

# Political Affairs

MARCH 1952 • 25 CENTS



- |                 |       |   |
|-----------------|-------|---|
| ANDER BITTELMAN | [ 1 ] | Corruption, Warmongering and Pro-Fascist Reaction |
| GEORGE BLAKE    | [15]  | The Supreme Court Will Not Have the Last Word!    |
| CHARLES P. MANN | [22]  | Mr. I. F. Stone and the Negro Question            |
| AJOY GHOSH      | [34]  | The General Elections in India                    |
| A GROUP REPORT  | [45]  | Women of the Soviets                              |
| JOHN SWIFT      | [51]  | The Parasitism of the U.S. War Economy            |

*On the Occasion of the Publication of*

# **A LANTERN FOR JEREMY**

**By V. J. JEROME**

THE COMMITTEE TO DEFEND V. J. JEROME  
and  
*Masses & Mainstream*

PROUDLY ANNOUNCE

co-sponsorship of a RALLY OF THE ARTS to honor this outstanding cultural leader, and to mobilize the widest support for his defense against Smith Act persecution.

Many notable progressive artists will perform on the "Culture Fights Back" program to be presented at Manhattan Center, 34th Street & 8th Avenue, New York City, on Thursday evening, April 24.

We urge all *M&M* readers who live in New York and vicinity to attend and to bring their friends.

Tickets may be ordered from the Committee to Defend V. J. Jerome, 799 Broadway, Room 643, New York 3, N. Y.

This will be the first public occasion at which copies of *A Lantern for Jeremy* (\$2.50) will be available.

Readers in other cities may order copies from their local bookshops, or by mail from:

*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.*

**A Theoretical-Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism**

Editor: V. J. Jerome

## Corruption, Warmongering and Pro-Fascist Reaction

By Alexander Bittelman

THE CURRENT REVELATIONS of graft and corruption in government have been growing more sensational by the day. We are having a regular epidemic of investigations and exposures, with one government agency after another coming into the limelight.

Republican Party leaders are naturally — and properly — blaming the Truman Administration, whose moral standards in politics stem from the Pendergast machine in Kansas City, and are symbolized by deep freezers and mink coats. But this orgy of corruption in government and politics is not confined to the Democratic Party and the Truman Administration. It is the same with the Republican Party, except that the latter is not now in control of the Federal government.

The moral debauchery and corrup-

tion in politics and government is truly a bi-partisan accomplishment. It is the working out of the two-party system of the monopolies.

It started this time with the five-percenters and the White House influence-peddlers, involving the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This was followed by the exposure of so-called tax scandals, involving the Internal Revenue Bureau and the Treasury. These tax scandals are of a double nature: direct tax frauds and legalized swindle in government grants of accelerated tax-amortization certificates to the monopolies holding government war contracts.

But things did not stop there. Next came hints and charges of corruption in Army buying, the Alien Property Office, the Maritime Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Veterans Administration,

and the whole business of military contracting and so-called public works. Logically and inevitably, it came down to an investigation of the Department of Justice itself.

It can already be seen that involved in these exposures of graft and political corruption are not just a few government officials, important as that is. Involved in this moral debauchery of government and politics are Big Business, war profiteers, Cabinet members, the White House, a Justice of the United States Supreme Court (the former Attorney General, Clark), the national chairmen of the Democratic and Republican parties, key officials of many government departments, and the heads of the Treasury and Justice Departments.

At the bottom of all of this are the monopoly ruling circles. It is they who dominate the government and the machinery of state, and the two major parties. It is they who set the moral tone to capitalist politics and government. The Kefauver Senatorial Committee, which made so much noise about Costello, has not even approached—did not dare to—the investigation and exposure of the true connections between monopoly, crime, and corruption in government and politics.

It is no accident that this orgy of graft and corruption in government and capitalist politics takes place simultaneously with the drive of pro-fascist reaction. Fascisation of mo-

nopoly rule and its state apparatus produces, not only the utmost in violence against, and oppression of, the people, but also the utmost in moral debauchery and degradation in government and politics.

### ECONOMICS, POLITICS AND MORALS

What is the economic and political basis for this orgy of corruption in government and politics? What is the moral climate in which all of this has been taking place?

On the economic side, there are four factors feeding and stimulating graft and corruption in government and politics. First comes the accelerated growth of monopoly. This inevitably leads to the extension of fraud, moral debauchery and outright violence in the economic and political relationships and dealings of the monopolies. The rise and consolidation of monopoly in the United States, as in other capitalist countries, beginning with the latter part of the 19th century, has meant the ever increasing practice by the monopolies of fraud and violence against their rivals, and especially against the working class, the Negro people, and the masses generally.

The rapid growth of monopoly in recent years has been stimulated most particularly by the militarization of the economy of the United States and the general war preparations. A growing war economy means natu-

rally an  
war in  
omy. V  
while c  
ing and  
industr  
owned  
nopolie  
econom  
pansion  
ination  
country  
along b  
in the  
price r  
by dire  
govern  
agencie  
the eco  
factor t  
and co  
monop  
A th  
is the  
profitee  
their h  
of the  
econom  
before  
go pe  
before  
lars; in  
a rise  
nomic  
lies ar  
tion o  
and co  
politic  
ernme  
Last

rally an increasing dominance of the war industries in the country's economy. War industries are expanding, while civilian industries are stagnating and declining. And since the war industries in the main are directly owned and controlled by the monopolies, the expansion of the war economy cannot but lead to the expansion of monopoly power and domination in the *general* economy of the country. This process has been helped along by various legislative measures in the field of taxation, amortization, price regulation, etc., and especially by direct monopoly control over the government's war and mobilization agencies. Thus, the militarization of the economy has served as a second factor feeding the expansion of fraud and corruption in government and monopoly politics.

A third factor in the economic field is the legalized and staggering war profiteering by the monopolies and their henchmen. Since the beginning of the current militarization of the economy in 1946, corporate profits before taxes have risen more than 90 per cent. In 1939, corporate profits, before taxes, were 6.5 billions of dollars; in 1951, they were 44.8 billions, a rise of 59 per cent. These astronomical war profits of the monopolies are the most brazen demonstration of the mounting orgy of fraud and corruption in the economics and politics of Big Business and its government.

Lastly, on the economic side are

the stupendous sums of money in the hands of a reactionary, war-preparing and war-waging government dominated by the monopolies. This government has spent in the five fiscal years, 1947-1951, the unbelievable amount of almost 198 billions of dollars. It is spending in the current fiscal year—1952—at the rate of 70 billions and is planning to spend in the fiscal year 1953 more than 85 billions. Here is where the money comes from—from robbing and exploiting the masses of the people—to fatten the monopoly vultures of graft and corruption in government and politics.

Now we come to the political basis of the present orgy of corruption. Most outstanding is the fact that the war and mobilization agencies of the government are in the hands of open and direct representatives of the monopolies, largely the Wall Street monopolies. This condition is represented and typified most dramatically by two open and direct monopoly spokesmen, Lovett and Wilson. Lovett handles the business of war and war preparations on the military and political side; Wilson handles the same business on the economic and industrial side. The two are, of course, very closely connected with each other and with the dominant monopolies of the United States. Naturally, the so-called politicians in the Truman Administration, although not open and direct representatives of the monopolies,

serve American monopoly capital and imperialism no less loyally.

A war-waging and war-preparing government thus dominated by the monopolies and actually handled by their open representatives must inevitably become rotten with fraud and corruption as well as with reaction and violence against the people.

This increasing dominance in government of open and direct spokesmen of the monopolies is giving rise to a very alarming political development. This is a reactionary political trend which leads to the consolidation of a more or less open war dictatorship of the monopolies. It is a trend which the united struggles of the American people headed by the working class can stop and reverse; but failure to stop it would mean growing and more intense fascisation of monopoly rule in the United States, as well as a growing and more intense war danger. This trend to a more or less open monopoly war dictatorship is another political factor feeding and stimulating fraud, violence and corruption in politics and government.

Finally, on the political side, is the fact that fascisation and corruption of monopoly rule are inseparable. Taft-Hartley, the Smith Act, the McCarran Act, the un-American Committee, the witch hunts, the murderous attacks upon the Negro people, rising anti-Semitic outbursts, McCarthyism, the deportation mania, loyalty drives, the persecu-

tion and jailing of Communists, the attempt to outlaw the Communist Party, and all the other manifestations of violent and aggressive pro-fascist reaction—all *this comes from the same source as graft and corruption in government and politics*. The source is the warmongering and pro-fascist monopolies and their servants, who are poisoning the entire moral climate of the United States.

In this poisoned moral climate, racketeering is a glorified avocation, so long as it is big and successful and within the formal and technical limits of the law. And no wonder: monopoly itself is one big glorified racket, as is the war economy.

In this monopoly-poisoned moral climate, violence and crime are being glorified, with the intent of promoting war hysteria, fascist hooliganism, murderous attacks upon the Negro people, anti-Semitic outbreaks, and anti-labor incitements.

For the poisoners and creators of this warmongering and pro-fascist moral climate, nothing is sacred, truth and right have no meaning, justice and beauty are things to laugh at. Everything is good and right that helps the monopolies to degrade morally and to brutalize the masses of the people, beginning with the children, and to use them for cannon fodder in a new world war and for storm troops in an advance of fascism.

This is the economic and political basis of the present orgy of corrup-

tion i  
which  
the de  
world  
another  
rotten  
alism  
the fa  
in the  
United  
menac

The  
menac  
though  
strugg  
gro ri  
condit  
curbin  
and e  
power  
strugg  
makin  
It is  
right  
human  
and d  
being  
can p

THE  
MO  
AN

The  
the U  
talist  
lence,  
dram  
mark  
of An

tion in government and politics, which is itself a major symptom of the deepening general crisis of the world system of capitalism. It is another sign of the growing decay, rottenness and parasitism of imperialism and capitalism. *It points to the fact that monopoly domination in the economy and politics of the United States has become a deadly menace to the American nation.*

The people are awakening to this menace. In the unfolding—even though slowly and unevenly—of the struggles for peace, democracy, Negro rights, and living standards, the conditions are being created for curbing the power of the monopolies and eventually for abolishing that power altogether. In these people's struggles, a new moral climate is making its way in the United States. It is a moral climate infused with right and justice and decency, humane and fair, and inspiring love and devotion to the progress, well-being and happiness of the American people and all peoples.

#### THE HISTORIC PATH OF MONOPOLY IS VIOLENCE AND CORRUPTION

The historic path of monopoly in the United States, as in other capitalist countries, is the path of violence, fraud and corruption. This is dramatically shown by a few landmarks in the rise and development of American monopoly. One of these

landmarks is found in the 1860's during the Administration of President Grant. Another left its mark on American history in the 1920's during the Administration of President Harding. And a third is inscribing its shameful story in the history books right now, in the present period, during the Administration of President Truman. These are landmarks in fraud and corruption, and they are also landmarks in the development of monopoly capitalism in the United States.

The Civil War and its outcome gave a powerful impetus to industrial growth generally and especially to the centralization and concentration of capital, thus laying the basis and creating the conditions for the rise and development of monopoly. And colossal corruption in government played an important part *in hastening and accelerating the growth of monopoly.* This was especially true in the building of railways and the expansion of railroad transportation.

Railroad companies played a pioneering role in the development of monopoly. They were "the basis of immense joint stock companies, forming at the same time a new starting point for all *other sorts* of joint stock companies, to commence by banking companies. They gave in one word, an impetus never before suspected to the *concentration of capital*, and also to the accelerated and immensely *enlarged cosmopol-*

tan activity of loanable capital, thus embracing the whole world in a network of financial swindling and mutual indebtedness, the capitalist form of 'international brotherhood.'" (Marx to Danielsson, April 10, 1879, in *Correspondence of Marx and Engels*, International, 1942, p. 358).

The railroad companies in collusion with government have robbed the nation of immense tracts of land (hundreds of millions of acres) and other natural resources. Graft and corruption in government enabled the railroad companies to rob the treasury of the United States of immense sums of money, to get all sorts of loans and subsidies. Even such a glorifier of American capitalism as Louis M. Hacker is forced to say that "the quick disposition of the public domain by the Civil War and Reconstruction Congresses ended in the firm establishment of monopolists on the land—whether as landlords, great cattle barons, timber dealers, or mineral exploiters" (*The Triumph of American Capitalism*, p. 392).

A second landmark in monopoly fraud was the period of World War I and its aftermath. Here we have the notorious corruption of the Harding era in the 1920's. During the war years, American monopoly was growing at an extraordinary rate. The granting of war orders overwhelmingly to the monopolies and the expansion of their domination in the country's economic life were the

immediate factors that speeded the concentration and centralization of capital and the growth of monopoly. Added to this was a new and decisive factor, namely, the shift of the economic center of gravity of capitalism from Europe to the United States, which began with the First Imperialist World War. This major advance in the growth of American monopoly was also a major landmark in government graft and corruption.

The best known and remembered so-called scandal is the Teapot Dome affair. But this was not all. There are in existence twenty-one volumes of Congressional investigation into war profiteering and corruption—an investigation carried on by a special committee of the House under the chairmanship of Representative William J. Graham of Illinois. This is a story of graft and corruption, not only of government, but of government in combination with Big Business. It is a story of the rapid expansion of monopoly dominance, accelerated by fraud and corruption in a government which was carrying on an imperialist war to expand the power of American monopolies all over the world.

Finally, the present marks a new level of graft and corruption, as it marks a new level in monopoly power and dominance.

World War II and the years following witnessed a tremendously accelerated growth of monopoly.

The bui  
during  
monopo  
than in  
of all w  
100 corp  
16 billio  
and equi  
ment at  
Further  
turing  
than 50  
per cen  
1939 an  
Commis  
House

97)-  
Follo  
War II  
growth  
velopin  
militari  
started  
gressive  
alism a  
world  
centrat  
ital ha  
ception  
has co  
break  
and pe

PRO-F  
POL

The  
Party  
all ki  
the re

The building up of the war economy during the war years enabled the monopolies to grow much faster than in peace time. About 75 per cent of all war contracts went to the top 100 corporations, as did most of the 16 billion dollars worth of new plant and equipment built by the government at the expense of the taxpayers. Further, the proportion of manufacturing establishments employing less than 500 people dropped from 51.7 per cent to 38.1 per cent between 1939 and 1944 (*Report on Monopoly*, Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, 1946, p. 97).

Following the conclusion of World War II, a new period of monopoly growth began. This has been developing on the basis of the new militarization of the economy, which started about 1946 as part of the aggressive drive of American imperialism and its preparations for a new world war. Consequently, the concentration and centralization of capital has been proceeding at an exceptionally rapid pace, and with it has come, inevitably, a fresh outbreak of corruption in government and politics.

#### PRO-FASCIST REACTION SEEKS POLITICAL CAPITAL

The leaders of the Republican Party are naturally seeking to make all kinds of political capital out of the revelation that the Truman Ad-

ministration is so deeply involved in graft. Senator Taft insists that corruption will be one of the main Republican issues in the national elections. General MacArthur calls for "a spiritual revival" and declares:

Moral decay and political irresponsibility have penetrated the roots of our cherished institutions. Powerful forces bent upon further entrenching political power at the expense of spiritual values resist public disclosures which question the moral integrity underlying public affairs (*N. Y. Times*, December 13, 1951).

Thus the Republican Party, which is no less rotten with graft and corruption than the Democratic Party, is preparing to ride into office in the Presidential elections on the rising wave of mass resentment against corruption in government. The Republican Party politicians are obviously encouraged by the fact that in the outcome of the 1951 elections mass resentment against corruption in government played an important role. Also encouraging them are the obvious effort of the Truman Administration to cover up as much of the government corruption as possible and to whitewash those spots that have already been exposed. The Administration policy seems to be to sacrifice some of the small fry in government in order to save the real big ones, including the President and his Cabinet. This policy is no doubt based upon the expectation that when it comes to a showdown the

Democrats can prove the Republicans to be as deeply involved in corruption as themselves. And this is probably true.

All of which goes to show that the politics and mechanics of the two-party system are again coming into operation in connection with the coming national elections. The monopolies are using both major parties to promote their drive to war and fascism; and, in doing so, they are promoting graft and corruption in both major parties. Being in office, and having had more chances to graft, the Democratic Party is naturally more vulnerable to attack on this issue during a national election. So, the other party of the monopolies—the Republican Party—is exploiting this vulnerability of the Democrats to get into office, and thus to place another monopoly party in power.

The more openly reactionary and fascist currents of monopoly capital are using the corruption to stimulate and to activate various fascist groupings and tendencies. Nixon and McCarthy, as well as MacArthur and Taft, are here playing an important part.

History shows that fascist-minded monopolies have made much use of corruption in governments under bourgeois-democratic leadership to overthrow such governments, to destroy altogether the democratic form of bourgeois rule and to establish the fascist form, which is the open

terroristic dictatorship of the most imperialist and chauvinist circles of finance capital.

Says Dimitroff:

Fascism delivers up the people to be devoured by the most corrupt, most venal elements, but comes before them with the demand for "an honest and incorruptible government." Speculating on the profound disillusionment of the masses in bourgeois democratic governments, fascism hypocritically denounces corruption (for instance, the Barmat and Sklarek affairs in Germany, the Stavisky affair in France, and numerous others). (*United Front Against War and Fascism*, New Century, 1935, p. 10.)

Tendencies of this sort are operating in the present political situation in the United States. The very forces of monopoly capital which feed and stimulate corruption in government and politics, as they stimulate the drive to fascism and war, are seeking to exploit the growing popular resentment against corruption in government in order to strengthen the more openly reactionary and fascist tendencies, *i.e.*, "the most corrupt, most venal elements" in monopoly politics.

