

affairs

APRIL 1952 • 25 CENTS



- [1] A Democratic, United Germany
and the Struggle for Peace

- [14] The Fascist Danger

- [26] Halt Bacteriological Genocide!

- [26] Some Problems of Work in
Right-Led Unions

- [42] The March *Coup d'Etat* in Cuba

- [52] Dr. Just: Pioneer Negro Biologist

- [61] American Imperialism
(*Book Review*)

IT'S HERE!

A LANTERN FOR JEREMY

the new novel by

V. J. JEROME



At all bookstores. Price \$2.50
Special de luxe autographed edition,
Boxed, \$5.00



A MASSES & MAINSTREAM BOOK



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

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

PRINTED IN U.S.A.



209

Vol. XX

A T

By Ric

THE N
a unit
and p
grown
of the
West C
war p
lionair
a resto
has no
creased
ments
danger
will b
what i
be de
kind,
Ameri
It w
the p
rinary
Repub
pying
Union
up th
with

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

A Democratic, United Germany and the Struggle for Peace

By Richard Walker

THE NEED to establish conditions for a united, independent, democratic and peace-loving Germany has grown urgent. Owing to the policies of the three occupying Powers in West Germany, and especially to the war program of the American billionaire imperialists, the danger of a restoration of German militarism has not been eliminated, but has increased. Moreover, current developments are determining whether this danger will be finally liquidated, or will be fed and stimulated. Hence, what is done at the present hour can be decisive for the future of mankind, including the future of the American people.

It was because of the gravity of the present situation that, on February 13, the German Democratic Republic appealed to the four occupying powers—United States, Soviet Union, Britain and France—to speed up the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany, declaring: "The Ger-

man people fully realize the blame that falls upon them for Hitler's war, but they do not feel that they are being treated fairly. . . . The German people need a treaty in order to end the partition of their country and build up a united, independent, democratic and peace-loving state." This message concluded with the hope that the Allied Powers would take positive action to end the abnormal state of affairs in Germany.

Three powers—the United States, Britain and France—ignored this appeal of the German Democratic Republic, representing one-third of the seventy million people of Germany. The fourth occupying power, the Soviet Union, replied. Its reply of February 20 said: ". . . the Soviet Government, on its part, will do everything possible to expedite the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany and the restoration of the unity of the German state. The So-

viet Government expects that corresponding steps will also be taken by the other Powers exercising the functions of control in Germany."

On March 10 the Soviet Government sent notes to the three western governments proposing that the four powers *immediately* begin work on a draft peace treaty for Germany, to be submitted to an International Peace Conference. The Soviet proposal declared that since an all-German government should take part in drawing up such a treaty, the four powers should act *immediately* to speed up the establishment of an all-German government in accordance with the desires of the German people. The Soviet Government also submitted a preliminary draft treaty for discussion, with the announcement that it would welcome other proposals from the western powers. Main points of the draft treaty were:

1. Restoration of Germany as a united state.
2. Termination of the occupation and the liquidation of all foreign military bases in Germany within one year after the peace treaty comes into force.
3. Guarantees to the German people of all human rights, including freedom of speech, press, religion and assembly.
4. Banning of all anti-democratic organizations.
5. Equality for former soldiers and former nazis in rebuilding Germany.
6. No alliances between Germany and other states directed against any

state whose armed forces fought Hitler.

7. Permission for Germany to have armed forces sufficient for defense purposes, but the production, quantity and types of military supplies and material to be established by the peace treaty.

8. No economic limitations on German peace industries and shipping.

9. Germany's frontiers to accord with the Potsdam decisions.

10. States concluding a peace treaty with Germany to support her application to the United Nations.

These Soviet proposals offer a working basis for establishment of the conditions for a peaceful Germany. They offer another opportunity to the peace forces of the world and to the American people to head off the restoration of German militarism, and to create the conditions for a lasting peace. The apologists of American imperialism attempted to minimize their importance with the allegation that they were mere "propaganda" and represented "nothing new." But this claim was belied by the consternation they caused in the ranks of the war camp. *The Wall Street Journal's* Washington correspondent wrote on March 26:

Stalin's move to offer Germany a peace treaty has President Truman's defense and diplomatic advisers really scared. . . . The U.S. worry is based on Germany's deep and earnest hope for being a united country. That hope spreads politically from the left to the right, and from the young to the old.

... The
American
on this
French
chance
that cou

The
the ini
German
democr
dismay
monger
York T

24, as a
not on
projects
and th

would
West, l
Western
support
eration
ing sol
lem." D

gogy, th
ing Am
the Sov
blow th
tire W
world

Such
proposa
tions fo
camp o
alists of

a blow
Soviet
ment ir
of the
days la

reply.

The

... There's also a split between the Americans, the British and the French on this Russian move. The British and French are inclined to take it as a chance of a deal with the Russians that could lead away from war.

The Soviet proposals, answering the initiative and demands of the German masses for peace and a democratic, united Germany, caused dismay among the imperialist warmongers, who saw them, as the *New York Times* editorialized on March 24, as a move which might "torpedo not only the immediate Western projects, such as the Schuman plan and the European army, which would integrate Germany with the West, but also the farther-reaching Western plans which aim at a self-supporting and self-controlling federation of states as the only enduring solution of the European problem." Discounting the *Times'* demagoguery, this organ of the war-profiteering American billionaires interpreted the Soviet proposals as a diplomatic blow that would knock out the entire Wall Street plan for a third world war!

Such was the impact of the Soviet proposals for establishing the conditions for a peaceful Germany in the camp of the war-profiteering imperialists of the United States. So great a blow for peace was struck by the Soviet note, that the State Department in fact suppressed the exact text of the Soviet proposals until, eleven days later, it had finally devised its reply.

The State Department reply, and

its support by sundry apologists for Wall Street imperialism, mustered old, discredited arguments against the Soviet Union as well as fresh-brewed petty objections to the Soviet proposals. The monopoly-coordinated press, covering up the war-bent policies of the U.S. ruling class, repeated the old canard about the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic being the main obstacles to the establishment of a peaceful Germany.

Within that same week, Premier Stalin again took the opportunity of reiterating the Soviet Union's impelling interest in a united Germany, in line with the U.S.S.R.'s whole effort to safeguard world peace. Replying, on March 31, to a series of questions put to him by fifty American editors, Stalin, when asked: "Do you consider the present time opportune for the unification of Germany?" said, "Yes, I do." And to the next question: "On what basis is the peaceful co-existence of capitalism and Communism possible?" Stalin answered, "The peaceful co-existence of capitalism and Communism is fully possible, provided there is mutual desire to cooperate, provided there is a readiness to honor the obligations assumed, and provided the principle of equality and non-interference in the internal affairs of other states is observed."

REMILITARIZING WESTERN GERMANY

The main development favoring the restoration of militarism in Ger-

many is the determined effort of the Washington government to speed up the conversion of West Germany into its military and economic vassal. The plan to consummate this war-breeding aim was railroaded by the Washington government through the conference at Lisbon last February of the fourteen governments participating in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. There the billionaire American monopolist, W. Averell Harriman, whose personal holdings in West German industry and former vast investments in pre-war Poland undoubtedly increased his zeal for his mission, used the threat of stopping dollar handouts to force agreement among the satellite politicians on Wall Street's plan. This plan called for establishment in the near future of a West German *Wehrmacht*, beginning with twelve heavily armored divisions, a tactical air force, and a substantial fiscal contribution.

Harriman's work was facilitated by a revived West German imperialism, already heavily indebted to, and interlocked with, the most powerful concentrations of American finance-capital. The West German imperialists, through their Federal government headed by Chancellor Adenauer, grasped eagerly at the opportunity to reestablish the German Army. Accordingly, it was decided that the foreign ministers of the three occupying powers would come to Bonn in the latter part of April to sign both a separate general treaty with West Germany and a war pact

launching the new *Wehrmacht*. (There can be no doubt that these imperialist conspirators want "unity" of Germany, but a unity to be forged by an attempt forcibly to foist a Nazi-like *Anschluss* upon German Democratic Republic.) Such a development, so pregnant with fateful possibilities for all mankind, was of course misrepresented to the world. Secretary Acheson and the British and French foreign ministers described it as a necessary expedient to defend Western Europe against the "threat of Soviet aggression." Mindful of the European and American peoples' opposition to a revival of German militarism, an opposition born of the experience of two world wars, the architects of this menacing structure pretend that it will be "integrated" into the so-called "European Defense Community." They assert that it will be strictly limited as to size and strength, and rigidly controlled within the framework of General Eisenhower's NATO high command. And in its reply to the Soviet proposals, the State Department professed to see a "step backward" menacing to peace in permitting a united, democratic Germany to have its own defense forces and to arm them, subject to limits fixed by the peace treaty!

This sickening hypocrisy compounds the deceit of the whole Wall Street maneuver. For it is not even a well-kept secret that the understanding between the American monopolists and Ruhr imperialists envisions the rebuilding of the old *Wehr-*

macht, with the weapons of the same name. Hitler's control over none of the standing army 29 of the Wehrmacht. Adenauer's machination against the traitor's More Street, agreement between German general Adenauer's "Federal" all decisions on the right of intervention necessary," cupation powers terminating that is defense allow in any Street be international sovereignty. Yet, the State

macht, fully armed and equipped with the latest and most destructive weapons, and commanded by the same nazi officers who commanded Hitler's armies. Even the occupation-controlled West German press is none too discreet about this understanding. And the *New York Times'* Drew Middleton reported on January 29 the deep misgivings among the West Germans concerning Adenauer's claim that the new Wehrmacht will differ in class composition and indoctrination from Hitler's troops.

Moreover, the terms which Wall Street, with German imperialists' agreement, intends to impose on the German people through the separate general treaty, dubbed a "Contractual Agreement," will oblige the "Federal Republic" to recognize that all decisions of the High Commissioners are inviolable, to recognize the right of the Allied powers to intervention and to the re-assumption of their full powers "if necessary," to sustain an indefinite Occupation by the troops of the three powers, to contribute under a non-terminable military agreement all that is within its power to "European defense," and most significantly, to allow the use of the German army in any country at the will of the Wall Street billionaires. Could such terms be imposed on a truly independent nation, exercising its full rights of sovereignty?

Yet, the State Department reply to the Soviet proposals insinuated that the Soviet Union wanted to deny

national rights to the German people—such rights as "freedom" to enter into associations with other Powers. As if this so-called "Contractual Agreement" were not the crassest kind of denial of the German people's right to self-determination; were not, indeed, a colonial statute imposed upon the people of the western part of Germany!

For the leading officials of the Washington government in West Germany have repeatedly demonstrated what kind of situation makes military intervention "necessary" for Wall Street. Early in February, when West German workers discussed the use of a general strike to defeat Adenauer's plan for a German Army, the American-controlled newspapers warned that occupation troops would be used against the strikers. The American-licensed and inspired social-democratic West Berlin *Tagespiegel* declared: "If the trade unions call a general strike, this will automatically lead to revival of the system of military government with all its consequences." Obviously, an already de-humanized, nazified German army will suit Wall Street's purposes for permanent colonization not only of Germany, but for suppressing attempts of other peoples to throw off U.S. imperialist chains.

The Wall Street government's claim that it decided to rebuild the German Army as a necessary expedient to "secure Europe's defense" is also false. Its effort at this time to speed up the remilitarization of West Germany represents a major part of

the total war program of Wall Street for world dominance.

Since V-E Day, the Washington government's German policy has been an attempt to implement this aim of the Wall Street imperialists. Thus the successive foreign affairs stewardships of James Byrnes, General Marshall, and Dean Acheson have repudiated and violated clause after clause of the Potsdam agreement between Truman, Stalin and Attlee, which committed the three powers to carry out the Crimea Declaration on Germany: "German militarism and Nazism will be extirpated and the Allies will take in agreement together, now and in the future, the other measures to assure that Germany never again will threaten her neighbors or the peace of the world."

But the Washington government acted almost immediately to violate its pledge to demilitarize, de-nazify and de-cartelize the part of Germany under its control, and to carry out the same policy in the French and British zones. At the same time, Wall Street exploited the Occupation to fasten its grip on the West German economy. To make this easier, it set up in 1949 the separate "Federal Republic," thereby dismembering Germany. The White Book of the National Front of Democratic Germany estimates that the present participation of American finance capital in West German industry amounts to 3,000 million marks (about \$865 millions), and that, in addition, German banks are in-

debted to Wall Street trusts to the extent of 10,000 million marks (\$2.5 billion), while the Bonn separatist government, the provinces and municipalities owe Wall Street another 17,000-20,000 million marks (\$4.2 to 5 billions). Since dollar exchange rates are arbitrarily fixed, a better basis for comparison is offered by the fact that the entire state budget of the Federal Republic for 1951 amounted to only 19,017 million marks.) The main participants include the biggest concentrations of finance capital in the United States. Rockefeller's Chase National Bank and Standard Oil of New Jersey, Morgan's General Electric and International Telephone and Telegraph Company, DuPont's General Motors, Ford, Dillon Read & Company, Brown Brothers & Harriman—these are the new co-owners of West German industry, the partners of the men who subsidized the Hitlerites and organized European industry for the carnage of World War II. They—along with Krupp, Thyssen, Klockner, Mannesmann, Hoesch, Haniel and Stinnes—are the bosses of the Ruhr.

With these interlocking economic and political interests, it was but another logical step for Wall Street imperialists to decide on the restoration of German militarism as a mercenary vassal to help it achieve its aim of world domination. But the decision to speed up this program was precipitated by a combination of other developments which produced a crisis of Washington's en-

ire fore
The n
over-al
U.S. im
rea; fail
and pov
France a
of econ
and of t
British
bilize th
the ent
Asian ar
colonial
atom-bo
Soviet a
The k
ber of s
gram. I
ability,
econom
crisis o
failure,
paign
anti-Sov
compan
wichhu
and rac
people,
like me
the Ar
Wall S
Asia or
THE S
AND
The
the gui
capitali
govern
dam d
policy

ture foreign policy.

The numerous components of this over-all crisis include the defeat of U.S. imperialism in China and Korea; failure to liquidate the influence and power of the Communists in France and Italy; the growing threat of economic crisis in West Europe and of the bankruptcy of French and British imperialism; failure to stabilize the status quo in Iran, Egypt, the entire Middle East and other Asian and African colonial and semi-colonial countries; the collapse of atom-bomb diplomacy following the Soviet atomic explosions.

The home front also saw a number of setbacks to Wall Street's program. Most important was the inability, by the transition to a war economy, to overcome the chronic crisis of overproduction, and the failure, despite an unrelenting campaign of unbridled war hysteria, anti-Sovietism, anti-Communism, accompanied by the use of terror, witchhunts, an increase in racism and racist crimes against the Negro people, and the growth of fascist-like methods, to win the masses of the American working people to Wall Street's war program in either Asia or Europe.

THE STRUGGLE FOR UNITY AND DEMOCRACY

The record indisputably establishes the guilt of the American finance-capitalists and their Washington government in violating the Potsdam decisions, and in pursuing a policy obstructing the establishment

of conditions for a peaceful Germany. Moreover, it suggests that the emphasis given the restoration of German militarism in the calculations of Wall Street betrays the extent of its reliance on this partnership with German militarism. Although the Wall Street billionaires are fishing in many cesspools of the world, a restored fascist German army is their highly coveted prize.

But what of the Social-Democratic attack on the proposals which presumes to see in them falsified versions of the Rapallo Treaty in 1922 and the Soviet Non-Aggression Pact with Germany in 1939, and viciously attempts to distort all these into a "betrayal" of the democratic and peace forces?

The Social-Democratic "argument" is easily disposed of. The Rapallo Treaty between Germany and the Soviet Union broke through the Allied imperialist blockade which sought to strangle the young Soviet power economically. And the 1939 Pact of Non-Aggression between the Soviet Russia and Germany enabled the U.S.S.R. to complete the military preparations which subsequently broke the military power of the Axis. In the light of the incalculable contributions to the strength of the forces of peace and freedom which history has already attributed to these two developments, it seems that only the most incorrigible liars and traitors to the cause of peace and freedom would still try to distort the verdict of mankind.

The fact of the matter is that implementing the Soviet proposals would guarantee a united, anti-fascist, democratic Germany. This would liquidate the conditions for the revival of German militarism and transform Germany, instead, into a bulwark of world peace.

