

gour ✓

political affairs

NOVEMBER 1951 • 25 CENTS

- | | | |
|------------------|-------|--|
| PETTIS PERRY | [1] | The Soviet Union's Consistent Peace Policy: Lessons from History |
| RICHARD WALKER | [12] | Dressing Up The War They "Do Not Want" |
| JOSEPH GORDON | [22] | The Epic Advance of Soviet Agriculture |
| MARTIN FISHER | [29] | Urgent Tasks for Strengthening the Party |
| ALBERT LEVINSON | [37] | The Passing of an Old-Guard "Socialist" |
| DOLORES IBARRURI | [44] | The Struggle of the Spanish People Against Franco |
| HENRY NEWMAN | [61] | On Bacteriological Warfare
(<i>Book Review</i>) |

THE EDITORS of
MASSES & MAINSTREAM

proudly announce

the publication of a new novel by

V. J. JEROME

tentatively entitled

A Lantern for Jeremy

scheduled for publication February, 1952

Price \$2.50

WATCH FOR FURTHER ANNOUNCEMENTS
ABOUT THIS IMPORTANT CULTURAL EVENT

MASSES & MAINSTREAM
832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

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. Y.
New Century
payments and
months; foreign



Vo



B

ns
ci

T

w

it

to

It

in

m

o

je

S

"

w

t

w

U

v

S

i

r

S

t

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

The Soviet Union's Consistent Peace Policy: Lessons from History

By Pettis Perry

(On the Occasion of the 34th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.)

THERE IS NO COUNTRY in the world whose aims and policies, especially its foreign policy, have been so distorted as those of the Soviet Union. It has reached the point nowadays in the United States where people must either ignore the historical record and jump on the bandwagon, joining in the lies concerning the Soviet Union, or be branded as a "foreign agent." Thus, today, those who have energetically advocated the necessity of friendship and goodwill between the peoples of the United States and the U.S.S.R., are victimized under the pro-fascist Smith Act, as is shown by the jailing and further indictments of Communist leaders.

Ever since the establishment of the Soviet Union, thirty-four years ago this month, the ruling classes and

governments of the capitalist states have not given up their monstrous schemes to undermine and destroy the first land of Socialism. The very founding of the Soviet Republic was met by the concerted military intervention of fourteen capitalist states, including the United States. Has anyone forgotten the Graves Siberian Expedition which ended in a fiasco? Has humanity forgotten the despicable role of Herbert Hoover and the U.S. State Department in cooperating, from 1918 to the early 1920's, with the counter-revolutionary armies of Kolchak and Wrangel, who were trying to re-establish by blood and bullets the reign of capitalism in the Soviet Union?

THE MONSTROUS LIE

The essential content of the Monstrous Lie concerning the foreign policy of the Soviet Union is the propaganda that the Soviet Union

is preparing for war and that it is the aggressor nation.

Can anyone be so naive as to imagine that any country can carry through preparations for war, for the mass invasion and conquest of such a powerful country as the United States, without at the same time spreading war propaganda among its own people in order to prepare them to be ready at a moment's notice to shoulder a gun? No one in his right mind can believe such a thing. And this is exactly the point. Not one of the American diplomats, all of whom, particularly in the recent period, have been hostile to the Soviet Union, could contend that the press of the U.S.S.R. shouts for war against the United States or any other country. Yet it is known that this is a daily occurrence in the United States, Great Britain, France, and other capitalist countries.

On March 12, 1951, the Supreme Soviet passed a law that states:

War propaganda, in whatever form conducted, undermines the cause of peace, creates the danger of a new war, and is therefore a grave crime against humanity.

Persons guilty of war propaganda shall be committed for trial as major criminals.

This evidences the fact that there is no war propaganda in the Soviet Union, and demonstrates that it is preposterous to imagine that the Soviet Union is preparing for war against the United States, England or any other country. How is it to be

explained that the United States and Great Britain have not enacted such a law?

For one thing, if such a law were adopted in the United States, and enforced, individuals from President Truman down to many newspaper editors would have to be thrown into jail as inciters of war against the Soviet Union, of war for world domination.

Another question: Can it be seriously maintained that any country can carry through large-scale war preparations, requiring the conversion of a major share of its economy to the production of armaments, and at the same time carry through a process of mass industrialization of the civilian economy, constant reduction of prices and the steady lifting of the tax burden from the shoulders of the people? Let everyone bear in mind the declaration of Joseph Stalin in this connection. In the interview given to *Pravda*, on February 16, 1951, he offered the effective answer to any such question as that posed above:

It stands to reason that if the Soviet Union is not reducing but on the contrary is expanding its civilian industry, is not winding up but on the contrary is expanding the construction of new civilian hydroelectric power stations and irrigation systems, is not stopping but on the contrary is continuing the policy of price reduction, it cannot simultaneously with this inflate war industry and multiply its armed forces without risking finding itself in a state of bankruptcy.

T
cliché
them
this
thems
Party,
nor, i
Trotz
What
borrow
phrase
less to
the So
stretch
periali
man
sewer:
people
periali
are for
the na

WHA?

Spok
have it
is not
has no
aggran
whole
took sh
against
quently
torn fr
ask, h
Hawaii
and o
Philipp
imperia
And w
Cruz b
What v

Truman has borrowed several clichés from the sewer. He borrowed them from those pen gangsters in this country who sometimes call themselves the Socialist Workers Party, but who are neither Socialists nor, in the main, workers, but rather Trotskyite agents of imperialism. What is this phrase that Truman borrowed from this gang? It is the phrase "Soviet imperialism." Needless to say, a workers' state, which the Soviet Union is, cannot by any stretch of the imagination be an imperialist nation. But why does Truman drag this phrase from the sewer? Because he knows that the people of the United States hate imperialism and war, although they are for the most part confused as to the nature of imperialism.

WHAT IS IMPERIALISM?

Spokesmen of Wall Street want to have it appear that the United States is not an imperialist nation, that it has no record or present policy of aggrandizement. Of course, the whole history of the United States took shape on the basis of aggression against the Indian peoples. Subsequently much of the Southwest was torn from Mexico by war. May we ask, how this country obtained Hawaii and Guam and Puerto Rico and outright domination of the Philippines and Cuba, if not through imperialist aggression and butchery? And what of the bombing of Vera Cruz by U.S. battleships in 1914? What were U.S. armed forces doing

in Nicaragua in 1926? And in Haiti in 1929? A true answer to these questions would reveal what we are doing in Korea today.

Appropriate is a concise, scientific characterization of imperialism. Lenin sets forth classically the basic features of imperialism as follows:

- 1) The concentration of production and capital developed to such a high stage that it created monopolies which play a decisive role in economic life.
- 2) The merging of bank capital with industrial capital, and the creation, on the basis of this "finance capital," of a "financial oligarchy."
- 3) The export of capital, which has become extremely important, as distinguished from the export of commodities.
- 4) The formation of international capitalist monopolies which share the world among themselves.
- 5) The territorial division of the whole world among the greatest capitalist powers is completed.

Imperialism is capitalism in that stage of development in which the dominance of monopolies and finance capital has established itself; in which the export of capital has acquired pronounced importance; in which the division of the world among the international trusts has begun; in which the division of all territories of the globe among the great capitalist powers has been completed.*

Not one of these features of imperialism applies to the system of Socialism. On the other hand, each one of them, without exception, fits the system of the United States, Britain, France, Holland, Belgium, etc.

* V. I. Lenin, *Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, International Publishers, New York, 1939, p. 89.

In preparation for this article, I have examined a wide range of treaties, from the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty, signed by the Soviet Government in February 1918, to the Charter of the United Nations. I have examined also the record of the Soviet Union's fulfillment of its treaty obligations. I have been unable—taking into account the standpoint of the bourgeois press and of the labor and Communist press—to find any evidence of treaty breaking on the part of the Soviet Union. I have found, on the contrary, a general pattern of treaty breaking on the part of the capitalist countries.

Without attempting to analyze in detail the various treaties and the role of various states with respect to them, I shall refer briefly to the fact that throughout the period of the rise of Hitlerism which menaced the national integrity of countries like England, France and Belgium, it was not the bourgeois governments of these endangered countries that sounded the warning against Hitler and challenged his war-bent treaty scrapplings, but rather it was the Socialist Soviet Union. Time and time again, the Soviet representatives in the League of Nations championed the sanctity of treaties and respect for national sovereignty.

A typical distortion with regard to Soviet foreign policy, this one especially propagated among the Negro people, has been the allegation that the Soviet Union did not support Ethiopia in its struggle against fascist Italy. On this one need but refer the

reader to the session of the League of Nations of July, 1936, where the Soviet Union repeatedly called for obligatory enforcement of economic sanctions against the aggressor, as provided for in Article 10 of the Charter of the League of Nations. It took this firm position, notwithstanding the fact that it recognized that Article's inadequacies. But unanimity was required for such action. And it was only the refusal of the so-called Western democracies to join in sanctions against the aggressor that permitted Mussolini to carry through the rape of Ethiopia.

But the Soviet Union did not rest there. Its proposal for sanctions was not limited to the economic; in order to restore Ethiopia's sovereignty, the U.S.S.R. extended its proposal to the point of including military sanctions against the aggressor. Litvinov, then representing the U.S.S.R. at the League of Nations, stated: "It transpired beyond doubt that by economic sanctions alone there was no possibility of ousting the Italian army from Abyssinia and restoring the latter's independence, and that this aim could be achieved only by more drastic sanctions, military included.*"

But this Soviet proposal, likewise, was summarily rejected.

In actuality, French and British imperialism were constantly maneuvering to give Italian fascism territories that belonged to other peoples in order to shunt Mussolini's territorial demands from British and

* Maxim Litvinov, *Against Aggression* (International, 1939), p. 56.

French
tries.
revela
Laval
In t
and I
cerned
the fa
imper
spur
withi
spectiv
"demo
ing cl
were g
anti-fa
which
mentur
against
The
tions
whe
ter jou
of the
picable
to clear
crime o
Mussoli
With
Manchu
betrayal
Austria,
slovakia,
icy of "
at hand
viet Uni
sistently
venturist
fascism
certed a
lective s
did the

French possessions to weaker countries. We need but remember the revelation of the scandalous Hoare-Laval plot to sell out Ethiopia.

In their sinister calculations French and British imperialism were concerned, among other things, with the fact that strong action against imperialist Italy on their part might spur an anti-imperialist upsurge within their own colonies—a perspective most unwelcome to these "democracies." In addition, the ruling classes of these Western states were gravely disturbed by the rising anti-fascist movement of the people which would have gained great momentum from determined action against Mussolini's aggression.

The slanderous anti-Soviet allegations with regard to Ethiopia—whether they came from such gutter journalists as George Schuyler of the *Pittsburgh Courier* or the dispicable Trotzkyites—were designed to clear the imperialist powers of the crime of giving the green light to Mussolini for subjugating Ethiopia.

With respect to the invasion of Manchuria, the "non-intervention" betrayal of Spain, the annexation of Austria, the crucifixion of Czechoslovakia, and the entire Munich policy of "appeasement," the record is at hand for all to see that the Soviet Union fought valiantly and consistently against this monstrous adventurism. It constantly insisted that fascism could be stopped by concerted action, by the policy of collective security. However, not only did the Western powers refuse to

heed this counsel, but each rejection of a Soviet effort put forth toward stopping violations of national integrity caused the bourgeoisie to turn handsprings in glee at the so-called defeat of the Soviet Union. And yet it was precisely these dangerous maneuvers on the part of the world imperialists that—save for the Red Army and its destruction of the Hitler juggernaut—would have brought humanity down in ruin.

So today at every conference of the UN, the main concern of the commercial press and the bourgeoisie in general is again how many "defeats" the Soviet Union will suffer in any and all proposals that it brings forward for the maintenance of world peace. And again, following every such defeat—which is supposed to be a defeat for the Soviet Union, but in reality is an attack upon the peace-loving peoples of the world—the imperialist bourgeoisie smacks its lips, and rubs its hands.

WHY THE IMPERIALISTS HATE THE U.S.S.R.

Actually, what is the reason for this hostility toward the Soviet Union? Is it because the bourgeois rulers of our land really believe that the Soviet Union is "preparing aggression," that the Soviet Union is an "imperialist" nation?

Let us call as witness Chamberlain's pal at Berchtesgaden and Munich. The gentleman is none other than Lord Halifax of Britain. Now that Churchill and his Tory

party have won the elections, Halifax has come out of the moth balls where he has been stowed for a number of years.

Speaking to the Foreign Policy Association in New York City in November, 1951, Halifax stated:

Most serious, of course, and controlling all the events of the past six years, has been the developing challenge of Russian-led Communism. Without this, obviously, there would be no grave threat to peace anywhere, no insecurity, no need for rearmament. Without it, the international organization we set up at San Francisco in 1945 would be working as it was meant to work. I need not argue about this or dwell upon it. We have to accept the fact and set it down as the major item among the world's liabilities.

Thus, it turns out that for the world to have peace, the Soviet Union must give up its Socialism and revert to capitalism, with all of its misery and degradation—suffered by the peoples under capitalist rule and by the colonial peoples under the British, French, Dutch or Belgian empires, or under the imperial sway of Wall Street.

Observe that the Soviet Union makes no demand that Britain must first free Africa and Malaya and the rest of its enslaved colonies before it will consider a peace policy with Britain. Observe also that the Soviet Union is not demanding as a precondition for discussing the issue of peace that the United States give up its capitalist system with its exploitation of the working class, its

national oppression of the Negro people, its assault upon the democratic rights of all the people, and its colonial enslavement of Puerto Rico, Hawaii, Guam, the Virgin Islands, etc.

Imperialism, however, is so arrogant that it feels called upon to dictate to the peoples of the world how they shall order their lives, and places obedience to this dictate as a condition for even discussing the possibility of peaceful co-existence.

The Soviet Union, on the other hand, maintains the position of the possibility and the necessity of peaceful co-existence between the Socialist and capitalist states. It has repeatedly made clear its position. But the war-mongering answer of both Truman and the British imperialists is slander and vituperation.

SO-CALLED "WESTERN CIVILIZATION"

Halifax hails the United States as that country which is saving "Western Civilization." What civilization has Mr. Halifax in mind? Has he perhaps in mind the civilization practiced in South Africa where the overwhelming majority of inhabitants cannot walk the streets in their own homeland without carrying sixteen passes, and where it is illegal for black and white workers to be members of the same trade union? Perhaps Halifax thinks the genocidal warfare being conducted by the United States imperialists against the Korean people is "civilized" beha-

vi
high
unsp
the
Kor
as r
issu
sion
Fede
O
Lor
of th
State
Neg
thou
mean
Neg
the r
dome
Sou
hall
is the
by th
1951,
electr
the U
Depa
And
K.K.
of br
Negr
Unit
necess
"civi
Now
deman
as a p
laborat
The p
policy
in the
tions.

viour? Perhaps his lordship finds a high degree of "civilization" in the unspeakable cruelties perpetrated by the Anglo-American aggressors on Korean men, women and children, as revealed by the eye-witness report issued by a multi-national Commission of Women for the International Federation of Democratic Women?

Or by "civilization" does the noble Lord have reference to the position of the Negro people in the United States—to the fact that in the U.S. Negroes have been lynched by the thousands? By "civilization" does he mean the stringing up of pregnant Negro women by their heels and the ripping of babies from their abdomens, as has happened in the Southland, U.S.A.? Or perhaps the hallmark of the Lord's "civilization" is the legal lynching of Negroes, as by the state of Virginia in February, 1951, when seven Negro men were electrocuted, while the President of the United States and the Justice Department kept perfectly quiet? And the immunity afforded the K.K.K. and other organized groups of brutes in their terrorization of Negro communities throughout the United States—perhaps this is a necessary ingredient of Halifax's "civilization"?

Now, the Soviet Union does not demand the abolition of these things as a precondition for peaceful collaboration with the United States. The principles on which its foreign policy is based rule out interference in the internal affairs of other nations.

WHAT ABOUT THE VETO?

United States imperialism makes a great deal to do about the so-called Russian veto and the allegedly non-co-operative attitude of the Soviet Union on the problem of effectively outlawing the atomic bomb. On this whole question, the architect of the so-called American plan for the atomic bomb, Mr. Bernard Baruch, had some revealing things to say in a recent issue (July 31, 1951) of *Look* magazine. Mr. Baruch was asked: "Do you think the veto in the United Nations should be abolished?" He answered:

No. I think the question of the non-use of the veto was first brought up when the American proposal for atomic energy (which I had the honor to present) was introduced. We proposed international ownership, inspection, and control with no right of veto after the treaty had been entered into. After you had entered into agreement you did not have the right to veto any action taken under it and in addition there must be swift, sure, and condign punishment. If we could come to agreement with Russia and we started to build atomic energy plants all over the world [including the Soviet Union?], suppose Russia said, "Well, we are tired of this. We won't let you in here, we are going to take it over."

Is this not what the Communists have contended all the time—that the Baruch Plan was a method of controlling the atomic energy of the world, a method of permitting United States imperialism to dominate the atomic energy of the Soviet

Union and the rest of the world?

But then, what is the Soviet Union told? It is told that no plans of modification can be considered in connection with the so-called American plan. That the Soviet Union must accept it as is, without any amendments whatsoever; and that once accepted, it is not subject to alteration.

But the agreement would require the Soviet Union to agree to the subordination of its resources to the whims and desires of United States imperialism. And this, of course, the Soviet Union has rejected. Because of this it is accused of being "impossible to deal with," "insincere," that "its word is not worth a thing"!