This clearly represents a serious danger to the American people. The rivalries between the two monopoly parties are growing sharper as we come closer to the national elections. This is taking place notwithstanding the fact that the class nature of the two parties is the same, that both

parties  
mote th  
capita  
Their  
crease,  
narrow  
interest  
each p  
force i  
the sha  
the Fed  
so-calle  
monop  
Wester  
is not  
jor pol  
peace,  
any ot  
these r  
nal in r  
the sar  
and fol  
monger  
tion. T  
tween  
divisio  
policie  
Month  
tends  
error  
be bui  
would  
not th  
But  
wrong  
contro  
betwe  
ings a  
tween  
no cor

parties defend the interests and promote the major policies of monopoly capital.

Their rivalries are bound to increase, and not alone because of the narrow vested political and power interests of the leading groups of each party. A powerful motivating force intensifying these rivalries is the sharpening fight for control of the Federal government between the so-called Wall Street grouping of monopolies and the Mid-West and Western grouping of monopolies. It is not a fight reflecting different major policies on such issues as war or peace, and democracy or fascism, or any other fundamental problem. On these major policies, monopoly capital in the United States proceeds from the same basic imperialist positions and follows the same aggressive, warmongering and pro-fascist orientation. To assume that the rivalries between the monopolies reflect basic divisions on these major issues and policies, as a recent editorial in *Monthly Review* (February, 1952) tends to do is to make a disastrous error. If progressive policies were to be built upon such errors, the result would benefit only the monopolies, not the people.

But from this it would be entirely wrong to conclude that the fight for control of the Federal government between the rival monopoly groupings and the divisions *within and between* the two major parties are of no consequence to the masses of the

people and their progressive movements. These monopoly rivalries are not taking place in "normal" times, but rather amidst the deepening general crisis of capitalism which tends to magnify and sharpen politically every little difference among the monopolies, no matter how small. Moreover, the current struggle for power among the rival monopoly groupings, the "older" ones and the "younger" ones, is also taking place amidst the growing and sharpening crisis in American imperialist foreign policy and the maturing of a great economic crash. This situation has aroused considerable anxiety among a good number of warmongering and reactionary monopoly spokesmen. And this, too, has the effect of greatly sharpening tactical and secondary differences among the monopolists and of imparting to these differences first-rate political importance, especially prior to a national election.

Candidates and parties of the monopolies must seek mass support during the elections; and the narrower and sharper the basis of struggle, the more reckless and unrestrained this fight for mass support is bound to become. It is already becoming so. This means that political demagoguery by the parties and candidates of the monopolies is bound to descend to new depths of deceit. They will play reckless demagoguery with the issues of peace, democracy, the well-being of the people, corruption in government

which the Republicans will exploit especially, high taxes, civil rights, etc. They will also play upon such fascist and warmongering issues as "the menace of Communism," "Soviet and Chinese aggression," "Communists in government," etc.

Each of the rival monopoly groupings and the corresponding political candidate will exploit to the utmost the people's fear of a new world war and their yearning for peace. As between Truman and Taft, each already accuses the other of representing and leading the war party; and, conversely, each is beginning to claim leadership of the peace party. Should the presidential candidates of the two monopoly parties carry on this kind of campaign to the end, each of them will, of course, mislead and gain the votes of large numbers of voters who fear war and want peace. But unwittingly they will also help widen the gates of expression for the genuine and honest peace forces.

The Taft-Hoover-MacArthur outfit, backed by the Mid-West and Western monopoly grouping, when making its appeal to bourgeois circles, concentrates largely upon the so-called "isolationist" sections of the bourgeoisie. These are industrial and agricultural bourgeois circles producing mainly for the home market, concentrated in the Mid-West, whose ideologist was the late Charles Beard, who called himself "a continentalist" and "nationalist." They also make a special appeal to those sections of the

bourgeoisie which are not getting much, if anything, of the war contracts, whose industries may even lag or decline due to the war economy, and which fear the prospect of being squeezed out of business or crushed by the monopolies as these expand their power through the war economy. The peace camp cannot, therefore, ignore the possibility that with the growing strength of a mass people's peace front in the United States, these bourgeois circles could be neutralized and their support for Wall Street's drive for a new world war considerably weakened.

The peace forces can make use of the rivalries between the various monopoly groupings and their political representatives in several crucially important ways. First, full use should be made of the mutual exposures and attacks of the rival imperialist groups (calling each other warmongers) to demonstrate to the widest masses that both monopoly groupings and their political candidates are imperialists and warmongers. Secondly, full use should be made of the fact that the monopoly rivalries are drawing into the discussions of foreign policy, and consequently into the political arena, new sections of voters, including workers, farmers, Negroes and city middle-class people. This is all to the good, in that it creates more favorable conditions for the peace forces to reach broader sections of the people with the true peace message. Thirdly, and most importantly,

full u  
ening  
intern  
to str  
peace  
amon  
major  
broad  
peopl  
peace  
in the  
tions.  
In  
forces  
of, an  
corru  
tics.

SOME  
QU

Th  
of th  
ruptio  
They  
taxati  
the n  
gover  
And  
again  
away  
racke  
instar  
Mo  
again  
being  
lated  
den  
the p  
chasi

full use should be made of the weakening of the imperialist camp due to internal contradictions and rivalries, *to stimulate and support all kinds of peace groupings and realignments among the mass followers of the two major parties, to consolidate and broaden the peace coalition of the people, and to rally all supporters of peace around a national peace ticket in the forthcoming presidential elections.*

In a similar way, the progressive forces of the people have to seize hold of, and to carry on, the fight against corruption in government and politics.

#### SOME POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES AND TASKS

There is no doubt that the masses of the people deeply resent the corruption in government and politics. They are especially sensitive to the taxation swindles, to the robbery of the national treasury by Big Business, government officials and their cronies. And the masses have begun to react against this condition by turning away from grafting politicians and racketeers, as was shown in many instances in the 1951 elections.

Moreover, this mass resentment against corruption in government is being deepened and further stimulated by the steadily increasing burden of taxation upon the masses of the people, by their decreasing purchasing power, by growing unem-

ployment, by the general worsening of the economic conditions of the bulk of the people. There is evidence to show that increasing numbers of people are beginning to contrast their own worsening economic conditions with the fantastic war profiteering of the monopolies and their agents and to connect this with the corruption in government and politics, with the war in Korea and the general war danger, with political reaction and the growth of the fascist danger. This broader understanding of the nature of the government corruption now revealed and of the way to fight it is just beginning to develop among wider masses. It is the task of the progressive forces to spread and deepen this correct understanding and to rally the mass struggle against political corruption around a *platform of independent political action.*

It is obvious that corruption in government will be a major issue in the coming national elections. The danger, as has been stated, is that the monopolies may succeed in exploiting this very issue to strengthen their two-party system, if the Left and progressive forces do not concentrate on directing the resentment of the masses along the channels of independent political action.

Since the issue of corruption is so directly and intimately connected with tax evasions and swindles by the corporations, on the one hand, and the increasingly intolerable burden of taxation upon the masses, on

the other, the fight for a people's tax program must be made a major issue in the elections, closely linked with the corruption issue. Such a program would have to concentrate on the following demands: (1) abolishment of the provisions of the taxation law which grant the monopolies the privilege of so-called rapid tax amortizations, since this is one of the main sources of war profiteering and political corruption; (2) abolishment of all sales taxes and all excise taxes upon articles of mass consumption; (3) a graduated tax on all profits from war contracts, beginning with 50 percent on profits from small contracts and sub-contracts and reaching 80 percent on profits from prime war contracts to the large corporations; (4) a graduated capital levy to cover Federal war deficits and to liquidate the Federal debt; the capital levy shall begin with a small percentage on properties of 50,000 dollars, rising progressively to higher and very high percentages on properties approaching one million dollars and over; and (5) abolishment of all taxation upon incomes under 5,000 dollars a year.

On the whole struggle against corruption, the National Committee of the Communist Party has projected the following important mass demands:

... the immediate establishment of a public investigating body, composed of representatives who have no ties with government or Big Business, to cleanse

the grafters from all government bodies and institutions.

... the immediate ouster of the U.S. Attorney General McGrath and J. Edgar Hoover, and the removal of Supreme Court Justice Clark who shut their eyes to this swindle while they arrogantly arrested and imprisoned working-class and Communist leaders.

... an end to graft and corruption in government.

... immediate punishment of rogues in top government bodies and the release of their Smith Act victims.

... the restoration of the Bill of Rights, the immediate quashing of all Smith Act indictments, the repeal of the Taft-Hartley, McCarran, and Smith Acts.

... the return to a peace economy, an end to the "defense" pork barrel, where graft is hidden in the name of "national security." (*Daily Worker*, December 24, 1951.)

The struggle against corruption in government and politics demands, therefore, the widest unity of the people—of all those who want honest, clean and democratic government, responsive to the progressive desires and needs of the people. This has to be a unity—a united front and coalition—of the working class, the Negro people, the farmers, and the middle classes of the cities, fighting to expose and defeat graft and corruption in government and politics. It has to be a united front and coalition capable of waging an independent political fight against the main source of graft and corruption—monopoly

power  
It  
error  
strugg  
and si  
for cl  
in pol  
cludin  
hearte  
masses  
clean  
is shap  
comin  
that a  
matur  
people  
youth  
and p  
profite  
and p  
ble fr  
the m  
for cl  
politic  
to the  
the li  
Comm  
name  
politi  
ment  
profit  
reacti  
From  
be a  
estim  
fight  
esty  
the n  
true  
misu

power and monopoly party politics.

It would be a Right opportunist error to undertake to develop the struggle against corruption purely and simply as an old-fashioned fight for clean government and honesty in politics. Lefts and progressives, including Communists, can wholeheartedly join with the broadest masses of the people in the fight for clean government and politics, which is shaping up as a major issue in the coming national elections. It is a fact that anti-corruption movements are maturing among wide circles of the people, especially among women and youth. *But corruption in government and politics is inseparable from war profiteering, warmongering, racism and pro-fascist reaction.* It is inseparable from the two-party system of the monopolies. That is why the fight for clean government and honesty in politics, to be effective and of benefit to the people, must be waged along the lines indicated by the National Committee of the Communist Party, namely: "Organize for independent political action to clear the government of grafters, warmongers, war profiteers, and pro-fascist racists and reactionaries."

From this it is clear that it would be a serious Leftist error to underestimate the vital importance of the fight for clean government and honesty in politics and to refuse to join the masses in this struggle. It is quite true that the monopoly parties are misusing this issue *to perpetuate cor-*

ruption in government and politics, to strengthen the two-party system, to prevent the rise of independent political action in the coming elections, to obscure and distort the peace issue and the issue of democracy and civil rights. The monopolies are using the corruption issue to stimulate fascism and fascisation. *These are real dangers.* But what is the answer? It cannot be to leave the issue to the monopolies and their two parties, for they would want nothing better. They would be completely free to exploit the issue to perpetuate corruption and to accelerate the drive to war and fascism.

It is also true that reactionary Social-Democratic leaders and labor reformists (leaders of the Liberal Party in New York, many leaders of the ADA and trade-union reactionaries) are seeking to meet the corruption issue with the traditional liberal-reformist policy of "clean government" and "turn out the rascals." In the face of the growing danger of war and fascism, this sort of policy, totally ineffective as a means of combating corruption in government, would serve perfectly the strategy of the two major parties of the monopolies. For this reformist policy seeks to prevent the struggle against the main source of corruption—monopoly domination in government, war profiteering, warmongering and pro-fascist reaction.

But what is the answer to this reformist policy? It is the working-

class policy of the united front and people's front. It is the policy of joining the masses in the fight for clean government, helping to build broad united fronts and coalitions along independent political lines, and striving to develop the struggle as a fight to clear the government of grafters, war profiteers, warmongers, white supremacists and lynchers, anti-Semites, witch hunters, and all pro-fascist reactionaries.

That is why Communists are joining this fight. They are joining it and are carrying it on in accord with the Party's main line—the line of struggle for the building of a people's anti-monopoly and anti-fascist peace coalition. It is the line of struggle for peace, democracy, equal rights for the Negro people, and the protection of the people's living standards.

Communists will not fail to explain to the masses that only Socialism will remove totally and forever the causes of corruption in government, that only under Socialism will

the people be able to realize fully and completely the principles of clean, truly democratic government and honesty in politics, as well as in all human relations.

At the same time, Communists will also make sure to explain the crucial importance of the united front struggle *today* for honesty in politics. This struggle in the national elections of 1952 and thereafter, will accomplish two things. First, depending upon the strength of the independent political action of the masses, this fight will tend to restrain and partly check the present orgy of graft, war profiteering, warmongering and reaction. This will be of immediate benefit to the people. Secondly, this united front fight will promote and accelerate the major struggle of our period — the struggle to curb the power of the warmongering and pro-fascist monopolies, to elect a government that will represent and be backed by a people's anti-fascist and anti-monopoly peace coalition.

By Geo

On Mon  
preme C  
tained t  
York's  
meaning  
assault  
were jus  
when,  
March  
handed  
made a  
and dea  
democr

One  
upheld  
the law  
of the  
courage  
to the b  
ditions  
clients,  
ment, l  
practice

The  
reaching  
tions—  
portatio  
Alien  
the M  
Court  
vote o  
memb

# The Supreme Court Will Not Have the Last Word!

By George Blake

ON MONDAY, MARCH 3, the U.S. Supreme Court by a vote of 6 to 3 sustained the constitutionality of New York's Feinberg Law. The tragic meaning and repercussions of this assault against academic freedom were just being debated and analyzed when, on the following Monday, March 10, the Supreme Court handed down three new rulings that made a shambles of the Bill of Rights and dealt new blows to the cause of democracy and peace.

One decision, by a vote of 5 to 3, upheld the contempt sentences of the lawyers in the Smith Act case of the 11 Communist leaders. The courageous attorneys who lived up to the best American democratic traditions in zealously defending their clients, now face, not only imprisonment, but the denial of the right to practice their profession.

The two other decisions — far-reaching in their dangerous implications—were made in relation to deportation cases arising out of the Alien Registration Act of 1940 and the McCarran Act of 1950. The Court held in the former case, by a vote of 6 to 2, that present or *past* membership in the Communist Party

(or any organization *charged* with "advocating the overthrow of the government by force and violence") is a deportable offense. Thus, membership *at any time* in the Communist Party, even if terminated prior to the passage of the 1940 Act, subjects a person to deportation.

The second decision was even more drastic. In this case, the Court, by a 5 to 4 vote, upheld the right of the Attorney General to hold individuals facing deportation *without bail*, "if he finds that their freedom might imperil the country's safety." This may be called the Concentration Camp decision.

These Supreme Court Mondays will live as evil days in which American liberties were profoundly shaken and undermined. They will live in infamy with such Mondays as June 4, 1951, when the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the pro-fascist Smith Act; as May 8, 1950, when the Supreme Court gave its constitutional blessings to the ultra-reactionary Taft-Hartley Act; as on those Mondays when the Supreme Court turned its back on the appeals of Willie McGee and the Martinsville Seven, and thereby gave

its sanction to the genocidal lynchings of Negroes in the United States.

This judicial trampling on the Constitution highlights the efforts of Government and the Courts to suppress all voices for peace, to crush all resistance to the war-makers. As the statement by the National Committee of the Communist Party (March 19) declared:

The Supreme Court majority of Truman appointees has declared war against the peace aspirations of the American people. With flagrant arrogance it has provided the 'legal' framework for further fascist onslaughts on the most elementary democratic rights of the people in a frenzied effort to intimidate into submission all opposition to the war-makers of Wall Street.

The course pursued by the Supreme Court culminating in the decisions of March 3 and March 10, represents a sweeping assault on the constitutional barriers that still stand in the way of a fascist state in our country. These last Mondays should have buried any illusions that may have lingered that the "sacred precincts" of the Supreme Court stand as a bulwark of our civil liberties. For the people who still believe that the courts stand above classes, evenhandedly balancing the scales of justice, the Supreme Court majority of Vinson, Reed, Clark, Minton, Jackson, and Burton has, through these far-reaching decisions, demonstrated that it serves, not as a "check and balance," but as a *unique and power-*

*ful instrument of pro-fascist reaction.*

In these two weeks the Court has struck a mortal blow at academic freedom in the Feinberg decision; it has sanctified the indiscriminate use of the "guilt by association test," and it has prepared the way for a far more sweeping indoctrination of the young generation with pro-war and anti-democratic ideas. It has seriously jeopardized the fundamental right of counsel, guaranteed by the Sixth Amendment, and has opened the floodgates for the prosecution, disbarment and jailing of all courageous attorneys who have defended and stand ready to defend persons accused of political offenses, that is, persons fighting for peace and democratic liberties. It has decreed that the Constitution no longer applies to non-citizens. It approves in advance such sinister legislation as the McCarran-Walter Bill, now pending in Congress, which goes far beyond the Alien Registration Act of 1940 or the immigration sections of the McCarran Act of 1950. This measure has been branded by Harry N. Rosenfield, head of the government's refugee program, as "America's Nuremberg Law." It has abolished the right of bail in deportation cases and thus strikes a most dangerous blow at one of our most cherished democratic safeguards that affects citizens and non-citizens.

