself to drop the "Marxist" camouflage and bare the fascist essence.

If Mr. Armstrong continues the propaganda mixture as before, it is

because he can find nothing new to say, and because he and those he serves still hope that the Tito myth can confuse the American people, impede the developing peace movement and hide from the people that there is one more fascist to join Franco, Chiang and the other "free nations" with which they have been allied.

Because the author is a recognized authority presumed to be above the studied forgeries of the gutter press, *Tito and Goliath* is also a revealing demonstration of the complete degeneration of bourgeois historical and political writing. For this book is not only completely un-documented, it is full of the wildest anti-Soviet slanders, sometimes presented as outright statements of fact, sometimes as sly insinuations.

CONCEALS FASCIST NATURE OF TITO REGIME

Typical of such cowardly falsifications in Armstrong's announcement that the great hero of world anti-fascism died in Russia in 1949, and the prefatory sentence: "Whether Dimitrov suffered physical punishment will never be known." Mr. Armstrong obviously lacked the courage to put the charge directly, but not the venomous bias to suggest it.

Armstrong reviews the course of Titoism in Yugoslavia as a process of the slow and incredulous awakening of the Tito gang to the fact that their "national" integrity and the rights of all "small nations" were being threatened by the Soviet Union.

Yet even Armstrong himself cannot sustain this fairy-tale in his eagerness to

reveal the respectable age of Tito's friendship for the Western imperialists. He recalls that "by the end of 1943 Churchill had put all his money on Tito. . . . Tito became Churchill's man. He referred to Yugoslavia with relish as 'Tito-land.'" He records too a report, sanctioned by Churchill, that when Tito was asked by the British Tory leader whether he intended to "introduce" Socialism in Yugoslavia after the war, he "categorically denied it."

The author works strenuously to conceal the fascist nature of the Tito regime. First of all, he demagogically attributes to the alleged evils of "Communism" those conditions of mass hunger, bureaucracy and corruption in Yugoslavia which he cannot risk denying. Secondly, he pretends that capitalism has been uprooted by Tito and that "bourgeois opponents of the regime" have been "liquidated or cowed."

This is a bare-faced lie. Included in Tito's government are such worthies as Stanoc Simich, cabinet minister, a Royalist diplomat before the war, and a member of a rich bourgeois family; Kosan Pavoich Bardjansky, landowner, once president of the Rightist pre-war Agrarian Party and pro-fascist politician; Milan Smilianich, priest, vice-president of the Serbian Parliament, and during the war a collaborator with the fascist terrorist bands of Mikhailovich. The rosters of Tito's parliament, army, secret police and his phoney "Communist Party" and "People's Front" are packed with other representatives of the exploiting classes.

Unfortunately for Mr. Armstrong's thesis, the open degeneracy of traitors to the working class like the Tito gang

proceeds faster than propaganda can conceal it.

Thus, while he was writing his book some months ago, it was still possible for him to make political capital out of the Tito gang's claims that People's China would sooner or later "cooperate tacitly and perhaps openly" with the Belgrade fascists against the Soviet Union. "Their arguments for hoping this are not entirely far-fetched," said Mr. Armstrong.

But on April 6, C. L. Sulzberger observed in the *New York Times*:

"Soon, perhaps in a month, perhaps a bit more—Yugoslavia is going to advise her own people through the press (guided by the regime) that China is another Soviet satellite with imperialist appetites."

Clearly, the Wall Street need for a base of war provocation in Europe has taken precedence over the myth of the "independent" Tito aligned with other "socialist" countries in heroic resistance to the Soviet "Goliath."

The myth of Tito as the champion of "national independence" against the Soviet Union, so earnestly propagated by Mr. Armstrong, has also taken a bad beating in recent days.

A Belgrade dispatch to the *New York Times* of April 17 quoted Ivan Karaivanov, head of the Institute of International Studies in Tito's foreign ministry, describing Soviet society as "Mongolian socialism."