Mr. Baruch in this same magazine anticipates the possibility of the Soviet Union winning a majority of the Big Five and thus being able to vote the United States down at some future date. Because of this, Mr. Baruch indicates that he wishes to retain the veto for future possible use by the United States. Here is what Baruch says:

There may come a time when this country may desire to exercise a veto because the majority of the world may vote for certain things which would challenge our whole life and history and, indeed, might injure the well-being of humanity itself. We might have to use the veto, because we might be quite alone on the Big Five. I don't think that we will ever use the veto except justly, but I don't want to give it up until I see some much better evidence of co-operation in the world—and some evidence that we don't have to do most of the co-operating.

OTHER OUTSTANDING ISSUES

Under the terms of the Potsdam Agreement the Powers were supposed to carry through the denazification and demilitarization of Germany. But even bourgeois sources confess that Nazis in Western Germany are coming back into power—more correctly, are being brought back into power—by United States, British and French imperialism. As a very recent example of this, Drew Middleton, correspondent in Western Germany of the *New York Times*, wrote October 29, 1951: "The return of former Nazis to positions in the Federal Government continues. British officials are 'horrified' at the return of Otto Dietrich, former press chief of the Nazi party, to German journalism. He works on an official trade publication in Duesseldorf."

It is clear, of course, that an essential aspect of Eisenhower's job is the remilitarization of a renazified Germany, to serve once again as the spearhead of an anti-Soviet invading force. When, in the face of all this, the Soviet Union asks for a meeting of the Great Powers to discuss the question of peace, it is accused of obstruction, of delaying tactics, of not wanting peace!

Is it not a fact that the United States Government is the government which blocks a meeting of the Big Five? It argues that such a meeting is not necessary to secure peace. It argues that United Nations as a whole is set up for that purpose. The

latte
ca
sets
app
as to
in t
agre
is so
the
plac
Thro
Fran
Th
the
ers,
impe
tion
caus
ism,
one
rely
milit
bayo
impe
at le
empi
ler's
they
peria
Unio
a cas
turne
It i
muni
expla
army
one c
Car
or fa
being
States
In th

latter point is correct. But in that case, why is it that the United States sets up the North Atlantic Treaty apparatus and alters geography so as to encompass Greece and Turkey in this militarist "North Atlantic" agreement? Why is it that the U.S. is so insistent that no meetings of the Big Four or the Big Five take place, but that meetings of the Big Three, Great Britain, the U.S. and France, are so imperative?

The main reason is that these are the three principal imperialist powers, and they gather to consider their imperialist interests and not the question of peace. They gather, too, because British and French imperialism, much weakened since the Second World War, find it necessary to rely upon American money and military aid. They hope that the bayonets and bombs of United States imperialism will help them to retain at least a meager section of their empire. Learning nothing from Hitler's shattered vision of conquest, they even dream that combined imperialism might conquer the Soviet Union and China, and that, in such a case, additional territory would be turned over to them.

It is argued that fascism and Communism are "twin evils." Yet, no one explains how it is that when Hitler's army began to collapse not a single one of his generals ran East.

Can anyone point to a single Nazi or fascist or Franco sympathizer being denied a job in the United States government or in industry? In the midst of the cry that Commu-

nism and fascism are twin evils it is the Communists who, because of their fight for peace, for the living standards of the American people, for Negro liberation, against the whole war drive for friendship and good will between the United States and the Soviet Union, are being hounded and jailed under the Smith Act. Just as Hitler came to power in Germany with the slogan of National Socialism, so today, in the United States, the fascist-minded imperialist bourgeoisie are raising the slogan of "saving democracy" to hide their destruction of democracy.

Just as Hitler inscribed on his banner, war against Communism as the way to "save civilization" so today the same slogan is being used by the American bourgeoisie. It is therefore attempting, with the Smith Act and the McCarran Act, to outlaw the Communist Party, it is jailing the Party's leaders and terrorizing all advocates of peace. Thus, it is imperative that the American people end once and for all this mad war drive, and demand as never before the repeal of the Smith Act, and the freeing of its imprisoned victims and the dropping of indictments against the further list of victims. And it is imperative that the American people insist on a conference of the Big Five, since agreement among them is the cornerstone of world peace.

PEACE CAN BE WON!

Who can imagine a peaceful world without the collaboration of these Great Powers? They alone are capa-

ble of waging world war; they alone can maintain world peace. China must be restored its full territory and given its rightful seat in the United Nations as a step in this direction, and the genocidal war against the Korean people must be halted.

Every proposal brought forth by the North Koreans and the Chinese volunteers for cessation of the fighting is met with a counter-demand by the United States of more and more concessions, to a point where the U.S. military command attempts to win by intimidation all that it has not been able to win by military operations.

In order to put an end to war-making, in order to repeal the Taft-Hartley, Smith and McCarran Acts, and in order to preserve the Bill of Rights the working class must energetically intervene. The starting point should be the broadest united front of the entire working class against the wage freeze, against inflation, high taxes, high prices and speed-up. This is the key to the fight for peace and democracy. There must be the broadest unity among A. F. of L. C.I.O., R.R. Brotherhood, and all independent unions, together with all the workers and farmers of this country and the Negro people and sections of the urban middle class. We Communists will do everything in our power to help in bringing about this coalition.

The present armaments race, led by the United States, is a threat to all humanity. The people, generally, and the working class, in particular,

must intervene to end this menace.

Various spokesmen of the bourgeoisie constantly bring forward the concept that we have more atomic bombs than the Soviet Union. The stark reality of the situation is that suppose it takes one atom bomb to destroy Moscow, and one to destroy Leningrad, the question must be posed: Would not that same number of bombs destroy New York City or Chicago? This is how the question must be posed, there is no middle way.

Molotov, speaking in a session of the General Assembly in October, 1946, said, concerning illusions about the omnipotence of atomic warfare:

Just indignation might grip the hearts of honest men and women in all countries; and excessive enthusiasm over the atomic bomb as a decisive factor in future war may lead to political consequences that will bring tremendous disappointments, first and foremost, to the authors of such plans. Finally, it must not be forgotten that atomic bombs on one side may draw a reply in atomic bombs, and perhaps something else to boot, from the other side; and then the utter failure of all of the present calculations of certain self-satisfied, but limited people, will be more than obvious. Illusions are always dangerous in serious matters, as both Baruch and his partners will probably have to admit.

According to the *New York Times* of July 29, 1951, the United States has eighty-five air bases ringed around the world, almost completely encircling the Soviet Union. Yet, the Soviet Union goes on about its business of peacefully building its economy,

unafraid of all threats emanating from the U.S. State Department.

The United States has soldiers, ships and planes in and around a dozen countries of Europe and the Near East, throughout Africa and the Western Hemisphere, throughout Japan and a score of Pacific islands and in much of southern Asia—all to "defend Western civilization"!

The Soviet Union is a first-rate power, fully capable of taking care of itself in any military venture. And today alongside the two hundred million Soviet peoples stand the nearly half a billion people of China and the one hundred millions of the People's Democracies of Europe. Thus, eight hundred million highly organized and completely united people are dedicated to unyielding resistance against the war drive of U.S. imperialism. And throughout the remainder of the world hundreds of millions more hate war and seek to live in peace and freedom.

The Soviet Union, standing at the head of the world peace camp, continues further to build and strengthen its Socialist society on the road to Communism. Class and national oppression are unknown in the Soviet Union. The sixteen nations that comprise the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics are joined together on the basis of national self-determination, which includes the right to secession. Its Stalin Constitution, its policy and practice make all such oppression a crime and treason to the state.

How the Negro people would appreciate the outlawing in such a firm fashion of oppression against them-

selves; how the Jewish masses of America would appreciate the outlawing of anti-Semitism in this country; how the Puerto Rican people would appreciate self-determination; how the Filipino people would be gratified at *real* independence!

The world peace camp is powerful enough to impose peace, and the prevention of a third world war is not only possible, but certain if the American people organize their will towards peace broadly and firmly and give expression to this will in unmistakable terms.

To press forward in the fight for peace, the advanced peace forces, especially the Communists, must bring before the people the full meaning of the consistent struggle of the Soviet Union over the years for the unity of nations, for the principle of non-intervention and national sovereignty, for the maintenance of peace. On this occasion of the 34th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution it is important to bring before the American people the lessons of history—what the cost has been in human lives and well-being because of the past refusals of governments to join in the concerted peace front repeatedly and ardently proposed by the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has proved itself an unflinching champion of world peace. Despite the slanders and falsifications of the war-inciters, this truth is increasingly breaking through on all sides. The test of the desire for peace is and can only be the desire for friendly co-operation with the Soviet Union, for peaceful co-existence.

Dressing Up The War They "Do Not Want"

By Richard Walker

THE OCTOBER 27, 1951 issue of *Collier's*, which the editors modestly call "the most important single issue that any magazine has ever published," consists of 132 pages of text, illustrations and advertisements. The text and illustrations are the product of ten months of work by the large editorial staff, aided by a number of contributions, on the theme, "Russia's Defeat and Occupation, 1952-1960," sub-titled "Preview of the War We Do Not Want." The sub-title, as becomes instantly obvious, is gratuitous and hypocritical. The word "preview" is a cover-all term intended to attribute the quality of objective judgment to the wishful thinking of the magazine's owners and this particular issue's inspirers and creators.

This issue of *Collier's* was neither its first war-mongering offense, nor will it be its last. True, it did so shock and horrify readers here and abroad that they denounced it as most "provocative" and even "depraved." Yet, these characterizations alone would be insufficient to single it out for special treatment, considering the current state of journalism and culture in the United States and the ownership-control and past record of *Collier's*. Of profound significance, how-

ever, is the fact that the editors themselves declare that their "over-all conception of this issue was confirmed in study and consultation with top political, military and economic thinkers—officials and foreign-affairs experts, both here and abroad" (emphases added—R.W.).

IN THE SHOW WINDOW

The entire work is geared around two feature articles. The first, intended to chart the war and the Soviet Union's defeat, was assigned to Robert E. Sherwood, playwright of "poor little Finland" infamy, whose services to reaction have earned him four Pulitzer prizes. The second, intended to blue-print how "Russia is given back to the Russians" and "a real and lasting peace" is established, was written by Arthur Koestler, that professional anti-Soviet scribe of cynicism, negativism, and anti-humanism, whom the war-incendiary editors of *Collier's* are pleased to call "perhaps the world's foremost political novelist today." Around these two main articles, based on a 60,000-word outline worked up by the editors and others, are a number of variations on the main theme which embroider it and are intended to produce veri-

similitude for the entire project. For these contributions, *Collier's* corralled four more Pulitzer prize-winners and people of various kinds of fame and infamy, including Allan Nevins, Stuart Chase, Walter Reuther, Walter Winchell, J. B. Priestley, Marguerite Higgins, Philip Wylie and Bill Mauldin.

Sherwood's theme article, "The Third World War," sets forth the course of this hypothetical war from its start on May 10, 1952 to its finish in January, 1955. *Collier's* editors declare that Sherwood spent five months before submitting this script. The result is truly prodigious: never, in so little time, has anyone compounded so many imbecilities!

This "Third World War," according to Sherwood and the editors' outline, was started by the Soviet Union, specifically by Premier Stalin plotting to kill *Collier's* main hero, Tito. Stalin acted, writes Sherwood, because rebellion and discontent in the "satellite countries" and in the Soviet Union had reached the perilous stage, as the result of Titoism, aided by "Displaced Persons" trained as saboteurs and undercover agents, and returned to their countries by the United States!

Stalin's "plot" fails. Tito is saved and the Yugoslavs, presumably including the peasant majority of the population (who are now on strike against Tito's policies) rally round their "leader," smash the invading but bewildered and weak Albanian, Bulgarian, Romanian and Hun-

garian armies. It requires no less than 15 divisions of the Soviet Army, supported by systematic bombing of Yugoslav cities by the Soviet Airforce, to drive Tito's half-million strong army to the hills for guerrilla activity. But "our" Tito comes through, never fear, and lives to be a hero comparable to Douglas MacArthur!

As Sherwood writes it, President Truman, with a speed almost as precipitous as that with which he defied the gallant "democrat," Syngman Rhee, rushed with an ultimatum on May 11 to befriend the valiant Tito—the obedient UN hailing his act, of course.

On May 14, three days after Truman has sent Stalin his "ultimatum," United States bombers begin round-the-clock atom-bombing of the Soviet Union which continues for three months and 16 days. These bombardments are carried out ever so meticulously; they hit only military and industrial objectives, but not "population centers"! Sherwood does not disclose how one atomizes an industrial objective without hitting a population center. A Pentagon military secret, no doubt. Nor are we given to understand the reason for this touching forbearance toward "population centers," in the light of the genocidal war that the Truman Administration is waging in Korea. Also, Sherwood and the editors have the Soviet Union wait until mid-September before getting around to atom-bombing the United States.

Of course, Sherwood and the editors could not permit the Soviet bombers—among whose crews are “American Communist bail-jumpers”—to avoid “population centers,” as the humane American atom-bombers did; they are depicted as trying to produce “unadulterated terror.” They bomb New York, Washington, Philadelphia, Chicago and Detroit, and Soviet submarines fire atom-headed missiles into Boston, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Norfolk and Bremerton. Then only, and not until them, do “our bombers” atom-bomb Soviet population centers!

Sherwood and the *Collier's* editors open the great Soviet land offensive precisely on Christmas Day, 1952. This offensive is completely demolished and the Red Army demoralized by the “UN’s” (The “UN’s” and “Ours” somehow become magically synonymous) atomic artillery firing point-blank at the massed Soviet troops. The Soviets, of course, know nothing of atomic artillery! From then on, things begin turning in “our” favor. In 1954, the “UN” offensive begins on all fronts—European, Middle Eastern, Asian—and coincides with mass desertions and uprisings in the Soviet Union and its “satellites.” China, owing to Mao Tse-tung’s defection to the cause of Titoism, dickers with “the West.” From then on, the “Third World War” is just one big pushover for “UN forces,” ending—as the cover of *Collier's* showed—with a hard-boiled American MP, wearing the

UN flag on his helmet, standing with fixed bayonet astride the Soviet Union and the People’s Democracies.

Then what? Is this the end? Not hardly.

After the greatest destruction in the world’s history “Russia” is given back to “the Russians,” and a “real and lasting peace” is established, according to the screed of Koestler, by the holding of elections in which twenty-two political parties, comprising all the traitors, renegades, saboteurs and hangers-on of the czarist regime, vie for first place. But the electorate is so used to signing “Da” (Yes), that they do not understand the processes of “real democracy,” so that a majority of the ballots have to be voided. Besides, the electorate is less interested in the election than in the Occupation’s brilliant innovation, the “Great Lottery.” Reconstruction goes on in the form of “Woolworth Villages”—gadget-type “houses” designed by the imaginative Americans. The most heroic example of the “new Russia” is the “Convicts’ Republic,” “liberated” and established by the 15 to 20 million “political prisoners” in Siberia! And first-place on the best-seller list is a translation of the Sears-Roebuck catalogue, with footnotes! All this is the foundation of a “real and lasting” peace, in the estimation of Koestler and *Collier's*.

The “embroiderers” of these themes attain the same level as the theme-writers. Marguerite Higgins sees “occupied Russia” as a land of

que
wa
hig
def
sol
the
lea
Wa
cap
glo
J. M
The
dra
non
and
pea
“ba
Exp
con
ac
viet
Col
omi
dam
tion
ther
fine
crea
of ‘
the
priv
“as
T
mai
sing
ever
the
lays
tors’
thin
cally

queues of women, many miles long, waiting to see fashion shows, buying high-heeled shoes, delighted by the deference shown them by American soldiers. Walter Reuther imagines the "liberated" Soviet trade union leaders will be faithful imitations of Walter Reuther, doing their best by capitalism, now restored in all its glory, by trying to "make it work." J. B. Priestley has the Red Army Theater Company performing real drama like "Guys and Dolls," not nonsense from Chekhov and Gorki and Shakespeare, while the "Europeans," not to be confused with "backward" Russians, bring "New Expressionism" to literature. Other contributors see "liberation" as the acme of culture manifested by Soviet people digesting *Time*, *Life* and *Collier's*. And the bourgeois economist, Stuart Chase, explains the fundamentals of the U.S.S.R.'s "liberation" by describing the restoration therein of capitalism, complete with fine "rugged individualists" and the creation of an entire new generation of "enterprisers," and—the heart of the matter—the selling of plants to private enterprise in occupied Russia, "as in Puerto Rico"!

This completes the summary of the main ideas in this "most important single issue that any magazine has ever published." Suffice it to say, the very publication of such ideas lays bare the dishonesty of the editors' protestations that they do not think war is inevitable, are emphatically opposed to any suggestion of

a "preventive" war, pray that the issue's effect will be to help establish and maintain an enduring peace. The editors could write this, and in the same editorial demand that the Soviet Government change its outlook and its policies—or disappear from the face of the earth!

But seemingly all things are possible for *Collier's*. The editors also have the gall to tell the readers of this issue that they have proceeded from a factual basis of the world situation today to a logical analysis of what may come; that their issue contains no careless fantasy or easy invention! Of course, if we accept this at face value, then we can understand how *Collier's* editors present as facts and logical conclusions such a colossal conglomeration of lies, malicious insinuations, wishful thinking, racist and chauvinistic contempt for other peoples, and psychopathic reverence for brutality and death. Such a work could come only from sick and crippled—but nonetheless dangerous—minds, in the employ of a decaying ruling class.

THE WORLD CONDEMNS

This is universally recognized wherever people—of varying politics—have endured the ordeal of reading this issue. Thus, Wenceslao Roces, former Assistant Minister of Education in the Spanish Republic, said "it seems like a joke, but it is a grotesque image of the most diabolical of dangers." The aggressors,

he added, "resort to inconceivable extremes that make it difficult to say what is most incredible, their infamy or their imbecility." To the Neuchâtel (Switzerland) *Express*, it is an "unspeakable concoction." The National Union of Hungarian Journalists has asked the International Organization of Journalists to "mobilize all honest journalists who support peace to condemn these criminals" who produced this "scurrilous provocation against peace." *Le Monde* of Paris said it "overreached the limit . . . in all its aspects a provocation." The Catholic *Courrier de Genève* in Switzerland characterized its contents as "fantasies, but highly evil-making fantasies. To foresee war itself, picture it as inevitable, is already an immense evil." The Ottawa *Citizen* thought it "entirely reckless sensationalism."