The fact further is that the main development favoring the establishment of conditions for a peaceful Germany is the initiative and demand of the German people, powerfully supported by the Soviet Union, for a peace treaty which would end Germany's dismemberment and allow the establishment of a united, independent and democratic state. This initiative and demand comes from all strata of the German people, in all sections of the country. It was first articulated when the Germans realized the aims of the American imperialists, as they became evident in the notorious U.S. imperialist policy of the recartelization, remilitarization and renazification of West Germany. The establishment of the separatist "Federal Republic" in 1949 confirmed the worst fears of the German people that the American billionaires intended to dismember their country permanently, as a pre-condition for swallowing the Western part, converting it into a war base and using the revanchist ambitions of German imperialists to attempt in the future a forcible "reunification" of Germany.

Accordingly, beginning with the People's Congress Movement for Unity and a Just Peace, launched in

late 1947, the campaign for German unity and a peace treaty rapidly developed, drawing in all sections of the German people. Out of the Congress movement came the broader National Front of Democratic Germany, which, following the establishment by the American imperialists of the separatist Federal Republic, proclaimed on October 7, 1949 the formation of the German Democratic Republic.

It is important to note, since the imperialists and their apologists instantly labelled this new state a "Soviet puppet," that the German Democratic Republic represents the interests of the German people themselves and embraces all strata of the population under the leadership of the Socialist Unity Party. Moreover, the motive for its establishment was the need for a powerful organization of the German people to struggle effectively against the divisive, war-breeding policies of the American billionaires. Even before the establishment of this state, the Soviet Occupation authorities had carried out the Potsdam decisions to the letter. It had demilitarized the eastern zone, denazified the administration and public services, expropriated the nazis, Junkers and monopolists, and established a system which guarantees the right to work, the right to social services, free education and cultural expression. In the German Republic, racist incitement and war propaganda are crimes punishable by fine and imprisonment. Fascist organizations are banned. Nearly

three th
shops fo
war cri
appropri
with all
resource
industries.
formerly
and war
and dist
poor fa
reaction
broken
Republic
for pe
family
Since
ment of
public l
ture to
lic regi
imperial
for a pe
German
carry o
decision
All
were r
speciou
regime
Washin
sought
issue,
his de
Germa
ter to
Assem
ism's V
ing ma
the G
repres
ing of

three thousand factories, mines and shops formerly belonging to nazis, war criminals and monopolists were appropriated and converted, along with all public utilities and natural resources, into people's owned industries. Estates and farmlands formerly belonging to 11,465 Junkers and war criminals were expropriated and distributed among landless and poor farmers. Hence, the back of reaction and militarism has been broken in the German Democratic Republic, and the basis has been laid for peaceful membership in the family of nations.

Since its formation, the government of the German Democratic Republic has made overture after overture to the separatist Federal Republic regime, as well as to the three imperialist occupying governments, for a peace treaty which would unite Germany, end the Occupation, and carry out the aims of the Potsdam decisions.

All these appeals and proposals were rejected on one or another specious ground by the Adenauer regime. Under direction from the Washington Government, Adenauer sought to sidestep and delay the issue, and simultaneously maintain his demagogic pretenses of desiring German unity, by referring the matter to the United Nations General Assembly, where German imperialism's Washington master had a voting machine. Against this maneuver, the German Democratic Republic representatives argued that the holding of free all-German elections was

an internal matter for the German people themselves, and that the creation of a UN investigation commission would represent an intervention in the internal peaceful affairs of the German people. Notwithstanding, the United States voting machine obediently carried out the Washington-Bonn tactic. Faced with this new device for interminable protraction of the Occupation and the restoration of German militarism, the German Democratic Republic on February 13 appealed to the four occupying governments to speed up the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany.

However, it should not be concluded from this that the German Democratic Republic represents the only section of the German people desiring such a speedy solution of the question. In the western occupation zones, where roughly two-thirds of the approximately 70 million Germans live, the struggle for a peace treaty and unification has merely taken on a different form. Whereas in the German Democratic Republic, where the people may freely express their views, the appeals have an affirmative character, in the western zones, where nazi laws, and a nazi-dominated administration govern under direction of a reactionary occupying authority, the people's demands assume the character of resistance to the war-organizing moves of their rulers.

And on the extent and depth of the resistance to re-militarization, the Wall Street-controlled American

newspapers as well as the German press both west and east are in agreement. From the slogan of "Ohne uns" (Count us Out!), the West Germans moved to the organization of plebiscites and private polls, the former banned by the Bonn police, which indisputably showed a great majority of the people in the West opposing the Washington-Adenauer policies. Widespread resistance to Adenauer's plans embraced all sections of the population, including former cabinet ministers, leading church figures, and the rank and file of the Social-Democratic Party. Especially important was the sentiment of the latter, for the Schumacher Right-wing leadership of the Social-Democrats has followed a consistent line of collaboration with the American imperialists, a line calculated to repeat betrayals of the German working class.

The White Book of the National Front of Democratic Germany marshals convincing evidence of the West German working-class demand for peace and unity, a demand voiced mainly by the rank and file of the Social-Democrats, along with workers influenced by the Communist Party of West Germany. The initiative of the metal workers of Hagen-Haspe in March 1951 resulted in a European Workers Conference against the remilitarization of Germany, at which 1,000 delegates representing 18 countries declared: "The workers of the other European countries have declared their solidarity with the German workers in the

common struggle against remilitarization. They hold that German workers have sufficient strength to prevent the remilitarization of Germany." An all-German miners' conference in Essen on January 13, 1952, representing 700,000 German miners, declared their readiness to fight unitedly against the Schuman Plan and remilitarization. Hundreds of work stoppages were called all over West Germany to protest the ratification of the Schuman Plan by the Bonn parliament and the proposed conscription program of the Adenauer."

From all this it is clear that the German people themselves, from the first days of the Occupation, have been opposed to a policy which would attempt to re-impose a fascist regime upon them and draw them into another war. But obviously, in their status of a defeated nation under foreign control, they have been unable to make their voices effective in international councils. Nor could they have formed so powerful an advocate and example of their desire and capacity for democratic self-government and peaceful relations with their neighbors as the German Democratic Republic without powerful assistance.

The most powerful friend and supporter of the German people—it may seem paradoxical to many people—has been the peoples who suffered most from the Hitlerite aggression. It is the peoples of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, and especially the Government

of the
most
litica
Germ
rehab
build
ocrati
It v
midst
when
stroyi
was t
tire o
Stalin
that I
the G
state
princi
Potsd
them
Conf
Chur
again
lishm
Repu
for a
loving
existe
cratic
existe
Unio
wars
blood
possil
count
It
attem
occas
ernm
agrec
Lond
draw

of the Soviet peoples, who have been most generous in economic and political support of the struggles of the German people to democratize and rehabilitate themselves, and to rebuild their country as a united, democratic, peace-loving state.

It will be recalled that even in the midst of the Second World War, when the German troops were destroying whole cities and the Gestapo was torturing the population of entire districts in the Soviet Union, Stalin asserted the Marxist principle that Hitlers may come and go, but the German people and the German state will continue to exist. And this principle was incorporated in the Potsdam Agreement, repeating the theme agreed upon at the Crimea Conference by Roosevelt, Stalin and Churchill. Moreover, it was Stalin, again in 1949, who hailed the establishment of the German Democratic Republic, calling it the "cornerstone for a united, democratic, and peace-loving Germany." Said Stalin: "The existence of a peace-loving democratic Germany side by side with the existence of the peace-loving Soviet Union excludes the possibility of new wars in Europe, puts an end to the bloodshed in Europe, and makes impossible the enslaving of European countries by world imperialism."

It would be repetitious here to attempt even to list the dozens of occasions on which the Soviet Government has attempted to obtain agreement with the Washington, London and Paris governments for drawing up a peace treaty with a

united Germany to end the Occupation and bring about a peaceable settlement of the German question. In the Allied Control Council and the Council of Foreign Ministers, in both the Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations, and by numerous direct appeals to the three Western Governments, Soviet representatives have repeatedly raised this question, offering proposal after proposal to meet objections raised by Western politicians.

Such is the record of the struggles of the German people and the Soviet Union for establishment of the conditions for a peaceful Germany. This record, in contrast to the sorry record of the Washington government and its British, French, and West German satellite regimes, leaves no ground whatsoever for the "plague on both your houses" approach with which the incorrigibly middle-ground liberals' attack the Soviet proposals of March 10.

The record shows that from the very outset of the Occupation of Germany, the Soviet policy of denazifying, demilitarizing and decartelizing its zone has fully accorded with the interests of the American people. Nor could it have been otherwise, for the Soviet peace policy has remained consistent throughout the 34 years of the Soviet Union's existence, and this peace policy has ever served the vital interests of the American people. The record shows, moreover, that the German people through their struggle against the policy of restoring the nazis and

militarists to power in their country, are also serving the vital interests of the American people. Their struggles merit and demand the fullest solidarity and support of the American people, especially the working men and women and the Negro people, who have most to lose from a restoration of German militarism and another world war.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR PEACE

From the foregoing, it is clear that the main obstacle to the solution of the German question in a manner consistent with the vital interests of the American people and of world peace is the program of Wall Street imperialism and the attempts to carry out this program by the Washington government. From this it follows that the American people have a decisive responsibility for the defeat of this Wall Street program and the establishment of conditions for a lasting peace. Their task becomes one of mounting speedily the broadest and most determined struggle for a peaceful Germany.

Speed is essential for victory in this struggle, for the tactic of Wall Street and its Washington government is to delay any serious action on the Soviet proposals, and to press ahead with its program. The maneuvers to realize this tactic began with the Washington Government's delay in replying to the Soviet proposals, and the picayune considerations it raised in opposition. The insistence on "free elections" was such

a maneuver, by which the State Department hoped to stall any action on the Soviet proposal for a four-power meeting to draft a peace treaty with the participation of a united German state. Walter Lippmann, in his column in the *Herald Tribune* disclosed the motive for this maneuver. On March 27, Lippmann wrote: "The object of our note is, manifestly, to support Dr. Adenauer's policy—namely to avert a sterile and confusing four-power conference about Germany and to avert also an all-German election during the next sixteen months . . . The theory of the policy is that while there is not now a popular majority in Western Germany for rearmament within the Atlantic Alliance, the West Germans can be persuaded to acquiesce in that if it is an accomplished fact before they have a chance to vote."

It is, of course, obvious from this that the means of "persuading" the West Germans to vote for the Wall Street program are to be, in addition to a fraudulent election, the reconstructed Wehrmacht and the fascist terror which the Washington and Bonn regimes are now resurrecting.

Lippmann, on April 1, warned the bourgeoisie against entrapping "ourselves in the notion that the Soviet government could not . . . agree to free all-German elections." He warned that "nothing stands between Dr. Adenauer and the all-German election which he must avoid before 1953 . . . except the Soviet Government's refusal to let

the U. S. . . .
tion stru . . .
in this . . .
Here w . . .
fact th . . .
ment's . . .
of this . . .
eral A . . .
both th . . .
lic and . . .
culated . . .
the fo . . .
treaty . . .

The . . .
over a . . .
liamen . . .
election . . .
parties . . .
sufficie . . .
liamen . . .
instru . . .
the A . . .
propa . . .
that t . . .

this il . . .
obstac . . .
govern . . .
treaty . . .
Germ . . .
reason . . .
name . . .
missio . . .
ture . . .
profes . . .
the N . . .

Bu . . .
cut th . . .
neuv . . .
weste . . .
wide . . .
cond . . .
them . . .

the U.N. Commission of Investigation study and report on conditions in the Soviet zone and East Berlin." Here we get a further exposure of the fact that the Washington Government's insistence on the formation of this commission by the UN General Assembly—a move fought by both the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union—was calculated to stall any real effort among the four powers to draft a peace treaty with a united Germany.

The Moscow radio declared: "For over a century Germans had parliamentary institutions with general elections and organized political parties. The German people have sufficient experience in holding parliamentary elections and require no instruction in this matter. . . . Now the American, British and French propagandists are trying to make out that the refusal to cooperate with this illegal commission is the main obstacle to setting up an all-German government and concluding a peace treaty with Germany." Indeed, the German people had more than this reason for opposing the commission, namely, the composition of the commission. The chairman of this creature of the war camp is an Icelandic professor who taught in Berlin under the Nazis from 1933 to 1943!

But on April 9, the Soviet Union cut the ground from under such maneuvers. In another note to the three western Powers, it proposed country-wide free elections be prepared and conducted by the German people themselves under the supervision of

a four-power commission. At the same time, the Soviet note stressed the urgency of avoiding delay of such elections and the drafting of a peace treaty. Soviet foreign minister Andrei Vyshinsky emphasized to the Washington Government's Chargé d'Affaires in Moscow that delay was unnecessary, since all problems raised by the three Western powers could be settled at a four-power conference.

But Wall Street and the German imperialists have indicated they have no intention of abandoning the program for the restoration of German militarism. Reports from both Bonn and Washington announced the intentions of the two regimes to railroad through the "Contractual Agreement," despite all objections. Hence, the necessity for speed and powerful actions by the peace forces to head off this conspiracy.

Clearly, the conclusive defeat of the Wall Street and Ruhr conspirators is required by the vital interests of the American people. The greatest speed and the broadest expressions of the American people's will for peace are needed. Immediate discussions among the four powers, with a mandate from the American people to the Washington government to reach agreement for the establishment of a united German government, is the need of the moment. Actions to compel the realization of this need will pave the way for subsequent efforts by the American people to establish the conditions for a peaceful Germany, and lay the foundations for a lasting peace in the world.

The Fascist Danger

By Eugene Dennis

We republish below the opening section of Comrade Dennis' memorable Report to the Party's Fourteenth Convention, held in 1948, because of its profound Marxist-Leninist estimate of the political developments in our country and the significance of that analysis for today. The events of the past four years have fully confirmed the thesis put forward by Comrade Dennis as to the specific mode of the unfolding of the fascist menace in our country. The entire Report, issued by New Century Publishers, will repay the most careful study and re-study.

The promoters of fascism and war, in their assault upon the Communist Party, have singled out its General Secretary, Comrade Dennis, for special persecution. Comrade Dennis was first sent to jail for a year, for "contempt" in challenging Congress' notorious refusal to enforce the Fourteenth Amendment. Thereafter, following his conviction together with his ten fellow-National Committee members in the first Foley Square Smith Act frame-up trial, in which he served as his own attorney, Comrade Dennis was also vindictively cited for "contempt" by Judge Medina, so that his prison sentence totalled five and a half years.

As the trials of the Smith Act victims throughout the country proceed, the fight to smash these frame-ups is joined with the fight to free Comrade Dennis and his fellow-National Committee members. In this fight, against the forces of fascism and war, inspiration and guidance may be drawn from Comrade Dennis' clear-sighted Report, here partially reprinted—the Editor.

COMRADES!

IN MY REPORT I wish to concentrate on one central question of the post-war struggle of the people for peace and democracy, namely, the growing danger of fascism and how to combat it.

Three years have passed since the end of the anti-Axis war and the military defeat of nazi Germany, fascist Italy and militarist Japan.

Fascism has been destroyed in the newly established democracies of Eastern Europe where the foundations are being laid for the transition to Socialism.

In Eastern Germany the process of democratization and demilitarization is well advanced. In great parts of China and in Northern Korea the victorious liberation movements have smashed the old feudal-militarist regimes and are bringing new

anti-imperialist peoples' governments into being.

But in Western Germany, Anglo-American imperialism is building up monopoly capitalism, and the cartellists are again doing business, under the new management of Wall Street. In U.S.-occupied Japan, the monarchy, feudalism and the trust remain. The Wall Street cartellists are converting Western Germany and Japan into spheres for American capital investment and control, as well as into spring-boards for predatory military adventures against the U.S.S.R. and the anti-imperialist governments of Eastern Europe and Asia.

In France and Italy, the decisive majority of the working class and their Communist Parties fight for peace, national independence, democracy and progress. The United States is trying to enslave these countries. It promotes the rise of clerical fascism in Italy. It seeks to prepare a fascist *coup d'état* in France, making use of the Blum Socialists to pave the way for the fascist De Gaullists. Similarly, American imperialism aids and tries to bolster the fascists in Greece, Spain and Latin America.