#### CLASS ROLE OF THE SUPREME COURT

It only blurs the issue to view

these de  
gressive  
retreat  
a tende  
under t  
The Su  
knuckli  
privy to  
cies of  
war tha  
Like  
which i  
is an in  
and its  
tion's h  
that rel  
eral ali  
vailing  
Suprem  
abandon  
tional l  
savage  
sonians  
democr  
ruled b  
was the  
War da  
Scott d  
had righ  
respect.  
which i  
velopme  
ment i  
stood ju  
monopo  
timize  
famous  
Durin  
Admini  
lar mov  
to seek

these decisions, as have certain progressive editors, as a "melancholy retreat" by the Supreme Court, or as a tendency on its part to "knuckle under to the hysteria of the times." The Supreme Court majority is *not* knuckling under to hysteria. It is privy to it, and to the bipartisan policies of reaction, fascism and atomic war that create it.

Like the entire state apparatus of which it is a part, the Supreme Court is an instrument of the ruling class, and its decisions throughout our nation's history bear the imprint of that relationship, as well as the general alignment of class forces prevailing at each period. It was the Supreme Court in the 1790's which abandoned all pretense of constitutional law and "impartiality" in its savage efforts to prevent Jeffersonians from restoring bourgeois-democratic rule to a United States ruled by alien-and-sedition bills. It was the Supreme Court in pre-Civil War days which produced the Dred Scott decision ruling that no Negro had rights a white man was bound to respect. It was the Supreme Court which in the period of the early development of a militant labor movement in the United States calmly stood justice on its head and applied monopoly-curbing legislation to victimize labor, and gave us the infamous Danbury Hatters decision.

During the Franklin D. Roosevelt Administration, when a rising popular movement forced the ruling class to seek new methods of dealing with

the growing crisis of bourgeois rule, the Supreme Court was its instrument and its decisions, upholding the Wagner Act, where it had previously ruled against Section 7A of the N.R.A., and other New Deal measures, and where it ruled favorably in the Schneiderman case, reflected the existing class alignments in the country at that time.

Today, the Supreme Court is headed by a Truman majority, a Wall Street majority. It serves *with* Congress and the Executive to advance the process of fascization of the state apparatus and to quicken its tempo. To accomplish this purpose, the majority reverses previous rulings, crudely scraps constitutional precedent and makes a mockery of the body of literature which has been called "constitutional law." Not only that, but individual Justices blandly reverse their own earlier findings.

Associate Justice Hugo Black put his finger on this interpretation of justice in his dissent in the bail case. "This is a Communist case and I suppose as long as you throw that one word in, everything may be all right," he wrote, adding: "But I have an idea that the liberty of every American is at stake. As long as I am here, I shall protest against every encroachment like this."

It was Mr. Justice Robert H. Jackson who rendered the majority opinion in the lawyers' case and in the deportation cases of Harisiades, Coleman, and Mascetti. It was Mr. Justice Jackson who also, on May 8, 1950,

in his concurring opinion in the Taft-Hartley case, said that the political oath under 9-H would be unconstitutional if it applied to Republicans, Democrats or Socialists. He professed to find it constitutional because it applies "only" to Communists. And it was the same Mr. Justice Jackson who, as prosecutor of the Nazi war criminals in Nuremberg, revealed the terrible consequences that resulted from the acceptance of these fascist lies about the Communist Party. Thus, the Nuremberg prosecutor actually discards his own findings because they are now in conflict with the pro-war policy of monopoly capital.

The tragic experience, the never-to-be-forgotten experience of Nazi Germany, begins to repeat itself in our country in the rulings of the highest tribunal, supposedly dedicated to the task of safeguarding our democratic institutions.

#### MASS ACTION CAN HALT FASCISM

These decisions make it compellingly clear that the Bill of Rights is in the gravest danger in history. They shout from the housetops that the Supreme Court, far from serving as a defender of the Constitution, serves to accelerate monopoly's drive toward fascist rule and war.

But these decisions, drastic and sweeping as they are, cannot be held proof of the inevitability of fascism in the United States. They prove quite simply that Americans cannot

rely on the Supreme Court for defense of the people's hard-gained rights and liberties. This is the profound lesson which must now be quickly brought home to millions. The inimitable Mr. Dooley once said that the Supreme Court follows the elections. That was not merely wit, but a penetrating observation. The highest tribunal, while an instrument of the ruling class, like that class itself, can be influenced by that powerful agent—mass action, popular initiative.

"They have rights who dare maintain them." This was the creed of James Russell Lowell. It is a creed that runs deep among the American people. It was the movement of the people that nullified the Alien and Sedition Laws of the 1790's and the Fugitive Slave Law of the 1830's. It was the militant unified movement of the people that intervened and forced the Court to reverse itself in the case of the Scottsboro Boys and Tom Mooney. It will take more than the "diktat" of the Supreme Court to institute fascism. It will take more than the combined action of Congress with its enabling acts and the Supreme Court with its judicial sanctions, to accomplish the dissolution of the trade unions and the organizations of the workers, the Negro people, and the democratic-minded masses.

#### MAIN POLITICAL CURRENTS

There is another fundamental consideration that bears on the question

of how  
sult of  
Court.  
reflect,  
main t  
can po  
grave i  
in acco  
though  
of the  
ments  
to defe  
gets an  
fascists  
are cle  
year ag  
trend:  
port of  
and de  
ment,  
accum  
actions  
its ons  
directly  
san wa  
sociate  
the Ne  
Hen  
made  
decisi  
the rea  
the go  
signed  
month  
sides t  
satisfac  
and its  
At the  
Smith  
McGra  
"they

of how imminent fascism is as a result of the actions of the Supreme Court. Do these decisions accurately reflect, or do they conflict with the main trends and currents in American political life today? It would be grave indeed if these decisions were in accord with the main currents of thought and action of the majority of the people. Whatever the sentiments of the people are with respect to defending reaction's *present* targets among the Communists, anti-fascists, peace fighters, etc.—and they are clearly more favorable than a year ago—the fact is that the growing trend among the people is not support of, but *opposition* to, the foreign and domestic policies of the government, as well as opposition to the accumulating acts of repression. The actions of the Supreme Court and its onslaught on civil liberties are directly associated with the bi-partisan war drive. They are directly associated with the attack on labor and the Negro people.

Hence, no basic estimate can be made of the popular reaction to these decisions, except as they also reflect the reaction to the main policies of the government which they are designed to advance. In the past six months, signs have multiplied on all sides that reveal moods of deep dissatisfaction with the war program and its economic and social effects. At the time of the second round of Smith Act arrests, Attorney General McGrath declared that it was because "they opposed the war in Korea."

Now the Gallup poll discloses that 56 per cent of the people consider the war in Korea useless and want an end to it. Seventy per cent of the people in a subsequent poll voiced their desire for a Five-Power Peace Pact. The government recently suffered a major setback to its war plans with the defeat of U.M.T., an event which reveals how strongly the people feel about the issues of rearmament, militarization and war.

Everywhere, on every vital issue, the cost of living, tax burdens, unemployment, wage freeze, the Florida murders, anti-Semitism, corruption, attacks on civil liberties and academic freedom—there is angry expression, resentment, militant action. Ofttimes, reactions are confused, struggles are short-lived, bound as they still are within the framework of the two-party system, and lacking the cohesion and direction of an organized people's coalition; but it is a swelling tide of protest against the hardships of life and against the policies of the government that are responsible. These sentiments are augmented tenfold and have acquired a bitter edge in the light of the daily revelations of the most sordid graft and corruption in every stratum of the government and ruling-class politics.

Who can doubt the impact of this issue or fail to see how it is merging with all other issues and creating an elementary revulsion among the masses to the *system as a whole*? Kefauver wallops Truman in the

New Hampshire primaries of the Democratic Party. Kefauver apologizes, he scrapes and bows, he concedes defeat in advance and then plays down the victory; *but the people made a choice*, not for Kefauver, but against Truman. Who can separate one issue from the other except to say that the issue of corruption was the straw that broke the camel's back?

The temper of the Supreme Court does not coincide with the temper of the people. It does not reflect the existence of majority support for the main bipartisan imperialist interests and policies it serves. The opposite is true. The people are moving against these policies and with increasing awareness and understanding of the basic issues involved. It is the dissenting minority in the Supreme Court, the Douglas-Black minority, that more truly reflects the democratic aspirations of the people. It is the courageous and principled stand of Douglas and Black that represents a genuine bulwark of democracy, not only within the Supreme Court itself, but in the broad market-place of public opinion, where the issues are being fought and debated by the people. These are not voices lost in the wilderness. Just as the reactionary Supreme Court majority reflects, not the strength, but the weakness of the ruling class and its growing desperation, so does the minority reflect, not the isolation, but the growing strength of the people's struggle for peace and democracy.

Reaction has gained additional pre-

cious ground. There is no doubt of it. The struggle, however, must continue with new vigor. The pro-fascist character of these actions of the Supreme Court will stimulate broader and more effective opposition. It will impart new meaning to the words of Henry David Thoreau, quoted by Eugene Dennis when he was sentenced for "contempt" of the House Un-American Committee: "They are the lovers of law and order who uphold the law when the government breaks it." The resistance to the attacks on civil rights is already widespread. The movement for nullification and repeal of the Smith Act and the McCarran Act is stronger and more embracing than a year ago. The fight on the economic front and for Negro rights above all reveals the emergence of new currents of unity that can draw the broad masses into active struggle, in spite of the opposition and divisive policies of the reformist and Social-Democratic leaders of the unions and mass organizations.

#### TASKS

The Communist Party must redouble its efforts on two fronts—on the one hand, to overcome passive or defeatist moods that may have been instilled in the labor and the progressive movements as a result of these new blows; on the other hand, to use these lessons to prove to the broad masses that *their* interests are vitally affected. The danger of fascism exists, not for one small section

of the  
This t  
respon  
tance.  
fective  
the w  
level  
for un  
its cla  
ties st  
ond r  
strugg  
the st  
and s

of the nation, but for the nation itself. This two-sided struggle is a *vanguard* responsibility of the greatest importance. It will be exercised most effectively, not by exhortation, but by the way in which the Party at every level develops the greatest initiative for united action in the struggle of its class and people. The civil-liberties struggle now focuses on the second round of Smith Act cases. This struggle, however, is inseparable from the struggles that must be unfolded and strengthened for peace, Negro

equality and the economic needs of the workers. The Party can, in the development of these movements, help give shape and form to the organization of a powerful people's anti-war and anti-fascist coalition.

The Supreme Court will not have the last word. *The people must and will take up the challenge.* Let March 3 and March 10 live as days that inspired a new, more united and victorious struggle for democracy and world peace.

# Mr. I. F. Stone and the Negro Question

By Charles P. Mann

LIKE EVERY DECENT-MINDED person, the *N. Y. Compass'* conscientiously progressive columnist, Mr. I. F. Stone, was angered and shocked by the enormity of the Florida "justice" which prepares the legal lynching of Walter Lee Irvin—an innocent Negro youth, already lynch-maimed—just after the murder of the N.A.A.C.P. leaders, Mr. and Mrs. Harry T. Moore. Under this stimulus, Mr. Stone tells us, he set down his uninhibited thoughts on the Negro question. Mr. Stone forewarned his readers that he would express himself "ignorantly, brashly, and presumptuously." This is indeed an unfortunate preparation for so serious a task as the consideration of such a matter as the destiny of the fifteen million Negro people in the United States, whose fate is indissolubly linked with that of the entire American population. That his article, "Who Will Free The Negroes?" in the *Compass* of February 17, 1952, evidences in truth a full measure of "ignorance, brashness and presumptuousness," on the author's part does not, however, eliminate its importance.

The significance of Stone's article lies in the fact that he has brought together and expressed in abbreviated form, in the space of a single column, at once: (1) elements of the highest level of consciousness on the Negro question thus far obtaining among non-Marxist liberals (Negro and white), as well as (2) the principal wrong policies, the chief ideological and tactical errors presently discernible in the movement for Negro emancipation from oppression. In addition, Mr. Stone, in the article as a whole, applies a peculiar exceptionalism to the Negro people in the United States in regard to social action, as though they were merely an undifferentiated, oppressed mass, unstratified by class division, and in some mysterious way capable of moving "Right," "Left," or "Center" at the command of a leader-agency. No, Mr. Stone, Negro society is not so uncomplicated! Unity has to be forged in struggle (external and internal)! The leaders will secure their authority and win command of the allegiance of the Negro masses in conflict and struggle with false leaders and wrong

policies. Moreover, their effectiveness as leaders will depend on the correctness of their program, and the energy and ability they display in organizing the masses to struggle for their aims. Is this not the outlook in regard to the presently split labor movement currently saddled with a corrupt and imperialist-minded leadership? Is this not the outlook in respect to the peaceful and progressive aspirations of the bulk of the American people now so shamelessly betrayed by the jingoism and demagoguery of the Truman-Dulles-Eisenhower axis?

But, let us start from the beginning and deal with the main content in Mr. Stone's article. We find, first of all, certain things in Mr. Stone's article which are to be welcomed.

\* \* \*

1. Mr. Stone has awakened to a certain recognition of the objective fact of the national character of the status of the Negro people in the United States, and that consequently the *mass character* of their oppression is akin to that of a colonially oppressed people in the clutches of an imperialist power. We say a "certain" recognition advisedly, for Mr. Stone's understanding of the national status of the Negro people in the United States is limited because he fails to locate geographically that nation. This is all-important, because a people who have no common territorial

land-base upon which, in the course of time, there have developed the remaining essential national attributes, namely, common language, common culture and common economic life—*i.e.*, class differentiation, allowing for production and exchange of produce, goods, and services — plus a psychological affinity growing out of a common historical development and experience, is not a nation. When Mr. Stone states that "the Negro is a submerged nation . . ." he is correct, but he does not tell us why. The Negro people in the United States are nationally oppressed. The submerged *nation* is located in the Black Belt, where five million Negroes constitute today a majority of the population of a contiguous stretch of territory (recorded in county units) forming a crescent moon shaped pattern through at least five Southeastern states, with port outlets at Charleston on the Atlantic and Mobile on the Gulf, encompassing the bulk of Mississippi, and a good section of South Carolina, Georgia and Alabama. In the immediately surrounding area of this *physical, material, heart-land base* of the Negro nation, another five million Negroes live in Southern states under analogous political and social conditions of disfranchisement, terror and economic degradation. Another five million Negroes, suffering under varying degrees of discrimination and exploitation, largely inhabit ghettos in several big Northern metro-

politan centers, New York, Chicago, Detroit, etc. The large Negro national minorities in the Northern cities are linked to the subject Negro nation in the South by many ties of common aspiration and common bondage. The struggle of the Northern Negroes to batter down the walls of the ghettos and toward attaining "equal acceptance in all places and equal rights in all things" gives leverage and inspiration to the epic struggle of the *Negro mass* in the Southern national homeland to wage its own many-sided *political* struggle toward achieving varying degrees and forms of state power and control of the land and resources, industry and institutions in the Negro nation's home territory. Correspondingly, every move toward political self-determination of the Negro nation on its "home grounds" brings closer the day when the Negroes outside of the South will be enabled to walk from their ghettos with the dignity and confidence of people whose kinsmen are the ruling power in a respected homeland.

To fail to define the physical location of the nation serves to resurrect Otto Bauer's idiocy of a nation being simply a cultural linkage of common ethnic units. The religious obscurantists and the racialists, not only the Bundists in old Poland and Russia, relied on the slogan of "cultural autonomy" (cheap! it cost the ruling tyranny no land!); Catholicism, Zionism, Moslemism, Hinduism, Aryanism, all utilize "cultural auton-

omy" for their reactionary ends. Therefore, the formulation of the status of the Negro in the United States as being "a nation within a nation," though indicative of a step forward in the development of Mr. Stone's understanding of the Negroes' status, is neither scientifically accurate nor sufficient as a popular presentation of the question.

2. Mr. Stone has more than once written admiringly of the development of the Anglo-Saxon juridical system. Now, looking upon the attempted legal lynching of Walter Lee Irvin, and back over the whole 300-year history of the Negro in the United States, he comes to the conclusion that American law is, as far as the Negro is concerned, but the codification of an all-pervading white supremacist doctrine and practice, a white chauvinism that is as organic a part of the vaunted Americanism of our national ego as any other of its "living traditions." He despairs of the "sterile" legal process ever grinding out justice to free the Negro. "In any community," Mr. Stone writes, "the law is fundamentally the law of the dominant race or class. America's law is white man's law." We would add the word "rich" to "white man's law," and then hasten to agree with this thought of Mr. Stone. The law is not only designed to buttress the interest of the oppressor nation in its domination of the oppressed nation, but

most p  
the ev  
wealth  
pressu  
people,  
Ocala,  
illusion  
of the  
tect or  
this to  
aband  
as an a  
of stru  
Mr. St  
differ  
courts  
taking  
ing ev  
mock c  
3. In  
ifests  
"brutal  
of whi  
against  
States.  
that th  
suprem  
such w  
popula  
strata  
more  
for its  
people  
guilt a  
crime  
that a  
benefic  
and p  
pound  
ploitati

most particularly it is drawn to serve the even narrower interest of the wealthiest class segment of the oppressor nation. Indeed the Negro people, after Martinsville, Laurel, Ocala, and Cairo, can entertain few illusions about the "sterile legalisms" of the courts and the "law" to protect or secure their rights. But is this to say the Negro people should abandon the courts and the "law" as an arena (and at times a weapon) of struggle? We say, of course not! Mr. Stone does not make clear the difference between *reliance* upon the courts and the law as opposed to *taking advantage, tactically*, of utilizing even the jaundiced chambers of mock class-justice for the struggle.