Voix Ouvrière, organ of the Swiss Workers Party, went further in its denunciations: "The journalists of *Collier's*, worthy disciples of the Nazis, do not hesitate to reveal ideas of the Hitlerite spirit which haunt their Yankee masters. . . . Are these fantasies of excited journalists? That is what was said of the Nazi propagandists, when they were talking to us of the projected conquests of the Third Reich." The Canadian Peace Congress and Toronto Peace Council declared it "degrades the ideals of the United Nations," and appealed to the Canadian Government to prevent its distribution in Canada. Similar views were expressed

by the British Columbia Peace Council and the Labour-Progressive Party, which dubbed J. B. Priestley a "cultural gauleiter" of Wall Street.

An important characterization was made by Cesar Andreu Iglesias, Chairman of the Communist Party of Puerto Rico: It is, he said, "the most extreme case of cynical, war-mongering propaganda produced so far in the United States. . . . Through atomic war, the Yankee imperialists hope to subjugate all free peoples and impose upon them the colonial conditions of our country. Puerto Rico lives under the occupation of Yankee troops, constantly engaged in military maneuvers."

Some voices, though all, too few, reflected similar feelings in the United States. The Pittsburgh *Post-Gazette*, though anti-Soviet and anti-Communist, called it "one of the most irresponsible pieces of journalism within our memory." The *Nation* said it is "fairly nauseating." The Arizona *Daily Star* considered it a dramatic example of the danger that "articulate publicists can shout us into war for unlimited and unattainable objectives." From the ranks of the peace movement, it was the Protestant theologian, Dr. Harry F. Ward, who gave a definitive characterization; he said it was "barbarity born of depravity."

MONOPOLY-OWNED COMMUNICATION

Collier's, like the commercial press, generally, serves the interests and

voic
An
sho
port
nent
Tug
and
glor
and
Fran
Pegl
unio
again
polic
peop
tiona
tions
nial
repre
zines
vision
panie
agenc
mon
trol a
cation
Inc
owne
by th
of fr
featur
the U
was
plored
by a c
by D
cellor
After
sion p
Respo
cago I

voices the aspirations of the rich. An examination of its record would show *Collier's* to be a staunch supporter of the power trust; an opponent of the Wagner Labor Bill, the Tugwell Pure Food and Drug Bill, and unemployment insurance; a glorifier of the House of Morgan and of the Spanish fascist dictator, Franco; a defender of Westbrook Pegler and a bitter opponent of trade unions; a chauvinistic provocateur against Mexico. But in following a policy bitterly hostile to the working people and their trade unions, to national minorities and oppressed nations in the colonies and semi-colonial countries, *Collier's* has been as reprehensible as the other magazines, newspapers, radio and television stations, moving picture companies, book publishers and other agencies of corporate wealth and monopoly capital which today control all the media of mass communication in the United States.

Indeed, the gradual acquisition of ownership and control of these media by the most powerful concentrations of finance capital has been a major feature of imperialist development in the United States. This development was documented—and mildly deplored—as recently as April, 1947, by a commission selected and headed by Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, chancellor of the University of Chicago. After an investigation, the commission published a report, *A Free and Responsible Press* (University of Chicago Press). The report declared:

The outstanding fact about the communications industry today is that the number of its units has declined. In many places the small press has been completely extinguished. . . . News-gathering is concentrated in three great press associations, and features are supplied from a central source by syndicates. There are eight majors in motion pictures, four national radio networks, eight to fifteen giants among magazine publishers, five to twenty-five big book houses. . . . The agencies of mass communication are big business, and their owners are big businessmen.

The report added that "the right of free expression has therefore lost its earlier reality. . . . The owners and managers of the press determine which persons, which facts, which versions of the facts, and which ideas shall reach the public."

This report, submitted by a commission of individuals closely connected with Big Business and, to say the least, politically conservative, had numerous shortcomings and proposed "self-regulation" as a corrective of the abuses it had noted. It nevertheless took note of the perversion of mass communication media to serve the interests of their owners. And it pointed out the heavy concentration of magazine ownership, and the growing tendency on the part of the biggest Wall Street fortunes to enter the magazine field. However, this Hutchins commission report goes less thoroughly into these two latter aspects of communications monopoly than a number of other

recent publications, such as *1,000 Americans* by George Seldes (Boni & Gaer, New York, 1947) and *Monopoly Today* by the Labor Research Association (International Publishers, New York, 1950).

The Labor Research Association publication specifically lists the tie-in of the biggest magazines in the United States with big publishing corporations, which are controlled along with the other mass communications media by the titans of Wall Street finance capital. It is this control that explains the "like-mindedness" of all the big newspapers, magazines and other media in the United States today. Indeed, it is doubtful if Joseph Goebbels and the Hitlerite program of co-ordinating the mass communication media of Nazi Germany attained a greater measure of co-ordination, of "like-mindedness," than prevails today in the "free press" and "free" communications media of the United States.

Within this context, therefore, *Collier's* policies cannot be considered exceptional or unusual. This is true especially since *Collier's*, like the Luce, McCall, Curtis, Cowles and Hearst magazines, is controlled directly by two of the eight main finance capital interest groups which dominate the United States economy and government — Morgan and Rockefeller. *Collier's* is a Crowell-Collier's Publishing Company product, together with *The American Magazine* and the *Woman's Home Companion*, which have a combined

circulation of nearly ten million, or approximately fifty million readers.

The House of Morgan's influence in *Collier's* is exerted by director A. H. Lockett, who also is a member of the board of directors of Newmont Mining Corporation, a Morgan holding company for mining interests in and outside the United States, including Africa. Two of Lockett's co-directors are South Carolina Governor James Byrnes, a champion of the jimcrow system, and Georgia-born General Lucius Clay, of Ilse Koch infamy, who currently co-directs Continental Can as well as the war-mongering, chauvinistic Freedom Crusade. Rockefeller's man on Crowell-Collier's is Thomas H. Beck, a co-director of the world's biggest financial institution, the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company of Stuyvesant Town Jim Crow notoriety. Another co-director of Crowell-Collier's is Sinclair Oil's co-director Alvin Untermeyer, also tied to the Rockefeller interest group.

Thus, the ownership-control of *Collier's*, its past record, and the current regimentation of mass communication media in the United States in the interests of Wall Street imperialism, suggest that the depravity of the magazine's October 27 issue was not exceptional or inconsistent with the general and usual level of imperialist propaganda. Indeed, *Collier's* outbreak of unashamed savagery and unconscious idiocy was foreshadowed by its long record of lying, racist and chauvinis-

tic
shou
can
ing
Wal
level
Stree
tail
ple p

COL
U.S.

Bu
cance
Colli
of C
but a
ing
of ou
views
tion
tical
functi

This
of V
when,
10, he
"quasi
World
noted
in the
saving
but e
doom
unless
Collier
the pr
and A
tempt
the A

tic, and anti-popular propoganda. It should serve to forewarn the American people of what will be forthcoming from all the other media under Wall Street's control, and of the levels of bestiality to which Wall Street will drag every aspect and detail of America's culture, if the people permit it.

COLLIER'S AND THE U.S. GOVERNMENT

But of even more basic significance is the fact that this issue of *Collier's* represents not only the views of *Collier's* editors and contributors, but also of the men presently making and implementing the policies of our government. They are the views of the bipartisan Administration of Harry Truman, in all its political, economic, social and military functions.

This was what Professor Fleming of Vanderbilt University meant when, in *The Nation* of November 10, he called the *Collier's* issue a "quasi-official American plan for World War III." Professor Fleming noted that each of the ultimatums in the issue's editorial "contains the saving phrase 'if they start a war,' but each unmistakably threatens doom for the Soviet Government unless it changes its ways." This *Collier's* formulation, of course, is the precise formulation of Truman and Acheson in their demagogic attempts to explain their policies to the American people. It is, more-

over, a precise characterization of the tactics of the United States delegations in the United Nations, of General Ridgway's negotiators in Korea. It is the pretext for the North Atlantic alliance, for the Japanese-United States security pact, for the Middle East Command, for the subsidization of France and Tito and Chiang Kai-shek, of the Greek monarchofascists and the Turkish feudal-militarists, and for the establishment of a ring of bases around the Soviet Union. Each of these moves is predicated on the assumption, "if they start a war"; but each constitutes another effort to back up the Truman-Acheson ultimatums by force and threats of force.

However, one is not compelled to prove the "quasi-official" character of *Collier's* issue by evidence of its similarity and identity to Truman-Acheson policy and MacArthur-McCarthy precept. *Collier's* editors have spared us this trouble, for, as we have shown in the beginning of this article, they blatantly boast of the fact that their "conception of this issue was confirmed in study and consultation with top political, military and economic thinkers—including high-level Washington officials and foreign-affairs experts, both here and abroad." This admission goes far beyond revealing the absurdities and essential bankruptcy of the dangerous planning of the Pentagon, as the New York *Daily Compass* columnist, I. F. Stone, so ably showed in his series on the *Collier's* issue. In addi-

tion, it expresses the cynical disdain in which the Truman Administration holds the United Nations and all attempts to bring about a lessening of the war danger, and a settlement among the five Great Powers. For the *Collier's* issue was a deliberate violation of a United Nations General Assembly resolution calling upon the governments of the world to ban the publication of war propaganda in their countries. By way of contrast, it should be mentioned that the Supreme Soviet forthwith passed a law making the utterance and dissemination of war propaganda a crime, punishable by imprisonment and fine. But far from taking seriously any admonition by the United Nations to ban war propaganda, the Truman Administration itself deliberately creates and disseminates war-mongering propaganda. Even the speeches of Truman and Acheson, though written with care to multiply use of the word "peace," betray the speakers' conviction of the necessity of war against the Soviet Union.

But *Collier's* admission that ideas of their issue were "confirmed" in consultation with Truman Administration officials exposes, above all, the contempt and hatred of the Truman Administration for the common peoples of the world, and particularly of the United States. The anti-popular, anti-human viewpoints expressed in this issue seem hardly possible in any modern society, especially one which prides itself on its technologi-

cal achievements. We have to bear in mind, also, the fact that no official of this Administration, indeed, no public official or politician of the two Wall Street parties, has publicly disavowed or protested this *Collier's* issue.

THE TRUE FACE OF IMPERIALISM

Collier's of October 27 wore the true face of Wall Street imperialism. Its ideas and viewpoints, its depravity and savagery, are the bag-and-baggage of imperialism. The Swiss workers' paper was correct in likening these ideas to Hitler's. Indeed, there is no fundamental difference in content; only the form is different—*Collier's* was a trifle slicker, talked about "democracy." In *Collier's* we see the Wall Street *Mein Kampf*, the racism of the Byrneses and Tamagdes and Churchills, the retrogression to values and standards of the slave-owning aristocracy of the Confederacy. It would have been more in keeping with the content of the October 27 issue had *Collier's* artist put a Confederate flag on the helmet of the American MP "occupying" the Soviet Union!

For *Collier's* savage issue lies in the stream of fascist development in the United States. Another aspect of the face of this fascist development is documented in the Civil Rights Congress' petition to the United Nations for relief from genocidal policies against the Negro people. And

further
by
ocrat
ties
Unit
troop
woul
wom
out t
peria
blood
side a
Pro
gerate
"A w
was b
world
fascist
States
every
ern n
less lo
shoul
and b
—to p
conclu
Trum
are tol
the So
sound
States
Wal
means
work
know
withh
cultura

further documentation is provided by the International Women's Democratic Federation report on atrocities against the Korean people by United States and Syngman Rhee troops. These documents, which would shock American men and women who could read them, bring out the true facts of Wall Street imperialism's malevolence and cold-blooded ferocity against peoples inside and outside the United States.

Professor Fleming did not exaggerate the situation when he warned: "A war which became, however it was begun, an effort to exterminate world communism, would bring a fascist dictatorship in the United States strong enough to suppress every vestige of dissent in the Western nations and to obtain the endless levies of men and resources we should require to control a ruined and barbarized world." Except that—to paraphrase Professor Fleming's conclusion—when *Collier's*, and the *Truman Administration* think they are tolling the bell of destruction for the Soviet power, the bell they toll sounds for the people of the United States.

Wall Street's domination over the means of livelihood of the cultural workers of the United States is well known. Spread of the loyalty oaths, witchhunt, and the blacklist in the cultural fields now renders the cul-

tural worker who still is not and does not wish to be, a conscious servitor of imperialism, will have to resist, to struggle, to fight for his rights as a human being and an artist.

A great deal more could be said, undoubtedly will be said, as indignation against this Morgan-Rockefeller propaganda for war gathers momentum around the world. Unfortunately, too little has been said by the American people, particularly by cultural workers and communications media workers of the United States. *Collier's* depraved issue represents everything that today imperils the American people's security and material well-being. Here is the source of the prostitution of science, art and journalism, which destroys the values of the scientific and artistic professions and robs their practice of the essential humaneness and love of people which is the fountainhead of all true science and art. Here is imperialism—the defiler and destroyer of the people's culture, and the source of the terrible war danger threatening the very lives of all of us.

The Epic Advance of Soviet Agriculture

By Joseph Gordon

WHILE WE IN THE United States are subjected to daily war scares and lying propaganda attacking Marxism and Socialism, the Soviet people move steadily forward on their historic course—the gradual transition from Socialism to Communism.

The most striking feature in the epic drama which is unfolding in the Soviet Union is not alone the rapid industrialization, the controlling of drought, the transformation of agriculture, the reversal of mighty rivers, the remaking of climate. With the change of the face of the country there is taking place the profound, historic change in the attitude and outlook of the whole Soviet people. Under the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government, the people are consciously directing the course of their epic transition to a Communist society.

The phenomenal economic and social advance of Soviet agriculture constitute an organic part of this great transformation.

Over a hundred years ago, Marx and Engels projected the "gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country" as one of the ten

programmatic points put forward at the conclusion of the Manifesto of the Communist Party. Lenin enlarged on this point in his writings. Thus, in his *Agrarian Question and "Critics of Marx"* he polemized against those who opposed the Marxist doctrine of the eventual abolition of the distinction between city and village on the ground that this would lead to the abandonment of the urban "centers of energy and culture." Lenin wrote (*Selected Works*, XII, p. 97):

The fact that we definitely recognize the progressive character of big cities in capitalist society, however, does not in the least prevent us from including in our ideals (and in our program of action . . .) the abolition of the antithesis between town and country. It is not true to say that this is tantamount to abandoning the depositories of science and art. Quite the opposite: this is necessary in order that these depositories may be opened up to the whole of the people, in order to abolish the isolation from culture of millions of the rural population which Marx aptly described as "the idiocy of rural life." And at the present time, when it is possible to transmit electricity over long distances, when the technique of

transport has been so greatly improved that it is possible . . . to carry passengers at a speed of more than 130 miles an hour, there are absolutely no technical obstacles to the enjoyment of the depositories of science and art—which for centuries have been concentrated in a few centres—by the whole of the population spread more or less evenly over the whole country.

This comment by Lenin was written in 1907. Just ten years later he was at the head of the first state which blazed the path toward realizing this principle.

A period of years was required to lay the basis for collectivized agriculture and integrate it with the total socialist construction. Under the leadership of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, the new Socialist Soviet state abolished the ownership of land by landlords and transferred it to the peasants—the preponderant segment of the population—and nationalized all the land.

It was this transference of land ownership to the peasants which resulted in the restoration of agricultural production following the ruination brought about by the imperialist world war and the civil war. The peasant ownership of the land in turn proved the necessity for the next great phase of agricultural development—collectivization.

It was in the eleventh year after the October Socialist Revolution that the Soviet Government announced the historic plan for full collectivization of Soviet agriculture.

The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union states (p. 287):

. . . The Party was guided by the following precepts of Lenin regarding the necessity of passing from small peasant farming to large-scale, cooperative, collective farming:

a) "There is no escape from poverty for the small farm."

b) "If we continue as of old on our small farms, even as free citizens on free land, we shall still be faced with inevitable ruin."

c) "If peasant farming is to develop further, we must firmly assure also its transition to the next stage, and this next stage must inevitably be one in which the small, isolated peasant farms, the least profitable and most backward, will by a process of gradual amalgamation form larger-scale collective farms."

The implementation of the line of the Party, which inspired support among the millions of peasants, meant the transformation of the 25 million small peasant holdings into 250,000 collective farms able to employ highly developed agriculture machinery and techniques. It meant the elimination of the kulak class, the remaining base of counter-revolution and capitalist restoration.

In the words of *The History of the C.P.S.U.* (p. 305):

This was a profound revolution, a leap from an old qualitative state of society to a new qualitative state, equivalent in its consequences to the revolution of October 1917. . . .

This revolution . . . furnished the Soviet regime with a Socialist base in

agriculture—the most extensive and vitally necessary, yet least developed, branch of national economy.

The Lenin-Stalin program in agriculture, in its victorious advance, proved indestructible in the face of the barbarous invasion of three hundred divisions of the German-fascist Wehrmacht. With key agricultural areas overrun by the hordes of Hitler, the world witnessed the miracle of continued production of farm products for the embattled Red Army and its supporting civilian population, and for the maintenance of industry.

With the crushing of the Axis, the termination of the war enabled the Soviet Union to redirect its full energies to the peaceful advance of its industry and agriculture.

The first post-war Five-Year Plan for Soviet agriculture was launched as a major part of the great objective of gradual transition from Socialism to Communism. This Plan has been successfully completed.