It is obvious that this chauvinist phrase is not alone an attempted slander against the Soviet Union or the Chinese people, but a racist concept right out of the Hitler arsenal. It is a fascist term, reeking with contempt both for the peoples of Asia and for

the universal brotherhood of Socialism. It measures the degeneracy of the Tito gang, whose "Marxism" is now equated with the "Mongol hordes" filth of *Mein Kampf* and the Hearst press here at home.

But such language as that from Titoites is only the verbal expression of their corruption and the fascization of Yugoslavia. To call the roll of the evidence of Tito's police-state is to make it clear that here, insofar as the true nature of the regime is concerned, is a replica of Franco Spain.

Here are the impoverished masses and luxuriating speculators, militarists and political bosses; the collapse of the agricultural program; the phoney "building" construction confined to elaborate facades and never completed; the jails packed with political prisoners; the organized absenteeism in mines and factories, the resistance of the peasantry.

Mr. Armstrong acknowledges what he cannot deny of the above. But he tries to hide that Titoism adds up to fascism.

It is necessary for Mr. Armstrong to challenge the evidence of the Rajk trial in Hungary and the Kostov trial in Bulgaria, because there Tito and his police chief, Rankovic were linked to the espionage network of imperialist powers and to the plot to overthrow the People's Democracies. But Mr. Armstrong cannot meet the evidence on its own terms, so he employs crude ridicule: "Everybody confessed to everything." He pretends that it was all fantasy: ". . . the scenario of a melodrama worthy of being played under the klieg lights." He implies that Rajk and other Titoite accomplices

were "drugged," like Cardinal Mindszenty. Only he censors the reports by eye-witnesses as conservative as Mr. Armstrong that Mindszenty, the Hungarian anti-Semite and pro-Nazi, was a hale and hearty confessor, at his trials, to crimes he could not possibly deny.

But all this does not suffice. And Mr. Armstrong, reviewing the case against Tito, Rajk and Co. finds himself conceding that "the tale is worked out in ingenious detail, and parts of it may even be true."

For the rest, *Tito and Goliath* rings the changes on the familiar theme that the Soviet Union "imposed" a boycott on Yugoslavia, and that all of that country's economic ills have flowed therefrom. The Yugoslav famine of 1950 is laid to two devils, the drought and "Marxism." As to the first, even the conservative London *Daily Telegraph* found itself wondering how a predominantly agricultural country like Yugoslavia which once exported much food and which "at the worst could be made virtually self-supporting," must now beg foreign bankers for help to avoid economic prostration.

As to the second, by the transparent device of blaming "Marxism" for Tito's capitalist failures, the author believes he can kill two birds with one stone. Tito is presented as the horrible example of Communist ineptitude, and his attempts to solve his insoluble economic problems by increasingly open espousal of capitalist remedies is pictured as a cautious step toward "Western democracy."

Mr. Armstrong is careful to quote a Titoite official as denying that "because Tito was disillusioned with Sta-

lin he had become convinced of the merits of Western capitalism" with the remark "that would have been untrue."

Thus, in his anxiety to maintain this weird balance of Tito Yugoslavia being a Communist state—but with all its evils due to "Marxism" and its hope lying in emulation of the capitalist West—Mr. Armstrong finds himself inextricably in a self-spun web of deceit.

He recites the list of "loans" to Tito by the London City, the United States Government and Wall Street bankers. (To the \$70,000,000 already granted, President Truman added \$29 millions for Tito's army in April). But he avoids discussion of the fact that Tito has turned over to American and other monopolists the rights in the lion's share of Yugoslav mines or that the Yugoslav workers and peasants are being forced to pay the pre-war "debts" of the Royalist government to Wall Street bondholders, as the price for the loans which keep Tito in champagne and his fascist police in arms. Nor will the reader of *Tito and Goliath* find in its index the names of Anaconda Copper, to which Tito has handed over valuable ore concessions, or the Mellon trust, whose subsidiaries have been given almost all Yugoslav bauxite mining rights.

Is it any wonder that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce exultantly declared in the January, 1951 issue of its *Economic Intelligence*, that "the profit motive has been resurrected in Yugoslavia"?