This sharpening postwar world of offensive of American imperialism, which combines the most reactionary intervention in the internal affairs of other nations with gigantic and aggressive war preparations, is accompanied by the growth of fascism in our country. *The development of fascism in the United States now ap-*

pears as a serious and threatening menace. The process of fascization, most directly engendered by monopoly's war drive, itself in turn serves as a key internal instrument to facilitate and accelerate Wall Street's preparations for World War III.

The United States is not Spain, nor is it Japan. It is not even Germany. As the center of world monopoly capitalism, it has become in the postwar period the chief center of world reaction. Obviously, therefore, if fascism were victorious in the U.S., it would subject the American people to a savage regime of unparalleled terror, oppression and exploitation. It would plunge the whole world into a new global war of unprecedented violence, horror and death.

* * *

Only those who have eyes but will not see can be blind to the increased danger of fascism in America. Yet in some quarters the danger is denied, while in others it is not understood.

Naturally, the architects and engineers of fascism and war—the monopolists and their apologists—try to conceal the process of fascization taking place under their direction.

To obscure their purposes, they try to portray the United States as the citadel of democracy. They proclaim that private enterprise and the two-party system are the hallmarks of liberty. They profess that they are championing human rights—by pre-

serving corporate and states rights. They selfrighteously "justify" every act of aggression abroad and of repression at home, asserting that they safeguard democracy by "combating Communism."

In essence, the reactionary Social Democrats and the trade union reformists subscribe to this thesis. They defend Wall Street's reactionary drive toward fascism and war—"because" they are "opposed to totalitarianism." They explain that the reactionary measures of the bipartisans in both foreign and domestic affairs are necessary "because" there is no other way to prevent the "infiltration and spread of Communism" abroad and within the nation. They extol the virtues of "the American way of life," and consider any form of American bourgeois political reaction a "lesser evil" with respect to socialism.

These Right-wing socialist and reformist labor flunkies of the economic royalists serve their masters well by denying the real source of the fascist danger and minimizing its gravity. They divert attention from the organizing center of native fascism to its lunatic fringe. They attribute the reactionary and pro-fascist acts of the government and Congress to "bad individuals"—and not to the system of monopoly capitalism that breeds war and fascism.

There is another school of thought, embracing millions of honest but confused workers and progressives who can't see the woods for the trees. They readily admit that the men of

the American trusts have launched a reactionary postwar offensive. But they cannot distinguish between the varied forms through which bourgeois reaction rules and manifests itself. To them this postwar offensive of monopoly appears identical with that which followed World War I.

They point to the Palmer raids, injunctions and "race riots" of 1919-1922, as well as to the Dawes Plan, and think that today history is merely repeating itself. They cite the current elections, the formal legal existence of the Communist Party and the trade unions, as evidence that things aren't really so bad here, after all. And so they prophesy that the present reactionary offensive of big capital will quickly run its course, that the "pendulum will inevitably swing" back and automatically assure the victory of the democratic camp. These well-meaning but misled people believe that the democratic sentiments and traditions of the American people are so strong that "it can't happen here." They see the fascist drive of the monopolies only as a temporary aberration, a passing "phase," and shut their eyes to the reality of its danger.

But those who are seriously determined to win the fight against war and fascism cannot put their reliance in the tactics and weapons that sufficed for earlier struggles, nor can they allow themselves to become prisoners of a Maginot line political psychology. They must uncover the *new features* in this postwar offensive of American monopoly, and estimate

correct
danger

To
know
dersta
genera
its de

As
and i
strate
terror
reacti
most
ance

Fas
capita
again
milita
icy, E
form

Th
not s
for t
is its
of c
anoth
open
ing t
natio

Fa
when
popu
and
flects
of ca
in th
ful

H
men
men
foll

correctly how and to what extent the danger is increasing.

* * *

To this end, it is necessary first to know clearly what fascism is, to understand its class nature and to generalize the universal features of its development.

As the history of nazi Germany and fascist Italy tragically demonstrates, fascism in power is the open, terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic and most imperialistic elements of finance capital.

Fascism is the power of finance capital, its organized vengeance against the working class and all militant progressives. In foreign policy, fascism is jingoism in its crudest form.

The establishment of fascism does not substitute the rule of one class for the rule of another. But neither is its advent an ordinary succession of one bourgeois government by another. Fascism is bourgeois rule by open, terrorist dictatorship, replacing the old form of capitalist domination, bourgeois democracy.

Fascism advances toward power where the working class and the popular forces generally are weak and divided. But its advance also reflects the weaknesses and instability of capitalism, which is unable to rule in the old way, or to pursue a peaceful foreign policy.

History tells us that the development of fascism and the establishment of fascist dictatorship does not follow an identical pattern in all

countries. The forms and methods of fascist rule also differ from country to country, determined by differences in the relation of class forces, national traditions and the economic position of monopoly.

But despite the specific features that mark the development of fascism in this or that country, there are certain general features which it displays always and everywhere.

Thus, while the way fascism has come to power differs in this or that country, in *every* country the drive toward fascism and its victory have been accompanied by extensive preparations for imperialist war, especially for an anti-Soviet crusade. Thus, too, while the establishment of a fascist dictatorship in certain countries has been preceded by the growth of capitalist reaction and by the adoption of a system of reactionary measures to cripple and smash the trade unions, to outlaw the Communist Party and ruthlessly to oppress all national minorities.

And, while the establishment of fascism has been accompanied by the abolition of bourgeois-parliamentary government only in certain countries, and in others has maintained the forms of a sham parliamentarism—yet in *all* countries fascism has savagely wiped out all democratic liberties for the masses.

No matter how fascism develops, or by what means it comes to power, fascism everywhere, as Dimitroff pointed out in 1935, has these characteristics in common:

"Fascism is a most ferocious at-

tack by capital on the mass of the working people;

"Fascism is unbridled chauvinism and annexationist war;

"Fascism is rabid reaction and counter-revolution;

"Fascism is the most vicious enemy of the working class and of all working people!"

* * *

Why does the danger of fascism increase in the United States at this particular time? What factors impel monopoly capital, spearheaded by its most extreme and bellicose sections, to move toward fascism?

The first and most decisive factor is the special position of U.S. capitalism in the postwar period, in which the general crisis of world capitalism has become deeper and more acute. The United States emerged from the war stronger militarily and, in certain respects, economically. (The productive capacity of the U.S. increased 50 per cent during the war, etc.)

At the same time, world capitalism was much weakened in the course of the war. Fascist imperialism was shattered in Germany, Japan and Italy. Britain and France were reduced to second-rate powers. New People's Democracies arose in Eastern Europe. Despite its great human and material losses, the Soviet Union came out of the war with its socialist system strengthened and its international influence tremendously enhanced.

The U.S. monopolies, with their swollen profits and increased produc-

tive capacity, face a relatively restricted home market and a shrinking capitalist sector of the world. Their "solution" is to embark on an aggressive program of imperialist expansion and intervention. They seek to bolster and restore capitalism in Europe and Asia, under U.S. hegemony. They prepare for a new world war to attain world domination.

Such an ultra-reactionary foreign policy cannot be carried through without complementary domestic measures. Therefore, the monopolists strive to militarize the country, curb labor, illegalize the Communist Party and smash the anti-war, anti-imperialist people's coalition and opposition. That is why monopoly reaction turns to fascism.

The second factor is connected with the first. American monopoly is haunted by the specter of the coming economic crisis, by the rapid maturing of the first postwar cyclical crisis of overproduction.

In an effort to avert or postpone the outbreak of the crisis, and to cushion its effects in the interests of Big Business, monopoly is organizing a war preparations economy, an economy of the Goering type, governed by the principle of "guns instead of butter." It resorts to a colossal twenty billion dollar armaments program. It uses the Marshall Plan to promote government export subsidies and protection for U.S. monopoly's foreign economic penetration, as well as to further the political enslavement of nations. It is

introd
"volun
when
trollin
tion a
priori
materi
eign r
lied v
measu
the st
Hitler
taking
of stat
The
delay
cyclica
tic m
masses
they
of the
which
severe
Desp
levels
million
Despit
wages,
standa
have b
monet
up an
heavie
of we
there
ductio
peacet
critica
goods.
This
fore l
impov

introducing the nazi system of "voluntary" cartel arrangements whereby the large corporations controlling basic materials and production are permitted to work out priorities and the allocation of these materials to the domestic and foreign monopoly firms financially allied with the suppliers. All these measures are being integrated, with the state power in the fashion of Hitler Germany. Thus, there is also taking place an accelerated growth of state monopoly capitalism.

These measures of monopoly to delay or circumvent the approaching cyclical economic crisis assure gigantic monopoly profits. But for the masses these measures mean that they are already experiencing some of the hardships and ravaging effects which are usually connected with a severe economic crisis.

Despite the present relative high levels of employment, nearly eight million workers now work part-time. Despite currently higher nominal wages, the real wages and the living standards of the working people have been reduced through run-away monetary inflation, intensified speed-up and regimentation, as well as heavier taxes. While the production of weapons of destruction increases, there is a steady decline in the production of means of production for peacetime purposes, as well as a critical shortage of many consumers' goods.

This program of monopoly therefore leads currently to great mass impoverishment, exploitation and

suffering, and will make the oncoming crisis more devastating and protracted in character. But it is also a program which, unless checked by the mass struggle for peace, will transform the war preparations economy into a full-blown war economy in an unjust and disastrous war.

Confronted with the growing resistance of the masses to this reactionary program and its logical consequences, the American monopolies are turning toward fascist methods of rule.

Thirdly, and related to the above factors, the postwar drive of American capitalism toward fascism shows itself in the unprecedented concentration and centralization of capital which developed at an unparalleled pace during and after World War II. The intensity of capitalist exploitation of labor has been increasing. Not only labor, but the masses of toiling farmers, as well as small business, have been drawn ever deeper into the clutches of monopoly domination and oppression.

Consequently, the internal contradictions of U.S. monopoly capitalism have sharpened tremendously. These have reached the point where the domination of the trusts in the economy and politics of the nation has not only become incompatible with peace, with the liberty and economic security of the American people, but has also become unacceptable to a growing section of the labor-progressive camp.

Fearful of the rising might of the new people's anti-monopoly party

and coalition, the increased role of working-class leadership in it and the growing influence of the Communists, American monopoly capital is losing faith in the possibility of governing effectively by bourgeois-democratic methods. Therefore, the most reactionary monopolies are turning ever more rapidly toward the introduction of fascist methods of rule and repression.

* * *

That is the *why* of the fascist danger in our country. How does this danger manifest itself? What are its symptoms and trends?

In the classic fashion set by Hitler, the postwar offensive of the American trusts shows its fascist colors by flying the flag of anti-Communism. Like Hitlerism, Wall Street reaction prepares for war under the guise of "preserving" world peace and democracy from "Soviet imperialist aggression."

Nazi Germany, presenting itself as a "have-not" nation, professed to seek only "room to live in" as justification of its expansionist course. American imperialism, boasting that the United States neither needs nor seek new territory, justifies its expansionism and aggressive military program as self-defense and benevolent protection of the small nations. Under this guise a vast military program for aggression to the tune of over 20 billion dollars, the largest peacetime military budget in world history, has been adopted.

Hitler proclaimed that nazi imperialism could not live in the same

world with the socialist system of the U.S.S.R. American imperialism, playing on the anti-fascist sentiments of the American people, declares that socialism is "Red fascism," and that the Soviet Union refuses to live at peace with the capitalist states. Under this guise the U.S. and its satellites have violated the Yalta and Potsdam agreements, vitiated and bypassed the U.N., organized an anti-Soviet economic blockade and embarked on a series of anti-Soviet acts and provocations.

Wherever fascism has come to power, it has incorporated the most reactionary, warmongering and imperialist elements of finance capital into the government, and elevated the military to positions of power over all aspects of civilian life. That process is far advanced in our country today. Wall Street's men have attained positions of decisive importance in both old parties, Republican and Democratic. They have secured control of the House of Representatives, where the extreme reactionaries, like Halleck, Martin, Parnell Thomas and Rankin, rule the roost. Extreme pro-fascists and warmongers like Forrestal and Royal are appointed to high public office, or, like Dulles, shape policy in a semi-official capacity.

From these controlling heights, the bipartisan pro-fascists and warmongers advance their military, economic and political preparations for expansionist adventures and an anti-Soviet war. This is true not only in matters of foreign policy but also in

the eff
to use
ment
of Righ
time e
pro-fas
Wall
of Righ
stituti
ment t
fascist
der an
pro-fas
practic
The F
tee, n
passed
ganda
against
ionists
sives.

On
fascists
the ev
serious
the tra
not or
for str
as we
siniste
passag
project
nazi-li
days o
a furt
to out
regula
Progre
destro
organ
come

the efforts of the U.S. monopolists to use their control of the government to subvert and nullify the Bill of Rights and to transform the peacetime economy of the country to a pro-fascist war economy.

Wall Street is subverting the Bill of Rights, as well as using the Constitution and the organs of Government to promote its reactionary and fascist aims. With the "loyalty" order and the "subversive lists," the pro-fascist monopolies have begun to practice the nazi-like rule by decree. The House Un-American Committee, never a legislative body, has passed from dangerous fascist propaganda to illegal, punitive measures against the Communists, trade unionists and other militant progressives.

On the legislative front, the pro-fascists have succeeded in enacting the evil Taft-Hartley Law, which is seriously crippling and undermining the trade unions and their capacity, not only for economic struggle, but for struggle against war and fascism as well. The introduction of the sinister Mundt-Nixon Bill,* and its passage by the House, as well as the projected re-introduction of this nazi-like legislation in the early days of the 81st Congress, signalize a further advance of the fascist drive to outlaw the Communist Party, to regulate the unions and the new Progressive Party, and to curb or destroy these and other progressive organizations. Should such a bill become law, it would signify a most

advanced stage in the fascist drive.

In the various states, also, a series of repressive measures have been passed to pave the way for the advance of fascism: examples of this are the Callahan Act in Michigan, and the activities of the Canwell Committee in the state of Washington.

There is no ground for any lingering illusion that the courts, particularly the Supreme Court, can be relied on to "check and balance" the drive toward fascism. The courts are major instruments of government by injunction and coercion. The lower courts have upheld, and the Supreme Court has refused to review, the infamous persecutions of the Un-American Committee. "Leaks" from the Justice Department violate Grand Jury secrecy, and, with the help of the most reactionary sections of the press, prejudice Grand Jury proceedings. They result in such monstrous fascist-like frame-ups as the current indictment of the National Board of the C.P.U.S.A., under charges of violating the infamous Smith Act. Trial juries, particularly in the District of Columbia, are directly intimidated by the "loyalty" order, so that verdicts of "guilty" have become a foregone conclusion in any case involving anti-fascists.

Militarization of the country goes hand in hand with the process of fascistization. Not only has the peacetime draft been enacted in the face of broad popular opposition, but the military are increasingly intervening

* Passed in 1950 as the McCarran Act.—Ed.

in the sciences, universities, industries and other aspects of civilian life, and placing them on the "alert," on a wartime basis.

All these measures to prepare the way for fascism are meeting with growing resistance. In the labor-progressive camp they arouse increasing uneasiness and mass opposition, even though their full significance is not everywhere adequately grasped.

* * *

While this and more is going on, the open advocates of fascism are trying to supplement government repression with a reactionary mass movement. They are instigating a campaign of terror and violence against the working class, the trade unions and the Communist Party.

The organization of violent, extra-parliamentary actions has a special significance today. Whether undertaken by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Catholic War Veterans, the Ku Klux Klan or chauvinist elements among the nationality groups, this activity is designed to provide American fascism with a mass base.

At the same time, the most extreme fascistic elements in the country are waging a mass political-ideological offensive to bring labor, farm, church and nationality group organizations under fascist influence. Shouting the battle cry of anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism, these forces are propagating chauvinist, white-supremacist, anti-labor, anti-Semitic and anti-Negro views.

What does all this add up to?

Are these just straws in the usual reactionary wind that blows "after every war"? If we put these jig-saw pieces together, do we see nothing more than the ordinary reactionary offensive of monopoly?