3. In his article Mr. Stone manifests a shocked awareness of the "brutality, irrationality and savagery" of white chauvinist practices leveled against the Negroes in the United States. He is appalled at the evidence that this rampaging virus of white supremacy cannibalism has infected such widespread strata of the white population. He concludes that all strata of the white population share, more or less, a direct responsibility for its continuation; that all white people to some extent share in the guilt and are a party to the genocidal crime against the Negro nation; that actively or passively, they are beneficiaries, recipients of material and psychological privileges compounded out of the misery, exploitation and indignities heaped

upon the Negro masses. Says Stone, "... every white man to some degree benefits from cheap Negro labor, if not in his factory, then in his home." And, again, he declares: "The People' as white people are responsible for what happens to the Negro and should be allowed no scapegoats." And Stone states furthermore, that, "Like Armenians living among the Turks in the old days, or Jews in Hitler Germany, Negroes live in America among white people indoctrinated from childhood with hostile and hateful attitudes."

Unlike many liberals who are given to a simple-minded and deliberate minimizing of the gravity and danger of the cancer of anti-Negro racism to all sections of the white population, Mr. Stone sees with horror the breadth and scope of the white supremacy corruption that has so deeply imbedded itself in the consciousness and practices of so large a section of the white people in the United States and is warp and woof of the whole legal, governmental, cultural and economic structure. While appreciating the spirit, the "heat reaction" of Mr. Stone's "discovery" of the denseness of the fog of white chauvinism over the minds of millions in this country, we must point to the basic error of his contention that the toiling white masses have an economic stake in the perpetuation of the oppression of the Negro people. On the contrary, to paraphrase a famous ob-

servation of Karl Marx in reference to the English working class vis-à-vis Irish freedom, the abominations of the white American masses have a main source in the segregation, discrimination and oppression of the Negroes! That the economic and political beneficiary of the super-exploitation and national oppression of the Negro people is the white capitalist ruling class and not the white toiling masses should necessitate no documentation. The profits accruing from greater exploitation of the Negro masses is utilized to batten down the hatches of the whole working class and popular masses in their striving to expand their living standards and political liberties. As Lenin wrote, "a people which oppresses another cannot itself be free." The super-profit taken from the special robbery of the Negro people does not go into the white worker's wage envelope, but into the money bags of the bosses. The bosses in turn use part of this special increment from the Jim Crow exploitation of the Negro people to buy congressmen to rivet more Taft-Hartley laws, wage freezes, and other links in the chains which bind all labor—black and white—to capital's golden chariot. They also use portions of their super-profits to subsidize the K.K.K. and Dixiecrats. Still other portions are "invested" in tinselled crumbs of special privileges—material and psychological—to certain sections of the skilled white

workers and to a few Negro intellectuals—Mrs. Sampson, et al—whose role it is to divert the working masses, Negro and white, from the path of unity and solidarity: to prime the pump of the Jim crow system for generating ever more super-profits for the imperialists. Also, Mr. Stone overlooks the *fact* of the existence, of a not inconsiderable progressive wing within the labor movement which fights *consciously* for Negro-white unity and against the super-exploitation of the Negro workers.

However, the conclusion Mr. Stone arrives at from the cited "observations" is the most dangerous kind of defeatist nonsense. He concludes that "all white people" are incurably saturated with anti-Negro hatred and it is futile "drive" for the Negroes to orient their strategy for liberation on the possibility of effecting a fighting alliance with the white working masses. He scorns the possibility that the white masses are capable of understanding the economic and political necessity, in their own real self-interest, to give up the "privileges" of their anti-Negro prejudices and to join the struggle for Negro freedom. Here Mr. Stone surrounds the incarcerated Negro people of 15 million by an undifferentiated, united, solid, all-class mass of 135 million hate-hardened white people and bids the Negro to fight his way free! No, thanks, Mr. Stone; we must reject this "brash" (also provocative, irrespon-

sible  
nation  
posi  
comes  
count  
that  
ocide  
with  
Of  
is "  
people  
dealin  
his an  
qualif  
you h  
canno  
trick!  
Mr.  
role of  
of the  
social  
questi  
he has  
as def  
rights  
nomic  
Mr. S  
ability  
to a  
true  
the fig  
4. T  
fessed  
and  
strugg  
the d  
grams,  
for the  
tion m  
interes

sible and criminal!) invitation to national suicide. (A super-"Leftist" position pushed to the extreme always comes to coincide with its "Right" counterpart: the Dixiecrats demanded that Negroes "submit, *retreat* to genocide"; our author advises "to hell with allies, *advance* to genocide!")

Of course, Mr. Stone protests he is ". . . not suggesting that white people are irremediably bad in their dealing with Negroes . . ." but all his arguments belie this self-serving qualification. This is precisely what you have argued to establish and this cannot be escaped with a debater's trick!

Mr. Stone would hardly deny the role of consciousness and the capacity of the white masses to awaken to social action in respect to such vital questions before the people which he has—and continues to—champion as defense of peace and democratic rights and the advancement of economic security. Is it not strange that Mr. Stone is so defeatist about the ability of the white masses to awaken to a consciousness of where their true self-interest lies in respect to the fight for Negro freedom?

4. Though exhibiting a self-confessed ignorance of the ideological and organizational strivings and struggles within Negro life, toward the development of effective programs, forms, strategy and tactics for the ever-developing Negro liberation movement, Mr. Stone makes an interesting and noteworthy recom-

mendation, in his odd, "presumptuous," didactic, and admonitory way. We cite the following comments from his article:

"The Negro needs to think of himself for what he is—a separate nation—and to create for himself representative organs which can speak for the Nation within the broader framework of the U.S.A." And, again, he thinks ". . . the Negro needs a kind of representative assembly of his own, to which he can send men elected to represent the Negro communities of America, and through which he can make his demands for equality felt," as it were, a kind of "unofficial state-within-a-state which can speak and bargain for and make demands in the name of the Negro people." He adds, further, that it would be well if the Negro "fully recognizes the realities he is up against and organizes himself accordingly, not just as a minority or a colored American, but as a submerged and oppressed nation-within-a-nation, fighting for full emancipation."

In short, Mr. Stone urges Negroes in the United States to develop a national consciousness and give it material expression in a centralized united organization of a particular type. This is excellent advice and in one form or another is a long-standing aspiration ever alive in the hopes of masses of thoughtful Negroes. The question however, remains: How is such organizational

unity to be materialized? What are the obstacles to its realization that have to be overcome and how? On what programmatic basis is this unity to be fought for and forged? What shall be the limited and long-term strategic goals? What shall be its forms of struggle? What strata of the dominant white population will it rely on for support, strategic alliance, tactical agreements, temporary mutual-interest coalitions? How does the movement utilize the contradictions besetting American imperialism in the world arena by virtue of the growth of the camp of socialism, the national revolutions in the colonies, the expanding worldwide peace front, etc.?

Mr. Stone is either obscure, contradictory or silent on these vital questions. Neither national consciousness nor its matured reflection in a single, united all-class Negro movement of national liberation will come to pass spontaneously at the behest of a seer or philosopher (be he ever so wise); it has to be organized and fought for, and will finally emerge as a result of the overcoming of the ideological and tactical differences which have their base in the respective class divisions which exist within the Negro nation. It is exceptionalist sophistry to argue otherwise.

\* \* \*

We turn now to a particular examination of certain ideas expressed by Mr. Stone which, if not relent-

lessly combatted within and in respect to the Negro liberation movement, would constitute most dangerous retarding factors in its development.

What does Mr. Stone offer as to the strategy of altering the relation of forces in favor of the Negro people's freedom struggle? Nothing! On the contrary, he "alters" the relation of forces permanently in behalf of the despoilers of Negro freedom. Stone presents the white people of all classes as a solid phalanx arrayed in determined and eternal opposition to the liberation aspirations of the Negroes. According to Stone, ". . . to look for any kind of mass white support in the Negro's struggle for full emancipation is a waste of time" [our emphasis]. Because, says Stone, "White men in labor unions are on the whole no less ready to keep him in a subordinate position than are white employers. *To look to the labor movement for mass action in this situation is impatient daydreaming*" [our emphasis]. Furthermore, he contends, "If anything, in the South itself, the so-called 'common man' is far more brutal, irrational and savage in his attitude toward the Negro than the upper class. 'The people' sit on juries. 'The people' man the police forces. 'The people' make up the lynch mobs. . . ." From this he arrives at the conviction that "The Negro and his white friends [From the above remarks of Mr. Stone, one is a little startled to discover

that the  
friends  
nonsen  
that so  
Negro  
'of the  
mytho  
Here  
propos  
moven  
waste  
vancer  
ing a  
poor  
strata  
we ar  
of the  
Faulk  
alists  
nation  
ington  
Kinkl  
Is v  
condu  
worki  
union  
But th  
graspe  
ideolo  
stan's  
conflic  
cal an  
and a  
masse  
own s  
to sh  
dices  
order  
econo  
again

that the Negro still has "his white friends"! ] need to break away from nonsensical stereotypes which pretend that somehow what happens to the Negro in America is not the work 'of the people.' This is democratic mythology and ideological drivel."

Here we have the outlandish proposal that the Negro freedom movement should abandon as "a waste of time" any strategy of advancement based on forming a fighting alliance with white workers, poor farmers, or other oppressed strata of the white population. Here we are presented with a playback of the combined chorus of the Faulkners, of the Southern Regionalists and assorted Negro bourgeois nationalists from Booker T. Washington to Marcus Garvey and E. Kinkle Jones.

Is white chauvinist doctrine and conduct widespread among the white working masses and within the trade union movement? Of course it is! But the decisive factor that must be grasped is that this white supremacy ideology and shameful conduct *stands in open contradiction to, and conflicts with, the economic, political and cultural interests, necessities and aspirations of the white toiling masses.* Therefore, to advance their own self-interest, they are compelled to shed these anti-Negro prejudices in one area after another in order to defend and advance their economic and cultural interests against their capitalist ruling class

exploiters. Hence the *material basis for alliance* between the Negro people's movement for freedom and the working class movement for economic political and cultural progress is an objective reality, not "ideological drivel," as Mr. Stone scornfully asserts. *The big task of the enlightened "white friends"* and of the Negro people's leadership *is to bring this consciousness to the labor movement and popular masses* in order that the white working people will be enabled to take action on the basis of such understanding of the true situation.

Furthermore, Mr. Stone insists that the white working masses "are more brutal in their attitude toward the Negro than the upper class." In his endeavor to confront the struggling Negro people with a solid front of white antagonists, to make his arguments against the struggle for Negro-white unity, Mr. Stone dares not address himself to the question: Who, *today*, what class segment of the white population, controls the reins of almost total power and keeps the Negro people in subjection? Who, indeed, but the genteel lynchers of Wall Street and Washington who coin \$4.5 billion annually from the direct economic robbery of the Negro alone! (Are not Wall Street's "gentlemen," the Truman-MacArthur-Dulles camp, more guilty of the massacre of Korea's millions than the soldiers who have put the torch to the Korean nation?) Yes, we

rightly demand the death penalty for the lynchers, but we never forget or forgive the inspirers and organizers of the mob who are never found at the scene of the crime but observe all the social amenities of polite society in the Big House of the ruling class. Moreover, where Negro-white unity was achieved, as in the Abolitionist movement, during Reconstruction, in the Populist effort, in labor struggles, it has been with the white masses.

If the Negro people's movement hearkened to Mr. Stone's advice on this score it would lead to its isolation and destruction.

\* \* \*

Since Mr. Stone's main poisonous advice to Negroes referred to above, namely, "to cast off all considerations of effecting alliance with the working class movement and go it alone," is theoretically indefensible, we are prepared for his next amazing proposal, which amounts in fact to an ideological nihilism. Writes Mr. Stone: "Neither 19th century liberalism nor 20th century proletarianism is enough for the Negro. The conceptions of the brotherhood of man and the solidarity of labor are not adequate for his plight." All other peoples require social theory to give consciousness and direction to their social action in order to advance their cause of liberation and social progress. But for the Negro people Mr. Stone rejects the crystal-

lized experiences and most advanced thinking of the various peoples of the world, the product of over 2,000 years of the struggle of the oppressed against their oppressors. The absurdity of Mr. Stone's position is self-evident. One need only add that the Marxist-Leninist position on the national question has proven its vital and indispensable service to the strivings of enslaved nations to attain their national liberation in the past (China is the classic case in point) and continues to do so among every unfree country and people in the world. The Negro people, in the solution of its problem of national liberation, precisely because of singular obstacles in its path, needs, not less, but more of the enlightening wisdom of the Marxist-Leninist science of liberation. This science provides a tested compass and guide to correct action, fusing, as it does, theory with practice.

After isolating the Negroes from their only logical allies, depriving them of the aid of all known theories of progressive social change, Mr. Stone now tells them to march forth against the white multitudes and free themselves. "Who'll free the Negroes?" Mr. Stone asks rhetorically in half the title of his article and answers in the other half, "They must do it themselves." The great Negro leader of the Abolitionist movement, Frederick Douglass, some hundred years ago, formulated the rejoinder to Mr. Stone's

query  
way:  
himse  
strike  
the sa  
concep  
cessfu  
mover  
strateg  
liance  
up the  
ity fo  
overp  
garch  
No  
Stone  
on t  
charg  
tactic  
ously  
Stone  
exam  
the le  
move  
dation  
impos  
above  
Negro  
more  
taliat  
"hero  
decide  
the "  
gro n  
taneo  
woul  
Let u  
just  
down  
"T

query much better in the following way: "He who would be free must himself strike the first blow." To strike the first blow doesn't mean the same as "go it alone." The whole concept of Douglass' great and successful leadership of the Abolitionist movement was based on the central strategic importance of building alliances of the Negro slaves linking up their interests to those of a majority force of the American people to overpower the slavemasters' oligarchy.

Now, let us see what advice Mr. Stone has to offer his "Light Brigade" on the eve of its fated brave charge, in the way of battle plan and tactics. But without ridicule, seriously now, what suggestion has Mr. Stone offered in the article under examination in the field of tactics, to the leaders of the Negro liberation movement? His tactical recommendations follow logically from the impossible circumstances, treated above, in which he has placed the Negro movement. They are nothing more than the carrying out of retaliatory terrorist adventures by "hero-bands," individuals whose deeds, it is presumed, would ignite the "doleful" and "slumbering" Negro masses into some kind of spontaneous revolutionary upsurge which would carry the day for freedom. Let us quote Mr. Stone's "thought" just the way he "brashly" put it down:

"The most terrible blow struck

against the British in Palestine by the Jews was when the Irgunists whipped British officers in retaliation against the whipping of Irgunists. These blows resounded throughout the Middle East." And he adds: . . . "Why should Negroes permit a Negro to be killed by a sheriff or a cop without retaliating physically?"

Indeed, there are times and circumstances when physical self-defense is mandatory for individuals as well as entire communities when beset by would-be murderers and pogromists, and the whole history of the Negro people in this country is replete with innumerable courageous illustrations of this truth. But this has nothing to do with what Mr. Stone is suggesting. He is advocating that the Negro liberation movement should adopt terror (or counter-terror) as a tactical policy, a principle, a *basic technique of liberation*. Mr. Stone, who claims to be "anti-ideology" when it comes to the question of the Negroes' freedom fight, is here revealed as offering up to the Negroes the long since buried corpse of noxious anarchist "theory" as a tactical guide for the liberation movement! Here Mr. Stone adopts the pose familiar in the early stages of all revolutionary social movements: those impetuous young firebrands who envision themselves in heroic messianic postures, rolling back seas with their own two hands for the sheep-like masses, chasing history before them, etc. It is well to recall that those

impatient petty-bourgeois intellectuals; those cultists who go into ecstasies over every formless and directionless elemental explosion from the crowd; those clever inventors of short-cuts, of gimmicks to set the wheels of social change in motion, historically have succeeded only in destroying themselves, wrecking the organizational machinery and throwing back the purposeful, conscious movement of the genuine *social action of the masses* toward freedom. The doctrine of terror (or counter-terror) is as inevitably a companion piece of *bourgeois* nationalism as is its opposite number: capitulation and accommodation to the continuation of a modified domination by the imperialist oppressor. Objectively, both tendencies are in the service of the oppressor power. From Bakunin down, *the ideologists of terror tactics* ended up in the employ of the oppressor power. Just so today, *the practitioners of terror tactics*, Trotskyites, Totoists, and CID operatives are in the hire of the Wall Street general staff for world domination and plunder. We must be on guard against the siren songsters of terror tactics and anarchistic action, no matter how sweetly their melodies might touch sympathetic chords in some outraged hearts. We must recognize and dare characterize them for what they are — *agents provocateurs!* This is something for Mr. Stone to think about.

Mr. Stone's article is interlarded

with many more confused and contradictory statements and half-truths than we have here subjected to analysis and they will be apparent to the thoughtful reader. We would suggest to Mr. Stone that he do a great deal more serious study and examination and that he engage in somewhat more practical services in regard to the Negro freedom fight before rushing into print with another column full of "advice" to the Negro people's leaders.

\* \* \*

What do we see as the correct course of development of the Negro people's freedom fight? Briefly put, it is that the unity of the Negro people is being and will continue to be forged and create ever higher organizational forms, first of all, around the commonly acclaimed demands and aspirations voiced by all classes of the Negro people, namely, an end to disfranchisement and discrimination, for equal rights and opportunities. Subsequently, demands must be advanced of a more distinctly national character in the direction of national self-determination of the subject Negro nation, corresponding to the growth in the national consciousness of the Negro masses. The Negro liberation movement will strive to develop a stable alliance with the progressive labor movement and all other democratic strata of the white population; it will gain strength from, and in turn rely on,

the for  
anti-co  
Its t  
forms  
capabl  
readily  
any gi

the forces of peace, democracy and anti-colonialism in the world arena.