Economic Intelligence is for the private eyes of American capitalists, who do not need the pap about "Marx-

ist" Yugoslavia, but just the straight story of another fascist with whom they can do business—like Franco and Peron and, in those happy days of yore, Chiang Kai-shek.

In order to blame "Communism" for the virtual collapse of the Titoite economy due to the official corruption, the huge army and secret police, and the wholesale sellout of its resources to foreign imperialists, Mr. Armstrong has to pretend that Yugoslavia's troubles have their parallels in "other" Communist-led countries.

Thus, he melodramatically announces that a visit to Czechoslovakia after the People's Democratic regime took over revealed vast poverty, empty store-shelves: "A city, a people, a life are gone." But a host of competent observers, including Alexander Werth of *The Nation*, Theodore H. White and others, have reported Czechoslovakia thriving, its stores filled, its people enjoying a higher standard of living than ever.

Why must Mr. Armstrong lie? For the same reason a Madrid organ of the Franco regime (which does not have precisely the same propaganda problems of the American organizers of the "free world") recently explained:

"It is expedient for the West to describe Tito as a Marxist."

As long as it will be possible, Mr. Armstrong and all other echoes of Wall Street will "expediently" make use of Tito to portray his regime as the innocent victim of a "Soviet imperialism" so rampant that it even turned on its Communist brethren.

UNDERESTIMATION OF TITO DANGER IS CRIMINAL

But the pressures of the Wall Street time-table for war and Tito's own mounting internal difficulties make the game more arduous every day.

Where Tito has for two years furnished newspaper headline material that his army would fight but "only in case of Soviet attack," his role in an imperialist attack in Europe is now openly revealed.

Writing in the *N. Y. Times* of April 15, M. S. Handler declared that Tito's request for arms from the United States, Britain and France was "based on a recent decision by the Yugoslav government that its army would have to participate in a general European war . . ."; a war, need it be added, directed against the Socialist Soviet Union and the People's Democracies of eastern Europe.

It is clear, of course, that Tito and his fascist crew have had to give up many of their transparent "Marxist" disguises at home, it being a little more difficult to delude a Yugoslav worker who sees his old Royalist exploiter back in the driver's seat than it is to beguile someone thousands of miles away.

Thus, M. S. Handler recently had to take note of the curious fact that Tito, in addressing his parliament, omitted a single mention of his alleged Communist Party.

This same discarding of a Tito pretense to being a Marxist, a pretense which no longer serves to trick the Yugoslav people is, in turn, used by Wall Street propagandists elsewhere. Thus, one finds Gaston Coblentz,

New
spori
grad
serve
Prem
the
away
M
Mar
pou
Hera
has
Tito
long
ciali
worl
from
state
M
stud
Mr.
that
Tito
Unio
The
tect
natio
of th
natio
and
Th
with
tion
Tito,
paw
worl
ment
sion
to b
Iran'
reser
tiona
fesse
Unio

New York Herald Tribune correspondent, bravely cabling from Belgrade on April 14 that "foreign observers are paying serious attention to Premier Marshal Tito's contention that the Communist state is 'withering away' in Yugoslavia."

Mr. Coblentz, whose knowledge of Marxism must be a horrendous compound of Tito-Trotskyite-fascism and *Herald Tribune* "spy" extravaganzas, has evidently mistaken the collapse of Tito's masquerade at home for the long-range perspective of genuine Socialist states of a time when, in a world at peace and permanently secure from imperialist threats, the Socialist state will wither away.

Mr. Armstrong is more learned a student of Marxism, no doubt, than Mr. Coblentz. His slanderous charge that the Communist condemnation of Tito stigmatizes Stalin and the Soviet Union is all the more reprehensible. The world knows Stalin as the architect of the Bolshevik policy on the national question and as the defender of the rights of nations to self-determination, and complete national freedom and sovereignty.

The fascist Chiang, who intrigues with Wall Street for a war of destruction against his own people, the fascist Tito, who offers Yugoslavia as the pawn to make the first move in a new world war, and the U.S. State Department, which openly and to the exclusion of Iran itself, "considers" what is to be done about the "problem" of Iran's nationalization of its own oil reserves, are sorry symbols of the "nationalism" which Mr. Armstrong professes to defend against the Soviet Union.