Clearly, the answer is no. These are moves designed to pave the way for fascism. They are the organic parts of the fascist offensive of American monopoly capital and its preparations for a new world war.

Yet it would be profoundly wrong in analysis and highly dangerous in policy to assume that this drive of Wall Street toward war and fascism has already reached its goal. Nor should it be assumed that the outbreak of war is necessarily and inevitably contingent upon the establishment of fascism, or that the ushering in of fascism is necessarily and inevitably contingent upon the outbreak of war. The reactionary and warmongering policies and measures of the trusts and their bipartisan political agents are facilitating and promoting the drive toward world war and the internal process of militarization and fascization now under way. This is a fact. But fascism has not yet triumphed! Nor is World War III and the victory of fascism in the United States inevitable. These, too, are facts of great importance.

* * *

We have considered some of the main factors impelling American monopoly capitalism toward war and fascism, and the manifestations and gravity of the fascist danger. Now

we mu
period,
such
drive o
ward v
After
powers
advanc
socialis
ened. I
spirit o
progress
in the
ple's p
powerf
reconst
Party
and in
liberati
people.
ary off
headwa
fascism
For o
war dr
coincid
velt, b
Roosev
The r
which
on Ro
Party,
phase
come
class fo
cial-des
because
of our
well a
and in
bor m
postwa

we must ask why, in the postwar period, the monopolies have made such alarming advances in their drive toward fascism, and hence toward war.

After the defeat of the Axis powers, the anti-imperialist camp advanced on a world scale, and its socialist sector has been strengthened. In our country, the fighting spirit of the American workers and progressives has been demonstrated in the development of the new people's party, in the unfolding of powerful economic struggles, in the reconstitution of the Communist Party on a Marxist-Leninist basis, and in an upsurge in the national liberation movement of the Negro people. Why, then, has the reactionary offensive of Big Business made headway, and why has the danger of fascism become so threatening?

For one thing, the reactionary postwar drive of American capital, which coincided with the death of Roosevelt, brought the breakup of the old Roosevelt-labor-progressive coalition. The majority of organized labor, which followed and was dependent on Roosevelt and the Democratic Party, was unprepared—in the first phase of the postwar period—to come forward as an independent class force. As a result largely of social-democratic influences, and partly because of the harmful consequences of our former revisionist policies, as well as because of the limited base and influence of our Party in the labor movement, labor in the early postwar period was not yet ready

ideologically or mobilized politically, to forge a new people's anti-imperialist coalition under working-class leadership. The mass of the workers, who learn the hard way in the school of experience, were, at first, reluctant to break with Truman and the Democrats. It took them quite a while to realize that Truman and the Democrats had already broken with labor, and with the progressive features of Roosevelt's policies.

It is true that after we repudiated Browderism and reconstituted our Party as a Marxist vanguard party, we reoriented with relative promptness to the realities of the postwar situation. We steered a course of uncompromising struggle against American imperialism and its political spokesmen, even though we did not in the first postwar months draw all the practical political conclusions from our correct estimate of the new situation and the need to forge a new people's coalition of which the working class would be the backbone and eventual leader. Because of this we were able to influence only a minority in the C.I.O.—albeit a sizable and influential minority—and only very negligible forces in the A. F. of L. However, we did succeed in reaching and influencing a more substantial section of the Negro people and key sections of the intellectuals and professionals. Nonetheless, this delay in the regrouping of the labor, democratic and anti-imperialist forces enabled monopoly reaction to gain considerable ground in its turn toward war

and fascism.

Secondly, the forces of fascism advanced on many fronts because they were able to break through on the ideological front. Wall Street's gargantuan anti-Communist and anti-Soviet propaganda war made some inroads among certain sections of labor and the middle classes. Masses of people who want peace have been deluded into believing that the cold war will avert a shooting war, and that the atom bomb, plus a huge armaments program, are defensive weapons which will assure peace by discouraging "potential aggressors."

Millions who fear mass unemployment and the impending crisis have been sold on the Marshall Plan, as a measure to ensure American prosperity and European recovery. Large sections of the population have been duped by the foul lie that Communism is "totalitarianism" of the Left, and so they have fallen victim of all kinds of anti-Communism poison. The temporary successes of its psychological warfare have also enabled pro-fascist reaction to advance.

Most importantly, this postwar drive of monopoly reaction toward fascism and war has been aided and abetted by the reformist and social-democratic lieutenants of monopoly. These agents of the class enemy have succeeded up to now in maintaining and deepening the split in the ranks of the working class, and especially in the trade union movement. Consequently, the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. remain divided. The C.I.O. national

leadership is engaged in bitter warfare against the C.I.O. Left Wing. And political divisions in the ranks of labor, fomented largely by the social-reformists and Social-Democrats, manifest themselves in a particularly dangerous manner in this year's national elections.

Clearly, the danger of fascism has been heightened by the class collaboration policies pursued by the official national leadership of the trade union movement, by the national leaders of most farm organizations and of most of the mass youth, women's and fraternal organizations. This class collaboration policy expresses itself in support for the Marshall Plan and the armaments program, adherence to the two-party system of Big Business, Red-baiting and anti-Soviet activity. It shows itself in the Murray-Tobin counsel to adopt a no-strike policy. It leads to the spectacle of trade union leaders who are against wage increases if the corporations are against them. It results in capitulation to the Taft-Hartley Act and passive acceptance of injunctions. It means holding the trade unions back from active opposition to the various reactionary measures through which big capital, its government and Congress pave the way to fascism. It leads to the betrayal of international working-class solidarity in the struggle for peace and democracy.

Thus, even where leaders like Murray and Green formally oppose such pro-fascist steps as the Taft-Hartley Law and the Mundt Bill,

their
perfu
head
work
prohib
locally
with
the C
monop
Wh
leader
the re
war d
the m
to the
leader
pates
betray
the na
Fin
bor m
Comm
share
that t
met w
of the
times,
spirit
have
adequ
ership
front
the f
Hartl
gro p
etc.
Oth
while
and s

their opposition is purely formal and perfunctory. They discourage and head off militant mass actions by the workers and their allies. They prohibit united front mass actions locally and nationally. They compete with the pro-fascist in Red-baiting the Communists and other anti-monopoly progressives.

While, of course, the reactionary leaders in the labor movement bear the responsibility for facilitating the war drive and fascization policy of the monopolies, the working class, to the extent that it tolerates such leaders and their policies, participates in the responsibility for this betrayal of the cause of labor and the nation.

Finally, the Left Wing of the labor movement, including certain Communist leaders, also bears a share of responsibility for the fact that the fascist offensive has not yet met with the necessary rebuff. Some of the advanced workers have, at times, underestimated the fighting spirit of the working people. They have consequently failed to give adequately bold and militant leadership and to develop a broad united front from below on such issues as the fight for peace against Taft-Hartleyism, for the rights of the Negro people and of the Communists, etc.

Other sections of the Left Wing, while developing a militant wage and strike policy, have manifested

strong tendencies toward economism. In particular, they have failed to exercise the necessary leadership in promoting and guiding the building of the new people's party, and in developing a fighting alliance between labor and its popular allies, the Negro people and the mass of the working farmers and city middle classes.

* * *

Division, confusion and backwardness still exist in the labor and progressive movements. We cannot gloss over these factors which enable the most aggressive and reactionary monopolies to press forward and advance the drive to fascism and war.

But neither can we underestimate the favorable aspects of the international situation, especially the great and growing power of the world anti-imperialist camp. Nor can we fail to appreciate fully the new trends in, and the great strength and potential fighting capacity of, the American working class and the entire anti-fascist and anti-imperialist camp. We must not fail to take into account the growing alertness of our own Party to its vanguard role and tasks. This new understanding of the indispensable vanguard role of our Party to assure the establishment of working-class leadership in the people's coalition and struggles is bound to bring untold strength to the camp of peace and democracy.

Halt Bacteriological Genocide!

The documents here presented focus the floodlight of truth on the perpetrators of bacteriological warfare. The Pentagon's cynical rejections of the accusations, together with the prevalent censorship, have prevented the knowledge of this crime from reaching the people. But the same forces that bombed Nagasaki and Hiroshima, that used napalm bombs, now seek to wage genocidal warfare against the colonial peoples and drown their national-liberation struggles in blood. Thereby they

admit the defeat of their own efforts militarily to prevent the conclusion of a Korean truce.

The documents speak for themselves. And they speak, above all, to the American people, to the working class, to all the peace forces, who must cry out that the government cease this monstrous warfare, ban the use of bacteriological weapons, agree to a cease-fire in Korea, and sign a Five-Power Peace Pact—the Editor.

APPEAL OF JOLIOT-CURIE PRESIDENT OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF PEACE

I HAVE been shocked to receive a message from Kuo Mo-Jo, President of the Chinese Committee for the Defense of Peace, conveying the news that the U.S. armed forces in Korea have made use of bacteriological weapons.

Between January 28th and February 17th, U.S. military aircraft in Korea disseminated, at the front and in the rear, the microbes of plague, cholera, typhus and other frightful, contagious diseases.

This horrible deed, that could never have been contemplated by a sane mind, has none the less been committed. It is a sequel to the no less monstrous crime of the destruction of hundreds of thousands of civilians in a few seconds by the atom bomb at Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The use of bacteriological weapons is a clear violation of international law—in particular of the Geneva Convention of June 17th, 1925.

They were employed by the Japanese armies in China. The U.S. General

Staff, and public figures in the United States, had earlier made no secret of U.S. preparations and intention to use these weapons.

This criminal act conflicts directly with the resolutions expressing the desire of all peoples adopted by the World Peace Congress at Warsaw calling for the prohibition of bacteriological, chemical and all other means of mass destruction.

By their support to the Stockholm Appeal, 500 million men and women, in demanding this prohibition, clearly demonstrated their desire for such slaughter never to be repeated.

Today the peoples can see the peril in which they stand, the ruthless methods of terror by which it is sought to bring them to obedience.

Public opinion must arise to denounce this crime.

This Appeal by Frederic Joliot-Curie was published on the 8th of March 1952.

On the 10th March 1952, Kuo Mo-Jo, Vice-President of the World Council of

Peace, forwarded to the World Council of Peace the text of the following protest.

PROTEST BY THE DEMOCRATIC PARTIES OF CHINA AGAINST BACTERIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

During nearly two years of aggressive war in Korea, the U.S. imperialists, whose brutality is unprecedented in history, have suffered disastrous blows. Over eight months have now elapsed since they were forced to accept negotiations for a cease-fire.

Today they not only have no intention of improving the position, but are using every means to obstruct the peace talks. Moreover, they are unscrupulously violating international conventions and are making themselves enemies of human justice in committing the terrible crime of launching bacteriological warfare on a large scale.

Since the 28th January military aircraft of the U.S. invaders have repeatedly spread large numbers of germ-laden insects over the frontline positions and in the rear of the Korean People's Army and the Chinese People's Volunteers, which has aroused unbounded indignation on the part of the Chinese and Korean peoples as well as Peace-loving people throughout the world.

The Chinese and Korean Governments have already made strong protestations in their respective communiqués against these actions. The peoples of China and Korea and of the whole world are protesting one after the other, but the U.S. Government is making every effort to disclaim its responsibilities. On the 4th of March, Mr. Acheson, Secretary of State, issued a shameless statement in which he made the following lie: "The United Nations forces

are not using and have never used any sort of bacteriological warfare."

However, the facts prove that not only do the U.S. aggressors continue to spread germs in Korea, but have further expanded the area of bacteriological warfare to our territory from the 29th February to 5th March. During these six days the U.S. invaders sent in succession 68 groups of planes in 448 flights and these planes encroached the air territory of North-east China, dropping large numbers of germ-laden insects over Fushun, Simmin, Antung, Kwantien, Linkiang and other places.

In addition they carried out bombing and strafing over areas of Linkiang and Changtienhokow. These facts prove indisputably that the U.S. imperialists are so barbarous and so cruel that they will stop at nothing and will employ any ruthless method in order to massacre the Chinese and Korean people. Their intrigues to prolong and extend the war in Korea have been entirely revealed.

Long before the Second World War the U.S. imperialists had already made their preparations for bacteriological warfare. Among the great Powers only the United States and Japan refused to ratify the Geneva conventions condemning bacteriological warfare. After the Second World War, the U.S. aggressors made use of numerous Japanese bacteriological war criminals, including Shiro Ishii, Ujiro Wakamatsu and Masajo Kitano, to conduct secret research in experimentation and making of arms of bacteriological warfare, using the soldiers of the Korean People's Army and Chinese volunteers as subjects for their experiments. All these facts are known to the whole world.

Because of these monstrous and inhuman atrocities committed by the U.S.

imperialists, the democratic parties and the whole of the Chinese people fully endorse the two solemn declarations of Chou En Lai, Foreign Minister of the China Central People's Government published on the 24th February and 8th March. To safeguard human justice, to safeguard Peace in Asia and the rest of the world, and to safeguard our own security and that of all mankind, we must wage a resolute struggle against the U.S. aggressors who are using bacteriological weapons. We must not cease the struggle until we have attained our aim. The democratic parties of China issue this solemn appeal to the people of the whole of China:

The more maniacal the U.S. aggressors become, the more they show their isolation and desperation. We, the Chinese people, must unite among ourselves and unite with the Asian peoples and all peoples throughout the world to resolutely answer the provocations of the U.S. aggressors.

We must continue to strengthen our just movement against U.S. aggression, and to help Korea, to redouble our efforts to increase production and practise economies to support the Chinese People's Volunteers and the Korean People's Army so as to deal destructive blows to the criminals of bacteriological warfare. The democratic parties of China issue this solemn appeal to Peace-loving people of all Asia and of the entire world, including also the peoples of America and Japan, and to all organizations which are striving for Peace.

The atrocities committed by the U.S. aggressors constitute not only a grave menace to the security of all humanity, but an insult to human dignity. The calamity which ravages the peaceful people of Korea today strikes at the peaceful Chinese people. If effective ac-

tion is not taken immediately to stop this monstrous crime perpetrated by the U.S. imperialists, a similar calamity will fall tomorrow on the peoples of the rest of the world. For the sake of human dignity and of World Peace, we must rise up and condemn unanimously the U.S. imperialists and impose the most severe sanctions against the criminals of bacteriological warfare.

Justice belongs to us and victory shall unquestionably be ours.

The National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference.

The Communist Party of China.

The Revolutionary Committee of the Kuomintang of China.

The China Democratic League.

The Democratic National Construction Association.

Non-Party democrats of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference.

The China Association for Promoting Democracy.

The China Peasants and Workers Democratic Party.

The Chiu San Society.

The Taiwan Democratic Autonomous League.

The New China Democratic Youth League.

EXTRACT FROM COLLECTION
OF MAIN REPORTS CONCERN-
ING USE OF BACTERIOLOGI-
CAL WEAPONS IN KOREA
AND CHINA

(Given below are a few typical examples from reports published in the Chinese press and the Chinese News Agency, Hsinhua.)

January 28, 1952: United States air-

craft fl
Longel
the re
spread
fore se
type r
fleas, a

Febr
of pap
fleas,
etc., w
the TI
craft o
near C
Ling
cricket

Febr
aircraft
fection
wari.
and d
Hajon
Anoth
and fl
podon
fected

craft flew over Tchingkuli, Weiwonli, Longchaotung, Longchouitung, that is, the region southwest of Ichon and spread three types of insects never before seen by the inhabitants. The first type resembled black flies, the second, fleas, and the third, ticks.

February 11, 1952: Large numbers of paper tubes and packets filled with fleas, spiders, mosquitoes, ants, flies, etc., were dropped from aircraft over the Ti-Yuen front. The same day aircraft dropped a large number of flies near Che-Pien-Li and fleas in the Choling area and fleas, flies, mosquitoes, crickets, etc., in the Pyongan area.

February 27, 1952: United States aircraft dropped more than twenty infection-carrying bombs south of Kuhwari. Two aircraft made two sorties and dropped flies and mosquitoes over Hajongkok, northwest of Wichonni. Another U.S. plane dropped pamphlets and flies on Masongi and Sanghwangpodong, northwest of Kuhwari. Infected insects were also found each of

Inchon and Chongju and southwest of Cholson.