Its tactics will be based on all those forms of *mass* struggle familiar to, capable of being understood by, and readily entered into, by the *masses* at any given period. It must resolutely

combat and reject all "Left" adventurism and Right capitulationism in its own ranks and constantly strive to introduce higher levels of consciousness into the actions of the masses, bringing clarity and perspective to their struggles.

# The General Elections in India

By Ajoy Ghosh

*General Secretary, Communist Party of India*

THE GENERAL ELECTIONS in India, which began in the month of November, 1951, were over in most States by the end of January 1952. On February 2, a hastily summoned meeting of the Working Committee of the Congress, the party that has ruled India for the last five years, took place to "take stock of the situation." The nature of the discussions at the meeting and the conclusions reached were not revealed to the public; but everyone knew what was worrying the Congress leaders so much and why they had met.

Commenting on the "momentous" nature of the Working Committee meeting and the "fateful" decisions it had been called upon to take, the *Sunday Standard*, owned by the millionaire press-magnate Goenka, wrote editorially: "The Congress victories in Bombay and most other States have been more than offset, ideologically speaking, by the Communist successes in the South. . . . They constitute a formidable opposition in Hyderabad, Madras and Cochin-Travancore."

Warning against "complacency," the editorial proceeded to say: "Red victories are neither a fluke nor an

accident. . . . Congress failure to solve the fundamental problem of land is the indirect measure of Communist successes in the South."

The Political Correspondent of the *Statesman*, the organ of British Big Business in India, who interviewed the Congress leaders after the Working Committee meeting, wrote on February 3: ". . . few Congress leaders were inclined to under-rate the Communist successes in the South. Their anxious faces, as they emerged from today's discussion, confirmed this view." Three days earlier, Mr. Shanker Rao Deo, a Member of the Congress Working Committee, speaking at a public meeting, had referred to the "heavy losses suffered by the States of the South" and concluded on a sombre note: "The defeat of the Congress by the Communists constitutes a very serious danger to democracy."

Apprehension about the future of "democracy" was not confined to ruling circles in India alone. As early as January 14, when the Congress had already suffered a series of reverses in the States of Kerala (Cochin-Travancore), Hyderabad and Madras, Mr. Chester Bowles, the

Americ  
made  
course  
to the l  
Comm  
in Ind  
succeed  
Asia w  
and der  
victory  
racy fa  
South  
"Our  
clared,  
days la  
posed t  
thousan  
during  
grant, h  
Preside  
nomic  
which,  
same ki  
the Ch  
All th  
results  
in India  
of "inde  
of adul  
rude sh  
in India  
True,  
tured 2,  
22 State  
to be fil  
489 Par  
figures c  
loss in p  
Congres

American Ambassador in India, made a speech at Washington in the course of which he drew attention to the battle between "democracy and Communism" that was being fought in India and said: "If Democracy succeeds in India, the whole of South Asia will be buttressed very strongly and democracy will have won a great victory." "But," he added, "if democracy fails in India, the outlook in South Asia is very bleak indeed."

"Our stake is very great," he declared, "we must wake up." Two days later, Mr. Chester Bowles proposed that America should give one thousand million dollars to India during the next four years "on a half-grant, half-loan basis." On March 7, President Truman pleaded for "economic and technical aid" to India, which, according to him "faced the same kind of threat that overpowered the Chinese."

\* \* \*

All these facts go to show that the results of the first general elections in India, held after the achievement of "independence" and on the basis of adult franchise, have come as a rude shock to the Congress Party in India and to its friends abroad.

True, the Congress Party has captured 2,249 out of 3,278 seats in the 22 State Assemblies (5 seats have yet to be filled up) and 363 out of the 489 Parliamentary seats; but these figures convey little idea of the heavy loss in prestige and influence that the Congress has suffered since 1946

when it swept the polls. Of the 103 million votes cast out of a total electorate of 176 million, no more than 43 million (41.96 percent) were secured by the Congress. While the Congress won a majority of seats in 18 out of the 22 State Assemblies, it secured a majority of votes only in four small States—Delhi, Coorg, Saurashtra and Bhopal—whose combined population does not exceed 7.5 millions.

In its Election Manifesto, issued several months before the polling, the Communist Party stated that the Congress had lost the backing of the majority of the Indian people and was counting on the disunity of the forces opposed to it for victory.

The elections have conclusively proved the correctness of this analysis. It is obvious to all today that, but for the undemocratic electoral system which operates in India (no proportional representation), the Congress would have been reduced to a position of a minority in practically every State in the country. And this would have happened, despite the dice being heavily loaded in favor of the Congress.

For, it must be borne in mind by all, the elections were far from free and fair. Apart from the tremendous traditional prestige which the Congress enjoyed, the undoubted personal influence of Nehru and the almost unlimited resources which the Congress commanded, the entire administrative machinery was geared in the election campaign to ensure

success for the Congress. Intimidation of voters was practiced on a large scale. Muslim voters were openly threatened that they would face dire consequences if they did not vote for the Congress, corrupt practices like the buying up of votes and impersonation of voters were resorted to on a large scale, and there are strong reasons to believe that tampering with ballot boxes took place in many constituencies. Even electoral rolls had not been prepared honestly; millions of people, especially from the poorer classes, did not find their names on the rolls.

If despite all this, the Congress won only a minority of the votes, that shows the extent of disillusionment of the people and their hatred against the Congress.

It is not this alone, however, that has caused such serious concern to the Congress leaders and to their friends and patrons, the big monopolists and landlords. It is not this alone that prompted Mr. Chester Bowles to propose that one thousand million dollars should be given to India during the next four years "on a half-grant, half-loan basis."

Many in the Congress had anticipated that a large number of people would vote against the Congress and quite a few seats would be captured by the opposition—although the extent of the popular vote against the Congress came as a surprise even to them. What, however, they, as well as the reporters of Indian and foreign papers had expected was that the So-

cialist Party of India with which, according to Nehru, the Congress had "much in common," would emerge as the main rival to the Congress, canalising popular discontent into "safe" channels and playing the role of His Majesty's Opposition. Others, extreme reactionary circles in India—the Princes, landlords and interests allied to them—had expected parties of communal reaction—the Jana Sangha, Hindu Sabha, Ram Rajya Parishad, and Akali Party—to provide the main opposition to the Congress and shift the policies of the Government even more to the Right.

It was on the basis of these expectations that confident predictions had been made about the outcome of the elections.

The Communist Party and the United Fronts consisting of Communist Party and other progressive parties and elements, these circles declared, had no chances whatsoever in the elections. The Party was banned in Cochin-Travancore (Kerala) and Hyderabad and virtually banned in the States of Madras and Bengal till a short while before the elections. The Telengana area had been under police and military rule for over three years and almost all the leaders of the Party and 2,000 of the workers were either in prison or underground. Two hundred and fifty leaders and functionaries were in prison in Bengal under the Preventive Detention Act; in Punjab, most of the leaders of the Party were either in jail or

under  
pendi  
of the  
Rajes  
E.M.S.  
har R  
Barm  
others  
Comm  
peasa  
on fra  
many  
leased  
dates  
Party  
in pri  
Wh  
peopl  
tions  
Unite  
seats?

The  
lation  
munis  
candic  
ward  
the K  
seats  
in the  
and r  
Party.  
Party,  
the C  
Comm  
agreer  
consti  
local  
liamer  
sembl  
comm

underground; warrants of arrest were pending against the foremost leaders of the Party, like P. Sundarayya, Rajeshwar Rao, Vasava Punniiah, E.M.S. Namboodripad, Chandrasekhar Rao, Srinivas Rao, Dasrath Deb Barman, Baba Gurmukh Singh, and others. Besides these, hundreds of Communists and trade-union and peasant leaders had been imprisoned on frame-up charges of all kinds in many States and had not been released on bail. Several of the candidates put up by the Communist Party and the United Front were in prison or underground.

What chances were there, many people thought, under such conditions for the Communists and the United Front to win more than a few seats?

\* \* \*

The elections upset all these calculations. Against heavy odds, the Communist Party and the United Front candidates (which included the Forward Bloc—Marxist—in Bengal and the Kamgar Kison Party) won 37 seats in the Parliament and 234 seats in the State Assemblies, as against 12 and 126 seats won by the Socialist Party. The Krishak Mazdoor Praja Party, which had broken away from the Congress and with which the Communist Party had United Front agreements in Malabar and in several constituencies in Madras State on a local basis, won 10 seats in the Parliament and 78 seats in the State Assemblies. Parties of Hindu and Sikh communal reaction led by the Princes,

feudal landlords, won 14 seats in the Parliament and 119 seats in the State Assemblies, scoring their heaviest successes in the States of Rapasthan, Madhya Bharat and Pepsu, where the Congress policy of appeasement of feudal interests had enabled them to consolidate and strengthen their position.

The Communist Party and the United Front consisting of Communists and other Left Parties and elements have emerged as a powerful factor in Indian politics, as the main opposition to the Congress. Left Socialists, led by Aruna Asaf Ali, cooperated wholeheartedly with the Party in bringing about these successes.

In many areas, especially in the States of Madras, Cochin-Travancore, Bengal and Tripura, the elections grew into something far more than mere casting of votes in the ballot box. They grew into a mighty mass movement for the agrarian reform, for adequate rations, for a living wage, for civil liberties, for the formation of national States—a movement that drew into its vortex millions of workers, peasants, artisans, agricultural laborers and the middle classes.

Scenes reminiscent of the mighty upsurge of the post-war years were witnessed in many parts of the country—with this striking difference, that the flags which waved over the vast gatherings were the Red Flag and flags of parties in the United Front and the slogans which rent the air were slogans against the Con-

gress and its Government. Accumulated hatred of five years of Congress misrule burst out into a mighty torrent which grew in volume and momentum as news poured in of defeats of Congress leaders and Ministers who had incurred special wrath of the people.

Never were the slogans of the Party and the United Front so popular, never the urge for unity so strong, never the desire to establish a People's Government so widespread.

Masses of the people, especially the poorer classes who have come to regard the Communist Party as their own Party, men, women, and even children, displayed initiative, the like of which has never been seen before, enabling the Party and the United Front to overcome difficulties of cadres, organization and finance, difficulties that the Congress leaders thought insurmountable. The masses were active organizers of and participants in the movement that developed as the polling day drew nearer. Braving intimidation, they marched to the polling booths in thousands like soldiers marching to the battle-field. Their orderliness and discipline evoked admiration even from correspondents of bourgeois newspapers, all of whom have noted the significant fact that it is among the poorest classes that the highest percentage went to the polls.

It was in the areas where the Party and the United Front were the strongest that the polling was the

heaviest—a striking feature being the part played by women. They had seen their children starve and their husbands and brothers impoverished and jobless, thanks to the policies of the Government; they had suffered indignities at the hands of the Congress police; they had witnessed the jailing and shooting of their bravest sons.

In the State of Tripura, the Communist Party won both the Parliamentary seats, while 19 out of 30 seats in the Electoral College were won by Communists and the United Front.

In Telengana, the scene of mighty peasant battles and brutal Government violence, the Democratic Front won the majority of seats (37 out of the 46 it contested), sweeping the polls in the districts of Nalgonda and Warangal. Ravi Narayan Reddy, the Communist leader, polled over three hundred thousand votes in the Parliamentary constituency of Nalgonda, securing 78 percent of the votes polled. It should be noted that this was the highest poll recorded by any candidate in India, even Premier Nehru securing no more than 64 percent of the votes in his home constituency of Allahabad.

Winning 78 seats in the Telugu speaking areas—Andhra, parts of Madras State and Telengana — out of 108 contested the Communist Party has emerged as the most powerful Party among the Andhra people, who number over 30 millions—firmly entrenched in the agricultural work-

ers and  
signific  
ers a  
well. A  
areas  
core, v  
battles  
Comm  
Front  
force.  
Assem  
ing th  
in all—  
opposi  
gal. S  
won in  
The  
prestig  
have s  
Those  
party  
been s  
be defe  
ness o  
It is  
est sh  
India  
that t  
than e  
in an  
streng  
ment,  
most  
and c  
establ  
regim  
they  
thous  
five y  
had f  
—it i

ers and poor peasants and making significant headway among the workers and the toiling intelligentsia as well. Also in the Malayalee-speaking areas of Malabar, Cochin-Travancore, which witnessed the immortal battles of Pannapra and Vayalar, the Communist Party and the United Front have emerged as the major force. With 29 seats in the Bengal Assembly, the United Front, including the Forward Bloc, won 45 seats in all—the Party constitutes the main opposition to the Congress in Bengal. Significant successes were also won in Punjab, Pepsu and Orissa.

These victories have raised the prestige of the Party immensely and have strengthened the United Front. Those who slandered the Party as a party of murderers and bandits have been silenced. That the Congress can be defeated has become the consciousness of the people.

It is this which has given the rudest shock to reactionary circles in India and abroad. They see today that the Party has become stronger than ever. They see that it is precisely in areas where, because of the strength of the democratic movement, the Government launched the most savage attack against the Party and democratic forces, where they established a military and police regime of utmost ferocity, where they shot down and jailed tens of thousands in the course of the last five years, where they thought they had finished the Communist Party—it is precisely in these areas that

the ruling circles have suffered the heaviest reverses and the Party and the United Front have scored the most resounding victories. The Government offensive against the Party, it is obvious to the blindest today, has failed. By its self-sacrificing championship of their cause, the Party has won the love, admiration and support of the people. The influence of the Party today is greater than ever before; there has been a big swing towards the Party in recent weeks.

Belatedly, the *Congress Sandesh*, published by the Congress Central Publicity Board, wrote about the "Spectacular Communist and near-Communist successes in the Cochin-Travancore elections, which have come as an eye-opener," about "the Communists having made good the boast that Telengana was behind them," about the "unwise policy of repression and police excesses" which led to "Congress defeats in Andhara." Belatedly, the pro-Congress newspapers made the discovery that the "Congress failure to solve the fundamental problem of land" had alienated the peasant masses who had once voted the Congress to power. Belatedly, the "foreign experts" and the informants of the USIS sent dispatches about the "menace to democracy" in India.

The elections have struck a heavy blow at the plans of the Anglo-American imperialists who had linked themselves with the most reactionary circles in India and were

striving to drag India into the war camp. The elections revealed the profound sympathy of the Indian people for the Soviet Union and China, their desire to establish ties of close friendship with the democratic countries, their hatred for the Anglo-American aggressors who are drowning the struggles of the colonial peoples in blood. The epoch-making victories of the Chinese people have been one of the most powerful factors in making the Indian people conscious of the need to establish a People's Government to solve the problems facing them.

\* \* \*

The failure of the Congress, which only a few years ago enjoyed unrivalled prestige and influence among the Indian people, to secure more than 52 per cent of the votes, shows the profound changes that have taken place in the Indian scene during the last five years. The utterly sham nature of the "independence" that India has won as the result of the Mountbatten Award is becoming increasingly clear to the masses. The Congress Party stands exposed as a party of monopolists and landlords, as a party that is striving to perpetuate the regime of starvation and madness, as a party which increasingly relies on batons and bullets to maintain itself in power. It can be safely asserted that seldom in history has a party with such mass influence been so discredited in such a short period.

The debacle of the Socialist Party, whose leaders had confidently predicted that they would capture at least 800 seats in the State Assemblies (out of 1800 contested) and 100 seats in the Parliament (out of 255 contested) and some of whom were looking forward to the formation of Socialist and Congress-Socialist Coalition governments, signifies decisive rejection by the people of the Right-wing Socialist policy of sabotage of mass struggles, refusal to forge democratic unity and violent hostility towards the Soviet Union, People's China and other democratic countries. The debacle has been so complete that a profound crisis has developed in the Socialist Party and there have been resignations from the Party in many areas. Cold figures show that in a number of States, the Congress could have been routed and democratic Governments established, but for the disunity of the democratic forces—disunity brought about mainly by the tactics of the Socialist Party leaders. Though themselves defeated, the Socialist leaders can, therefore, feel satisfied that they have ensured victory for the Congress in most of the States.

The Socialist leaders, however, have learned nothing. In two States—Madras and Cochin-Travancore—where the Congress has been decisively defeated, securing only 152 out of 375 and 44 out of 108 seats respectively, the Socialist Party has stubbornly refused to join hands with the Communists and other pro-

gressiv  
ermme  
they  
nor  
United  
parent  
as well  
this sh  
helping  
rule of  
In th  
Party,  
give  
parties  
grown  
ample  
dras a  
Congr  
unity  
lead to  
Gover  
The  
no lon  
the m  
Comm  
in the  
democ  
challe  
—this  
broad  
parties  
countr  
that st  
On  
electe  
sembl  
the fo  
in the  
laid d  
ciples  
Demo

gressive parties to form popular governments. They have declared that they will join "neither the Congress nor the Communist-sponsored United Democratic Front"—a transparent piece of hypocrisy; for they as well as the people know that by this sham neutrality, they are only helping the Congress to impose its rule on the people.

In the rank and file of the Socialist Party, as well as among the progressive elements in all democratic parties, the desire for unity has grown immensely strong. The example of Cochin-Travancore, Madras and Tripura has shown that the Congress can be defeated and that unity of the democratic forces can lead to the establishment of popular Government.

The revelation that the Congress no longer enjoys the confidence of the majority of our people, that the Communist Party is a major force in the country, that United Front of democratic forces alone can seriously challenge and defeat the Congress—this has created the basis for a broad United Front of progressive parties and elements, that want our country to be free and independent, that stand for democratic reforms.

On February 12, a meeting of 165 elected members of the Madras Assembly took place to take steps for the formation of a popular Ministry in the Madras State. This meeting laid down the objectives and principles which would guide the United Democratic Front if it succeeded in

forming a Ministry.