Yet, if Mr. Armstrong's wishful dreams of a world Communist movement disintegrated, and a world peace movement divided by the Tito plots and propaganda seem far removed from the realities, it would be criminal folly for Americans, of whatever political persuasion, to underestimate the very real danger that Tito Yugoslavia implies for our country.

The disruptive activities of O. John Rogge, paid Tito agent here (the Rogge who announced to the Warsaw Peace Congress that the Civil War should not have been fought to end chattel slavery); the lavish use of funds for Titoite literature and to buy trade union and liberal figures, and the revelation of Earl Browder's ties to the Titoites,* all these emphasize the continued capacity of Titoism for impeding the developing peace movement in the U.S.A.

But central to the issue of Tito for the American people are the unmistakable signs that the Truman-Wall Street war machine is grooming Yugoslavia for the role of Europe's South Korea, and Tito for its bloody Syngman Rhee. The feverish arming of Yugoslavia, the repeated headline announcements of Soviet "moves" toward the Yugoslav border (moves which never materialize but which condition the public toward anticipating conflict in that area) all are reminiscent of the steps leading toward the intervention in Korea, as a jumping off place for a full-scale war in the Far East.

* In *Political Affairs*, February 1951, John Gates points out that, in his latest writings, Browder "resorts to slanderous lies about the spread of 'authoritarianism' in the U.S.S.R., and invents a 'war-minded trend' in the Soviet Union and the international Communist movement. This is exactly what Tito says today."

The continuing disasters attendant on the Korean adventure for the Korean people, America and all the world, serve notice on every American lover of peace to be as vigilant in pre-

venting Wall Street's use of Tito to spark a war in Europe as in barring similar use of Chiang Kai-shek in the Far East.

Tito to
barring
in the



New — And Indispensable!

IRON CITY

By LLOYD L. BROWN

A novel which strikes at the heart of Jim Crow oppression, called by Paul Robeson "*the book we have been waiting for!*"

Popular edition \$1.50; Cloth \$3.00

THE WOMAN QUESTION

Selections from the writings of Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, V. I. Lenin, and Joseph Stalin, covering the enslavement and exploitation of women, the bourgeois family, emancipation of women and socialism, relation of sexes, etc.

Popular edition \$.50; Cloth \$1.25

PAMPHLETS

<i>Marxism and Negro Liberation</i> , by Gus Hall	\$.10
<i>Voices for Freedom</i> , prepared by Civil Rights Congress10
<i>I Take My Stand for Peace</i> , by W. E. B. Du Bois02
<i>Public Enemies in Public Office</i> , by Carl Hirsch10
<i>Who Wants War? How the Soviet Union Builds for Peace</i> , by J. Clark03

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway • New York 3, N. Y.

JUL 23 1951

A vital contribution!

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

By VICTOR PERLO

In this brilliant extension and application of the main thesis put forward in Lenin's classic, *Imperialism—the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Victor Perlo has made a contribution of lasting importance to the study of American political economy.

With impressive documentation, buttressing each proposition with facts and figures from government, United Nations, and similar sources, *American Imperialism* traces the worldwide expansion of United States corporate interests, the unlimited objectives of this expansion, and the use of the U.S. government to make possible this growth of Wall Street's empire in such fields as oil, metals, food, and in industry and trade generally.

This new International book analyzes concretely the present division of the world's economic resources among the great Wall Street trusts, and builds up irrefutable evidence of the systematic U.S. penetration of Asia, Africa, Latin America, and western Europe. It describes the vast profits obtained from intervention abroad and from the special exploitation of the colonial peoples, including the Negro people in the South. It is against this frame of reference that the author discusses the Marshall Plan and Point Four.

In sum, this is a magnificent study of U.S. imperialism's grand strategy of political, economic, and military domination of the world, and its consequences on the standard of living, the peace and freedom of the people of the United States.

Price \$2.25

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway • New York City 3

M

put
ism,
udy

with
ces,
ates
the
Wall
and

sion
usts,
n of
vast
bita-
outh.
the

rand
orld,
edom