February 28, 1952: Aircraft dropped infested rats west of Kujang. Infected leaves of trees were found in sectors west of Manghaesan, and southwest of Kuhwari. Germ-carrying insects were also found north of Pyong-yang, west of Munchon and southeast of Tosan.

March 2, 1952: United States aircraft dropped great clouds of flies, fleas, midges and other infected insects on Munchon and Songchon.

March 3, 1952: U.S. aircraft dropped a cannister full of germs north of Anju and three more over Sukchon.

March 4, 1952: Large amounts of infected cotton were spread by seventeen artillery bombardment on Chinese and Korean positions southwest of Maryangsan. Artillery bombarded the Chinese-Korean positions on the western front and large numbers of infected feathers spread following these explosions. The same day, a U.S. aircraft spread infected leaves over Hwakok, northeast of Kaesong.

Some Problems of Work in Right-Led Unions

By John Swift

This is the first of a two installment article. The concluding section will appear in the May issue.—Ed.

EVERY READER of *Political Affairs* is aware of the central and decisive importance of uniting the ranks of organized labor for peace and progress. Every reader will likewise agree that this cannot be accomplished without winning the workers in the present Right-wing led unions, for these constitute the overwhelming majority of the organized working class.

Yet awareness and agreement while essential, are not sufficient. Nor is it of any particular value to preach to the labor movement or to try to shame it by declamations and appeals. Such general appeals do little good and often considerable harm. For frequently one feels frustrated after reading articles that call upon labor to rise to the occasion, to do thus and so, to break from the war camp, to forge an alliance with the Negro people, to stop Red-baiting in its ranks, to break from the two-party system, etc. And this feeling of frustration arises from the knowledge that constantly haunts the worker-reader of the real state of affairs in the labor

movement, of the tremendously wide gap between what it *ought* to be and what it *is*.

The class-conscious worker sees the Left-wing and progressive unionists exerting their main influence and leadership over a number of independent unions with a total membership of something over a half-million. He sees these unions, however, physically separated and often isolated from the main sections of the labor movement. He sees the labor movement as a whole divided *within* itself and *against* itself, with the A. F. of L., C.I.O., and Railroad Brotherhoods led by men who, while they are considered labor spokesmen, are less the spokesmen of labor and more the spokesmen of Big Business in the ranks of labor.

Perplexed by this state of affairs, the class-conscious worker wants to see the *bridge* by which the gap between what is and what ought to be can be spanned. Without seeing this bridge, without being able to tread on it with a degree of confidence, he feels completely incapable of moving in the direction of concrete labor unity. Often this finds expression either in phrasemongering or in cynicism towards the working class,

both of which feed each other and lead to general passivity.

How are we going to get this labor unity so that the labor movement can play its progressive role? How are we going to get this labor unity, starting from what actually is, from the present relationship of forces within the organized working class, from the present level of working-class understanding, and not from wishful thinking? How?—that is the question.

* * *

Before attempting to answer a few aspects of this question, it would be well to touch on the historical background of the problem of work in reformist-led trade unions. Obviously, this problem long predates our recent Party discussions of it. Specifically, the problem has an American as well as an international history.

Its American history goes back to the turn of the century when the rise of monopoly capital enabled the bourgeoisie to use its super-profits to bribe the upper stratum of the working class, thereby laying the economic basis for the victory of Gompersism in the labor movement. In answer to this opportunism an ultra-“Left” tendency arose which expressed itself in a disgust with the official labor movement and a withdrawal from it. As early as 1912, Comrade Foster, seeing the error of this ultra-“Left” policy and realizing that the organized workers were only being abandoned to the mercies

of the labor opportunists, fought for a policy of tireless and methodical work within the official labor movement. By his leadership and example, he proved that despite the Gomperses and Greens, it was possible to achieve important successes for the workers even within the Right-led A. F. of L. of that day.

In the early years of the world Communist movement, a number of young Communist Parties also developed an ultra-“Left” approach to the then existing Social-Democratic controlled labor unions. Seeing no perspective for work within these unions, the Communists withdrew, leaving them in the main to the opportunists. As early as 1920, Lenin, in his brilliant polemical booklet, *“Left-Wing” Communism: An Infantile Disorder*, severely criticized these “Left” Communists, calling them “foolish,” and said that, “Greater stupidity, and greater damage . . . cannot be imagined!” (*Selected Works*, Vol. X, p. 95)

Since then, many things have changed. In France and Italy, for example, it is the Communists who today have the closest links with the labor movement. It is this which constitutes their great strength, while it is the Social-Democrats whose influence in the working class is steadily waning. Also, there are today no Communists in any part of the world who do not wish to be linked with the unions.

In our country, too, changes have taken place. The Communists do

have greater strength and influence in the labor movement. But the *primary*, the most important change of all that has taken place in this period of time, is that the great bulk of the industrial workers are now organized into trade unions. The labor movement has grown from approximately three million members in the 1920's to fourteen million today.

This is not merely a quantitative addition, for a quantitative change of this magnitude must inevitably carry with it important qualitative elements. In the first place, the industrial working class has in the main become trade union conscious. As we well know, trade-union consciousness remains still within the ideological framework of bourgeois consciousness—that is, it still accepts the capitalist system. But this in no way belittles the significance of this development, for trade-union consciousness represents an important step *forward*, represents movement and transition, and thereby approaches more closely to the nodal point from which the leap to mass class consciousness can take place.

Furthermore, the trade-union movement is no longer the privileged domain of a relatively small, highly skilled, labor aristocracy. Today it includes the great mass of the unskilled and semi-skilled workers in trustified industry.

Of great significance is the fact that for the first time hundreds of thousands of Negro workers are members of trade unions. This has

added a quality of militancy and of Negro-white unity, which, with all its present limitations and shortcomings, represents something new and something growing.

Often in our vexations at the relative ideological backwardness of the American working class, at its failure to break from capitalism, and at the fact that this mighty Gulliver stands hat in hand before the Lilliputian political pigmies of our day, we tend to overlook and even depreciate the historic significance of the *new* fact: that the bulk of the industrial workers are now members of class organizations.

Lenin, in 1920, considered it of extremely great importance that millions of workers in the West, were, as he put it, "*for the first time* passing from complete lack of organization to the lowest, most elementary, most simple, and (for those still thoroughly imbued with bourgeois-democratic prejudices) most easily accessible form of organization, namely, the trade unions." (*Selected Works*, Vol. X, p. 94)

And Stalin understood its special meaning for the United States, where for historic reasons the workers lagged far behind their European brothers, not only in general class consciousness, but even in the more elementary matter of trade-union organization. When an American trade-union delegation interviewed Stalin in 1927, he asked: "How do you account for the small percentage of American workers organized in

trade
p. 389
diffic
but sin
ers th
answer
ization
The
from a
movem
and o
it coul
has no
tical f
reform
fluenc
for th
our co
differ
takes
tion,
with
capital
for ec
and
strong
begin
a new
earth.
Tha
the la
assum
Wit
groun
of th
move
starti
like t
Fir
is th

trade unions?" (*Leninism*, Vol. 1, p. 389) The delegation had some difficulty in answering this question, but since then, the American workers themselves have provided the answer, not in words, but in organizational deeds.

The outstanding fact that emerges from all this is that, while the labor movement has now grown in size and organizational strength so that it could be a power in the land, it has not yet become a decisive political force, because it is still under reformist and Social-Democratic influence and leadership. If it were not for this fact, the whole situation in our country and the world would be different. For when American labor takes an independent political position, when it refuses to go along with the war policies of monopoly capital, when it starts to fight all-out for economic security, Negro rights and civil liberties, then the last stronghold of world imperialism begins to crumble and the danger of a new world war will fade from the earth.

That is why the work of winning the labor movement for these tasks assumes such vital urgency today.

* * *

With this historical sketch as background, let us take up a few aspects of the question of how we are to move towards labor unity of action, starting not with what we should like to be, but with what actually is.

First, let us ask ourselves: What is the reason for our tendency to

neglect work in the reactionary-led trade unions? Why do we concentrate our primary attention upon those unions already under progressive leadership? One could, of course, answer by saying that a base of operations is always of great importance and should be consolidated. And this would be quite true. For there is much that still needs to be done to make this a firm and solid base. But then again, a base which becomes completely surrounded and hemmed in by the enemy will not long remain a base. For the very concept of a base is that it be a strong-point *from* which and not merely *in* which to operate.

Another answer could be that life is comparatively easier in unions where the progressives already have a majority, while it is far more difficult in unions where the Right-wing rules. This, too, is true but cannot explain the tendency under discussion. For the whole world knows that if there is anything that characterizes a Communist, it is his fearless, self-sacrificing devotion to the people, his staunchness in the face of the heaviest odds. After all, those who seek the "easier" path in the ultra-reactionary, witch-hunt-infested America of 1952 are not likely to be Communists. Therefore this answer, too, must be discarded; for it is a calumny against the valiant members of our Party.

There is another and more basic explanation for this weakness, and that is that our work in the reform-

ist-led unions frequently suffers from a lack of perspective and a wrong approach.

Of what does this lack of perspective and false approach consist? It consists of the tendency to view these Right-led unions rather one-sidedly and statically. We tend to see only their class collaboration side. In other words, we tend to see the reformist leadership but not the rank and file.

But the class collaboration policies of the union leadership represent only one side, and this is by no means the side that gives the union its basic class character. For these unions are not only instruments of class collaboration. They are first of all vehicles of the working class, the most elementary and basic mass organizations of the class. They are the means by which the working class defends itself from the economic encroachments of capital. And this is true, even where the unions are under Right-wing leadership.

Hence, every Right-led union has two sides to it: its elementary class struggle origin and nature, and its class collaboration policies and leadership. These two opposites exist side by side, interpenetrate each other, and express themselves in the contradiction between the strivings and needs of the rank and file, on the one hand, and the official policy and aims of the top leadership, on the other. This contradiction must in time be resolved in the interests of the workers and the class struggle, or be re-

solved in the opposite way, by the complete negation and destruction of the unions. And if there are some who think that trade unionism can no longer be wiped out in the United States, let them heed the voice of working-class experience which proves that, especially in periods of economic crisis, the bosses set their sights on destroying the trade unions. That the capitalist class has not given up this objective even today can be seen by the Taft-Hartley Law, the most onerous and most reactionary features of which will be utilized precisely at the moment when a mass reserve army of unemployed tends to lower labor's bargaining position. Also, let us not forget that the pre-Hitler German labor movement was far more powerful than ours, but still gave way to a fascist labor front. This is the logical outcome of class collaboration.

The failure to take into account the dual features of a Right-led union, unavoidably and inevitably must lead to serious errors in policy and tactical approach. To fail to see the class collaboration policies and leadership and to see only the class origin and character of reformist-led unions, is to veer towards gross Right opportunism which results in strengthening the current of class collaboration and consciously or unconsciously participating in selling out the workers.

On the other hand, to fail to see the class character of a union, to see

only th
not th
ward
means
work
oursel
are m
in stre
a conse
to the

The
still is
and en
plains
file w
often
is why
ions as
defend
when
leaders
guish
conside
ship w

Unle
worker
way c
unions
the d
action.

It w
simply
attitud
what
of the
pared
sia, St
Russia
develo

only the rotten reformist leaders and not the rank and file, is to veer towards "Left" sectarianism, which means seeing no perspective for work in these unions and isolating ourselves from them—even when we are members. And this, too, results in strengthening the labor fakers by a conscious or unconscious surrender to them.

* * *

The fact that a Right-led union still is a working-class organization and engages in the class struggle explains the attitude of the rank and file workers towards their unions, often despite their leadership. That is why the workers view these unions as their own. That is why they defend them so vigorously. Even when under corrupt, gangster-ridden leadership, the workers try to distinguish between the union which they consider their own and the leadership which is foisted upon them.

Unless this psychology of the workers is understood, no real headway can be made in reactionary-led unions, which means no headway in the direction of labor's unity of action. Instead, a great deal of harm can be done.

It was Stalin who profoundly and simply explained the reasons for this attitude of the workers. Explaining what he called the "special feature of the situation in the West," as compared with that in old Czarist Russia, Stalin pointed out that in old Russia the trade unions arose and developed "after the Party was

formed, around the Party, and in amity with the Party." "Trade unions," he said, "did not yet exist in Russia when the Party and its organizations were already leading, not only the political, but also the economic struggles of the working class—even small and very small strikes. This, mainly, accounts for the exceptional prestige enjoyed by our Party among the workers before the February Revolution, as compared with the trade unions which existed here and there in an embryonic state."

"In Western Europe," Stalin continued, "the trade unions developed under totally different conditions. In the first place, the trade unions there were formed and underwent extensive development long before the working class parties came into existence. Secondly, instead of the trade unions growing up around the party of the working class, the parties of the working class emerged from the unions. Thirdly, as the field of industrial struggle, which is closest to the working class, was pre-empted, so to speak, by the trade unions, the political parties . . . were forced into the background."

Sharply criticizing those Communists who failed to grasp this truth, Stalin said: "They do not understand that, good or bad, the rank-and-file worker regards the trade unions as his citadels, his strongholds, which help him to maintain his wages, his working day and so forth." And concluding on this point, Stalin declared:

"He who fails to understand this characteristic feature in the mentality of the average worker in Europe will understand nothing about the present position of the Communist Parties." (J. Stalin, *Leninism*, I, pp. 158-60.)

Stalin was speaking of Europe in 1925, but how much validity this has for America of 1952! There can be no question but that "good or bad," the workers consider their unions as their "citadels." Especially is this true of the workers in the trustified industries, where the older generation still remembers the pre-union days of industrial serfdom. The union has given the workers a feeling of collective strength and class dignity. This is even more true of the Negro workers in trustified industry, who love their unions with a passion which flows from their status as doubly-exploited members of the working class, from their position as members of an oppressed people. The union to the Negro worker represents a bridgehead, narrow though it may be, to equality on the job, to Negro and white unity, and thus also to his people's ultimate freedom. That is why up and down the length and breadth of the land, there is not an industrial community in which Negroes work and have the right to union membership, where they are not also among the staunchest, most militant and most progressive fighters for their union.

It is this mentality of the workers toward their unions which explains why workers will gripe so much

about union bureaucracy, thereby often creating the impression that they are turning away from their union, but when the chips are down, when the union is under attack, they will rise overwhelmingly to its defense.

This was most graphically illustrated around the union-shop issue. Here the bosses thought they really had a question that would confuse and divide the workers. Yet when they put it to a test, the capitalists got the surprise of their lives. In more than four years since the Taft-Hartley slave law was passed, 5,547,478 workers cast valid ballots in government supervised union-shop elections. These took place in 46,119 different industrial shops in every state of the union. Furthermore, Taft and Hartley and their other Big Business Congressional cronies, weighted these elections against the unions by inserting a clause in the law making a majority vote for a union-shop insufficient for a union victory. The union had to get a majority, not only of those who voted, but of *all those eligible* to vote. The results showed 5,071,978 workers voted for the union shop. This was 91.4 percent of the valid ballots cast. Actually 97.1 percent of the elections went on record for the union shop!

We can see this same approach of the workers to the question of raiding. The main success of the raiders occurred under one of two circumstances: either when it was possible to confuse the workers into believing that the union itself had split down

the mi
between
or at
led un
becaus
infamo
this lat
to tak
union,
they c
raiders
siderab
union?
that, r
if they
above
would
union
Wh
if it v
a gen
drifte
the ele
their l
to gu
they v
the m
least
in nea
union
organ
work
won
passe
Th
been
room
felt t
tion
skille
their

the middle and that therefore a choice between two sides had to be made, or at the time when the progressive-led unions were not on the ballot because they had refused to sign the infamous Taft-Hartley 9H clause. In this latter case, many workers refused to take the chance of voting "No union," which was the only way they could have voted against the raiders. They feared, and with considerable justification, that a "No union" vote could lead exactly to that, namely—no union. And even if they opposed raiding, they wanted above everything else to be sure they would have a union, for even a "bad" union is better than no union.

Where once a vote was taken, even if it was very close, the workers as a general rule, slowly but surely drifted into the union that had won the election. Here, too, they often put their likes and dislikes aside in order to guarantee that, come what may, they would have a union in which the *majority* of the workers were at least organizationally united. And in nearly all cases where the defeated union maintained its own separate organization and tried to keep the workers out of the union that had won the election, the workers bypassed it, leaving it isolated.