During the five-year period 536,000 new tractors (counted in 15 horsepower units) went to the farms. This means far more than the equivalent number of tractors on American farms, because Soviet collective farming methods on large acreages actually average over four times as many work hours per year per tractor as compared with American tractors on the smaller acreages of American farms.

More and more the Soviet factories are turning out diesel tractors

which develop more power on less fuel. In 1940 only 6 per cent of Soviet tractors were diesel powered. But by 1951, the level had risen to 25 per cent.

Ninety-five thousand grain combines, many of them self-propelled, were made available to the collectives through the agency of the Machine Tractor Stations. Some fifty thousand trained agronomists are instructing the collective farmers in the use of the new machinery and demonstrating new methods and suggestions which the National Academy of Agricultural Sciences is continually submitting to the work brigades. It is now possible for an authoritative Soviet journal to state: "The use of mechanical energy per collective farmer is approaching the level per worker in industry. . . ." (*Economic Questions*, Dec. 1950.)

Three years ago the great 15-year Plan for transforming agriculture and ending droughts was adopted. Vaster than a dozen Tennessee Valley Authorities, involving enormous systems of tree belts and extensive soil building and flood control, this project presumes a nation at peace, free to develop its resources by the collective labor of all its citizens.

These achievements are but the necessary preparations for new and greater things to come. An indication of the dynamic spirit which pervades the villages is the widespread movement to amalgamate the smaller, collective farms into larger, more efficient units. What has hap-

pened so far is that collectives as small as 1,500 acres have combined with several others to form one farm of 7,500 or more acres. One such amalgamation found that, whereas formerly the total income of the several collectives had been 500,000 rubles, the first year after the merger, the one large collective had an income of 800,000 rubles.

In another instance, near Tambov, five collectives joined to form the Red Putilovets farm. Over three hundred and fifty farm members were involved. Chairman Chernyshev informed the *Izvestia* correspondent: "We've never worked so well. Our plots were too small under the old system. Now we can introduce the ten-field system during the course of the next two years."

The Soviet press has been reporting the experiences which have accompanied this widespread process of amalgamation. It notes that prior to amalgamation, the larger collectives had been outdistancing the smaller ones by a wide margin. Generally the larger collectives had double the income per member of the smaller ones. Amalgamation has corrected this. During 1950, the number of collective farms dropped from 252,000 to 123,000, as a result of some 60,000 mergers. It is noteworthy, too, that the larger and more prosperous farms have been making a practice of extending comradely assistance to their smaller neighbors, which of course is the opposite of our familiar cut-throat competition.

Many efficiencies are being noted as a result of this process.

Odd-shaped fields and senseless lay-outs which hamper the use of the largest tractors and implements have been eliminated.

Each department of the farm's activities permits specialization by the brigades in charge. This goes for grain crops, industrial crops, truck, fruit, beef cattle, dairy, swine and poultry. In a grain area like the Kuban, a tractor brigade of four to seven tractors can do all the work necessary on about 3,500 acres. However, strict warnings have appeared in the press that the brigade must not replace the authority of the membership meetings of the whole collective.

The amalgamated farmers are finding that they can form from their members permanent construction crews. Often the first project is the building of a small brick factory to meet the needs of the farm's building program. This includes homes, barns for the livestock, silos, not infrequently a power station for electrification and irrigation of the area.

This building program has brought to light the fact that Soviet villages and homes have not had the benefit of careful planning by architects specializing in the features of rural life. Now that the amalgamation of collectives permits them to have full-time construction brigades, there is felt a demand for architectural aid in designing better homes and better layouts for villages. N. S. Krushchev,

Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, remarked last March that, "For the first time in history, scholars are concerning themselves with the building of villages."

Amalgamation lowers the cost of administration. In collective farms of about 20,000 work-day units per year, the administration cost ranges around eight per cent. But where the work-days top 100,000, the cost drops to three per cent.

The more concentrated operations are permitting a great increase of on-the-job schooling. This year, in the Ukraine alone, more than one million men and women enrolled for courses sponsored by their collective farms. This schooling in addition to work parallels the factory school system under which many millions of industrial workers have raised their qualifications.

In this atmosphere of increased mechanization, improved methods of production, and easy access to technical instruction, the collective farmer is leaving far behind the old ways of the peasant. In fact this transformed peasant is more on the level of trained agricultural engineer. Each winter hundreds of thousands of collective farmers take courses of study to widen their knowledge. Each winter hundreds of thousands go to the farms to help and also to learn. The difference between the culture of the city and that of the country, the difference between the intellectual workers and manual

workers grow less and less each year.

* * *

Many new possibilities open up with the heightened technical understanding of the new collective farm citizens. It is now possible for campaigns to be carried through by the quarter million collective farms in close association with the National Academy of Sciences. Thus every last farm is kept abreast of the latest scientific knowledge and technique. The farms have no financial problems as to how to pay for the new and improved farm machinery. The only problem is how fast the factories can turn out the new machines which are immediately sent out to the collectives, or, whether the means are at hand for rapid adoption of newly proved production techniques for a given crop.

A recent example of such a campaign was the transforming of what had been the commonly accepted methods of cultivating the millet crop, a favorite cereal in the Russian diet.

The campaign had its origin when the academicians proved that millet under proper conditions can reproduce to an extraordinary degree. On an experimental plot, it was found that one seed was capable of producing 26,157 grains, having a total weight of nearly one-half a pound. No grain of wheat, rye, or barley has been known to reproduce on this scale. Further, it was known that millet withstands drought far

better than wheat, because it only requires half the moisture.

However, the Academy also noticed that millet was generally a rather unsuccessful crop. The national yield per acre tended to fall, weeds seemed to get ahead of it to such an extent that collective farmers hated even to plant the crop.

But Trofim Lysenko, chairman of the Academy, was convinced that here was a crop ideally suited to the drier sections of the black earth regions. Furthermore, the scientists were spurred by the mass popularity of millet kasha. So the habits, the likes and dislikes of the millet plant were subjected to intensive study, on which was based a program for the scientific cultivation of millet.

At this point, the Academy went to the people. Hundreds of academicians and thousands of their assistants were mobilized to go to the farms. Some of them groused, complaining that they would become divorced from their scientific work and their qualifications would deteriorate. But Lysenko replied: "It will raise your qualifications. . . . It will win the respect of the collective farmers for the scientists."

So the Academy set itself the task of transforming the cultivation of millet *in a single season*. Early in the year, some three hundred district conferences were held to explain the recommended methods. In addition, numerous rallies of collective farmers were held, countless leaflets and articles were published, and 265,000

educational posters were displayed.

A few simple rules were underscored. These included late planting, only when the soil temperature at a depth of ten centimetres reached 12-15 degrees centigrade. This was one of the weed control measures, because millet, unlike wheat, sprouts only in warm soil, and under usual planting methods the weeds get a head-start on the millet. Rows were spaced further apart than had been the custom. A liquid fertilizer was developed, and collective farmers advised to apply it forty days after sprouting. The Academy supplied all farms with simple designs for making ordinary spike-tooth harrows fit the widened millet rows. Professors and their assistants spent the season cruising around the farms, advising, helping, demonstrating, earning their proud title "The Fighting Academicians."

This vast effort resulted in an average yield of over 22 bushels to the acre from two and a half million acres, or about triple the previous average yields.

Far out in Kazakhstan, an aged farmer named Chaganak Bersiyev attained astonishing yields on some experimental plots. On one ten-acre field he actually attained a yield of 294 bushels per acre, undoubtedly a world's record. He journeyed to Moscow to receive the congratulations of the Academy for his achievement. He was welcomed by Lysenko, who discussed with him his methods and findings. At one point Chaga-

nak explained a new method of handling millet which he hoped would raise the yield still higher, and, turning to Lysenko, he said: "What do you advise?" "It is not for me to advise you," answered the President of the Academy, "I must learn from you."

Summing up the millet campaign, the Academy was able to report:

The experiment in organizing on a wide scale the cooperation of agricultural scientific theory with practical agriculture has been fully justified. . . . The distinction between manual and mental labor is being obliterated in our country. . . . The Academy's work did not cost the collective farms a single extra penny, and not a single extra man had to be hired.

These post-war developments in the Soviet Union's rural life demonstrate that the Marxist-Leninist program solves the economic and social

problems of the working farm population no less than of the urban workers. As new and improved farming methods are adopted, as power equipment and electrification become more widespread, old small-scale ways of operating become obsolete. But in this process of change we do not see human wreckage. We do not see people being driven from their farms to become rural refugees on some back mountain place unsuited for agriculture. No one is caught in the back eddies of the changing technique and forced into the ranks of city unemployed.

Instead, we see a new kind of people on the land. Like the Soviet working class, the collective peasantry constitutes a totally new class, a class of the socialist society, building in moral-political unity with the entire Soviet working people, a prosperous and cultural life.

Urgent Tasks for Strengthening the Party

By Martin Fisher

THE DECISION of the Supreme Court upholding the conviction of the eleven leaders of our Party and its refusal to grant a rehearing represent a major step toward fascism in our country. This affirmation of the Smith Act flagrantly nullifies the Bill of Rights. It signalizes the desperate course of the bi-partisan Truman Administration to silence all opposition to its suicidal drive toward world war.

It is already clear that the bi-partisan Administration intends to use this unconstitutional law in wholesale violation of the people's elementary rights. The whole of the American people, particularly labor, the Negro people, and all fighters for peace and democracy in our country, are menaced. The sweeping attacks against our Party and its activities are in the first place blows against the rising popular demand for peace to which our Party gives voice and leadership. They are aimed at driving our Party underground, at isolating it and destroying its effectiveness, particularly among the workers and the Negro people.

With the decision of the Supreme

Court and the ensuing wholesale arrests, our Party enters a new stage in the struggle for its right to function freely and fully as the political party of the American working class.

SOURCE OF OUR PARTY'S STRENGTH

Our Party has withstood with courage and steadfastness the prolonged, many-sided attacks against its rights during the post-war years. How can we explain this capacity for perseverance and "fighting back?"

Our Party's capacity for leadership and struggle under the present adverse conditions derives first of all from the fact that it is guided by Marxist-Leninist science. It is because of this that our Party was able to analyze and estimate correctly all major new political developments during this period—the expansionist aims of American imperialism, the character of the Korean war, the crisis in United States foreign policy, the fascist trends on the home-front, and the developing war economy. The practical policies advanced by our Party around the central mass task, the struggle for peace, expressed

the deep-going urge for peace among the workers and the people of our country.

There has emerged in our Party a skillful, heroic Marxist-Leninist leadership, exemplified first of all by Comrade William Z. Foster and the eleven leaders of our Party convicted under the infamous Smith Act. Their courageous guidance has inspired and continues to inspire our whole Party and thousands upon thousands of non-Party people as well.

The "thought-controllers" cannot so easily wipe out the history-making liberating science of Marxism-Leninism from the American political scene. In his great work, *Outline Political History of the Americas*, Comrade Foster describes the source of strength of the Communist Parties in the following way:

The real strength of the Communist Parties in the Americas, as well as in the rest of the world, is to be found in their sterling qualities. It lies in their clear understanding of social evolution, flowing from their grasp of the principles of Marxism-Leninism; in their organic composition, made up as it is of the most advanced elements of the working class and its allies; in their matchless discipline and tireless energy; in their unbreakable bonds with the toiling masses, due to their loyal defense of the latter's interests; in their militant fighting spirit, bred of their knowledge that they are fighting victoriously on the side of history; in their knowledge that they are in the front ranks of the forces making for a new and free social order. These are some of

the elements that make of the Communists a growing force everywhere; that strike terror in the hearts of exploiters all over the world; that make the Communist Parties of the Americas, as elsewhere, invincible and indestructible in the face of every hardship visited upon them by the desperate and dying capitalist system.*

The Party draws its strength from the working class which gave it birth, and it is as indestructible as the working class.

This is well understood by the employers, by the Administration and all its fascist-like agencies, and it explains why they go to such fantastic lengths to distort our aims and role in the labor movement and to give sinister meaning to our concentration policy in industry.

Both the Supreme Court decision on the Smith Act and the recent Congressional Un-American Committee hearings in which militant trade unionists have been subpoenaed, have as their goal the launching of a sweeping drive to oust Communists and militant workers from industry, from the shops and trade unions. Their aim is to isolate the Party from the basic sections of the working class—to root us out, so to speak, as a means of regimenting the whole labor movement.

THE POLICY OF INDUSTRIAL CONCENTRATION

Our industrial concentration pol-

* W. Z. Foster, *Outline Political History of the Americas* (International, 1951), p. 387.

icy, which the class enemy takes such pains to distort, is a policy dictated by the *needs and interests* of the workers in the face of monopoly's program of war and fascism. It is a policy designed to help promote the class-consciousness and political independence of the working class. It is a policy to guarantee working-class leadership and participation in the struggle for peace and democratic rights.

Our industrial concentration policy is a policy of directing our greatest energies toward winning the workers in the basic industries and shops to an understanding of this central task today. A huge proportion of these industrial workers are Negro men and women, suffering double oppression as workers and as Negroes. They constitute a great fighting force in the ranks of the working class.

The employers and their government resort to every foul means to vilify our Party's industrial concentration policy and to misrepresent it as something "sinister," as a "plot" and a "conspiracy." This slanderous allegation was eloquently answered by Comrade Henry Winston at the Party's 15th National Convention in December, when he said in his Report:

What is behind the fantastic fairy tale that the Communist Party is a training school and apparatus for "sabotage"? . . .

* *Political Affairs*, February, 1951, p. 24.

we Communists will put sand in the gears of their machinery. They are afraid we will put ideas in the heads of the workers in the basic industries.

The government is not afraid that we Communists are going to blow up its vast system of war industry. It is afraid we are going to explode the myth that the developing war economy can bring anything but more hardship, worse misery, to the masses of the American people.

The bipartisan atom maniacs are not really afraid that we Communists are going to steal their death-dealing A-Bombs, or give away their secrets of biological warfare. What they really fear is that we are going to master the know-how of organizing the workers in the basic industries, of winning them to the struggle for peace, to the rallying slogan: Outlaw the monstrous atom-bomb.

That is why we find ourselves up against all these new efforts to drive our Party out of industry, out of the shops, out of the trade unions. That is why our industrial concentration policy is now the center of such vicious employer and government distortion, in their desperate attempt to convince the people that our concentration policy has some "sinister" objectives.*

The carrying out of our industrial concentration policy necessarily involves finding the best forms of struggle and organization around a specific program for each industry, and the building of rank-and-file movements on the broadest united front basis in the shops and trade unions. In this connection, the building of

The employers are not afraid that

the Party shop clubs in the plants of basic industry is decisive.

At no time in our history has the question of strengthening our ties with the American working class been so urgent as now. The growing resistance to the staggering burden of the war economy opens up in many respects new opportunities for leading the masses in struggle.

There are new stirrings among sections of the workers, particularly in the maritime, auto, metal mining, and transport industries. There is mounting evidence that the American workers, despite the misleadership of the labor officialdom, will not permit the destruction of their living standards. Once they are fully aroused to the dangers of encroaching fascism, they will fight tooth and nail for the preservation of their trade unions and hard-won rights.

The recent economic struggles show that the working class has the capacity to shatter the wage-freeze program that is beating down living standards. We can have no clear perspective unless we see that such economic struggles are the first steps toward full-scale resistance to the entire imperialist war program. This means that the ever-conscious task of the Communists must be to participate fully in these trade-union struggles and to brook no tendency that will lead to separation from the working masses in these economic struggles, even on the most elementary plane.

In many ways the recent experi-

ences recall the early 'thirties, the period of the birth of the militant unions of the C.I.O. in the auto, steel, maritime, and other industries, when department, shop, and industry-wide struggles reached gigantic proportions. It was frequently the meticulous, detailed, well-knit, and highly collective activity of a small group of Communist trade unionists, working in unity with progressive non-Communists, which broke through the open shop, company terrorism and spy systems, established the powerful industrial unions, and won conditions which the employers are now so desperately trying to wipe out.

Building rank-and-file movements in the shops and unions of basic industry today presents many similar problems. It requires correct tactical approaches to involve the greatest number of workers in defense of their conditions. It requires forms of struggle and organization against employer-inspired efforts to strip the unions of their fighting spirit, against the sell-out policies of reactionary labor leaders, and against the provocations of stool-pigeons.

The Communist shop worker, if he is to gain the confidence of his work-mates, must stand out as a fearless defender of their interests. He will thus establish close ties with non-Party workers in his department. By regularly consulting with them, he will gain their support and confidence and win them for struggle around their grievances and inspire them to join in the fight for peace

at union meetings, shop steward meetings, and daily among the workers in the plant. He should diligently strive to win these workers as readers of our press and literature, and as financial supporters of our campaigns.

This task cannot be carried out unless every Communist belonging to a trade union becomes active in his shop or union, and fully participates in his Party club. Communist shop workers who are members of community clubs should be transferred without delay into shop clubs where these exist, or be brought together to form new shop clubs where such do not exist.

Communists, progressives, militant young workers and others we can influence, should be encouraged to go to work in industry, where they should strive by patient, modest conduct to imbibe the traditions and experiences of their fellow-workers, to learn all there is to know about the industry, to gain a knowledge of the alignment of forces within it, and to contribute to the fighting capacity and the class understanding of the workers.

No Communist activity worthy of the name in shops and trade unions can be conducted save by laying great stress on the fight for the special interests of the Negro workers. This struggle entails the fight for jobs on all levels for Negro workers, for upgrading, for the elimination of wage differentials and all forms of discrimination. It entails a consistent

struggle for the employment of Negro women, who have been so shamelessly excluded from most industries. It also entails a fight to gain for Negro trade unionists full equality in the leadership of the unions. It is especially the responsibility of Communist trade unionists to wage a relentless and increasing struggle against white chauvinist practices in the trade unions.