Congress leaders know well that the formation of a non-Congress democratic Ministry even in a single State, no matter how modest its program, would be fatal for the Congress, not merely in the particular State, but in the country as a whole. With their own eyes, the people would see the difference between the Congress and the United Democratic Front in action. They would see that the prevalent hunger and nakedness are not due to "natural calamities" but to the pro-landlord and monopolist policies of the Congress Government. They would see that blackmarketeering can be suppressed, civil liberties restored and people's standard of life raised if the real representatives of the people take over power. Such a "dangerous" development would spell the end of the Congress even in areas where it still has considerable following.

Congress leaders are, therefore, determined to install their own Government even in States where the electorate has decisively rejected them. They have launched a whisper campaign that severe repression against the Communist Party is imminent and that those who join hands with the Communists would be jeopardizing their own safety. They are spreading the lie that Communists are loyal, not to their own country, but to "Russia and China" and would, therefore, "sell India." They are raising the bogey that Communists would "swallow" the

other parties in the United Front and establish their own dictatorship. And they are praising Mr. Jai Prakash Narayan and the other Socialist leaders for refusal to have any truck with the Communists or with any United Front that includes the Communists. Feverish efforts are being made to form a united anti-Communist Front.

Together with this, Congress is striving to buy over the independents and other parties which opposed and defeated the Congress at the polls, in order to form Ministries in States where it does not command a majority in the Assembly. It has come down from the high pedestal and has declared that it is prepared to form Coalition Ministries "where necessary."

This, however, is not all. In Bengal, where the Congress secured only 38 per cent of the votes but won a majority of seats, thanks to the disunity of the Left forces, the end of the elections saw a fresh terror drive against the Communist Party. Several Communist candidates released on parole to enable them to participate in the elections were re-arrested immediately after the elections were over. Among them were leaders of the Party in Bengal like Bhupesh Gupta, Rabi Mitra and Bejoy Modak, three elected Members of the Bengal Assembly—Ranen Sen, Ganesh Ghosh and Bejoy Choudhary—and one Member of the Parliament, Tushar Chatterji. All these arrests were effected under the

notorious Preventive Detention Act, which empowers the Government to keep a person in prison as long as it desires without even the semblance of a trial.

On February 28, the Government of India extended the life of the Preventive Detention Act by another 6 months, on the plea that "the next 6 months would be a very testing and trying time for the country." This extension was sanctioned by the old Parliament, whose unrepresentative nature has been proved in the elections and many of whose members and Ministers have suffered crushing defeats at the polls.

Such was democracy of the Congress-brand in action!

These measures of the Government have been condemned by all progressive elements in India and a powerful movement is growing for the restoration of full civil liberties and the release of all political prisoners.

\* \* \*

Significant though the victories of the Communist Party and the United Front have been, they have also revealed serious weaknesses, which have to be overcome in order that the democratic movement may triumph over its enemies. Due to the disunity in the working class and the weakness of the trade-union movement, the Congress won the majority of seats in most of the big industrial centers of the country. The working class, occupying a vital position in our economy, has

to pla  
liberat  
the str  
movem  
in the  
lishme  
Party i  
of the  
us. Ar  
ing us  
base at  
pecially  
poor  
whom,  
Teleng  
been  
movem  
Furtl  
poorly  
the Sta  
and ro  
one sea  
and tw  
centre  
class m  
areas ar  
Bengal,  
consider  
wing S  
by Pri  
tionarie  
States I  
and M  
popular  
their o  
have str  
level of  
parts of  
when th  
when m  
develop

to play a key role in the national-liberation movement, and, therefore the strengthening of the trade-union movement, the healing of the split in the working class, and the establishment of the leadership of the Party in its own class constitute one of the most important tasks facing us. An equally important task facing us today is to strengthen our base among the peasant masses—especially agricultural workers and poor peasants, vast numbers of whom, except in areas of Andhara, Telengana, and Kerala, have not yet been drawn into the democratic movement.

Further, the Party polled very poorly and failed to win any seat in the States of Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and 10 other States, and won only one seat each in Assam and Mysore and two seats in Bombay, the oldest centre of the Party and the working-class movement in India. In these areas and in parts of the South and Bengal, the Congress still retains considerable hold, as do the Right-wing Socialists. Even parties formed by Princes and communalist reactionaries have been able, in several States like Crissa, Rajasthan, Pepsu and Madhya Bharat to utilise the popular discontent and strengthen their own position. The elections have strikingly revealed the uneven level of the movement in various parts of India. In the present period when the crisis is deepening rapidly, when mighty battles and tumultuous developments are ahead, when the

ruling classes, panicky at their reverses, are planning new attacks on the popular movement, the weakness of the Party in the greater part of the country constitutes a serious danger.

Also the tremendous radicalization of the masses that has taken place has yet to be consolidated and given concrete organizational form. Mass organization of workers, peasants, women, students and youth is still extremely weak. It is united mass organizations embracing all the anti-imperialist classes that alone can constitute a firm basis for United Front and defeat the attempt of the Government to weaken and destroy the popular movement. Such organizations have yet to be built and the United Front placed on a broad powerful basis. Without this, the United Front would be only a top alliance between the leaders of the constituent parties and not the organ of a developing mass movement.

A significant feature of the elections has been that it was in the areas of Telengana, Andhara, Malabar, Cochin-Travancore, Tripura and parts of Bengal where the Party and the United Front had entrenched themselves firmly among the basic masses of the people—workers, toiling peasants and agricultural laborers—there the victories were the most sweeping despite all efforts of the Congress and the Right-wing Socialists. The lesson, therefore, has to be learned anew today—the lesson that the Party and the United Front can be

come a decisive force in the country only on the granite foundation of firm support among the most oppressed and exploited masses. All democratic parties and elements that desire to fight for a popular Government have to be drawn into the struggle to build united mass organizations on the broadest basis.

The Peace movement also is lagging far behind the needs and possibilities of the situation and broad-based Peace Committee have yet to be formed drawing in the basic masses of the people—workers, peasants and the toiling intelligentsia.

The powerful swing among the broad masses to the Left, towards the Party and the United Front have placed immense political, organizational and educational tasks before the Party. It has made Party Members conscious more than ever before of the need to strengthen the Party, to combat all tendencies that weaken the Party, to raise the ideological-political level of the existing cadres and draw new cadres into the Party, to create educational as well as popular agitational literature on a mass scale, to take the

slogans of the Party among all sections of the people.

The elections have shown not only the extent of popular discontent against the Government. They have also shown what links the Party has forged with the masses in various parts of the country. They have been a tremendous education for us all.

Vast masses have reposed their trust in us; people all over the country are looking to us to build the United Front and lead them to victory; we must prove worthy of this trust and fulfill these expectations. Learning from the example of the immortal Party of Lenin and Stalin, learning from the history of the great Communist Party of China, we must not get dizzy with the modest successes we have won but redouble our efforts to develop the movement which will sweep away the present Government and ensure a life of happiness and prosperity for our people. Such are the lessons our Party has learned from the elections and the recent events in India.

(March 12, 1952)

AG

[On  
Wome  
lowing  
group  
their v  
Saw P

BEFOR  
of a n  
wome  
portun  
had gi  
place"  
We w  
would  
with t  
womar  
Lening  
the op  
the wo  
learn a  
new so

In S  
Kislov  
comm  
Comm  
talion  
fense o  
which  
buildin

\* Publi  
1951. 25  
was rende  
Lucas, M  
Clack, D  
Roberts.

# Women of the Soviets

## A Group Report

[On the occasion of International Women's Day we reprint the following chapter from the report of a group of nineteen Americans on their visit to the USSR, entitled *We Saw For Ourselves*\*—Editor.]

BEFORE OUR VISIT all of us had heard of a new freedom and equality for women in the Soviet Union, of opportunities and achievements that had given to the phrase "a woman's place" rich and positive meaning. We wondered what Soviet women would be like. Would there be losses with the gains, especially losses in womanliness? Our trip to Moscow, Leningrad, and Stalingrad gave us the opportunity to meet many of the women of the Soviets, and to learn about the role of women in this new socialist society. . . .

In Stalingrad we met Madame Kislova, a sturdy woman with a commanding presence, who as a Commissar for a Red Army Battalion participated in the heroic defense of the Stalingrad tractor plant which was fought for building by building, wall by wall, workbench

by workbench. At a banquet for our delegation in the Stalingrad Palace of Culture, Madame Kislova told us that the very room in which we were being feasted had been the scene of a pitched battle. The Nazis were able to capture only part of the Palace of Culture. Unable to advance any further and enraged at the resistance, they burned down that part which they held, bound two women defenders of Stalingrad whom they had captured and threw them into the flames.

Women played a large part in the notable victory at the Battle of Stalingrad. They served in fighting units; they worked at the important job of transporting supplies; and they took complete charge of the children who had been caught in the city by the surprise attack by the Nazis on that quiet Sunday, August 23, 1942.

Alexandra Cherkassova, childcare center worker of Stalingrad, started a reconstruction movement throughout the Soviet Union which today bears her name. Cherkassova's story is widely known in the U.S.S.R. and we heard of her in each city that we visited.

During the battle for Stalingrad, Sergeant Pavlov with a seven man

\* Published by *New World Review*, New York, 1951, 25c. The report embodied in this chapter was rendered by Mrs. Pauline Taylor, Mrs. Mollie Lucas, Mrs. Therese Robinson, Mrs. Jacqueline Clark, Dr. John A. Kingsbury, Prof. Holland Roberts.

reconnaissance unit drove the Nazis from a workers' apartment building and defended that building for fifty-seven days in the face of incessant bombing and shelling. After the Germans were driven back toward Berlin, this apartment house became known as "Pavlov's House" in honor of its heroic defender. Cherkassova determined to rebuild it and, although she knew nothing about reconstruction, organized other women of the city to do the job. Day after day, they devoted their free hours after their regular work to the voluntary labor of clearing away the rubble and rebuilding the house. Others began to emulate Cherkassova and her unit of women and the movement spread through Stalingrad. In this way much of the city was rebuilt and the idea spread to other sections of the Soviet Union—to Leningrad, Moscow, Kharkov, to all the areas that had been devastated by the Nazis. We were happy and proud to meet this noted woman and to bring back peace greetings from her to America.

Everywhere we went we met remarkable women, many of whom are mentioned elsewhere in this report. To us they were all outstanding women, but as we rapidly came to discover, they were not exceptional in the U.S.S.R., for the Soviets are creating a society with full freedom and equal rights for all women as a matter of course.

There are many more that we could tell about. For example, Val-

entina Orlikova, captain of the whaling ship "Storm," began as an ordinary seaman on a sailing vessel and worked her way up through the ranks. A woman of delicate beauty, Captain Orlikova has served on Soviet ships for more than ten years and has made a number of voyages around the world. During the war she came to the United States as a third mate and is well known to the San Franciscans in our delegation who met her at that time, as well as to many New Yorkers who met her when her ship docked there.

The life of Varvara Georgievskaya is a dramatic example of the contrast between conditions under the tsar and under the Soviets. Her youth was spent in tsarist Russia. As a schoolgirl she dreamed of some day becoming a physician, but, for the daughter of a poor village teacher, this dream was unrealizable. Varvara was twenty-five when the Revolution made higher education available to everyone, and she entered medical school at Moscow. A military surgeon during the second world war, she is today one of the leading surgeons in the Botkin Hospital and has published some twenty papers in medical journals. She participates in the many-sided life of the Moscow district in which her hospital is located and is a deputy to the District Soviet. In addition she keeps up with the latest literature and conducts a philosophical circle for physicians.

The contrast between two worlds was summed up by Evdokia Tur-

chanin  
U.S.S.R.  
when  
Region  
lived t  
life has  
has br  
people  
Soviet  
my lif  
the co  
my co  
declin  
to hav  
gether  
our co  
when  
border  
of the  
even o  
truste  
govern  
We  
the So  
energi  
becom  
ever b  
activit  
them  
in all  
of cu  
work.  
Alm  
tive p  
ment:  
lion a  
almos  
Supre  
public  
high  
the S

chaninova, People's Artist of the U.S.S.R., in her acceptance speech when she was elected a deputy to the Regional Soviet. She said: "I have lived two lives. And only my second life has been a genuine life, one that has brought me close to the great people of my native land, to my own Soviet Government. It has joined my life with the general interests, the common anxieties and joys of my country. And so, in spite of my declining years, I want to continue to have the possibility to work together with you for the benefit of our country. Tell me where and when could a woman beyond our borders, a woman from the midst of the people who has lived 80 years, even dream that she would be entrusted with honorable work in the government?"

We found that in the society which the Soviet people are building the energies and abilities of women have become a greater social force than ever before in history. No avenue of activity is barred to them. We found them taking their places beside men in all branches of production, and of cultural, scientific, and political work.

Almost a million women hold active positions in the Soviet government: approximately one-half million are members of local Soviets, almost 2,000 are members of the Supreme Soviets of autonomous republics, and 277 are members of the highest state authority in the land, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.

One-third of the judges of the supreme courts of the republic, one-half of the judges in regional and area courts, are women.

In the technical and scientific fields, the figures are just as impressive. There are 250,000 women engineers and technicians in the U.S.S.R., 100,000 physicians, 35,000 employed in scientific institutes and laboratories, and 1,800,000 working in the field of public education. In fact, 44 per cent of the specialists with higher education in the Soviet Union are women.

The millions of women who work in the factories and in transport total 40 per cent of all workers in the Soviet Union. At the Stalin Plant and in the Polygraphic Linotype Works women who have mastered the high skills required of the modern industrial worker are operating complex machines with ease and efficiency. Of hundreds of thousands of women in Leningrad we found that many hold posts as directors of factories, heads of brigades or shifts. During the war women took the places of men in the factories, mills, and mines, and a number of them fought in the ranks of the Soviet Army and the partisan units. Their employment in civilian positions did not terminate with the end of the war, unless they themselves wished it to, for it was not considered merely an emergency measure as in other countries. We found that in all positions, women received equal pay for equal work.

In agriculture, again we find hundreds of thousands of Soviet women working as agronomists, technicians, mechanics, chairmen of collective farms, and directors of machine and tractor stations, while more than 700,000 women are now drivers of tractors and combines, captains of tractor teams, heads of field brigades, and managers of livestock branches. In the United States, the Department of Labor reports that the number of women employed in *all* types of agricultural work totals 840,000.

This extensive activity on the part of the women of the Soviets has in no way weakened family ties. On the contrary, the family has been strengthened, for as women have become equals in the society, so have they become equals in the marital relation.

Alexandra Alexandrova is a hostess we met on the plane on the way to Stalingrad.

She is an attractive, healthy brunette of 28 who was born near Moscow and has always lived there. Her parents were collective farmers; both of them died in 1933 when she was eleven, but she was well taken care of under the law which protects orphaned children, and graduated from high school in 1940. She spent the war years working at a heavy bomber base and then several years in an office as a clerical worker before she took a special one-month course to prepare her for her present work as an air hostess.

When Alexandra mentioned that

she was married to a pilot, we asked her if she had met her husband on the job. Her eyes glinted as she replied: "*First* I married a pilot, and *then* I took up flying." Let no one mistake the situation—the pilot had come to her!

Her wages are based on the number of miles flown monthly and they vary from 1,200 to 1,500 rubles a month. Her husband earns 2,500 to 3,000 rubles monthly, and their combined income is ample for their needs. For convenience they have two furnished apartments, two rooms at a Moscow airport and a large room and bath in the city. The total rent for both apartments is 50 rubles a month.

Women in the Soviet Union have leisure time to spend with their families, to continue their education, engage in cultural activities, participate in sports and other forms of recreation. We found Soviet women simply but well dressed, using a little less makeup than American women do, and not going in for startling hair-does. Their clothes are very much like those of American women, and there is a prevalent interest in the latest fashions—with fashion shows and style exhibitions.

Although the majority of women work, there are many who prefer to be housewives. These women participate in the life of their society by contributing voluntary time to the nurseries or working in other civic causes. They can place their own children in nurseries or keep them

at ho  
wh  
assur  
well  
whic  
a nur  
for t  
This  
not c  
child  
of, b  
with  
Moth  
off d  
child  
Expe  
not p  
over  
reduc  
a job  
wome  
with  
six w  
and t  
sary.  
guara  
their  
moth  
exper  
every  
the n  
The  
free n  
sultat  
darga  
villag  
Ninet  
finem  
place  
wome  
of cha

at home as they wish. For the women who wish to work, there is every assurance that their children will be well cared for. Every enterprise which employs women must furnish a nursery school and a kindergarten for the children of its employees. This makes it possible for women not only to feel secure that their children are safe and well taken care of, but also enables them to visit with their children during the day. Mothers with babies are given time off during the day to nurse their children with no deduction in wages. Expectant and nursing mothers are not permitted to work night shift or overtime, and it is a penal offense to reduce a woman's pay or refuse her a job because of pregnancy. All women are given maternity leave with full pay five weeks before and six weeks after the birth of the child, and this leave is extended if necessary. After childbirth women are guaranteed the right to return to their jobs. An allowance for both mother and child to provide for extra expense is given at each birth, and every child is assured by law of all the necessities for a healthy life.

There is an extensive network of free maternity homes, children's consultation centers, nurseries and kindergartens set up in the towns and villages throughout the country. Ninety-five per cent of all the confinements in the Soviet Union take place in lying-in hospitals where women receive competent care free of charge. Expectant mothers are also

registered at special state consultation centers so that they are certain of constant medical observation. Mothers with large families are given special state allowances, and there are allowances also for the care of unmarried mothers and their children. The Soviet people have put into operation that vast system of children's institutions and communal catering planned by Lenin, and considered by him as an important step in the liberation of women when he wrote: "Public dining rooms, nurseries, kindergartens, these . . . are the means that can liberate the woman in actual practice, these are the practical means of lessening and abolishing woman's inequality with man as far as her work in production and in social life is concerned."