The main exception to this rule has been that of groups of skilled tool-room workers, who have mistakenly felt that, by separate craft organization and because of the shortage of skilled workers, they could improve their bargaining position over that

of the unskilled and semi-skilled production workers. Also as a general rule, after a union was once raided, the workers stood by their original vote, refusing to heed the new siren call, even when coming from the union which originally had been the victim of the raid.

The starting point, therefore, of any approach to unity of, and unity with, the workers in the Right-wing led unions, is to accept, and not merely accept, but to agree with, their class approach towards their own union. We must be sure that opposition or disagreement with leadership policies and practices can never be made to appear in the eyes of the workers as opposition to their union, or an attempt to belittle its achievements. For the pride which a worker feels in his union and its accomplishments is an important asset, not a liability. And there is none in the United States who can more rightfully share this pride than the Communists. For the Communists were among the pioneers who helped bring unionism to the workers in the trustified industries. It was William Z. Foster, the foremost leader of our Party, who more than any single individual contributed to the organization of the unorganized and to the strategy and tactics of militant trade unionism.

It is precisely because the labor fakery, the Murrays, Reuthers, Dubinskys, Hutchesons, Rieves, and the others, know full well the feeling of the workers to their unions, that they

consciously try to distort every *inner-*union disagreement with their class-collaboration policies and dictatorial practices, into the appearance of an *anti-*union opposition. Note that after John L. Lewis appeared as a guest speaker before the Ford Local's giant 10th Anniversary Celebration last June, Walter Reuther sought to evade the embarrassing but pertinent questions put to him by insinuating that the presence of Lewis at the celebration meant that certain Ford local leaders were contemplating taking the local out of the U.A.W. This of course is preposterous. The demagogue Reuther knows full well, however, that he dare not discuss the proposals of the progressives on their merits. That is why he must seek to make these proposals appear as anti-union attacks instead of the pro-union defenses that they really are.*

* * *

It is the failure to see the Right-led unions as class organizations, the tendency to confuse the leaders with the rank-and-file, which explains the failure or slowness to fight *concretely* for labor unity wherever the class struggle expresses itself. And it expresses itself everyday in every shop and in every union. For just as it is true that people speak in prose long before they know what prose is, so workers, whether in Right-wing or

* This article was written before Reuther's dictatorial seizure of Local 600. But even after this most blatant violation of elementary trade-union democracy, Reuther denies that his action was directed against an inter-union opposition. Instead, he tries to pass it off as an emergency action to "save" the union from "anti-union" forces.—J. S.

progressive-led unions, participate in the class struggle long before they are *conscious* of its existence.

If the principle of labor unity is to have any meaning at all, therefore, it must find its expression and grow out of an even more elementary trade-union *solidarity*. When workers are on strike, when they are fighting their boss on the picket line, when their kitchen pantries are empty, that is when they need help and should get it, *irrespective* of their leadership or the political position they may have taken on one or another occasion. And the Communists in the labor movement must be the first to teach the workers this simple truth. It is they who must plant the many tiny acorns of solidarity from which alone can and will arise the mighty forest of working-class unity. The adage, that a friend in need is a friend in deed, is still a good one to remember.

In 1951, thousands of important strike struggles were fought out. Most of these were of workers in Right-led unions. How did the progressive workers express their solidarity? How did they work to express the solidarity and unity of the workers, plant to plant, union to union, industry to industry? There were, of course, numerous examples of class solidarity displayed. But these were still the exception. Attention, however, should be called to two splendid examples of such solidarity and unity of action.

The first was the magnificent unity

of ac
the s
dustr
ing m
L. A
Mill
the
them
Th
indec
ed b
solid
lowi
cont
rinc
tion.
expi
rene
To
sign
hoo
wid
The
cross
Har
"T
the
stal
T
sol
tor
B.A
wh
abo
leg
ph
act
thi
...
de
ev

of action which was welded during the strike in the copper mining industry—from Left to Right, including independent union and A. F. of L. And while the independent Mine-Mill Union played the leading role, the victory won belongs to all of them.

The second was displayed by the independent Longshore Union headed by Harry Bridges. This act of solidarity took place under the following circumstances. In July, the contract between the M.E.B.A. (Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, C.I.O.), and the Isthmian Line, expired. The company refused to renew the contract and forced a strike. To break this strike it proceeded to sign up 37 ships with the Brotherhood of Marine Engineers affiliated with the A. F. of L. Seafarers Union. The Longshore Union refused to cross the C.I.O. picket lines, and Harry Bridges was quoted as saying: "I've got no love for the C.I.O., but there's a trade union principle at stake here."

The net effect of this simple act of solidarity can be seen by the editorial which appeared in the M.E.-B.A. paper. It read: "In these days, when wolves, jackals and hyenas abound in the labor movement and a legitimate strike is a signal for the phonies to strikebreak and scab, an act of honest trade-unionism is something to be appreciated and lauded. . . . The entire I.L.W.U. from president Harry Bridges . . . down to every rank-and-file member has dem-

onstrated its loyalty to trade union principles."

Well said, indeed! It is a sad commentary on the moral climate in the American labor movement that acts such as this are the exception and not the rule.

Yes, every *concrete* ounce of labor solidarity is worth a hundred pounds of *general talk* about it. The "wolves" and "jackals" which "abound in the labor movement" have sullied the air with their foul animal stench of "mine for me and to hell with the next fellow." This is true to such an extent that now and then even honest progressive trade-union leaders and workers begin to think of answering the wolves by acting like wolves themselves. They begin to think only in the narrow terms of "my union versus your union," and forget the elementary truism that working-class principles stand above both individuals and individual unions, and that either the workers will learn how to fight together in order to win together, or they will all surely lose separately.

Labor solidarity and unity must be fought for daily, not just on special occasions. And never—NEVER—must it be merely an empty gesture, something just for the record. It must at all times be the very heart and soul of Communist and progressive trade-union work.

When it becomes this, hundreds and even thousands of opportunities will be found for applying it in practice. For the problem of solidarity

and unity begins in every department of every shop, mine and mill. The problem of the unity of the Negro and white workers, of the skilled and unskilled, of the men and women workers, of the older and newer workers, of the employed with the unemployed, are all distinct facets of the problem of solidarity and unity which arise right on the job.

Of greatest importance is the struggle for Negro and white unity. The key to the problem here is the white worker who must learn that *his* stake in this unity is just as great as that of the Negro worker. He must learn that this unity cannot be firmly established and cemented unless the white worker fights for *full* equality for the Negro worker, first on the job, but also off the job. And the special task of white Communists is not that of *telling* Negro workers how much they stand for equality, but of *proving* this by fighting for it *in the ranks of the white workers*.

In the many industrial plants where the skilled crafts belong to separate unions, this undoubtedly represents a negative factor in terms of plant-wide workers' unity. But it can be transformed into a most important positive factor having repercussions beyond the single plant itself. This is possible where the progressive workers consciously work to *subordinate* the differences arising from different union membership, and to *elevate* that which these workers have in common, namely, their common status as wage workers in one plant.

Different union affiliations need not and should not be an obstacle to joint action in behalf of joint grievances, in contract negotiations, in wage disputes, and in generally presenting a common front before the boss.

Even where at first every overture is met by rebuff, the progressive worker and the progressive union must never cease to work for united action. In those cases where the workers of the other union get embroiled in a struggle, even after they have turned down joint action, it is the duty of progressive workers to come to their assistance in every possible way and never to sit back, shrug off the problem and say "good for them."

It must be understood that, when you boil it down to its hard core, the difference between honest progressive trade unionism and class-collaboration unionism is the difference between really defending the interests of the workers and merely pretending to do so. And this difference will at first become apparent to most workers, not on so-called big national and international questions, but on the most immediate and closest questions to them, the questions of bread and butter. Nor can this difference be discerned merely in words. It will have to show itself in deeds; the simple deeds that every worker can test on the basis of his own experience.

Where workers are employed by giant corporations owning scores of huge mines, mills and plants, and

where
work-
union
begin
and
time.
every
other
in w
the c
wher
have
and
nego
ally
gree
this
and
tory.
H
atio

where, as is so frequently true, the workers belong to widely separated unions, it is of great importance to begin the fight for joint negotiations and joint united action at contract time. The present situation where every union tries to outsmart the other, generally leads to a situation in which they all get outsmarted by the corporation. For even in instances where the workers of a given plant have full confidence in both the will and ability of their own leaders to negotiate a "good" contract, it logically follows that the greater the degree of unity of all the employees of this company, the stronger they are and the better their chances of victory.

Here, too, if proposals for united action are defeated on union floors or

turned down by the other union, this cannot be used as a pretext for giving up the struggle for unity. It only means that more work must be done in the ranks of the workers, and they must at all times know exactly what the score is. Above all, let us repeat, the struggle for unity cannot be considered as a gesture or a maneuver to put someone else on the spot. For the workers are generally fed up with the maneuvers of one union against another. Often, therefore, even sincere proposals are rejected because the workers suspect a concealed booby-trap. How they feel about insincerity is best seen in the fact that there is no epithet in the workers' rich arsenal of salty language which has so much derision and sting to it as when they call someone "a phony."

The March Coup d'Etat in Cuba

By Blas Roca and Juan Marinello

THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE of the Popular Socialist Party, meeting in special session, made an extensive analysis of the military *coup d'etat* of March 10, of its causes and effects, and arrived, by unanimous agreement, at the following conclusions:

1. The *coup d'etat* of March 10, headed by Batista, has created a national political situation which pushes the country along the path of reactionary abnormality.

The masses, confused by the course of the events, without any orientation at all on the part of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties, are looking for a positive course of action to continue, under the new situation, the struggle for the salvation of Cuba, for the eradication of the faults and evils which kept it down, for the transformation and development of its economy, for the people's welfare, for peace and democracy.

That orientation, in order to be effective, must be based on the examination of the causes and factors that led to the *coup d'etat*, of the basic objectives which it is pursuing, and of the position of the different classes and parties with respect to it.

2. Although the "big morning" of March 10 surprised the people of the city, the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois leaders of the government parties and of the Orthodox Party, it had a long period of incubation.

Its basic causes are found in the policy of the North American imperialists, whose agents intervened directly in its accomplishment.

This *coup* is a manifestation of the policy followed by the Yankee imperialists in Latin America, in tune with its orientation towards war and aggression.

The preparations that Washington is making to unleash an atomic third world war with reactionary, imperialist, anti-socialist, and anti-democratic aims, sharpens a reactionary and anti-democratic policy with respect to Latin America.

During World War II, which was an anti-Hitlerian and anti-fascist war, a war supported by the people, the North American rulers appeared interested in supporting the installation, in Latin America, of governments that were more or less liberal, democratic, and popular.

But since the end of the war, since plans have been projected in the White House for aggression

against free peoples, to take control of the world, to unleash a new war in an alliance with the Nazis, Japanese militarists, Franco-ists and fascists, enemies of yesterday, the orientation of Washington with respect to Latin America is exactly the opposite.

Today Washington favors putting into power in our countries militaristic and feudalistic gangs and the most reactionary and most unpopular elements of the bourgeoisie.

The Yankee imperialists have fomented or supported the recent *coups d'etat* in Venezuela, Costa Rica, Peru, and Bolivia, and the caricature of elections as held in Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Nicaragua, etc., through which there have been put into the government or confirmed in the government the reactionary, militaristic and feudalistic bands which tyrannize these and other countries of the Americas.

The imperialists do everything possible to prevent the existence or the establishment in our countries of governments with a mass base, with an anti-imperialist orientation or with a Leftist tinge.

The imperialists fear that governments with a mass base, although led by anti-Communist bourgeois and petty-bourgeois forces, will find themselves compelled, under the pressure of the people, mobilized by their very promises, to make concessions to the national pro-independence, pro-peace feeling and to

the demands of the workers and peasants.

In the case of Cuba, the imperialists wanted to maintain the division of the working class and to impede the process of popular unity which is growing, thanks to the united front policy followed by our Popular Socialist Party.

Motivated by this policy, the Yankee imperialists have been fomenting the *coup d'etat* of Cuba for some time back.

3. The Yankee imperialists were frightened by the loss of prestige of the Prio government and of the bourgeois-latifundist parties on the one hand, and, on the other, the growth of the influence of our Popular Socialist Party and the rise of the Orthodox political movement with a mass base.

Prio was already incapable of fulfilling the demands of the imperialists and had come to depend on the pressures of Mujal,* of the bands of "gangsters," and of the provincial bosses of his own party.

The movement for labor unity has been growing by leaps and bounds. Wherever there have been union elections the "cetekarios"* have been swept out. The hierarchy of C.T.K. was losing more of its prestige every day. The imperialists feared that any political change in the country would lead to the complete defeat of its most brazen agents

* Mujal—Right-wing labor leader.—Ed.

* "Cetekarios"—The name given to members of the C.T.K., government-supported Labor Union, headed by Mujal.—Ed.

in the labor movement, the "cetekarios" divisionists.

The imperialists wanted to reduce the demands of the bands of gangsters and of the "cetekarios," of Mujal and his associates, without weakening anti-Communism and the division and corruption of the working class.

Because of this situation, already in the middle of the past year, there had been strong pressures by the imperialists in favor of a *coup d'etat*. Those pressures were publicly exposed in two articles by Edward Tomlinson, columnist of the *Miami Herald*, who pointed to Batista as the man destined to seize power in agreement with the military.

Batista then rejected, as is known, such insinuations, but waited and wanted to reach the presidency by means of the elections.

4. Towards the middle of February it became evident that Hevia would lose the elections, even though Batista continued to support his candidacy, since the opposition opinion, strengthened by the policy of our Popular Socialist Party, was turning in the direction of Agramonte as the candidate who could defeat the government.

Prio and his gang saw as the only way out of the perspective of defeat, the accomplishment of a *coup d'etat* to prolong his rule. It is probable that, in planning it, he counted on winning the support of Batista, which would explain what he had stated with reference to the proposed

coup for April 15.

Batista, on his part, also saw a *coup d'etat* as the only way out, but not in favor of Prio or Hevia, but rather in his own favor, in order to put himself into power.

The immediate objectives of the *coup d'etat* have been, therefore, first: to avoid the defeat of Prio and Hevia at the hands of the popular oppositionist avalanche, which would have produced basic and important changes in the orientation of the country, whatever might have been the "intentions" and the "points of view" of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois leadership of the Orthodox Party; second: to put the power in the hands of Batista, with the hope that he could, without the ballast of the unpopularity of the administration, reorganize the administration's political forces around him, disperse and confuse the Orthodox forces, and then hold elections which had already been won beforehand.

5. Prio and his government were incapable of any successful opposition to the *coup d'etat*, or of defending in any way their civil power and the Constitution.

Greatly discredited, lacking any authority or influence with the masses, confronted by the deepest popular revulsion, they could not hope that the people would spontaneously mobilize to defend them just by hearing that the military *coup* was taking place.

Prio and his government, already involved in the same game of plan-

ning
at a
Bat
what
Or
gove
polit
coal
inab
dison
The
mob
slog
This
of t
the
natio
lar p
T
men
selv
lead
ator
tryin
wag
him
cure
T
gen
only
som
The
all
sup
poli
bac
gen
spit
on.
*
Prio

ning a coup and in maneuvers aimed at achieving the collaboration of Batista, were in no position to foresee what action Batista would take.

Once the *coup* started, Prio, the government, the P.R.C.* and other political parties of the government coalition showed their complete inability, their impotence, their disorganization and disorientation. They were not able to realize a single mobilization, not to raise a single slogan, nor to adopt any position. This is a logical result of the nature of the bourgeois-latifundist class, of the government and of the anti-national, anti-labor, and anti-popular policy followed by these.

The P.R.C. and the other government parties are destroying themselves little by little. Their principal leaders, their representatives, senators, mayors and councilmen are trying to jump on the Batista bandwagon, to reach an agreement with him, in order to maintain their sinecures and positions.

The C.T.K. raised a slogan of general strike which was taken up only by its die-hards in aviation and some confused groups of workers. The C.T.K. for some time had lost all influence over the masses. Its only support come from governmental, police, "gangster" and employer backing. The masses rejected the general strike call of the C.T.K. in spite of Orthodox efforts to bring it on.