Our members and progressive non-Communists should join with broader sections of the workers to help build such vital organizations of the Negro workers as the Negro-Labor Councils, which will contribute to strengthening the alliance between the working class and the Negro people's movement for liberation.

ROLE OF THE PARTY CLUBS

Today there emerges a number of problems affecting the functioning of our clubs and groups. Energetic efforts should be directed toward making the club fully self-reliant, steeled in struggle, rooted among the people, alert to all political developments, and able to provide leadership in struggle.

We have thus far been unable adequately to translate into life the very clear and correct exposition of the role of our clubs in the present political situation contained in Comrade Winston's Report to the 15th National Convention. Comrade Winston stated:

The new, smaller-sized club can meet, function and grow only if it has a concrete task—a plan of work. Under present day conditions the failure to develop programs of action for the club will immediately create difficulties for us. The inactivity of a member will stick out like a sore thumb and be seen more easily. Every member will know what the other is doing. That which knits the club together into an effective functioning, fighting organization able to give leadership to the workers on every major question, must be geared to a club plan. This plan must flow from the particular problems of the workers to whom leadership must be given.

This means that each club must know where it is to work and among whom; what section of the workers in a given plant it is going to concentrate on. *Each club must have an objective* and each member must have specific tasks in relation to the plan as a whole. Each club must hammer out from week to week policies and tactics for the realization of its plan, and provide a system whereby political and organizational check-up is made. . . . *Every club must have a central purpose.* And this purpose must be fitted into a plan of action which arises from the needs of the people.*

The alert Communist club can always find a way to carry on activity on the day-to-day issues in common struggle with non-Party people. The possibilities are many for cementing ties with people, with workers in the shops, plants, and neighborhoods, as well as in the mass organizations,

churches, fraternal orders, and women's organizations. Because of its direct and close ties with the people, the club is in a position to stimulate and nourish these contacts and to win for the Party the support of thousands of non-Party people.

In the light of this task of the basic Party organization, a sharp correction must be effected in regard to *where* Party members place their greatest energies. As of today, far too many of our clubs, club leaders and members, devote themselves almost exclusively to inner-Party work, whereas every Party member, in addition to his inner-Party leadership or administrative responsibility, should have as his *major concern* a responsibility of mass work.

Our members should become involved on a far wider scale in the daily work of all people's organizations. The Communist who is not an active member of a peace committee, trade union, fraternal order, P.T.A., women's, veterans' or youth organization, or of any other mass organization, stands in grave danger of becoming completely isolated, cut off from the life-giving contact with people in organized struggles and activities.

The smaller-sized club was established in the interests of greater mobility and a higher level of collective work, with every member sharing in the Party's work. The smaller-sized club can help to prevent needless exposure of members to pro-fascist lawlessness which could lead to loss of

* *Ibid.*, pp. 37, 40.

jobs and other victimization. Above all, the smaller-sized club can be effective in *preventing disruption of our mass work.*

An outstanding weakness today is the general failure of the clubs to issue leaflets, shop bulletins, or neighborhood papers, in their own name and through their own initiative. Essentially, this constitutes an underestimation of Party agitation and its influence in mobilizing the people in a united fight around vital issues before them.

How immensely significant would be the appearance of tens of thousands of shop bulletins and club leaflets, in the face of increased repressive measures against our Party! Such impressive activity would be a major means of maintaining continuity in our leadership of the mass struggles, political and economic. If every single club of our Party would issue a leaflet at least once or twice a month—even if only in one hundred copies—we would reach basic working class masses in all areas.

The Marxist press and literature have an enhanced role to play as the principal mediums for guaranteeing a common line of policy, a unified program of action, and the moral and ideological unity of our Party. A continuation of "business as usual" attitudes and of routine methods of circulation would be disastrous. The characteristics of a correct approach are: confidence in the ability of the Party to reach and influence masses with its literature; new methods of

distribution based mainly on home and shop deliveries to selected workers and active fighters for peace and Negro rights, with emphasis on safeguarding the supporters and readers of the press from victimization by the "thought-controllers."

But more than ever the distribution of Marxist literature is a *mass* question in which the fight for freedom of the press and freedom of thought goes hand in hand with the task of distribution. An open, bold mass struggle for fundamental constitutional rights must be coupled with more vigorous and efficient distribution of the Marxist press and literature.

In many clubs, wrong concepts of how to safeguard the Party and its members have developed in recent times, inevitably resulting in withdrawal from mass work, in no distribution of leaflets and the press, in no recruiting, and, in some instances, in no club meetings. Such distortions of organizational functioning must be eliminated as paralyzing and liquidationist trends.

The holding of the Party club meeting is a matter of profound, principled significance. No matter what difficulties arise, *experience has shown* that Party clubs can hold regular meetings. This is demonstrated especially by the experiences of numerous shop clubs in large plants where the question of safeguarding members from loss of jobs and other forms of victimization is of the utmost importance.

Meetings of the club are indispensable because they are a center for clarifying policies, for clearing up points of difference, for planning activities and mobilizing the membership for the tasks to be fulfilled. The club meeting, even if attended by only some of the members, becomes a place where members learn and are encouraged to participate in the work of the Party. Through drawing in more and more forces, not only into discussion of the issues facing the Party, but also into activity and leading work, the club meetings bring about ever closer contact between the Party and the workers, between the Party and the people, generally.

* * *

There are many urgent problems pressing for solution in the over-all task of strengthening our Party for its vanguard role today. These include, in the first place, the ideological strengthening of the Party, in order to enable the entire membership to wage a fight for Marxism-Leninism as a struggle integrally bound up with the fight for peace, economic security, and the rights and

freedoms of the entire American people, and to keep the weapon of Marxism-Leninism sharp and bright in a systematic attack upon the ideology of fascism and imperialist war. These problems include indispensably the sharpening up of our cadre policy and system of leadership to meet the pressing tasks of the present struggle. These and other vital aspects of the task of strengthening the Party, politically, ideologically, and organizationally, require their special, extensive discussion.

The affirmation of the pro-fascist Smith Act by the Supreme Court will not stop the fighters for peace, democratic liberties, human rights, and social progress. And our Party will continue to be in the vanguard of the fight.

As Comrade Eugene Dennis stated:

Come what may, the Communist Party will continue its efforts to unite the American people against the monopolists and their political puppets seeking to rush our nation into the disaster of a third world war. Come what may, the cause of peace, democracy and social progress will continue to gain supporters and triumph over its enemies.

The Passing of an Old-Guard "Socialist"

By Albert Levinson

With the passing on August 31, 1951, of Abraham Cahan, who for nearly fifty years was the editor of the *Jewish Daily Forward*, mouthpiece of the Social-Democratic Federation, and the Right-wing Dubinsky machine, there disappeared from the scene a figure who was a product as well as a representative of Social-Democracy in the United States.

The passing of Cahan, which was very much noted by President Truman, the capitalist press and the labor bureaucracy, coincided with the fiftieth anniversary of the Socialist Party (founded in August, 1901) which went unnoticed. An evaluation of the role of the "socialist" author of the novel, *The Rise of David Levinsky* may also illuminate the rise and fall of the Socialist Party.

In an autobiographic article in the *Forward* (May 4, 1947), Cahan stated that he had become a socialist on board the ship that brought him to these shores as an immigrant, in 1882. "What kind of socialist—a social-democrat or an anarchist—I did not know," he wrote. This was typical of Cahan, a "practical" man who had a particular aversion for theory. However, while he never did know what type of "socialist" he was, he set out from the very beginning to combat Marxism. In the '30's Cahan

exclaimed at a Socialist Party convention: "Marxism is bunk." On December 20, 1932, on the occasion of the death of the father of revisionism, Eduard Bernstein, the *Forward* stated editorially:

The pious "orthodox" Marxists, who have considered as holy every word which Karl Marx uttered, have bitterly attacked Bernstein. Some even demanded that he be expelled from the Social Democratic Party as a traitor. Fortunately, the big majority of German Social-Democracy did not follow the advice of the fanatics. Bernstein remained a member of the Social-Democratic Party and hardly ten or fifteen years had passed before his ideas and principles became victorious, first in the Social-Democratic Party of Germany and afterward in the entire socialist movement of Europe.

Abraham Cahan was hereby openly proclaiming his allegiance not only to Bernstein, but also to Noske, Sevring, Scheidemann and the other social-traitors of German Social Democracy for whom Bernsteinism paved the way, and who, in turn, paved the way for Hitler. But in reality Cahan began his war on Marxism at the very beginning of his career, long before 1932. He was one of the leaders of the group, on the East Side, which in 1897 split

away from the then existing Socialist Labor Party. The official, Cahanist, history has it that the reason for this split was the policy of dual unionism which the De Leon leadership of the S.L.P. had adopted in 1894 when it established the Trade and Labor Alliance for this purpose. This—the policy of dual unionism—might have been a reason for *some* of the people who joined the splitters. Cahan, who began the struggle inside the S.L.P. before this false policy was adopted, had other reasons. His was mainly a struggle for a “free,” “socialist” press—free not only from party control but also from socialist principles, as his record as editor of the *Forward* shows. The struggle of the group which had Cahan as one of its leaders was essentially a struggle for a line of opportunism, class collaboration and the support of the policies of the bourgeoisie.

The Spanish-American War of 1898, almost immediately after the split, supplied a glaring example. The *Forward*, which was founded in April 1897, supported the war, while the S.L.P. and the group led by Eugene Debs, as well as many liberals, opposed it. It is true that at the time Cahan was not on the editorial board of the *Forward*, for he had become a reporter on the *Commercial Advertiser*. He was not, however, opposed to the war policy of the *Forward* group (the *Commercial Advertiser*, of course, was pro-war). The reason for his leaving the position of editor of the *Forward* soon after establishment, was the resistance of the

members of the editorial board, notably that of Morris Winchevsky (“Grandfather of Jewish Socialism,” who, in 1922, became a founder of the *Freiheit*), to the domineering Cahan and his sensationalist journalism. In March 1902, when the Cahan wing of the *Forward* group gained the upper hand, he returned as editor with absolute powers—a position he retained until his death at the age of 91 (during the last few years of his life, only nominally).

Cahan was not a leader in the Socialist Party. When the Party was founded, in 1901, he was away from the movement altogether, as we have seen. As editor of the *Forward*—in reality the *Forward* personified—he was free to give his own interpretation of Party policies, or to formulate policies of his own, remaining at the same time a prominent member of the Party. Through the *Forward*—a financially powerful business enterprise—he gave invaluable assistance to the Right wing in the trade-union movement. Together with the Right wing, whose control in a number of unions was maintained mainly through the *Forward*, he exerted considerable influence in the Socialist movement, primarily at top level.

Together with Morris Hillquit, Meyer London, Victor Berger, and others of the reformist wing in the Socialist Party leadership, Cahan represented an element of pseudo-intellectuals and professionals, trade-union bureaucrats—all with a petty bourgeois background and without any working-class traditions. One must,

therefore, view Cahan not as an individual—without, of course, denying the role of the individual in history—but as a representative, or product, of a certain element; one must think more of Cahanism than of Cahan.

Even in this group, as we have indicated, there was struggle—against Cahan's methods, his type of journalism, the nature of his "socialist" propaganda. When Cahan resumed editorship, there appeared on the front page of the *Forward* (March 15, 1902) an announcement detailing "improvements," number one of which was a series of articles about the "Irish or Italian Gentiles who have become converts to Judaism because of girls in the Jewish quarters." On March 29, Cahan followed this up with another announcement: "We have collected piles of facts about marriages in the Jewish Ghetto, about girls of the Ghetto who remain unmarried, about girls who marry too young, interesting reasons why a girl stays unmarried," etc., etc. But on the same day there also appeared in the *Forward* a letter which indicated that the new policy did not appeal to many of the readers. (Cahan was not yet powerful enough to suppress letters of protest, as was his practice throughout most of his reign as editor.) That letter questioned whether the new features had anything to do with scientific socialism. In another letter, two days later, a reader stated that a socialist newspaper "must be socialistic and must be a workers' paper." In reply, the *Forward* devoted a full editorial

on April 2 declaring that "for this purpose we never need here and do not need now a daily newspaper." The *Forward*, the editorial contended, is not a party, but a newspaper "to sow and disseminate socialist thought, to preach the socialist system among the great mass." In itself, of course, such a statement was not incorrect, and in view of De Leon's sectarianism such an attitude had an appeal to many a socialist. The trouble was that the Cahanist group merely utilized the situation to rid itself of responsibility to the socialist movement and to socialist principles. How could the "socialist system" be preached with the aid of the sensational and lurid content with which the paper was flooded? Clearly, this form of journalism was part of a growing crass opportunism in the labor movement of this country.

The followers of Cahan defended the gutter journalism—even if shamefacedly—with the argument that in this manner the "socialist thought" would be disseminated to a wider mass of people. It is needless, however, to point out that Hearstian methods of securing a wide circulation do not go hand in hand with socialist education. Socialism itself was sensationalized, vulgarized—and compromised.* Even the Russian

* Let me cite here one glaring example, connected with the book *Woman and Socialism* by August Bebel, leader of the German socialist movement before World War I. Here are some of the headlines to which Cahan resorted (in 1912) in order to boost the Yiddish edition of the book: "Why Were Women in the Past More Beautiful Than at Present?" "A Moslem Woman Cannot See Even the Doctor," "King Solomon Had A Thousand Wives And That Was No Sin," etc., etc. Rumor had it that Bebel himself put an end to this scandal.

revolution of 1905 was turned into a subject for sensationalism. Readers of the paper were scandalized by the Hearstian headlines on the front pages of the *Forward* during the revolutionary months of October-December 1905, as were visiting representatives of the Jewish Socialist Bund and of the Socialist-Revolutionaries. Likewise, the methods of the *Forward* during election campaigns came in for sharp criticism. I well remember the storm that was raised among socialists on the East Side during the 1914 elections when the *Forward* group which was in charge of the Congressional campaign engaged the assistance of the Hearst press in order to elect the Socialist Party candidate, Meyer London, to Congress.

With the rising wave of workers' struggles, in 1905 and immediately after, and with the mounting dissatisfaction with Gompersism, the *Forward* group began to show its true color. The Industrial Workers of the World which was then organized, with the participation of Bill Haywood and Eugene Debs, was bitterly attacked by the *Forward* group and especially by Cahan. While the official leadership of the Socialist Party was "neutral" in the fight against Gompersism, with some socialist trade unionists even putting up their own candidate for A.F.L. president, the *Forward* group more and more openly began to side with the reactionary Gompers machine.

CAHAN AND THE TRADE UNIONS

Among the many myths spread about Cahan was one to the effect that he helped build the trade-union movement. The truth of the matter is that while the *Forward* was, willy-nilly, utilized in the struggle of the needle workers against the sweat shop, since nominally it was the only socialist and labor newspaper on the East Side, the workers paid dearly for this "support." The history of the needle workers shows many a struggle when the *Forward* was an instrument in the hands of corrupt machines to break the resistance of the rank and file. Other workers, too, soon recognized the *Forward* for what it was. In June, 1904, the United Hebrew Trades adopted a resolution which stated that "the *Forward* is very antagonistic to the unions" and decided not to send any reports to the Cahanist paper (the resolution was published in the anarchist *Freie Arbeiter Stimme*, June 11, 1904). This resentment of the workers against the *Forward* was expressed most dramatically during the general strike of the tailors, in 1913, when the windows of the *Forward* building were smashed by the infuriated strikers who were up in arms against the treacherous leadership of the United Garment Workers which Cahan and his group supported. It was as a result of this struggle that the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union was established, over the violent

opposition of the *Forward*.*

During the Cloakmakers' strike of 1916 there was mass resentment against the corrupt union machine and the *Forward*, in connection with the strike settlement. The role of Cahan and his clique in the 20's and 30's, during the desperate struggle of the notorious Sigman machine and the *Forward* against the overwhelming majority of the membership of the I.L.G.W.U. in New York and other centers, and particularly the role of the *Forward* in the struggle against the fur workers, are still fresh in the memory of tens of thousands of trade-unionists.**

We are touching here upon a period when the Socialist Party was in full disintegration—a development in which the *Forward* had played its role, through its own style of "dissemination" of "socialist thought." From the very outset there were two distinct wings in the Socialist Party, one represented by Debs, Haywood and others (later, by Charles E. Ruthenberg and his comrades), and another by Morris Hillquit and Victor Berger (later, by John Spargo and Charles Edward Russell). On the one hand, there were the proletarian ele-

ments who conducted historic struggles, and on the other, there were the petty-bourgeois elements, with professionals in prominence, who shunned all struggle.

When the Socialist Party was founded in August 1901 (in Indianapolis), there were brought into it elements who were either remnants of the Populist movement of the '90's, adherents or former adherents of Colonization (the "establishment" of "socialism" through cooperative colonies similar to the utopian attempts of Robert Owen), or those greatly influenced by these lines of thought. During this period the reformist wing was gaining the upper hand in German Social-Democracy, a factor that exerted influence in this country on the Socialist movement in which German newcomers were prominent as pioneers. The Victor Berger group in Milwaukee and the *Forward* group in New York were devotedly hewing to the line of German Social-Democracy.

With the aid of these groups the Hillquit-Berger leadership in 1912 expelled Bill Haywood and his followers from the Socialist Party (the *Forward* fumed against the "Red intriguer," Haywood). But the real test came during World War I, when the *Forward* played a role that was truly unique even among Right-wing socialist newspapers: it was *pro-German* until April 1917 and *pro-Ally* after the United States entered the war. Cahan's excuse for his pro-Germanism was that Czarist Russia, which was oppressing the Jews, was

* Some of the pioneers of the Amalgamated never forgot the role of the *Forward*. As late as July 1938, after a vicious attack by Cahan in the capitalist press on Sidney Hillman, the late President of the Amalgamated, accusing him of "communism" (in connection with the struggle of the Dubinsky machine against the American Labor Party), the New York Joint Board of the union passed a resolution, signed by Louis Hollander, J. Catalanotti, A. Miller, and Murray Weinstein, which stated: "Ab. Cahan, as editor of the *Forward*, joins hands and gives assistance to the open and hidden fascists, the open-shoppers and Red-baiters."