Soviet women have suffered and sacrificed in the front ranks with Soviet men. Perhaps the most significant symbol of that sacrifice for us was Liubov Kosmodemyanskaya, whom we met at our farewell banquet in Moscow. She was a striking figure, a tall woman with almost snow-white hair. She talked to our delegates and someone asked: "Do you know who she is?" And then answered without pausing, "That's Zoya's mother."

Zoya Kosmodemyanskaya — we knew her story well. We had always thought of her mother as a subdued, weathered, little woman, standing battered but unbowed. And now this commanding, beautiful woman, in a black evening gown, all kindness

and graciousness, making certain that all our delegates and especially our nine Negro members were enjoying this final evening among their Soviet friends. As she took us by the hand, one by one, we could see traces of tragedy in her face but no self-pity, or brooding sorrow. Instead dignity and sure, quiet strength.

As she spoke of her work in the great Soviet peace movement, we thought: Only nine years ago this fall your Zoya was leading her senior class here in Moscow's Public High School 201, and you saw her and her brother Shura off to school every morning and welcomed them home at night. You talked with them daily about the war and your hearts grew heavy as the fascist robbers drew closer to Moscow.

Soon you heard Zoya's decision, "Mother, I must leave school and join the Partisans. I must fight for our dear Soviet land."

Then a few weeks of silence and

word came: Zoya has been captured and the Nazi murderers have hanged her. That night you listened to Shura tell you that he and eight of Zoya's classmates had joined the Red Army. Shura, who was to suffer many wounds in the years ahead and to die thirteen days before Soviet power blasted the last Nazi from the bunkers of Berlin.

All of this, and Zoya's flaming words of defiance as the Nazi noose tightened around her slender school-girl neck ran through our minds as we talked with her mother about our joint work for peace.

The women of the Soviets do not grieve about their past, or about their sacrifices in the war against fascism which we fought together. They spoke to us of the future, a future of lasting peace, security, and steadily increasing prosperity and they asked us what the women of America are doing to stop the drive toward war.

By Job

It is N  
were it  
program  
be in th  
In its y  
the Ne  
1952, a  
in const  
element  
cession.  
by the  
tures [r  
was su  
of the c  
this set  
That  
slow, is  
is imp  
knowle  
arms e  
averted  
the Na  
much p  
econom  
Times  
characte  
tem as  
state as  
Irresp  
New Y  
the fac

# The Parasitism of the U. S. War Economy

By John Swift

It is now generally conceded that, were it not for the huge armament program, the country would today be in the grip of an economic crisis. In its yearly economic supplement, the *New York Times*, of January 2, 1952, admits that the 1951 "setback in consumer goods contained all the elements of a first class economic recession." "This," it adds, "was averted by the slow rise in defense expenditures [read: war expenditures], which was sufficient to keep the economy of the country at a high point despite this setback in consumer goods."

That the "slow rise" was hardly slow, is here beside the point. What is important, however, is the acknowledgement that *only* this rise in arms expenditures and production averted an economic crisis, even if the *New York Times* prefers the much paler designation of "first class economic recession." After all, the *Times* could hardly be expected to characterize its beloved capitalist system as being in or near so sordid a state as that of a "crisis."

Irrespective of the terminology the *New York Times* employs to describe the facts, it is the facts themselves

that most eloquently describe the present state of U.S. capitalism. Thus, in the same economic supplement, there appears an article singing paeans of praise to the "remarkable progress of American private enterprise [which] is seen in the . . . profits, taxes, and dividends since the lush year of 1929." Yes, truly remarkable! Profits after taxes (remember: after taxes!) rose from \$8 billion in 1929 ("the lush year"), to \$18 billion in 1951. And yet the title of the article is "Taxes Drain Away Business Profits" (!).

Even more remarkable is the conclusion drawn by the writer. Apparently oblivious to the portent of what he is writing, he outlines the trend of industrial production over the past 22 years since 1929. In this he shows that (measured by the Federal Reserve Board's Index based on the 1935-39 average as 100), production fell from 110 in 1929 to the "depression low of 58 in 1932." Then production rose to 113 in 1937, only to fall again to 89 in 1938. "Since then," continues the writer, "war and its aftermath have played a major part in the general prosperity."

And now comes the grand finale, the happy ending of our tale; for the writer says: "The rearmament program is again becoming the force behind the wheels of industrial output." Then he adds that a "truce in the Korean conflict will not change the present plans of military preparedness."

Need anything more be said about the "remarkable progress of American private enterprise?" The "progress" of cut-throat buccaniers minting gold from the bloody El Dorado of war!

#### TRUMAN'S "ECONOMIC STRENGTH"

What are the real effects of the huge arms program on the nation's economic health? Can it hold back the flood waters of economic crisis, and for how long? What will happen when the arms program has run its course? These and sundry questions are being asked today by increasing numbers of people and from all classes of society. For even among the "we never had it so good" gang of monopoly capital, there is a growing uneasiness, and a strident note of fear for the future is being heard more frequently.

In the self-same economic supplement of the *New York Times*, a leading article soberly warns that "business does not look for 1952 to be a year of unalloyed boom" and that "a note of caution is being sounded by some." The article adds: "Some [cap-

italists], primarily in defense will do well. Others, in consumer goods fields, may find sales . . . slipping behind last year." While the *Journal of Commerce*, of December 24, as quoted by the *National Guardian*, finds that "The optimistic prophecies of a short 12 months ago have gone sour. The gears of our economy have slipped a cog somewhere . . . many of the older generation who cut their eye teeth in the Great Depression and have had their illusions of a New Era rudely shattered are becoming fearful of the shape of things to come."

But if a certain pessimism is noted here and there, it has by no means touched the calm serenity of the President. Seeing all and knowing all, this mighty sage peers into the misty future and sees—exactly nothing at all. But, genius that he is, from this very nothingness he perceives perpetual prosperity.

In his "Report on the Economic Conditions of the Nation" (*New York Times*, January 14), and via the pens of his economic ghost writers, he proclaims the arms program as a blessing in disguise. "The past year," he declares, "has been marked by great gains in our basic economic strength." "Furthermore," he says, "the productive capacity of the United States leaves no room for faintheartedness or defeatism."

What about the drop in consumer goods production and sales that took place during 1951? According to Truman's own report, consumer purchas-

ing "in  
about  
second  
rea). V  
or decl  
at all.  
three-q  
volunta  
. . . be  
level.  
"Vol  
Someh  
way. B  
to see t  
where  
untary  
peciall  
that th  
of real  
shrinki  
But  
fessor  
this is  
Truma  
stabiliz  
or thro  
progra  
will co  
omy ca  
ing wi  
Thū  
tic for  
siders  
as sho  
to war  
but jen  
there  
into a  
how t  
full p  
ment."

ing "in the second half of 1951 was about 3.5 percent lower than in the second half of 1950" (just before Korea). Was this due to overproduction or declining purchasing power? Not at all. He explains: "For the last three-quarters of 1951 consumers have voluntarily elected to buy at a level . . . before Korea," *i.e.*, at a reduced level.

"Voluntarily elected" to buy less! Somehow we never thought of it that way. But that is only because we fail to see the "free world" in all its glory, where everything is "free" and "voluntary"—even, or should we say, especially, poverty. Can it possibly be that the mass pay-envelope in terms of real wages has done some visible shrinking?

But for Truman, as it was for Professor Pangloss in Voltaire's *Candide*, this is the best of all possible worlds. Truman says: "If the world situation stabilizes, so that we can after two or three years taper off the defense program," then the true millennium will come, for "our expanding economy can double our standard of living within a generation."

Thus Truman is not only optimistic for the immediate future but considers those who see the present boom as short-lived, and inevitably leading to war or economic crash, as nothing but jeremiahs of despair. On his part, there is no "fear that we would get into a depression by not knowing how to make use of the blessing of full production and full employment."

His formula for creating perpetual economic motion is also relatively simple. It goes something like this: First we produce and pile up armaments. During this arms boom, a potential consumer demand and market is built up. Then in two or three years if all goes well we "taper off" and shift gear to civilian production, filling the pent-up demand. When this runs its course, we shift back to producing armaments. In this way, *ad infinitum*, we not only "defend the free world," but avoid economic depression and achieve perpetual prosperity in which "our productive ability will enable us to achieve a material well-being never before known."

What will happen to the man-made mountains of atom bombs and armaments? Truman does not say. But these are not for war—not on your life! They are all for peace—every last napalm bomb! In fact, he says: "It is because we seek peace—a just and lasting peace—that we have to shoulder this burden." (Why burden?—this must be a slip of the pen.)

And thus the American people are being sold a pig in a poke—armaments without war—over-expanded war economy without economic crisis—and for the stark reality of lower living standards today, they are being traded the illusory promise of a doubling of living standards in the sweet bye and bye.

And, of course, there are those Big Business spokesmen who believe that even Truman knows better. Ray-

mond Moley, in his syndicated column of January 30, writes: "He [Truman] must know that, despite his optimistic economic predictions, the present boom cannot be sustained indefinitely. With all due allowance for the delusions which seem to prevail among his economic advisers, those people must know that the chance of a collapse before 1956 (the next presidential term) is exceedingly likely."

The cynic Moley even accuses the President of desiring to be out of the White House when the day of reckoning arrives.

Whether Mr. Moley is right or wrong about Truman's desires is not too important. What is important is that many people apparently have been influenced by Truman's phony economics. It is therefore tremendously important to see things as they really are, to understand the dynamics of the huge armament program—both its immediate as well as its long-term effects. Let us apply ourselves to that task.

#### THE PARASITISM OF THE WAR ECONOMY

Having already mentioned that the country would today be in the midst of an economic crisis, were it not for the armament-induced boom, let us start our investigation by asking ourselves exactly how these increased arms expenditures produced this result—even if it is only temporary. Only then shall we be able to see

exactly where we are and where we are heading.

There is a rather simple notion current about this. It is that by spending large sums of money on armaments the government is providing the additional fuel needed to keep the economic pot boiling. But it is important to ask: Where does this fuel (money) come from in the first place?

To the extent that the arms program is paid for from current taxation (so-called "pay-as-you-go")—and at this point the great bulk of it is (87 percent in the proposed 1953 budget)—this money is actually siphoned off from the annual national income. That portion of the money coming from the income of the workers and middle classes (farmers, small business people, professionals), would essentially have circulated back to the production process through the purchase of consumer goods—necessities as well as luxuries. Thus, the taxes drawn from this portion of national income provide no additional fuel and add nothing to total production. All that happens, is that there is a shift in the relative size of the component parts of the total national product—a shift from civilian goods production to war goods production.

It is as if a number of inches were sawed off one end of a ruler stick and glued to the other. The net result would be a change of relative positions; but the actual length of the ruler would remain the same. It is

likew  
meas  
uct  
tions  
men  
sump  
creas  
even  
He  
leaps  
sums  
outp  
doub  
W  
ess, a  
or re  
ment  
this  
pros  
the i  
have  
Of  
porti  
not  
pow  
valu  
whic  
the  
class  
Bu  
Adm  
the r  
mass  
nopo  
porat  
taxat  
more  
lows  
\* A  
a year  
at the  
end of  
a year

likewise for the economic ruler that measures the size of the annual product. Not even the weirdest incantations of bourgeois economic medicine men can transform a reduced consumption of the people into an increased national production—and even less so into prosperity.

Hence, those who see the annual leaps in armament expenditures\* as sums to be merely added to annual output, are in great part only seeing double.

What really happens in this process, and what they either fail to see or refuse to see, is the impoverishment of the masses, and what effect this has on the economic life and prosperity of the nation—and also on the issue of war or peace, we shall have occasion to deal with later.

Of course, it is true that a sizable portion of the arms expenditures does not come from mass purchasing power, but is taken from surplus value, especially from that portion which contains the huge profits of the corporations and the capitalist class as a whole.

But the emphasis of the Truman Administration has been on placing the main burden of taxation on the masses of people and not on the monopolies. Hence, even if the big corporations squeal like stuck pigs about taxation, the main burden is falling more and more on the "little fellows."

\* Armament expenditures rose from \$18. billion a year pre-Korea to a rate of \$24. billion a year at the end of 1950; to \$45. billion a year at the end of 1951; to an estimated rate of \$65. billion a year at the end of 1952.

Indeed, bourgeois economists have a special theory about this. For them, the more that is stolen from the food, clothing and shelter of the people by direct and indirect taxation, the better it is supposed to be for the economic welfare of the nation. According to these learned but not wise gentlemen, the greater the people's ability to buy, the greater the "inflationary pressures" on the economy.

That there are inflationary pressures and that these are growing, is undeniable. But the underlying cause for this is by no stretch of the imagination the consumption capacity of the masses. At this point let us repeat once again, that those who see the expenditures for war production as a great boon to the national prosperity, and at the same time insist that this be paid for out of the income of the common people, want to eat their cake and have it too.

We are reminded of the scene in Anatole France's *Penguin Island*, where the rich elders of the community are asked to agree on a public levy to defray state and church expenses. These patriotic penguin gentlemen immediately state their readiness to sacrifice their all for flag and creed. But placing the public good above their own narrow interests—as is so characteristic of their class at all times and in all places—they immediately perceive that taking this levy from the rich would be a most grave injustice to the poor. For, as everyone knows, the poor live on the wealth of the rich, and if some

of this wealth is taken away, what will the poor have to live on? Also, the poor already have so little, what difference does it make if they have a little less? In this way the rich penguins logically prove to one another and to their puppets in government that sparing the rich is the very best way to spare the poor, for then the poor are left with at least something—the wealth of the rich!

When it comes to taxes, the above type of logic still governs the thinking of our Wall Street elders and their economic "expert" stooges.

Despite all the Big Business moaning and groaning about high taxes, there is much to the charge that these taxes are passed on to the consumer. For corporate profits *after* taxes remain more than twice as high as they were in 1929—"the lush year," and also the year of the great crash (great economic crashes follow lush profits, like the hang-over the drunken spree). For is it a secret that since 1929 the big corporations have added a trick or two to the art of concealing profits and manipulating huge tax rebates? Just the other week, for instance, when the tax scandals shocked the nation—we are fast becoming a scandal shock-proofed nation—the Big Business weekly, *U.S. News*, offered its readers the assurance that the chances of getting away with tax evasions are still quite good—something like 50,000 to 1. Even a rigged Reno roulette wheel cannot equal odds like these.

## PRODUCTION AND THE WAR ECONOMY

What then explains the artificial stimulation which total production has undoubtedly received by armament expenditures? The main factors are the following: 1) a shift to an arms economy requires a corresponding shift in capital investments from the civilian to the war-production industries, plus a considerable relative and absolute expansion of these industries; 2) With the fall in mass buying power and/or aggravated by overproduction in consumer goods, there also takes place a corresponding fall in the rate of profit in the civilian sector of the economy, with a consequent flight of investment capital to the war production industries where a guaranteed demand and an abnormally high rate of profit are assured for a period of time.

Thus, the present war boom is in great measure a consequence of this rush to invest new surplus capital, as well as to shift older capital values from the consumption to the armament production industries. It is this which has been and continues to be the *main* factor stimulating production this past year and which has thus far prevented the outbreak of an economic crash.

Statistically this is evident in the fact that in June, 1950, at the outbreak of the Korean War, industrial production stood at 199 of the 1935-39 average of 100, while a year later in June, 1951, it stood at 223. But how

strong  
produ  
tailm  
be see  
despite  
invest  
ductio  
been  
post-K  
the sa  
of 195  
cold c  
erly o  
Doe  
tion in  
ate ec  
in the  
tainly  
ventor  
manul  
to assu  
reache  
lion. M  
have j  
billion  
of the  
\$41 bi  
sale i  
those  
not d  
the pa  
tic cut  
These  
wool  
perce  
radio,  
Ho

\* Ne  
billion  
precedin  
\$59 bil  
lin in

strong is the downward pull of overproduction, accentuated by the curtailment of mass buying power, can be seen in the revealing fact that despite an all-time record of capital investments,\* average monthly production for the past half-year has been at 219—four points below the post-Korea peak of last spring, and the same as for the first six months of 1951. It is this which has thrown cold chills down the spines of formerly optimistic economic observers.

Does this levelling off of production indicate evidence of an immediate economic crisis—i.e., immediate in the sense of the next months? Certainly the vast accumulations of inventories on a retail, wholesale and manufacturers' level could lead one to assume so. Total inventories have reached an all-time peak of \$70 billion. Manufacturers' inventories alone have jumped from a little below \$30 billion in June, 1950 (at the outbreak of the Korean War), to well over \$41 billion today. Retail and wholesale inventories also are well over those of June 1950, and have either not declined or barely declined in the past few months despite the drastic cuts in civilian production in 1951. These cuts amount to 25 percent in wool fabrics, 14 percent in rayons, 40 percent in television, 16 percent in radio, 15 percent in automobiles, etc.

However, one must counterbal-

ance these with opposite factors at work. In the first place, new capital investments and renewal of old capital values continue at an exceedingly high rate—for the first quarter of 1952 even higher than in 1951, although even Truman's report forecasts a reduction in the rate of investment for 1952.

The decisive importance of capital investments in influencing the course of an economic cycle, was stressed by Karl Marx, who showed that:

It [the developing economic crisis] becomes noticeable, not in the direct decrease of consumptive demand, not in the demand for individual consumption, but in the decrease of exchanges of capital for capital, of the reproductive process of capital. (*Capital* (Kerr), Vol. II, p. 87.)