* P.R.C.—*Partido Revolucionario Cubano*—Prio's Party—also called *Autenticos*.—Ed.

The leaders of the C.T.K., repudiated and hated by the working masses, have been running to put themselves at the disposal of the new government, to ask that Army and Police protection be maintained so that they can retain, by violence, the positions that they have usurped.

6. The Orthodox Party could not give a correct or appropriate orientation either, with respect to the *coup d'etat*, remaining practically paralyzed during the first moments.

Its masses, having an electoral majority, had no leaders which could call on and mobilize them behind a correct slogan.

After the *coup d'etat* had been consummated, on the night of March 10 the Orthodox Labor Commission made an effort to mobilize the workers in a general strike under the leadership of the C.T.K., with the unpopular line of restoring Prio to the presidency and maintaining in their positions Mujal, Hirigoyen, Jesus Artigas and other hated opportunists who had been imposed on the labor movement as leaders.

In none of the statements formulated by the Orthodox leaders was there a single mobilizing slogan, nor was there a formula which offered a way out, or which outlined a course of action for the Orthodox masses.

This is a result of the entire line followed by the Orthodox leadership prior to March 10.

The Orthodox leadership rejected

the line of forming a united front with a program of peace, democracy, social welfare, labor unity and administrative integrity which, if it had been established, would have made the *coup d'etat* impossible.

The Orthodox leadership rejected our plea that, without deals, they formulate a popular program and issue a call to Batista that would facilitate the defeat of the administration. If this had been done, it would have taken away from Batista the pretext which he used for reorganizing the military commands about him, the pretext which the Orthodox Party, once they won, would carry out more fervently than Grau.

The leadership of the Orthodox Labor Commission followed a policy of sabotaging the united front of the workers, that is to say, of protecting the "cetekario" leaders and of allying themselves with them. The divisionist and discredited opportunists of the C.T.K. prevented the timely mobilization of the working class against the *coup d'etat*.

This entire line, against popular unity, is derived from the subordination to imperialism, to the same imperialism which fomented the *coup d'etat* which was aimed against the electoral possibilities of the Orthodox Party.

The imperialist and government agents within the Orthodox Party, such as Portell Vila and Dorta Duque, who shrieked every kind of slander against our party when it

proposed the Program for Victory, have remained "discreet" and with their arms folded with respect to the present *coup d'etat*.

7. The new government of Batista, product of the *coup*, does not represent anything which is essentially different from the government of Prio.

Each represents the interests of the landowners, the latifundists, big business and the bourgeoisie.

Each shares the point of view of the subordination of Cuba to the Yankee imperialists.

The new government of Batista does not propose to initiate any reform which basically modifies the policy followed by Prio;

Nor does it propose to follow an independent policy in favor of peace and national independence;

Nor does it propose to undertake the Agrarian Reform, which would eliminate latifundism and distribute free land among the peasants;

Nor does it propose to undertake any plan for the protection of national industry, of trade with all countries and the industrialization of Cuba;

Nor does it propose to eliminate racial discrimination nor to put into effect a program such as that contained in the bill on Education & Edicts against Racial Discrimination;

Nor does it propose to guarantee democratic freedom of the working class so that it can eliminate the leaders imposed by violence and

fraud,
basis
an ant
defens
with r

Prec
ment c
do any
undert
ures, i
of po
gather
admin

8. T
tista h
fundam
sterism
possib
damer
not ta
tion.
ready
elemen
gangs
the A
nor c
have
one e
ficiari

9.
noun
gress,
tain t
the c
Cong
now
Hous
tiona

* A
—An
govern
some s
Ed.

fraud, and can build unity on the basis of trade union democracy, an anti-imperialist ideology and the defense of the worker's demands with respect to capital.

Precisely because the new government of Batista does not propose to do any of the above, although it may undertake some demagogic measures, it cannot eliminate the causes of popular discontent and will gather the same unpopularity of the administrations of Grau and Prio.

8. The new government of Batista has announced that one of its fundamental aims is to end "gangsterism." Although this is entirely possible without effecting any fundamental change, until now it has not taken a single step in that direction. On the contrary, there are already gathered around it gangster elements or those connected with the gangsters. Neither the A.R.G.,* nor the Association of Ex-combatants, nor other "gangster" organizations have been bothered, nor has a single one of the known leaders and beneficiaries been apprehended.

9. The new government first announced the dissolution of Congress, then that they would maintain the prerogatives and the pay of the congressmen, but without the Congress functioning. And they are now making moves to have the House and the Senate give constitutional legality to the violent change

of government.

The suppression or suspension of the functions of Congress is the extension of the *coup d'etat* to this other elected body of the parliamentary mechanism, and accentuates its anti-democratic complexion.

To end "gangsterism" and prevent the *coup* which Prio was preparing for April 15—pretext used for the "big morning"—it was not necessary to dissolve the Congress nor to suspend elections.

10. Batista can see himself free of the pressure of the bands of gangsters, cetekarios and of the political bosses who were draining the government of Prio, but, on the other hand, the power is going completely into the hands of the armed forces, of the military commands which will inevitable return to the extortions, impositions and abuses of the past.

In spite of all this, Batista can make some secondary concessions to the masses, with the aim of winning some of them over to him, such as increasing the salary of sailors, soldiers and the police.

11. The unity of the people's forces and mass action can prevent the government from following a course of open reaction and indefinitely postponing the elections which should be held on June 1.

The unity of the people's forces, the reorganization and the struggle of the masses under the new situation can give Cuba the way out which it needs.

* A.R.G.—*Asociación Revolucionaria Guiteras*
—An association of gangsters, used by the Prio government, and responsible for the murders of some seventy labor leaders in the last few years.—*ib.*

The key to a people's victory, today as yesterday, continues to be unity, the united front, the mobilization of the masses united.

The government of the *coup* does not offer any solution for the masses, for the people.

Neither is there any solution in the struggle to reestablish in power the unpopular government of Prio and his band of "gangsters," "cetekarios," opportunists and grafters,

Neither can we limit ourselves to sterile motions of condemnation, without any other perspective of what is to be done.

It is necessary to formulate a positive program which based on the objective situation, can unify the masses in the struggle for a way out of the present situation.

The slogans which can serve as a base today for the unity and mobilization of the masses against the present situation and for a democratic solution, are the following:

- Full restitution of the Constitution.
- Reestablishment of the constitutional guarantees.
- Respect for Congress and its prerogatives and functions.
- Effective dissolution of the "gangster" organizations and jailing of the "gangsters" and goons.
- Democracy for the workers so that they can, without impositions or interference on the part of the government, free themselves from the leadership which

has been imposed on them and elect by democratic vote, their own leaders.

- Respect for the right to strike and the struggle of the workers for their demands, their rights and their own improvement.
- Respect for municipal autonomy.
- Calling of elections for the highest elected tribunal before September, in order to avoid the closing of Congress and to reject the formulas which are proposed to suspend the terms of the Representatives and Senators.

These immediate demands, which indicate the path to follow out of the present situation, must be the program of action of the United Front Committees already constituted, must serve as the program to form new Committees of the United Front, of the Orthodox masses, the Paupistas, Autenticas, etc., of the masses in general.

The emergence from the present situation does not mean, however, the solution of the vital problems of our country.

That solution can only be achieved by the constitution of a National Democratic Front government, that is to say a government which represents the alliance of the working class, of the peasants, of the urban petty bourgeoisie, and the democratic and progressive sectors of the national bourgeoisie, and which would be capable of applying a program of

peace,
unity a

The
tion w
of des
dents,
but on
United
and ac
of the

12. A
will re
tentio
they a
not wo
them i

If w
line a
not be

The
that t
pound
into r
cratic
is to m
and a
first ta
ent s

spread
slogan
that

transf
presen
crime
policy
solutio
of Pri
the o
the r
and th
electio

peace, democracy, welfare, labor unity and administrative honesty.

The way out of the present situation will not be found through acts of desperation, nor by chance incidents, nor by abstentionist positions, but only through unity, through the United Front, through mobilization and activity of the broadest masses of the people.

12. A good line, a good program, will remain in the realm of good intentions and of frustrated hopes if they are not fought for, if they are not worked for actively so as to turn them into realities.

If we limit ourselves to stating our line and our slogans, our task will not be complete.

The primary condition in order that the slogans and orientation expounded upon here be converted into reality and become the democratic solution which Cuba awaits, is to make the masses aware of them and approve them. Therefore the first task to save Cuba from the present situation, consists of actively spreading our points of view and slogans among the masses, to teach that it is not possible to expect transformations and change from the present government, that this government will continue, basically, the policy of Prio, nor would it be any solution to fight for the restoration of Prio and his gang to power; that the only solution is in fighting for the restoration of the Constitution and the immediate calling of general elections in which the people can

choose their rulers.

This task must be undertaken by the Committees, the cadre and membership of the Popular Socialist Party and by all who desire to save Cuba and find a democratic way out of the present situation. This task must also be undertaken by the United Front Committees already formed and by those that will be organized.

It is not enough that the masses understand and approve the slogans. It is necessary that, to the same extent, they organize and unite to struggle for them. The Committees of the United Front, organized in the communities, towns, sugar mills, docks, and centers of work are the organisms through which the masses can unite and organize to take action in favor of the democratic resolution of the present situation. It is necessary, therefore, to convene and mobilize the existing Committees of the United Front and to constitute everywhere new United Front committees to bring together the working masses, peasants, white collar workers, students, youth, etc., whatever may be the party to which they have affiliated. At the vanguard of this task must be the committees, cadre and members of the Popular Socialist Party but all must participate in it who want mass action instead of adventures, all who want a real solution for Cuba.

The working masses are and must be more and more the decisive force of society, the driving force of every

democratic and progressive struggle. The divisionism introduced by imperialism, by means of violence and through the "cetekario" hierarchy, in the labor movement, paralyzes and corrupts the masses ideologically. The working masses can only serve effectively in the progressive and democratic struggle if they free themselves from the traitors imposed by violence on their unions, if they undertake the path of unity. For this, it is necessary to bring about the removal of the traitorous union functionaries and the election of candidates of unity, candidacies which reflect the broadest united front of the working masses including "unitarios"* and "cetekarios," of all parties and all trends, who must struggle for the immediate demands of reinstating those who have been suspended from their jobs, for at least a 30 per cent increase in all salaries, wages and pensions, for paid vacations, for guaranteed retirement and for the specific demands of each community, of each factory, of each shop. In this task the Committees of the Popular Socialist Party and its members must be at the vanguard, but there must also be the participation of the workers of the Paupist Party—who have taken a position of unity—the workers of the Orthodox Party and all the workers who want the salvation of the country and to advance their rights and demands.

* Unitarios—those who are working for labor unity.—Ed.

The struggle for a democratic solution to the present situation requires that the parties and mass organizations have freedom of action, that the masses can mobilize democratically. Therefore it is necessary that a particularly intense struggle be conducted against every attempt to disturb or impede the normal functioning of the parties and mass organizations. The parties and mass organizations must continue to hold their meetings, mobilizing the masses and denouncing every denial, every arbitrary measure against these democratic rights.

In the propaganda an important place must be taken by the task of making the masses see, in addition to the immediate solution, the permanent solution of these evils, which can only be achieved through the National Democratic Front, through the constitution of a government of the National Democratic Front and the application of its program of peace, democracy, welfare, labor unity and administrative integrity, as outlined by our Popular Socialist Party in its Seventh National Assembly. This program must be studied, not only by the Popular Socialists, but also by the Orthodoxes, the Paupists, the Autenticos, etc. This program must be made to reach every last hut in our land.

In the task of convincing the masses of the correctness of our slogans which will enable them to unite and mobilize, a role of primary importance is played by the demo-

cratic
Hora,"
All wh
cratic a
they m
cialist P
to a br
of thes
paymen
ever, th
the ma
to cont
of truth
To
masses
the ma
peasant
groes,
organiz
Youth
front o
mean a
port fo
for the
tion an
genera
The
is the
Cuban
cialist
strengt
lar Soc
and r
scientific
success
gle fo
gress,
The b
forward
The

cratic press such as "La Ultima Hora," "Hoy," and "Fundamentos." All who are interested in a democratic and progressive solution, be they members of the Popular Socialist Party or not, must contribute to a broader and better distribution of these organs and their prompt payment, since today, more than ever, they depend on the support of the masses to continue coming out, to continue carrying their message of truth and united front.

To organize and mobilize the masses it is necessary to strengthen the mass organizations of women, peasants, of students, youth, Negroes, etc. The strengthening of organizations such as the Socialist Youth and the promoting of united front organizations of youth would mean a very powerful means of support for the entire present struggle for the restitution of the Constitution and the immediate holding of general elections.

The vanguard of all this struggle is the Marxist-Leninist party of the Cuban proletariat, the Popular Socialist Party. In proportion to the strength and discipline of the Popular Socialist Party, the more its cadre and membership are active, conscientious and prepared, the more successful will be the present struggle for the Constitution, for progress, for peace, and for freedom. The best workers must now come forward to strengthen their Party. The most revolutionary peasants,

students, office workers and intellectuals, youth and women must come forward now to strengthen the Popular Socialist Party. It is necessary to intensify the study of Marxism-Leninism in the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, the doctrine which teaches the path of Peace, of patriotic anti-imperialism, of the salvation of Cuba. It is necessary to help the economic campaign of fund raising which the Party is conducting, since those funds are indispensable for our campaign for a democratic way out of the present situation. It is necessary to keep up to date the payment of dues and contributions to the Party which today more than ever, are necessary to propagate its line and its policy.

All this is not only of interest to the cadre and membership of the Popular Socialist Party, but is incumbent on all workers, on all those who are patriotic and have a democratic feeling, who have an obligation to help the vanguard Party in the struggle and in the orientation, the Party which neither sells out nor gives up, the Party of the "mambises"* of today.

National Executive Committee
of the Popular Socialist Party

JUAN MARINELLO,
President
BLAS ROCA
General Secretary

* "Mambises"—fighters for independence.—Ed.

Dr. Just: Pioneer Negro Biologist

By James Elson

DURING THE HEIGHT of the Lysenko controversy in this country attention was called in the Left press to the late Dr. Ernest Everett Just, the distinguished Negro biologist from Howard University in Washington, D.C.¹ His writings were referred to as being directly in support of Lysenko's concepts in biology. It certainly is true that many of the things Dr. Just believed serve to support the theoretical conclusions of the Michurinists of the Soviet Union and the world. This is especially true whenever he used the dialectical method in drawing conclusions from his observed data. His method of thought was in some respects far in advance of that of most biologists in capitalist countries.

Long ago Engels stated:

... the revolution which is being forced on theoretical natural science by the mere need to set in order the purely empirical discoveries, great masses of which are now being piled up, is of such a kind that it must bring the dialectical character of natural events more and more to the consciousness even of those empiricists who are most opposed to it. The old rigid antitheses, the sharp,

impassable dividing lines are more and more disappearing. . . . It is however precisely the polar antagonisms put forward as irreconcilable and insoluble, the forcibly fixed lines of demarcation and distinctions between classes, which have given modern theoretical natural science its restricted and metaphysical character. The recognition that these antagonisms and distinctions are in fact to be found in nature, but only with relative validity, and that on the other hand their imagined rigidity and absoluteness have been introduced into nature only by our minds—this recognition is the kernel of the dialectical conception of nature. It is possible to reach this standpoint because the accumulating facts of natural science compel us to do so; but we reach it more easily if we approach the dialectical character of these facts equipped with the consciousness of the laws of dialectical thought. In any case natural science has now advanced so far that it can no longer escape the dialectical synthesis.²

Thus Engels foresaw clearly how the inexorable logic of reality would drive scientists such as Dr. Just to theoretical conclusions that are essentially dialectical in character. Increasing numbers of individual sci-

¹ Herbert Aptheker, in the *Daily Worker*, January 26, 1949, and in *Masses and Mainstream*, February, 1951.

² Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring*. International Publishers, New York, 1939, pp. 17, 19.

tists in the United States and other capitalist countries are succeeding in breaking with their bourgeois training and have become Marxists. Many more, through the force of facts, have taken a path to a greater or lesser degree similar to that taken by Dr. Just.