** See Philip S. Foner, *History of the Fur and Leather Workers Union*, New York, 1949.

on the side of the Allies. As in 1898, during the Spanish-American war, the *Forward* in 1917 disregarded the position of the Socialist Party, which was officially against the war. When the *Forward* switched to the side of the Allies, Cahan more than ignored the anti-war resolution adopted by the Party's convention at St. Louis in response to the pressure of the membership; he treated it with contempt. To this day the St. Louis resolution is referred to in the *Forward* as an abomination which was responsible for the downfall of the Socialist Party. That the flouting of this resolution and the treachery of the Hillquit leadership during and after the war were responsible for the debacle (as was true of other Socialist parties) matters not at all to the *Forward*.

CAHAN'S ANTI-SOVIETISM

For a brief period after the October Revolution, Cahan sought to attach himself to the great mass of the people who were enthusiastic for the new workers' state that had arisen on the ashes of Czarism. In 1920, Cahan stated in the socialist *New York Call* that Soviet Russia "is the most wonderful thing that has happened since the Great French Revolution smashed the bulwark of Feudalism."

The "pro"-Soviet position which the *Forward*, along with many Social-Democratic newspapers in various countries, was compelled to adopt by the Left-ward movement of the masses, brought its circulation to

the pinnacle of its strength—over 200,000. However, with the subsidence of the post-war revolutionary tide, due chiefly to the counter-revolutionary role of Social-Democracy, the *Forward* abruptly reverted to type. With the revolt of the needle workers against the bureaucracy of Benjamin Schlesinger (a leader of the *Forward*) in the I.L.G.W.U. and against the corrupt machine in the union of the fur workers, and with the founding of the *Freiheit* (in 1922), the *Forward* embarked on the road of becoming a most vicious anti-Soviet sheet, many times surpassing even the Hearst press in fabrications.

The attacks of the *Forward* on the Soviet Union soon became more and more lurid and fantastic. When the Moscow subway first began to function the *Forward* complained (May 5, 1935) that "in former days the Russian people were made to build palaces for the czars, now they are made to build palatial subways for Stalin." It was during this period that considerable turmoil was occasioned on the East Side by a series of articles on the Soviet Union from the slander-pen of one of the chief writers of the *Forward*, Harry Lang, which were immediately featured in the Hearst press. In one article Lang wrote (Dec. 5, 1933) that there was a tax on the dead at the cemetery of Kiev, the capital of Soviet Ukraine. In another series of anti-Soviet articles, by the renegade Fred Beal, the *Forward* told its readers (June 27, 1935) that in the

Ukraine they were making sausages of human flesh. One may safely state that throughout the capitalist world there is no newspaper that surpasses the *Forward* in viciousness directed at the Soviet Union. In this field, this "socialist" paper was easily on par with the Nazi newspapers, sometimes surpassing even them.

Needless to say, the *Forward* bitterly fought against the unity of the people to combat Nazism. When Hitler was brought to power, in 1933, Cahan, in a series of articles in the *Forward*, did all he could to put a damper on the struggles of the masses, urging them to have confidence in Hindenburg and Von Papen, who would render Hitler harmless. Likewise, Cahan urged the masses to have confidence in Chamberlain who—the *Forward* maintained—was the mainstay of peace in Europe.

During the war the *Forward* did all it could to sabotage the work for Russian war relief and was most violent in its attacks on everybody (including Wendell Willkie) who stood for the opening of the Second Front. After the war, the *Forward* opened its columns (June 3, 1946) to the white guard general Denikin whose anti-Soviet armies had perpetrated mass slaughters of the Jews in the Ukraine. The Cahanist paper virtually sought to suppress the news of the commutation of the prison

sentence of Ilse Koch, burying the news story on page 10. On February 16, 1951, the *Forward* published a feature article in praise of General Lucius D. Clay, the man responsible for the commutation. Of course, the *Forward* supports the alliance with Franco and the arming of Western Germany. It has greeted the Supreme Court decisions upholding the pro-fascist Smith Act. During Peekskill the *Forward* gave vent to a furious attack on Paul Robeson and the thousands of Negro and white workers who resisted the fascist onslaught.

Alongside with the *New Leader*, the *Forward* is a manifestation of the utter degeneracy of Right-wing Social-Democracy, which is today abjectly performing the role of agent of imperialism and the war-makers in the ranks of the labor movement.

At the funeral of Cahan, Labor Secretary Tobin, as special representative of Truman, delivered a eulogy on this "socialist." This was but two days after Truman had stated that the "Democratic Party had saved the country from Socialism and Communism." (*N. Y. Times*, Sept. 5). And it was but one day after Tobin, at the behest of Truman, had obtained an injunction against the copper miners. This, truly, gave the final touch to the portrait of Abraham Cahan, arch-symbol of Right-wing Social-Democracy in the United States.

The Struggle of the Spanish People Against Franco

By Dolores Ibarruri

THE GREAT STRIKES and mass demonstrations which recently took place in different cities and regions of Spain, especially in Catalonia where the strikes began, have struck a serious blow against Franco-fascism and have opened the path to the development of new struggles against the regime and for the democratization of Spain.

One cannot fail to see a close relation between the situation created for the Franco regime by these struggles and the haste with which the United States established a military pact with the government of General Franco in order to strengthen his authority and prevent his fall.

The war instigators need General Franco to convert Spain into a military base, a point of strategic support, in the development of their plans for aggression. They also need the raw materials of Spain, among them minerals of strategic value, such as wolfram, zinc, tin, mercury, lead and iron ore, which are already being exported to the United States. They need the fascist regime because a democratic Spain, a Spain with a

government jealous of its sovereignty and national independence, a Spain in which the people could freely express their will, would not accept its transformation into a Yankee colony; neither would it tolerate an effort by a foreign power to use Spanish soil as a springboard for aggression against the Soviet Union and the popular democracies, toward whom the Spanish people have only the greatest feeling of gratitude.

WALL STREET BULWARKS FRANCO

The United States, cunningly and hypocritically, has been preparing for the incorporation of Franco-Spain into the new holy alliance of incendiaries of war, and by its side have been its French and British allies. But the United States wanted to execute this plan in a natural way, by the force of circumstances rather than appearing to force the issue; otherwise the hypocrisy and falseness of its propaganda of defense of freedom and democracy, the proclaimed objectives of the Atlantic bloc, would be exposed.

Only when confronted with the awakening spirit of the Spanish peo-

Note: Translated from *España Popular*, Mexico City, September 21, 1951.

ple, ready to struggle against the Franco regime, did the United States force the situation. Then it removed its mask and seemed quite ready openly to come to terms with Franco and consolidate his fascist regime in Spain.

On the road to incorporating Spain in the bloc of aggressor countries, the Anglo-American imperialists have used the Socialist leaders to undermine Republican resistance. These Socialist leaders, headed by Trifon Gomez and Indalecio Prieto, have sought to create among the Spanish people the defeatist attitude of the impossibility of restoring the Republic. The Socialist leaders have struggled to destroy the representative institutions of the Republican Government-in-exile with the argument that their very existence (the Republican cabinet and the parliamentary representation) were obstacles to solving the Spanish problem. At the same time, they have repeatedly expressed the view, in the press and in speeches, that Spain should participate in the Marshall Plan and the Western bloc, declaring that only the Americans could solve the Spanish problem.

In a speech made by the then President of the Spanish Socialist Party, Indalecio Prieto, at a party assembly in Toulouse in March, 1947, the Socialist leader said this: "If they turned over the Republic to us we would not have to tear our brains out to win it back. But they are not giving it back to us. . . . There

is no path other than that of meeting the desires of the Western powers, contenting ourselves with whatever these powers may wish to give us."

From this viewpoint, they have labored furiously to prevent the unity of the democratic, Republican forces, and to justify, on the basis of division within the Republican camp, the Anglo-American policy of support of Franco-fascism. And they have been, as they are now, the vehicle of anti-Communism among Spanish émigré circles.

Playing with sophistries of the devil's advocate and relying on the reactionary point of view that might makes right, the Socialist leaders have argued the lack of juridical basis for the legitimacy of the Republic, accepting as irrevocable fact the existence of the fascist regime of General Franco; they reach the conclusion that Spain has no democratic alternative to the present regime. With this reasoning they seek to justify their pact with the monarchists and their readiness to serve the imperialists.

They have shrunk from no effort, however disgraceful, to give currency to the American policy in the Spanish Republican camp, within Spain and in exile. Maneuvers, threats, promises, betrayals. . . . Especially in France, where they counted on the support of Jules Moch, the Spanish Socialist leaders have become specialists in police informing and the fingering of Com-

munists. They assumed this role because the Communists, alone, opposed their policy of surrender; because the Communists were those who alerted the workers to the true objectives of Socialist propaganda in favor of the Americans; because the Communists kept alive the Republican, anti-Franco spirit in exile and inside Spain.

The French Government, which included several Socialist ministers, ordered the deportation of the Spanish Communists who were in France, at the same time that it prepared to exchange ambassadors with Franco Spain. All activities of the Spanish Communists in France were prohibited, including all their publications, which had strictly avoided reference to internal French affairs, dealing solely with the struggle against the Spanish fascist regime.

The Communists were muzzled, unable to speak or act. But the Socialist and Anarchist leaders, permitted full freedom of action, launched a campaign of incredible slander against the Communists, while offering themselves to the Americans in disgusting servility. The Anarchist leaders declared that "as between Franco and the Communists they preferred Franco." The Socialist leaders asserted "that they were more anti-Communist than Franco and that they were in a far better position than the Franco government to carry out in Spain the aggressive, anti-Communist policy which the Americans needed."

In this atmosphere, the realization of American plans respecting Franco was very easy. It was possible for the U.S. to use the very arguments of the Socialist and Anarchist leaders, including that of Negrin, who in a series of articles published in the *New York Herald Tribune* in April, 1948, affirmed the necessity of applying the Marshall Plan to Spain, independently of the Franco regime.

In the UN, the Yankee-dominated majority, freed of all scruple by socialist duplicity, voted to lift the ban against Franco-Spain. England and France, which could have barred approval of this resolution, so damaging to the Spanish people, abstained from voting in spite of having signed the Potsdam agreement in which the Spanish regime was condemned for its fascist character and origin.

Why did England and France abstain from voting in the UN? For reasons of conscience? No; because they knew that the vote was assured in favor of Franco. Abstention permitted them to preserve appearances to a degree, and, before the workers of their respective countries, continue to play upon their hatred of the Franco regime. However, the Spanish people were not deceived by these diplomatic wiles.

The working masses of Spain knew well the philistinism of the representatives of the so-called democratic countries and their attitude in the UN toward the Spanish problem. Spanish anti-fascists did not

forget the pro-Franco position of the English, French and U.S. representatives, who in the UN meetings of 1946, refused to accept the proposals of the U.S.S.R. and the popular democracies, which in effect would have established an economic blockade of Franco Spain. These representatives hid behind the pretext that economic sanctions would hurt the Spanish people. In reality of course, they knew only too well that an economic blockade would be the death of the fascist regime of General Franco, whose difficult situation was known in London and Washington, and that the plans of the instigators of war did not include the overthrow of Franco and reestablishment of Democracy in Spain. The fascist regime was more useful to them.

With the lifting of the ban on the Franco regime, the American imperialists and their lackeys hoped to strike a death blow against the popular, anti-Franco resistance inside Spain; they believed this decision would put an end to the Spanish problem.

They were wrong. The UN decision favoring Franco did not destroy the morale of the masses. On the contrary, it cured them of the illusions of the possibility of Anglo-American aid for restoration of the Republic. It made them see that the solution of the Spanish problem did not depend on American or English "aid," as the Socialist leaders had been arguing for so many years, but

on the struggle of the Spanish people, sustained and aided by the active solidarity of the camp of peace and democracy, headed by the Soviet Union.

In the weeks following lifting of the ban against Franco, "official" Spain, for the first time since the smashing of Hitlerism, could sleep peacefully. Until then it had lived in constant dread, feeling the ground sink under its feet every time a delegate of the Soviet Union or one of the popular democracies rose in the UN to defend the rights of the Spanish people and to stigmatize the fascist regime of General Franco. No longer would its dreams be disturbed by the menace of an economic boycott, which the delegates of the Soviet Union and the popular democracies had proposed, and which in a very brief time could have ended the regime of General Franco. The Anglo-American fomentors of war had publicly made their choice: they preferred a fascist Spain to a democratic Spain.

Grim and determined, gritting their teeth and clenching their fists, the people of Spain watched the celebration of their oppressors. They cursed the American rulers, and the English and the French. They were filled with hatred and loathing.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS WORSEN

With the promise of American credits, Franco grandly announced

the end of price control, of economic restrictions, and, in effect, the end of misery. But lies are short-lived. The people quickly sensed the meaning of American "friendship" with the Franco gang. In a matter of days after Franco and his Minister of Industry and Commerce had announced the beginning of a new era of prosperity and abundance, the prices of consumer essentials shot sky-high. . . .

What happened to bread was the most scandalous. Since the beginning of the Franco regime, bread has been an article of luxury for the workers. The bread ration today amounts to 100 to 150 grams for the workers; it is not white bread, but an incredible mixture of flours never before used for bread in Spain.

Toward the end of last year, the Franco government launched a great national bread swindle. It set up a plan providing that anyone who wished to eat white bread, and who could afford to do so, would pay the government in advance for a year's supply, and the government would set aside the amount of wheat necessary for the order.

A kilo of rationed bread was fixed at 7.50 pesetas, official price (in 1936 a kilo of bread cost 0.65 pesetas). Under the circumstances, not a single worker family, existing on a miserable daily wage, can afford white bread, since it has no resources with which to buy the necessary wheat. Thus bread, which has always been a staple food for the

masses, is today a luxury reserved for the privileged few, while the workers and the people in general must be content with the 100 to 150 grams of rationed bread. By comparing present wages and prices of consumer goods with those existing in 1936 (the average wage of a worker has risen from 10 pesetas in 1936 to 14 to 18 pesetas) one can understand the extraordinary misery which the fascist regime of Franco has visited upon the Spanish people.

To the rise in prices for articles of wide national consumption in the brief period from November of last year to February of this year was added the increase in public service rates: water, gas, electricity, rents and transportation. The Franco government, backed by the American imperialists and in compliance with their orders, has placed upon the masses the main burden of cost of the war plans. The Spanish people are literally carrying on their backs the weight of the "friendship" of the U.S. toward the Franco government.

The sudden price rise was immediately felt by the working class families and peasants, in the economy of the middle class—the small merchants and manufacturers—and in certain sectors of the bourgeoisie not directly connected with official institutions or which, for different reasons, do not enjoy the friendship or protection of the government clique.

Merchants and small shopkeepers

sav
ing
drop
falle
activ
class
to th
were
levie
The
disc
thes
with
gree
whic
man
begi
of c
the
The
Spai
lonia
polic
fasci
a str
ary
prob
The
of t
mid
cern
whic
fright
of Co
ters
wher
taken
the s
caliza
reflec
Bish

saw their business fall away; the buying power of the working class dropped sharply and with it has fallen all industrial and commercial activity. To this was added a new classification of business damaging to the small merchants, who, besides, were subjected to new taxes and levies.

The situation produced a wave of discontent and indignation among these elements, which began to join with the people; among them a degree of radicalization has set in, which although slow and still with many vacillations and hesitations, is beginning to place them in the camp of opposition and struggle against the Franco regime.

This picture, general throughout Spain, is particularly sharp in Catalonia, where the protests against the policy of misery and war of Franco-fascism started. In this region exist a strong, working class, revolutionary tradition and a live national problem made acute by oppression.

The radicalization of the masses of the petty bourgeoisie and the middle classes is causing serious concern not alone in the ruling circles which are constantly trying to frighten these strata with the specter of Communism, but in foreign quarters of reaction and in the Vatican, where extreme measures are being taken to bar a democratic solution of the situation. Concern over the radicalization of the middle classes was reflected in an interview held by the Bishop of Tarragona in Barcelona in

April, 1951; at one point this ecclesiastist said: "The middle class was the grand reserve still left us; now it is beginning to crack with great danger to the social structure."

THE STRIKES AGAINST FRANCO

What caused the outburst of popular indignation which in Catalonia brought into the streets the tumultuous protest of over half a million men and women, confounding those who thought the Spanish people would never be able to challenge the terrible and bloody fascist repression?

Superficially, it was the increase in streetcar fares which imposed a great burden on the meager budgets of the working class and the poor people in general. But the real basis was hatred toward the regime; the accumulated bitterness and fury of twelve years of lack of freedom—twelve years of fascist tyranny, twelve years of terror, police persecution, deprivation and misery, of constantly declining living standards; twelve years of passive resistance, awaiting the proper moment for struggle.

The fare increase was the straw that broke the camel's back. The protest against the increase was initiated by the students of Barcelona, a fact of extreme significance in view of their social origin. And the whole population solidly supported their action.

The boycott began peacefully the

last week of February, but after several days the protest became violent. When the trolleys and buses were attacked, the police who were riding them fired upon the demonstrators. Official cars were overturned and burned, kiosks selling fascist newspapers were set afire, and gasoline was hurled against the City Hall, producing a number of blazes. In several places cobblestones were thrown and an effort was made to raise barricades but the militia charged the demonstrators and prevented the attempt. In the demonstrations, clashes between the police and the crowds produced a number of deaths and many casualties.