The "decrease of exchanges of capital for capital," or to put it in other words, the decrease in the renewal of capital, already is very pronounced in the sector of the economy producing consumer goods. But an opposite trend has been artificially stimulated in the sector of the economy working on armament orders. Of course, at the rate at which both plant expansion and rationalization (speed-up) are taking place (stimulated by the tax-refund steal which enables corporations to pay only 18 cents on the dollar for the new plants and equipment), it will not be long before over-capacity has also gripped the war-production industries.

Another fact that bears on the economic perspectives for 1952 is that a

\* New capital investments totalled over \$23 billion in 1951, more than 30 percent above the preceding year. Total domestic investments were \$59 billion in 1951, as compared with \$49 billion in 1950.

large proportion of the military funds appropriated during the past fiscal year have not yet been actually spent. In other words, industry has not been converted or expanded at anything near the pace of congressional appropriations of funds. Hence, armaments production has not yet reached its peak (even at the current level of military appropriations). The *U.S. News* of January 18th, estimates that of \$130 billion already appropriated for armaments, only \$38.5 billion have actually been spent. Thus, there are still \$91.5 billion to be spent from the 1950 and 1951 appropriations—without regard to the new 1952 appropriations.

One of the reasons for the slowness in expenditures, as compared with appropriations, is that the first effect of the Korean War was not, as some would assume, a one-sided rush of capital to the war industries. While increased capital investments did flow to armament production, the most pronounced immediate reaction of Big Business was to "cash in" on the wave of scare-buying created by the fear of war shortages in the civilian market. This sellers' market soon ended, and in the middle of 1951, manufacturers suddenly awoke to the startling fact that inventories had been expanded to the bursting point. Since then we have been witnessing an opposite movement in the very same anarchic fashion. Yesterday, the King Midas worshipped by capital was the consumer market; today, it is the war goods market.

### WHITHER THE WAR ECONOMY?

The present boom is entirely artificial and will last only so long as capital investments continue to pour into armament production. Further, the greater the volume with which capital flows in this direction, the faster it will spend itself. Hence, the question naturally arises: What then?

According to Truman the answer is simple. We'll "taper off," *i.e.*, the armament gallop will be reduced to a more leisurely trot. But this tapering off business is not as simple as it sounds. The very changes in the structure of the economy brought about by the wholesale shift of investment capital from civilian production to war production tend to become powerful objective forces pressing, not for a reduction of the tempo, but for its increase—for the transformation of the armament gallop into a mad war flight.

Why is this so? It is not only because to "taper off" means major dislocations and mass unemployment in the war production industries. It is also because—and this is far more important—the very burden of the war economy which is being placed on the backs of the masses tends to shrivel buying power, so that there is no inducement for capital to flow back to the consumer goods industries in large quantities, for these already face over-production (not because there is no need!—only because there is no effective demand!).

This is what Joseph Stalin meant when he said in 1939 that war economy results in "giving industry a one-sided war direction . . . restricting to the utmost the production and especially the sale of articles of general consumption—and, consequently reducing consumption of the population and confronting the country with an economic crisis." Stalin said this in describing Hitler's war economy. That is also true of Truman's, even if his is called "defense" economy.

That section of the bourgeoisie which believes that the war production tap can be turned down in a year or two at will, without dire economic consequences—in fact with a pent-up demand for consumer goods, is making an entirely false comparison between the war economy of World War II and the post-war boom that followed it, and the present quite different situation.

In 1945, American capital rushed to reconvert to civilian production so as to cash in most rapidly on a relatively immense world and national market for consumer and capital goods. In the world market, Big Business saw a golden opportunity to grab for itself the markets and sources of raw materials of its vanquished imperialist foes (Germany, Japan, Italy), as well as of its prostrated imperialist partners (Britain, France). Every major capitalist nation, with the single exception of the United States, was suffering from a crisis of under-production, for the war had exhausted their economies

and wrought wholesale devastation on their productive capacities. This left a vacuum which American capitalism rushed to fill.

Today, in contrast, the problem in the capitalist countries is no longer that of under-production, but the danger of a crisis of overproduction. The only remaining untapped market for U.S. goods is the Soviet Union, China and the Peoples' Democracies, in which the threat of crises of overproduction has been removed forever, and where planned expanding economies can absorb great quantities of American goods. But to take advantage of this huge market requires an approach opposite to that of the present war drive and war preparations. It requires a policy based on peaceful co-existence and the arbitrary removal of every artificial barrier to trade and commerce between the world's two social systems, Socialism and capitalism.

Within the country, conditions likewise have changed. During the four years of American direct participation in the last war, a considerable curtailment in both the production and sale of consumer goods took place. This was particularly true of durable goods, such as autos, refrigerators, radios, television, farm implements, electrical appliances, plumbing and building materials, etc. Many of these were completely withdrawn from production and the market. This was necessitated by the scarcity of critical raw materials and a relative labor shortage. Thus, the ac-

cumulated purchasing power arose because demand exceeded supply and was further enhanced when prices were held in line after 1942.

Today, however, there are no real shortages of consumer goods. Despite the drastic cut-backs in production in 1951, the problem is still that of over-production. Reduced buying today therefore is due in the main to reduced demand, not reduced supply. Nor is it likely that any real shortages will develop. In fact, the effective market demand will remain even narrower than mass earnings, for the simple reason that a goodly chunk of 1952 wages will go to pay for goods bought on installment credit over the past few years and particularly during the scare-buying spree following the opening of the Korean hostilities. In 1943, during the war, installment credit went down to \$2 billion and total consumer credit to \$5.3 billion. In 1951, however, installment credit climbed up to over \$13 billion and total consumer credit to \$19.4 billion.

To top this, the already restricted purchasing power of the people is being further curtailed by the government's financial policy of placing the cost of the war economy on the backs of the common people. In contrast with World War II, which was financed in the main through borrowing, the present Korean war and armament program are being financed from current revenue, on a so-called "pay-as-you-go" basis. During the five-year period of 1941-45, only 33 percent of the budget came

from current revenue. In 1952, on the other hand, 91 percent will be met by current taxes. Thus taxes are eating away more and more of wage earnings and middle-class income. The tax increase in 1951 raised taxes on low income groups by 17 percent—proportionally more than for any other groupings. And it is a poorly guarded secret that the only thing that may stave off another similar increase this year, is the approaching congressional election. This only means that much more will be asked for in 1953.

Furthermore, there is today no real attempt to hold the price line, nor can there be so long as the reduction of mass purchasing power is seen as a patriotic duty. Since Korea, retail prices have risen some 15 percent according to the even ultra-conservative estimates of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. And these price rises are of far greater significance than those that took place during World War II. We must remember that the period prior to that war was one of relative deflation, with prices still below the 1929 level. The Consumers' Price Index of the B.L.S. shows prices for the year 1929 at 122 of the 1935-39 average of 100. In 1939 when World War II began, it was 99, or 23 points below 1929. This jumped to 123 in 1943 and 128 in 1945, or still only slightly above the 1929 level. The real increases came only with the end of the war and the end of price control. Between August, 1945 and August, 1948 the cost of living rose by

35 percent or to 174 on the B.L.S. Index. The increase since Korea must therefore be seen as additional layers capping already formidable price peaks. Also, the B.L.S. Index, while notorious for its underestimation of the rise in the cost of living, does not even pretend to take into account the repeated rises in income and excise (sales) taxes, national, state and local.

Nor is it likely that the cost of living will decline in the period ahead. On the contrary, the whole trend is towards still further increases in living costs, despite the deflationary influence of overproduction in many consumer lines. At first sight it may appear paradoxical that prices should continue to rise side by side with overproduction in various consumer goods. But this only emphasizes a point made earlier; namely, that it is not the buying power of the masses which is the underlying cause for the present inflation. Its basic cause is the war economy—the fact that billions upon billions of dollars are being poured into the market, purchasing means of subsistence for the workers engaged in the war industries and the men in the armed forces, as well as buying immense quantities of raw materials and capital goods, that go to make up the tanks, planes, ships, guns and atom bomb. But while means of subsistence, raw materials and capital goods values are being constantly drawn out of the market, no equivalent commodity values are being returned to it. This is so be-

cause armament manufacture creates neither means of consumption nor means of production, but *only means of destruction*. It is this which explains the rise in prices and the general inflationary pressures.

In his writings on the effects of a prolonged period of turn-over of capital, *i.e.*, a period in which a considerable time-lag exists between the initial outlay of productive capital and the appearance of the finished product on the market, as for example in railroad construction, Karl Marx drew the conclusions that:

In capitalist society, where social intelligence does not act until after the fact, great disturbances will and must occur under these circumstances.

And he elaborates:

Since elements of productive capital are continually withdrawn from the market and only an equivalent in money is thrown on the market in their place, the demand of cash payers for products increases without supplying any elements for purchase. Hence a rise in prices, of means of production and of subsistence. To make matters worse, swindling operations are always carried on at this time, involving a transfer of great capitals. . . . So far as means of subsistence are concerned, it is true that agriculture is stimulated. . . . Furthermore, in those lines of business in which production may be rapidly increased, such as manufacture proper, mining, etc., the rise in prices causes a sudden expansion, which is soon followed by a collapse. The same effect is produced on the labor-market. . . . A

portion of the reserve army of laborers who kept wages down is absorbed. Wages rise everywhere, even in hitherto engaged parts of the labor-market. This lasts until the inevitable crash throws the reserve army of labor out of work, and wages are once more depressed to their minimum or below it (*Capital*, Vol. II, pp. 362-3).

How much more true is this of war economy where the time-lag is never made up, because no new values are actually created, only old values destroyed? For, despite Truman's ignorant boast about the "great gains in our basic economic strength," war economy is a huge parasitic monster, in whose maw more and more of national production is devoured. That is why Stalin was right when he pointed out that it is impossible to militarize a country and at the same time increase civilian production and consumption, build huge peace-time construction projects, and lower prices. The very fact that the Soviet Union is doing just these things is proof of her peaceful intentions and peace-time economy.

Applying Marx's statement to the present situation, one is moved to make at least three comments. 1) Real wages are not rising today, but falling, thanks to the invention of the wage-freeze and the treachery of capitalist-minded labor leaders.

2) Today, side by side with labor shortage in certain industries, we are witnessing a growing unemployment in others. The technological changes in industry since World

War II and the growing speed-up, have helped increase labor productivity so rapidly that labor shortages actually exist in only a few industries and areas and for only a number of skilled occupations. At the same time, dislocations and overproduction have thrown tens of thousands out of work in the auto, textile, television, building-trades, radio, clothing, and other industries. In this the Negro workers are the hardest hit of all. Also hard hit are the women and youth, who are generally concentrated in the lighter industries. Thus, this, too, exerts an increasing downward pull on mass purchasing power.

3) As for Karl Marx's reference to speculation, swindling and corruption, he certainly would have called the bourgeoisie of his day honest by comparison, had he lived to see our modern swine wallowing in the bloody morass of war contracts and war profits.

#### THE REAL ALTERNATIVES

These are the facts. What do they prove?

They prove first that it is a delusion to believe that anything good can possibly come from the armament program. Even the fact that it has thus far prevented a major depression is not a plus, but a minus, for this was accomplished by generating a compression which is bound to explode with a hundred times greater force tomorrow.

But there are narrow-minded individuals who may say: "Let tomor-

row t  
conce  
we r  
day?  
progr  
living  
To o  
millio  
quent  
And  
Korea  
The  
ican  
dire c  
altern  
Amer  
ternat  
preve  
crisis,  
press  
spend  
out t  
rating  
end s  
ing i  
of ro  
child  
age i  
ing  
defea  
polio  
tryin  
lectio  
our r  
in m  
well-  
Th  
vent  
crisis  
woul  
inter

row take care of itself; all we are concerned with is today." To these we reply by asking: What about today? Who is paying for the war program? What is happening to living standards? To civil liberties? To our youth militarized by the millions? To the civil rights so frequently promised the Negro people? And yes, what about the dead in Korea?

The alternative before the American people is not war economy or dire economic crisis. This is only the alternative of Big Business. For the American people there is another alternative, a course which could have prevented for a time an economic crisis, without adding to explosive pressure. That would have been by spending \$65 billion a year wiping out the slums of our cities; inaugurating great agricultural reforms to end share-cropping and tenant farming in the South; building thousands of roomy, sanitary schools for our children; ending the shameful shortage in hospital facilities, and granting substantial sums to science to defeat the dread diseases of cancer, polio and heart malady—instead of trying to finance this by charity collections; improving and extending our national system of highways; and in many other ways adding to the well-being of the American people.

That program, too, would have prevented the outbreak of an economic crisis for a period of time and it would have been a program in the interests of the people and of peace.

It would have meant an expansion of the industries serving the needs of the people and not the goliath of war. Such a program, while far short of Socialism, would substantially benefit the vast mass of the American people.

Clearly such a program was not in the interests of the monopolists who seek the speediest and steepest enhancement of their profits and world domination through war. Moreover, such a program was not adopted because the people were not united and organized to carry it into life in the face of the opposition of the monopolists. Primarily to blame for this are the men who stand at the head of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. and Railroad Brotherhoods. These, by their "me-too" policy towards the big capitalists, by their going along with the suicidal war program and war hysteria, sold out not only their own members, but the entire American people.

The facts prove further, that from an economic point of view, it is going now to be much more difficult to prevent the Scylla and Charybdis of either a ghastly war or a terrible economic crash. For the billionaires, reaping immense profits from war orders, are going to resist with all their might any policy of "tapering off." Already they are frightened to death that a cessation of hostilities in Korea may relax war tension, may reduce and even remove the war hysteria without which the American people would never have permitted

themselves to be so hoodwinked.

The answer of the imperialists to the threat of economic crisis, will inevitably be, "Use the arms and armies." If they do not believe the moment ripe for all-out war, they will seek to employ their armament in "smaller" wars—ruthlessly devastating other lands as they have Korea.

Also borne out by the facts, is the conclusion that the period of time in which the question of war or peace is to be decided is relatively short. Official army and government spokesmen have talked of either 1953 or 1954 as being the year of decision. All this demonstrates how important is every minute of every day to save our country and our people from catastrophe.

And World War III can be prevented. American imperialism does not hold all the cards in its hands. In fact its hand is quite weak. All of its boasting of strength and "victories" is so much bluff—at which it has great talent. And the trump card, which is the great desire of the peoples of the world for peace, is playing against the imperialists, as logically it must.

All over the world the forces for peace are growing, affecting and in turn being affected by, the sharpening contradictions within the camp

of the imperialist powers. In the United States, the warmongers are still having their own way in great measure, but their failures in foreign policy in both Asia and Europe and the mounting burdens of the war economy, are creating a growing doubt and division in the ranks of the people and even in capitalist circles.

The American people, like those throughout the world, want peace. Whenever given the opportunity they have expressed themselves for peace. But up to now they have not actively resisted the war program, for two reasons. First, because large numbers of them swallowed the Big Lie that the Soviet Union was the aggressor and wanted war and that the U.S. program was purely defensive. Second, that somehow the armaments program would bring all-around prosperity. The conditions are rapidly multiplying for undermining and destroying these illusions. From every side the American people will begin to see ever more clearly the blind alley into which the war policy has led them, the shallowness of war-boom "prosperity." It is our Party's great responsibility to help bring them more rapidly to that understanding.

## **New Books and Pamphlets**

---

### **ATOMIC IMPERIALISM:**

#### ***The State, Monopoly, and the Bomb***

By JAMES S. ALLEN

Reveals how efforts of U. S. Big Business to establish world monopoly over atomic energy have sharpened danger of global war. Also exposes Wall Street's seizure of control of uranium mines in Canada, Africa, and other parts of the world, the complete militarization of science; the fascist trend toward mixed state and corporate controls in the new atomic industry, and analyzes the role of world peace movements in the fight for atomic and general disarmament.

International Publishers, \$2.90

#### **NEGRO REPRESENTATION—A STEP TOWARDS**

##### **NEGRO FREEDOM**

10¢

by Pettis Perry

#### **STAND UP FOR FREEDOM! THE NEGRO PEOPLE**

##### **VS. THE SMITH ACT**

5¢

by Lloyd L. Brown

#### **WOMEN ON GUARD: HOW THE WOMEN OF THE WORLD FIGHT FOR PEACE**

10¢

by Betty Millard

#### **BEHIND THE FLORIDA BOMBINGS:**

##### **WHO KILLED N.A.A.C.P. LEADER HARRY T. MOORE**

##### **AND HIS WIFE?**

5¢

by Joseph North

#### **WHITE CHAUVINISM AND THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE**

10¢

by Pettis Perry

#### **THE SOVIET UNION BUILDS FOR PEACE**

10¢

by Laurenti P. Beria

#### **FOR PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE**

20¢

by Joseph Stalin

---

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

A Great Publishing Event!

## **HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES**

*By William Z. Foster*

“How have the American Communists used their theories and Marxist-Leninist teachings to promote the advance of the American working class to leadership in the nation? What policies and programs of action have they produced and applied to build the alliance of the working class with the Negro people, the working farmers and city middle classes? How is the Party being built, how does it function, what is its role in the daily struggles of the masses, what is the content of its inner life? How does the Party fight opportunism and bourgeois influences in its midst?

“Foster’s book gives the answers. Prepare to learn, study and popularize the *History of the Communist Party of the United States* and its great lessons for today and tomorrow.”

—ALEXANDER BITTELMAN in *Political Affairs*, Jan., 1952

•  
A New INTERNATIONAL Book Scheduled for May Publication  
•

**NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS**

832 BROADWAY, NEW YORK 3, N. Y.