The boycott lasted from February 24th to March 5th, at which time the authorities were forced to announce cancellation of the fare increase. But this did not satisfy the masses; through their own experience they had learned in a few hours, and after twelve years of waiting, that struggle was possible even under the worst conditions; that Franco fascism could not halt this struggle when the people, and above all the working class, are determined to defend their right to live.

During this period, the United Socialist Party of Catalonia—party of the Catalan Communists, named thus after the merger, in 1936, of the Communist Party of Catalonia with various small democratic, worker parties of Catalanist and Socialist tendencies—waged a wide campaign of agitation among the masses, call-

ing upon them to prepare for a protest strike against the policy of war and misery of Franco fascism.

And it is interesting to point out that in Catalonia, where anarchism and nationalism had preponderant strength among the working class and petty-bourgeoisie, where tens of thousands of workers of anarcho-sindicalist tendencies and groups of the middle class and nationalist bourgeoisie participated in the struggle, neither the anarchists nor the nationalists emerged as a leading force. The workers looked only to the United Socialist Party, alone, called with them and stimulated them in protest; the propaganda of the United Socialist Party, alone, called on the Catalan people to resist and struggle, reflecting and interpreting the sentiments of the working class and the people of Catalonia.

The call to the protest strike against the policies of Franco, issued by the United Socialist Party in the course of the streetcar boycott, was not in vain. On March 12th, a week after the end of the boycott, the Catalan workers quit work and the general strike of Barcelona was on. Basic industries were paralyzed, business was shut down, telephone communications, all travel and amusements were suspended; even radio announcers ceased functioning.

Through the streets of Barcelona marched tens of thousands of industrial and white-collar workers, men and women, who shouted their opposition to the policy of hunger, mis-

ery and war of Franco; they sang the *Internationale*. "This is our reply to the UN," said the workers. "This is our answer to the Americans."

The demonstrators smashed the windows of the lower floors of the Hispano-American bank.

On this day, the masses, in reality, took over the streets of Barcelona. For them and for the whole world, what happened was a surprise. But because there was no unified, articulate leadership, they did not know how to use their own strength. This was so, notwithstanding the heroic efforts of the Catalan Communists who under difficult conditions had labored, underground, through all the years of fascist terror to preserve the spirit of working class resistance. This was so, despite their active participation in the organization and preparation of the strike. They had failed to achieve—and this was decisive in view of the fascist character of the regime—the unity and coordination from above of all the anti-Franco forces.

The workers themselves today ask, when they examine the results of the strike: Why didn't they raise basic, democratic slogans, such as the demand for the right of association, assembly and press; for the end of monopolist, fascist interference in industry and business; for freedom of trade for the peasants, and for unity of workers and peasants in the struggle for defense of their vital interests?

Why, when the masses were in

the streets, was no effort made to occupy the factories, to liberate prisoners, to take over official buildings and fraternize with the soldiers when the latter were still in a state of expectancy and sympathy toward the people? Why wasn't the question raised of continuing the struggle and of forming revolutionary committees, composed of representatives of all the anti-Franco forces, to direct and broaden the struggle?

Responsibility for failure of the Catalanian struggles to be extended throughout the country, and to raise more concrete and higher objectives, falls primarily on the Socialist and Anarchist leaders, who repeatedly have denied the possibility of struggle, who systematically developed an anti-Communist policy of division and who rejected all proposals of unity with the Communists for the organization of resistance to Franco fascism.

Despite the weaknesses observed in the course of the struggle, the breadth of events in Catalonia has made a deep impression on the country, setting in motion the will and energy of the masses, as in Euzkadi, Navarre, and Madrid. Throughout Spain the masses are preparing for new struggles.

The disastrous policies pursued by Franco-fascism in the twelve years of absolute rule by this clique of adventurers and criminals have been alienating certain strata of the bourgeoisie and the aristocracy. While supporting the policy of oppression

and exploitation of the masses through terrorist methods, they are not satisfied with the way state affairs have been carried out by the fascists, whose bandit and corrupt methods for personal enrichment have led the country so close to disaster.

Through different means, none of them democratic, and directed particularly toward restoration of the monarchy, these forces are trying to save the situation, without Franco if possible, but maintaining intact the repressive apparatus, the foreign policy of submission to Yankee imperialism, and a readiness to serve the plans of the instigators of war.

The first to move in this direction has been the Church, which, because of its closeness to the masses, knows the prevailing spirit. Appearing as the defender of the masses, it has sought to channelize their discontent by pretending to take exception to some of the aspects of Franco policy, appearing to join in the demand for freedom of press—naturally not of the democratic press. But this attitude is displayed by people who traditionally have maintained a vigorous hatred toward freedom of expression and who now wish to parade as democrats.

Ecclesiasts such as the Archbishops of Seville and the Balearics, and the Bishops of Valencia, Granada and Tarragona, have in different pastorals expressed the need "of exercising charity to alleviate the sufferings of the poor," "of respecting human

rights," and "of freeing industry and commerce from state control," "allowing the development of free initiative as the basis for prosperity of the people."

In a bland, jesuitical way, they express their disagreement with the internal policies of the government and this—apart from their proposals—contributes to the weakening of the regime and to strengthening the opposition groups.

In the development of the plans of the Spanish Church, which like those of the Vatican, the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie, are directed toward saving reactionary fascist control in Spain and checking the radicalization of the masses, the Church has established, with government tolerance, pseudo-independent worker organizations and launched publication of the weekly newspaper, *Tu*. Through these media they demagogically expose a partial picture of the situation the working masses face, of course without attacking the causes. They have even tried to play the part of victims of the regime, their publication having been temporarily suspended because they claimed they did not have sufficient freedom of expression.

The plans of the Church, and the bourgeois forces working behind it, call for the creation, in the event of a changed situation in Spain, of a large Christian-Democratic party like the Italian, with a worker-and-peasant social base, gathering together the old agrarian organizations

and Catholic worker groups, and supported by the Basque nationalist movement, whose exiled leaders are well-known Catholics. While enjoying the false reputation of "democrats," these Basque leaders are neither hostile nor alien to these imperialist-Vatican schemes.

In the Biscayan strike and in the so-called white strike of Madrid, the workers clearly sensed the behavior of these forces which have nothing in common with the interests of the working class. During the Biscayan strike, so different from that in Catalonia for its lack of militancy, the workers saw foreign elements belonging to reactionary organizations acting to keep the movement from acquiring the militant character which the strikes directed and organized by the working class had always shown.

And the Basque workers were making no mistake when they asked who was leading the strike. The spokesmen for Basque nationalism had openly declared that, knowing the working class of the Basque country was preparing to make May 1st a great day of struggle against the regime, in accordance with the orientation of the Communists, they wanted to undermine it by checking the growth of influence of the Communists. The people knew that in protests of the working class and the Catalan people, the only political force intervening actively and bodily was the Communists; friendliness toward the Communists was grow-

ing through the country.

This strategy, nevertheless, did not succeed in Pamplona. Pamplona is the capital of Navarre, a region known as the cradle of Carlism and reaction, which contributed to the Franco army the Requetes and shock troops against the Republic. But in Pamplona there exists traditionally a working class of a high level of class consciousness. On learning of the events in Catalonia and the Basque country, they joined the protest, and with a militance that corresponded with their understanding and consciousness of the necessity to struggle, rose up against the Franco regime.

Against the workers of Pamplona, as in Catalonia, the forces of repression were hurled. The demonstrators were fired upon, causing many deaths and casualties, among them some women.

LESSONS FROM THE STRIKES

What have these struggles taught us?

In the first place, these struggles have shown once more to the Communists the necessity of linking agitation with organization for struggle. And when the struggle begins, not to be content with initial successes, but by means of them, to lift the struggle to a higher level, accurately estimating the situation and the readiness of the masses to fight and not under-estimating the power and influence of the Party.

In the second place, these struggles indicate the radicalization and the desire to struggle of the workers and the mass of people who have displayed a higher understanding than their old leaders. Except for the Communists, all the leaders of the old worker organizations of Anarchists and Catalan nationalists were surprised by the events in Catalonia, and in the course of them, they were incapable of reacting sufficiently to press and develop the struggle.

The third lesson is proof of the instability of the regime and of the narrowing of its social base (shown in the active collaboration with the people and the working class on the part of industrialists and merchants, as well as the middle class, not only in Catalonia but wherever the protests mounted).

Fourth, confirmation of the correctness of the Communist Party in relation to the necessity of unity and the possibility of struggle against the Franco regime. At the same time, it demonstrated the complete failure of the Anarchist and Socialist thesis that the working class lacks militancy and that struggle is impossible.

Fifth, these struggles have shown a change of tactics on the part of the Church and Vatican reaction, which resulted in their participating in popular protest, in order to confine them and control the discontented masses. The Church tried to channelize the mass discontent in ways foreign to the working class and in support of methods alien and con-

trary to the interest of the popular masses.

These experiences have great value for the development of future struggles. They will allow us, in the development and organization of the great battle that will free the Spanish people, to correct the weaknesses observed in the course of recent events. Struggle is possible and the unity of all democratic and anti-Franco forces is possible, too, as the great actions of the working class and people of Catalonia have shown in so striking a manner. The realization that the struggle initiated in Catalonia is the beginning of the general struggle for the overthrow of Franco-fascism is widespread among the masses. Discontent grows throughout the country and especially in basic labor centers such as Asturias, Jaen, Puertollano, Coruna, El Ferrol, Reinos, Sagunto, Almaden, Rio Tinto, and the areas of great agricultural worker concentrations; each day the workers are faced more keenly with the necessity of struggle against Franco fascism.

The condition of the working class in the industrial areas is hard and painful, and the life of the agricultural proletariat and the poor peasants is beyond endurance. Of 3,700,000 agricultural workers in Spain, according to Franco statistics, which never tell the whole truth, only 500,000 are more or less steadily employed; the rest, that is to say, 3,200,000 agricultural workers, are employed only two or three months a

year.
hard
who,
live
is ref
and t
very
decla
of tul
ficien
Th
the p
preda
crop
on m
region
town
turn
cemb
30 to
refuse
quota
Whea
where
nently
1947
design
aband
prever
rillas.
dwelli
aiding
dreds
they
hidd
The
cultu
ten th
Repub
region
holds

year in the periods of sowing and harvest. The lot of these families who, for the major part of the year, live on roots and wild plants, is reflected in high infant mortality and the impoverishment of youth, a very large percentage of whom are declared unfit for the army because of tuberculosis or general health deficiency.

The difficulties and desperation of the poor peasants, victims of the predatory system of requisitioning, crop levies and taxes, have led them on many occasions and in different regions to refuse collectively as a town or region to pay the tax or to turn over their crop quota. In December of last year, the peasants of 30 towns in the province of Teruel refused to deliver their required quotas of grains to the National Wheat Board. In this same province, where guerrilla groups have permanently existed, the armed forces in 1947 compelled the peasants in a designated mountainous zone to abandon their homes and lands to prevent them from aiding the guerrillas. The police burned down the dwellings of peasants suspected of aiding the guerrillas, as well as hundreds of hectares of woodlands where they believed the guerrillas were hidden.

The poor peasants and the agricultural proletariat have not forgotten that they were given land by the Republic. Today, even in farm regions always considered strongholds of support for reaction, the

poor peasants and strata of middle farmers are supporters of the Republic, and the Communist Party enjoys great influence among them.

DECAY OF THE FRANCO REGIME

The question of change of the regime in Spain is now on the order of the day, not only among the popular masses but even among the bourgeoisie.

Except for a small minority of bankers and major industrialists linked with trusts and international finance, in whose behalf the policy of the Franco government is being developed, the interests of all the active forces of the country have suffered by reason of the policies of the Franco clique.

Under state protection, a system of financial corruption has flowered, permitting a small group of favorites, well-known for their connections with top officials, to accumulate fabulous fortunes, and to engage in every type of speculation and manipulation.

The generals who fought alongside France against the Republic hold outstanding posts in the major corporations. These companies follow a custom established by the monarchy of making gifts of preferred stock to the Caudillo and his family. Franco thus takes a lively interest in the fortunes of these concerns and gives them special state protection. General Saliquet, member of

the army general staff, directs a shoe manufacturing trust and monopolizes the shoe supply contracts for the army, which give him fat profits; General Munoz Grande, chief of the notorious Blue Division, controls through two of his relatives, the monopoly on cotton and with it the life and development of the textile industry of Catalonia.

Franco's brother, who is ambassador to Portugal, is president of the board of a shipping company and director on the boards of a dozen large companies. In 1936 he was an obscurity; today he is one of the richest men of Spain.

The corruption of the Franco clique is a favorite topic of conversation among the people. The widespread knowledge of the scandalous pilfering of state funds has caused such intense hatred and discontent among all social classes that the government has found it expedient to recognize the existence of this corruption. It blamed the "traders and speculators," seeking thus to head off the popular indignation, and announced that measures would be taken against those who exploited the hunger of the people. But these demagogic promises have remained on paper because Franco can hardly jail himself, the principal culprit, or fine his relatives and friends, truly a band of outlaws dedicated to despoiling Spain.

An approximate idea of the state to which Franco has reduced the country is given in an article by the

writer George W. Herald, published in the U.S. magazine, *United Nations World*, in June, 1951, under the title, "How Strong Is Franco's Army?" In it the advantages and disadvantages of Spain's participation in the Atlantic bloc are examined. The article points out:

The rolling stock of the railroads is so antiquated that its annual mileage has been reduced from 48 million kilometers in 1929 to 28 million in 1949. A quarter of the 2,500 locomotives which Spain possesses are constantly immobilized in the repair shops.

As a result of this, the entire country is menaced by paralysis. Iron production has fallen from 7,900,000 tons in 1920 to 2,500,000 tons in 1950; copper has fallen from 2,600,000 to 150,000 tons in the same period.

Textile production has dropped 40% in the last ten years. Of the 550,000 tons of fertilizer which Spain needs, it produces only 86,000 and lacks the money to buy the rest. The result is that 2,000,000 hectares of workable land has been left abandoned since the end of the civil war. . . .

It is clear, even for the most inept in economics, that not \$60,000,000 nor \$100,000,000 nor \$500,000,000, which the Americans dangle as a promise of aid to Franco, can be anything but a drop in the bucket insofar as the economic needs of Spain are concerned. Even more so because the millions offered are not to increase agricultural production destined for the civilian population, nor to develop industry to satisfy the national

need
pro
of s
struc
lars
army
pate
Am
In
Spai
catic
cline
tion,
war
Am
ther
enin
coun
invol
tion,
a sh
good
for t
ishm
Th
conse
the c
only
the r
Th
in Sp
what
and
ing t
into
peopl
der f
Th
group
the p
Catal

needs, but rather to speed up war production of steel, the extraction of strategic minerals, and the construction of military bases. The dollars offered are to re-equip the Franco army and put it in shape to participate in the war at the bidding of the Americans.

In the light of the situation in Spain today, with its general dislocation of economy, its industrial decline, insufficient agricultural production, and lack of raw materials, the war preparations imposed by the Americans indicate that very soon there will be an unprecedented sharpening of misery for the masses. A country's preparations for war always involve restriction of civilian production, the accumulation of reserves, a sharp price increase in consumer goods, reduction in living standards for the masses and general impoverishment of the country.

This must come as an inevitable consequence of the sharpening of the crisis, a crisis that can be resolved only by the revolutionary struggle of the masses.

The strikes and protests produced in Spain are eloquent testimony to what will happen tomorrow if Franco and the Americans continue furthering their plans to transform Spain into a strategic base and the Spanish people into a reserve of cannon fodder for the Atlantic bloc.

This prospect is fully realized by groups of the bourgeoisie, who since the popular protests and strikes in Catalonia and other parts of Spain,

have tried to contain the growing mass discontent by posing the necessity of certain changes in the political façade of the regime.

ANGLO-AMERICAN IMPERIALIST CONFLICTS

In examining the events in Spain and the domestic situation, one must not lose sight of the contradictions and the struggle for domination in Spain between the British and American imperialists, contradictions which make the situation even more complex. While this struggle does not display the same crudeness and brutality prevailing in the countries of the Middle East, it is no less acute. Every Yankee step forward in Spain represents a step backward for the English, and for England this is a very serious problem. It is serious from the viewpoint of what Spain means to England as a source of industrial raw materials and of all types of agricultural production for internal British consumption, and because of its key position on the routes of the Empire.

England is not resigned to losing Spain and is resisting American penetration in the peninsula. From the point of view of its war policy, the British imperialists and their agent, the labor government, are in agreement with the Americans in making Spanish men and bases available in the development of a policy of aggression against the Soviet Union and the popular democracies. But

the English want themselves, not the Americans, to be the ones to enlist the services and the forces of reactionary Spain in the Atlantic bloc. They wish to be the ones, and not the Americans, who dictate policy in Spain and manipulate to advance on the political scene the figure of the pretender to the throne, surrounded by his anarchist cohorts, indistinguishable today from monarchist police agents, and the demo-fascist Socialists, all of whom are ready to press the anti-communist policy of Franco and the imperialists.

This battle between the two imperialist vultures quarreling over the prey that is Spain, explains the "interest" and the favorable reception the English press and radio have accorded the recent protests of the Spanish working masses. It contrasts strikingly and eloquently with the silence they observed through all the years since 1939 in regard to the heroic and unequal struggle of the Spanish people, including the occasion on which the Franco army mobilized its airforce and artillery against the guerrilla units that operated in Levante, Aragon and Andalusia.

Treacherously through these hard years, they maintained a conspiracy of silence around the resistance of the Spanish people because, with an eye to the future, England tried to avoid antagonizing Franco. At present, English propaganda airs the struggles of the Spanish people, appears to sympathize with these strug-

gles and insinuates the need for political changes in Spain.

All of this is much too vulgar for the Spanish people to fail to see through, or to understand the true objectives of the British laborites who seem to disagree, more or less, with the decision of the United States to establish a military pact with Franco.

SPAIN WILL BE FREE

The Spanish people are determined to win their freedom and reestablish democracy in Spain. They will not withdraw from the path, because to renounce these sacred objectives would be to renounce life.

The United States military pact with Franco, and the credits in exchange for which the national sovereignty of Spain has been or is about to be handed over to the American imperialists by the Franco government, will not solve the Spanish problem. These steps will do no more than put off the solution. As the old saying goes: "He laughs best who laughs last." The Spanish people, as they demonstrated in their liberation war of 1936 to 1939 against fascist aggression, are not a people passively to accept the brand of fascist slavery. The most glorious pages of their history remain still to be written. Catalonia, as the workers said, referring to the most impressive popular protest, "is only the beginning."

The concept that it is possible for the forces within the country to overthrow Franco, supported in the course

of their struggle by the camp of democracy and peace and with its active sympathy, is gaining ground among the masses and stimulating their initiative and militance.

Wholly apart from their immediate results, these struggles, it can be affirmed, open a new stage in the battle of the Spanish people for liberation, a battle which will not be halted until the Franco regime is destroyed.

It would be a grave error, of course, to think the destruction of Franco fascism will be easy, that it can be achieved in the present state of disunity among the Republican forces, or without coordinated effort with the non-Republican groups and forces of opposition, both civil and military, which exist and are growing inside Spain.

The Communist Party has proposed the formation of a Republican-Democratic Front for struggle for the Republic. Apart from the fact that the Communist Party does not consider this Republican-Democratic Front as an end in itself, but as a first step in the unification of Republican and democratic forces to reach a broader union of anti-Franco forces, events have shown that we must move rapidly toward this goal; that we must move toward the formation of a National Front with all the anti-Franco forces; that we must hammer out a compromise with all the forces disposed to struggle against fascism, for peace and the salvation of Spain.

Above all the differences, disparate

judgments and interests, the fundamental objective of all the anti-Franco forces should be to end Franco-fascism, defend the peace and prevent Spain from being dragged into the war at the bidding and for the benefit of Yankee imperialism.

Influenced by persistent anti-Communist propaganda, many conservative forces interested in the destruction of Franco-fascism are not as effective as they might be, obsessed as they are by the Communist specter which Franco and the imperialists have been dangling ceaselessly before their eyes.

When for the sake of saving Spain, the Communist Party, in 1942, proposed formation of a National Union of all anti-Franco forces, regardless of social composition or political or religious ideas, it was not proposing an idle slogan without basis or content. The Communist Party was and is firmly determined to put an end to the suffering of our country and to prevent Spain from being hurled into a suicidal war. It is, therefore, ready for any sacrifice to achieve it. The premise for defending the life of Spain is to end the Franco regime. And when a political force proposes to overthrow a government, a government which is the expression of a certain economic and political system, it must consider what will replace this government.

Under present conditions in Spain, the Communist Party does not propose the conquest of power, and the establishment of the dictatorship of

the proletariat. It proposes, rather, the establishment of a type of democratic regime that would restore to the people the democratic liberties they enjoyed under the Republic.

Only a provisional, revolutionary government can do this, emerging from the struggle of the masses against Franco-fascism. This government must be an anti-Franco government and democratic. Its function, primarily, must be the immediate re-establishment of democratic freedoms and calling for popular elections to enable the people freely and democratically to decide the kind of regime that should be established in Spain.

This is the solution to the present situation as the Communists see it. And they believe it to be the only way to ward off the catastrophe to which the present regime is leading Spain.

The struggles and protests in Catalonia have inaugurated a new stage on the road to liberation of the Spanish people. Neither American dol-

lars, nor British or Vatican maneuverers can stop the Spanish people from carrying through to the end the struggle begun in Barcelona.

The protection extended Franco by the Yankee imperialists will make this struggle harder, more painful and more complicated. But the people are ready to gain their freedom and they will not retreat. In each day's struggle their forces are tempered and they begin to understand that once united, they are stronger than Franco and his gang of usurers and traitors. And the people know, besides, that they are not alone. Joined with them, in sympathy and moral support, stands the invincible peace camp, headed by the great Soviet Union and the standard-bearer of peace and the independence of peoples, Comrade Stalin. They want to see the Spanish people free and happy, participating in the great family of democratic peoples and lovers of peace, in a progressive Spain—independent and democratic.

ON

by

Mateo
vic
Ch
Em
For
Mo

In 1
Conve
of the
1950,
Party
out th

...
way o
—only
chain
struct
not ex
to mi
an *ess*
of sci
demon
scienti

The
eviden
It dem
it incr
instru
be wis
ble na
headed
paciou

* Poi

Book Review

ON BACTERIOLOGICAL WARFARE

by Henry Newman

Materials on the Trial of Former Servicemen of the Japanese Army Charged with Manufacturing and Employing Bacteriological Weapons, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1950.

In his report to the Fifteenth National Convention of the Communist Party of the United States, held in December, 1950, V. J. Jerome, chairman of the Party's Cultural Commission, pointed out that:

... capitalism, having made war its way of life, can foster—indeed, tolerate—only that sort of science which is chained to the war machine. The destructive implications for science are not exhausted in the fact of its bondage to militarization. Militarization means an essential debasement and perversion of science. It means also a progressive demoralization and degeneration of scientists.*

The book under review is convincing evidence of the truth of this analysis. It demonstrates that imperialism finds it increasingly imperative to turn to instruments of mass murder which may be wielded by a handful. The invincible nature of the world's peace forces, headed by the Soviet Union, drives rapacious imperialists to seek destructive

devices to replace human death-dealers.

This volume covers the Soviet trial, held in Khabarovsk in 1949, of Japanese militarists charged with planning and waging biological warfare (B-W). This gruesome account of atrocities fully rivaling those of the Nazis takes on added meaning as United States imperialism steps up its preparations for launching a third world war and threatens to use deadly germs. The trial makes clear that the United States has kept from punishment Hirohito and General Ishii Shiro, arch war criminals who authorized and directed B-W against China and planned it against the Soviet Union, the United States and England. Only the swift action of Soviet forces blocked the execution of the latter atrocity.

The story begins in 1931 when, under the secret instructions of Emperor Hirohito, a detachment to prepare germ warfare was set up in Japan's Kwantung Army stationed in Manchuria near the Soviet border. In 1936, coincident with the formation of the aggressive Anti-Comintern Axis, additional detachments (later designated simply as 731 and 100) were set up near Harbin, China. These units were assigned the task of determining the most practicable germs for B-W and of devising methods for their production and use in mass extermination of civilians. Dis-

* *Political Affairs*, February, 1951, p. 201.

eases fatal to cattle and crops were also studied. Subjects for the experiments, numbering over three thousand Soviet and Chinese citizens, were provided by the Japanese police. These human guinea pigs were used to test various methods of spreading cholera, typhoid and other deadly bacteria. Of all those sent to this death factory, not one survived. A typical "experiment" was to drop from a plane thin-walled porcelain receptacles filled with plague-infected fleas on a "proving ground" in which "logs" (as human experimentees were called) were chained naked to stakes. These experiments were also made at Mukden on American prisoners to determine their immunity to infectious diseases. As pointed out by the Soviet Prosecutor, the "painful death to which thousands were put, was to have prepared for the death of millions."

To verify the results of such small-scale tests, plague-infected fleas were dropped by airplane near Hankow in 1940, in Changteh in 1941, and in Chekiang, central China, in 1942, and in all cases epidemics followed. The American press at the time published the report of the head of the Chinese Red Cross fixing Japanese responsibility.

As Japan's position worsened, preparations for the use of B-W were intensified. Monthly production of detachment 731 alone was raised to 600 pounds of plague germs, 1,100 pounds of anthrax germs, 1,700 pounds of typhoid germs and a ton of cholera germs.

General Yamada, commander-in-chief of the Kwantung Army, Japan's main striking force, testified that: "If hostilities against the Soviet Union had not broken out, the bacteriological

weapons could have been used against the U.S.A. and other countries." He admitted further that: "The Soviet Union's entry into the war against Japan, and the swift advance of the Soviet Army into the heart of Manchuria deprived us of the possibility of employing the bacteriological weapon against the U.S.S.R. and other countries. . . ." The fact here disclosed that the Soviet Union saved the world from the horrors of B-W, exposes, quite aside from all else, the slanders of those who sought to justify ignoring the Soviet Union at the Japanese Peace Treaty conference in San Francisco because of the supposedly small Soviet contribution to victory over Japan.

The trial indicated that documents were given to Joseph B. Keenan, chief American prosecutor at the International Military Tribunal at Tokyo, showing the B-W crimes committed by the Japanese ruling group. These documents, however, "were not submitted to the tribunal." American imperialism as of V-J day made peace with the Japanese militarist-monopolist clique responsible for Pearl Harbor and prepared from the outset to use the experience and services of the former enemies in its own aggressive plans.

Of especial significance was General Yamada's command, in order to prevent capture by Soviet forces, for "the evacuation of the personnel and valuable equipment of both detachments (731 and 100) to South Korea." This equipment and personnel turned up later in Japan, including General Ishii, the commander of Detachment 731 and 100 who is now reported to be doing "research" in the United States!

There is, indeed, much evidence, quite aside from what is contained in the volume under review, of consider-

able
the
Thu
Red
Mac
Japa
the
men
insti
bact
crim
(N.
U.
lagg
chain
logic
decla
port
logic
indic
hind
King
on b
this
at Ca
of d
duce
ing
howe
cente
Missi
alrea
devel
tion"
Th
repor
on B
that r
the
organ
tion
than
State
dition
ties, r
comin

able activity by the United States in the field of bacteriological warfare. Thus, the Soviet Navy newspaper *Red Fleet* specifically charged that MacArthur in 1946 sent "eighteen Japanese specialists in germ warfare to the United States to carry out experiments in 'numerous laboratories and institutes of America.' Since that time bacteriological stations staffed with war criminals have been set up in Japan" (*N. Y. Times*, April 13, 1951).

U.S. war-time B-W research had not lagged behind Japan's. George Merck, chairman for the U.S. Army of its "Biological Warfare Committee," boastfully declared in January, 1946, in his *Report to the Secretary of War on Biological Warfare*: "All evidence to date indicates that the Axis powers were behind the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada in their work on biological warfare." The scale of this work can be seen in the fact that at Camp Detrick, Maryland, the germs of deadly undulant fever can be produced by the ton, each ounce containing 25 trillion bacteria. Detrick is, however, primarily only a "research" center. At Vigo, Indiana, Pascagoula, Mississippi, and Dugway, Utah, plants already in 1946 were "set up for the development of larger-scale production" (*Life*, November 18, 1946).

The U.S. State Department's own report, in 1946, to the United Nations on B-W declared: "It is quite probable that research directed toward enhancing the virulence of pathogenic microorganisms would result in the production of varieties much more virulent than those now known" (*Dept. of State Publication* 2661, I, pt. y). In addition to seeking more virulent varieties, research is directed towards overcoming the factors in nature which

hinder epidemics.

The late General Henry H. Arnold, who commanded the U.S. Air Force at the time of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki A-bombings, made clear the strategic place B-W occupies in the war plan of American imperialism when he remarked in his contribution to *One World or None*, edited by Dexter Masters (N.Y., 1946): "It is worth noting that biological warfare, consisting of the spreading of disease, could occupy a position similar to atomic warfare." B-W is viewed as an "ideal" weapon in that unlike the bomb only people and not property are destroyed.

A most revealing fact on U.S. plans to use B-W is that in 1925 the Geneva Protocol against such barbarism was ultimately ratified by forty-one nations including the Soviet Union, England and France. *Two countries failed to ratify the treaty—the U.S. and Japan!* And in 1946, *President Truman withdrew it from further consideration by the Senate!* Similarly, in the U.N., the United States has obstructed efforts to ban B-W.*

There is evidence that American B-W preparations have gone beyond the laboratory stage. *Red Fleet* stated that bacteriological weapons were tested in 1949 against Canadian Eskimos, causing an epidemic of plague. And the People's Government of Korea has demanded that "MacArthur and Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway be tried as war criminals for using 'bacteriological warfare' in the Korean war" (*N.Y. Times*, May 9, 1951).

B-W is evidently one of the "fantastic new weapons" with which Truman recently threatened the world. One of its prime uses as a terror weapon is to

* On this, see Theodor Rosebury, *Peace or Persistence* (N. Y., 1949).

panic not only other nations but also the American people into blindly accepting Wall Street's drive for war, and thus to throttle the growing demand for peace. Exaggerated claims of the effectiveness of B-W are made. On this point the conclusions of the Nazi High Command which, as disclosed at the Nuremberg War Crimes trial, planned but did not use B-W, are illuminating. After noting that B-W cannot be "decisive" and cannot be used against enemy troops because of the danger of infecting one's own, *Deutsche Wehr*, semi-official organ of the German Army, declared: "It is the effect on morale that must be considered above all . . . it is wise not to exaggerate the effects, especially in the case of a population which is neither ignorant nor easily intimidated" (quoted in *Living Age*, February, 1938, p. 495).

B-W involves the complete prostitution of science which instead of curing and preventing disease is used to create and spread it. War is waged not against germs but with germs against men, animals and plants. The savagery involved was recognized by the International Congress of Microbiologists in 1948 which adopted a resolution "condemning in strongest possible terms all forms of bacteriological warfare."

The emphasis the Pentagon places on B-W is a symptom of the extreme degeneracy of American capitalism. Planned pestilence is the kind of planning it is best able to do. This reliance on B-W also reflects the fact that, confronted by the might of the U.S.S.R. and its possession of the A-bomb, the strength of the People's Democracies, and the demand of the peoples of the world for peace, Wall Street's war

strategy is increasingly in crisis. As the prospects for cannon-fodder decline, American imperialism feverishly searches for substitutes such as germs to take the place of men. President Roosevelt pledged in June, 1943 not to use "such weapons unless they are first used by our enemies." But the Pentagon, now chafing at any restriction on its aggressive plans, denounces this "attitude" as "unrealistic and actually harmful in 1951" (*N.Y. Journal-American*, Oct. 31, 1951).

Pravda, referring to Forrestal's directive as Secretary of Defense to expand B-W work, declared: "This is why the trial in Khabarovsk is not only a trial of a gang of Japanese war criminals generated by a Fascist regime. This is a trial of all the sinister forces which are preparing new crimes against humanity." The trial of these Japanese war criminals was a service to humanity and its record in this volume gives a timely warning against the imperialist forces striving to push the American people upon a similar atrocious path.

Germ warfare preparations continue to be conducted under an "iron curtain . . . even more rigid than that which surrounded atomic energy development during World War II" (*N. Y. Journal-American*, Oct. 31, 1951). The extreme secrecy covering these preparations for B-W stems not only from military reasons but also from the rulers' awareness of the horror that knowledge of these facts would evoke from the vast majority of the American people. The facts must be brought to these masses. Wall Street's barbarous plan for B-W must be exposed and the demand raised to ban B-W as well as the A-bomb, and to conclude a Five-Power Peace Pact.

crisis. An
odder de-
feverishly
as germ
President
1943 not to
they are
But the
ny restric-
denouncen
ic and as
K. Journ-

tal's direc-
to expand
is why the
only a trial
criminal
ne. This is
rces which
against ho-
e Japanes
to human
lume gives
imperialis
American
ous path.
ns contin
iron curtain
that which
development
Y. Journ
The extreme
arations in
military re-
s' awarene
lge of the
e vast nu-
people. The
hese mass
an for B-2
mand rais
A-bomb, and
Peace Pro



NEW... RECENT... FORTHCOMING PAMPHLETS

THE SMITH, McCARRAN, TAFT-HARTLEY CONSPIRACY TO STRANGLE LABOR by George Morris	\$.10
HOLD HIGH THE TORCH! by Richard O. Boyer	.03
LIFT EVERY VOICE FOR PAUL ROBESON by Lloyd L. Brown	.03
GRASP THE WEAPON OF CULTURE by V. J. Jerome	.10
VOICES FOR FREEDOM—NO. 2 prepared by Civil Rights Congress	.10
MUST THERE BE WAR? by Joseph Clark	.10
HOW TO PROTECT YOURSELF FROM THE ATOM-BOMB by Robert Friedman	.03
MARXISM AND NEGRO LIBERATION by Gus Hall	.10
AMERICA'S RACIST LAWS by Herbert Aptheker	.10
PEACE — AND PRICE CUTS, TOO! by Felix Baran	.05
WHO WANTS WAR? by Joseph Clark	.03

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS
832 Broadway • New York City 3

New and Coming International Titles

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

DEC 15 1951

For Peaceful Coexistence

By **JOSEPH STALIN**

LIBRARY

Interviews and statements propounding the view that the peaceful coexistence of the socialist Soviet Union and the capitalist United States of America is not only possible but necessary in the interests of both nations and the peace of the world. \$20

The Right of Nations To Self-Determination

By **V. I. LENIN**

This long-awaited volume of Lenin's basic theoretical essays on the national question includes his views on national oppression, colonialism, social chauvinism, and opportunism on the national question. It points up the tasks of the working class within both the oppressed and oppressing nations in the struggle for self-determination.

Paper \$.90; cloth \$1.50

The National Question and Leninism

By **JOSEPH STALIN**

Recently translated into English, this important work of Marxist theory was written in 1929, in answer to a number of letters raising specific points with reference to the national question, it discusses the concept of "nation," the rise and development of nations, the future of nations and the correct Marxist-Leninist policy on the national question. \$20

Order from your bookshop or:

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway • New York City 3

Titles
COLLEGE

001

ew that the
on and the
possible but
he peace of
\$.20

etical essays
national op-
portunism
of the work-
ing nations

cloth \$1.50

ism

nt work of
o a number
the national
he rise and
the correc
\$.20