* * *

Within biology, some of the main inroads of dialectical thought for the past few decades have been made in the field of experimental embryology. Here the experimental procedures involved have uncovered facts that have contradicted the mechanistic or idealistic interpretations erected by the old-time descriptive embryology, by Mendelian genetics and by Loebian physiology. Among the greatest of the experimental embryologists of the United States and of the world was Dr. Just, and he helped to deepen the inroads.

Experimental embryologists in general are more or less clear in their criticism of bourgeois genetics. Mendelian genetics conceives of the genes as discrete, or separate, particles aligned on the chromosomes within the nucleus of the cell. They are presumed to be structures which in some mysterious manner are able to reproduce themselves without more than the nutritive influence of the cytoplasm—the cellular substance surrounding the nucleus—and which are able rigidly to determine the heritable characteristics of animals and plants.

Even the descriptive embryologists know that during the development

of the fertilized egg there is a regular differentiation of cells and of parts of the body until the adult condition is reached. The several early stages of this differentiation are very different from the stages that appear subsequently. Furthermore, in many of the lower forms of animal life (especially in marine species) there are free-living larval, or immature, stages that are adapted to their conditions of life, yet in no way do they resemble the adult. If genes determine the adult characters, then these same genes are present in each nucleus of the embryo and the larva during every stage of development, and they must therefore also determine embryonic and larval stages which are totally different. Geneticists have erected Mendelian explanations of these phenomena, but their explanations remain unsatisfactory. Considerable doubt is thus thrown on the conceptions of bourgeois genetics.

The experimental embryologists, however, have succeeded in uncovering many more fundamental discrepancies. For example, Ethel Browne Harvey found it possible to initiate by artificial means (that is, by parthenogenesis) the development of fragments of the eggs of several species of sea urchins when these fragments contained no remnants of the egg nucleus. The egg nucleus had been completely removed, and development had been started without the presence of any sperm. Thus none of the differentiation that might occur could be caused by the influence of nuclear material, or genes. In

Dr. Harvey's experiments many such eggs, before they died, underwent a relatively normal series of consecutive cell divisions, producing nearly normal embryos, comparable to those produced from normal eggs after fertilization. This could not occur if the nucleus were the *only* portion of the cell with the power of determining heredity.³

Another series of experiments showed that if the nucleus of the egg of one species of sea urchin is removed, and the remaining cytoplasm is fertilized by the spermatozoan of a second, rather different species of sea urchin, an embryo will be produced which may even develop to maturity. The resultant adult individual will show certain paternal features (derived from the sperm, as would be expected). However, they also will show certain *maternal* features, although no maternal chromosomes or genes are present!

These lines of evidence, and many more, have made it inevitable that the experimental embryologists have come into conflict with the standard Morgan school of genetics, to the point where T. H. Morgan himself wrote a signally unsuccessful book attempting to circumvent the arguments of the experimental embryologists.

* * *

Dr. Just, as a Negro in the United States, was subjected to the terrible discriminations perpetrated against Negro professional men and women.

³ E. B. Harvey in *Biological Bulletin* (1936), vol. 71, pp. 101-21.

In spite of his high professional standing he was denied job-equality, denied the freedom to go where he pleased and live where he pleased, and denied full association with his fellow-scientific workers.

In the face of this racist oppression, Dr. Just perfected his ability until he became recognized as one of the outstanding biologists of the United States, and as the foremost authority in the world in his specialized field of research. He refused to accept proffered permanent employment in research institutions in Europe, even though he was personally more happy in the relative lack of discrimination he found there.

Finances had been a great problem to him throughout his undergraduate days, and he supported himself by working part-time. Nevertheless, he graduated from Dartmouth in 1907, the only student in his class to earn his degree *summa cum laude*. Even with this great promise he was unable to afford graduate study until years later, and no large, general university would employ him—a Negro scientist.

He succeeded in obtaining a position as instructor in Howard University. Here he advanced in rank, becoming a full professor in 1912. Later, after obtaining his doctorate at the University in Chicago in 1916, he became head of Howard University's Department of Zoology and he also served as professor of physiology at the Howard Medical College. During this period his outstanding contributions to the Negro peo-

ple w
A.C.P.
garr
physic
provin
cal sc
Dr.
entist
duced
was a
of sev
cal E
Journ
plasm
life h
search
in an
able
Cell
delph
Dr. J
Unit
the s
his b
most
mas
whic
ance
in th
view
versa
writ
thou
by
the
proa
elli
does
atter
but
to g
plas

ple were recognized when the N.A.A.C.P. awarded him the first Spingarn Medal, in 1915, for his work in physiology and for his efforts in improving the standards of Negro medical schools.

Dr. Just was an indefatigable scientist and a prolific writer. He produced scores of technical papers and was a member of the editorial boards of several journals, including *Biological Bulletin*, *Physiological Zoology*, *Journal of Morphology*, and *Protoplasma*. Near the end of his fruitful life he summarized much of his research and outlined his philosophy in an extremely interesting and valuable book entitled *The Biology of the Cell Surface*, published in Philadelphia and London in 1939. Because Dr. Just was a Negro scientist in the United States, and because many of the scientific concepts he expressed in his book contradicted some of the most tenaciously-held and basic dogmas of the metaphysical concepts which dominate biology, the appearance of the book was largely ignored in the scientific press. The few reviews that appeared were nearly universally critical. Thus, J. F. Danielli, writing in *Nature* (London, 1939), thought the book was "weakened" by Dr. Just's frequent attacks on the prevalent "physico-chemical approach" of bourgeois biology. Danielli summarized by saying: "Dr. Just does a useful service in directing the attention to the role of the cytoplasm, but it is feared that in his attempts to give important roles to the cytoplasm, he has abstracted more from

the significance of the nucleus than is permissible." We shall examine Dr. Just's ideas concerning the relative roles of the nucleus and the cytoplasm in detail below.

* * *

Mendelian genetical thought in present-day bourgeois biology places a mechanistic overemphasis on the role of hypothetical genes. At the time of cell division, chromosomes are formed from the chromatin material lying within the nucleus, and the genes are conceived to be discrete particles arranged along them in linear fashion. Bourgeois thought in biology (as elsewhere) leads to an atomistic concept of reality, rather than a dialectical mode of thought, which recognizes clearly the inter-relationships of all the parts of a whole. Typically, the bourgeois mind makes a metaphysical attempt to understand the function of a whole as equal to the sum of the functions of all its parts, rather than realizing, dialectically, that the parts of a whole stimulate one another in working together to produce a function of the whole that exceeds the sum of the individual functions of the parts. However, it is also typical that the metaphysical mode of thought leads inevitably to crass idealism. Thus, often, the bourgeois mind tries to understand the function of the whole idealistically as controlled by the function of one or a few of its parts. For example, in human history, the events of history are considered to be due to the action and direction of brilliant (or powerful) individual

"heroes", in utter neglect of the movements of classes.

During its development, the biological science of cytology (the study of cell structure) has undergone two main extremes of emphasis. During its early years of existence as a science there was great interest in the structure of the cytoplasm. Most of the emphasis was placed on the study of the visible structures of the cytoplasm, with endless techniques devised for making such structures clear to the observer. At first the nucleus was ignored to a large extent, and the intimation was that individual cytoplasmic structures, or the cytoplasm as a whole, were the controlling cell structures. With the development of Mendelian genetics, however, emphasis was switched to the nucleus as the bearer of hereditary characters, and subsequently by far the main emphasis in cytology was placed on the nucleus. *Neither in the early emphasis on the cytoplasm, nor in the more recent great emphasis on the nucleus, has the inter-relationship between the nucleus and the cytoplasm been clear to cytologists.*

In recent years the activities and structure of the cell have in large part been interpreted in terms of the activities of the "directing" nucleus alone. The process of cell division, the fertilization of the egg by the sperm, the differentiation of the cells during embryological development, and the structures and activities of the mature animal or plant have been explained as controlled by the action

of the nuclei of cells. More particularly this control is thought to be from the sole influence of the biggest bosses of all—the Board of Directors of the cell—the genes. Thus, recently, insofar as the cytoplasm has been investigated, it has been in the spirit of indicating that "this is what the nucleus has done" to the cytoplasm.

Unfortunately for bourgeois biologists, the facts that they themselves have discovered about cells are becoming "insubordinate." The facts are demanding a dialectical explanation of the inter-relationships between the nucleus and the cytoplasm, and there are some non-Marxist scientists who are able to (or are forced to) overcome their bourgeois training sufficiently to make some of the necessary deductions. It is in this framework that Dr. Just appeared with his work, *The Biology of the Cell Surface*. The whole book is an attack upon the concept of the nucleus as the sole important organelle of the animal cell, and if Danielli thought that Dr. Just "has abstracted more from the significance of the nucleus than is permissible," then he would have found, had he read the book a little more carefully, that Dr. Just himself was aware that he had, for the sake of argument, placed undue emphasis on the cytoplasm—and more specifically on the outer rind of the cytoplasm, the ectoplasm. He stated (p. 363):

Because of the up to now existing failure to assign to ectoplasmic behavior a role in the integrative action of the living system, it has been necessary to

emphasized clearly a resides system of life a integrat regions, basic m alive. nucleus constitu in the

A fr dialect imposs ception it is c is, in i and e Marxi ganism consid or of a cons the nu An ac be att inter-ganist theore delian the f senko wher Meno above while plasmi the enviro sofar recog

emphasize what that role is. I wish very clearly again to state my position: life resides in the whole of the protoplasmic system taken as a unit—the phenomena of life are not to be dissociated from the integration of the system's constituent regions, the integration which is the basic manifestation of the state of being alive. . . . Life is not confined to the nucleus only and certainly not to the constituent genes; nor yet does it reside in the ectoplasm alone.

A fundamental generalization of dialectical materialism is that it is impossible to get an adequate conception of any object or event unless it is considered in its context—that is, in its relationship to other objects and events around it. Thus, to the Marxist, the life activities of an organism cannot be understood by a consideration of the nucleus alone, or of the cytoplasm alone, or even by a consideration of the interactions of the nucleus and the cytoplasm alone. An adequate understanding can only be attained through the study of the inter-relationships of the living organism and its environment. The theoretical split between the Mendelian geneticists of the world and the followers of Michurin and Lysenko in the Soviet Union and elsewhere lies primarily here, in that the Mendelists think of the nucleus (and above all the gene) as all-important, while they consider that the cytoplasm is the protector and feeder of the nucleus, and they neglect the environment altogether, except insofar as they have been forced to recognize the genetical effects of

such extreme environmental factors as X-radiation and the strongly poisonous colchicine. On the other hand, the Michurinists have found that they can change the inheritance of animals and plants by suitable manipulation of the environment. This was expressed by N. I. Noujdin of the Institute of Genetics of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., who said:

The Michurinists take as their point of departure the unity of the external and the internal. Only on the basis of the contradictory unity of the external and internal in variations does the external, passing into the internal, become the basis for development. Taking this as their point of departure, the Michurinian geneticists, setting out to direct variation, proceed by the road of directing the process of development, and not by the road of seeking specifically acting mutagenic factors.⁴

Honest but misled or misinformed scientists in capitalist countries often accuse the conscious Marxist of having made up the facts—or at least of having selected them—to fit the theory. Yet one need not be a conscious Marxist to derive dialectical theories, but need only make an unbiased study of the available facts to come to similar conclusions, if one's mind is sufficiently unfettered by his bourgeois training. Dr. Just, in spite of the fact that he was by no means a conscious Marxist, said

⁴ Quoted in T. D. Lysenko, *et al*, *The Situation in Biological Science*. International Publishers, 1949, pp. 123-124. See, H. Lumer, "The Achievements of Marxism-Leninism in the Field of Genetics," in *Political Affairs*, July, 1950.

much the same thing as Noujdin on the basis of the facts he had observed in developing marine eggs. He wrote (pp. 366-67):

... a conception which assumes that either the individual alone or only the outside world is real, has no biological basis. The interdependence between individual and outside world is a postulate which has its sanction not from any abstract philosophical principle, but is true because of the biological basis here set forth. The best system of philosophy, then, is that which recognizes living thing and outside world as one interdependent continuum. Instead of building our philosophical theories of life on the behavior of electrons, it is safer to build them on a biological basis.

Thus, Dr. Just, in this respect, was far ahead of most contemporary bourgeois biologists. His discovery of dialectics in nature inevitably led him into conflict with the dominant metaphysical mode of thought in biology. Throughout his book, attacks on this "physico-chemical" school of biological thought are vigorous, and often very clear. Thus, he stated (pp. 11-12):

It is often said that in their thinking biologists are the most mechanistic of scientists, holding fast to concepts that the most mechanistic astronomers even have abandoned. Indeed, many biologists besides Loeb believed—and many even now believe—that biology as a science must finally be concerned with the ultimate particles, that life as well as all physical phenomena can be interpreted on the mechanistic basis of the motion of particles in a system that

is rigidly ordered as to time and space. But so far any attempt at "the visualization of all phenomena in terms of groupings and displacements of ultimate particles" has failed for biology. And it is to be doubted that any such "visualization" can ever succeed.

What is more, he realized that mechanism inevitably gives rise to idealism. Thus, in speaking of certain theories and hypotheses erected by other biologists regarding the initiation of embryological development, he said: "It is sad irony that a theory of vaunting mechanistic conceptions had, as its basis, work [i.e., the discovery of parthenogenesis], the true value of which lay in establishing the fact that the egg as a cell is self-acting, self-regulating and self-realizing—an independently irritable system. For the spermatozoan, the theory's mechanistic conception is more vitalistic than even the ardent vitalist could desire: for it says the living spermatozoan does what it does only because it is alive" (pp. 237-38).

Here Dr. Just has made some strong points, and has carried his theoretical conclusions considerably beyond the confines of bourgeois science. Bourgeois science is fundamentally limited in scope. Moreover, in capitalism's declining stage, especially during the period of its general crisis, strong mystical trends inevitably appear, and bourgeois thought becomes unscientific, or even anti-scientific.

The theoretical barrenness of bourgeois science is clearly exemplified

by the Norwegian historian of science, Erik Nordenskiöld, who critically examined the idealist theories of such vitalists as Hans Driesch and Emanuel Radl, and of such mechanists as Max Verworn and Jacques Loeb. He was able to show rather clearly that the point of view of the vitalists could not withstand the criticism of the mechanists, and furthermore that the point of view of the mechanists could be devastated by the vitalists. He reflected his own bourgeois limitations, however, when he said: "In such circumstances obviously the wisest course would be: neither mechanism nor vitalism, but *resignation in the face of the inexplicable.*"⁸

All that the bourgeois natural scientist generally can offer us then is hopelessness and intellectual sterility—but this is not surprising, for the same is true of the bourgeoisie in all other fields, from art to economics, from literature to politics. On the other hand, science as such deals with facts, and the greatest among bourgeois scientists, such as Dr. Just, are able to a great extent to break out of the shackles of bourgeois metaphysics and mysticism.

Dr. Just lived and worked in a bourgeois country. Therefore it is not surprising that, although he recognized that the nucleus, the cytoplasm and the external environment constituted "one interdependent continuum," and although he was aware that all attempts to visualize biological phenomena in terms of "group-

ings and displacements of ultimate particles" have failed, he at times did not bear these principles in mind when drawing theoretical conclusions from the facts at hand.

Dr. Just presented a dialectical hypothesis in his discussion of embryological development, as follows:

Because of the rapid rise of genetics, hegemony in the protoplasmic organization has been ascribed to the chromosomal structure of the nucleus and the cytoplasm has been subordinated as though it be a mere protective and nutritive shell. It is no part of the purpose of this book to minimize the achievements of genetics and the investigations on chromosomal structure. . . . Instead, inasmuch as life, as we know it so far, resides in the whole system, the pages which follow aim to show how far life processes are related to the dual and reciprocal components, nucleal and cytoplasmic structure. (p. 8)

Thereupon he showed that during cleavage (cell division) of the fertilized or parthenogenetic egg there are repeated nuclear and cytoplasmic divisions, with a resulting increase in the proportion of nuclear material to cytoplasmic material, while at the beginning yolk and fat remain constant in quantity. From this he reasoned that nuclear material is built up out of cytoplasmic material, and hence the cytoplasm can influence the nucleus and by this means can influence the hereditary characteristics of the animal. During later stages of the development of the embryo the yolk and fat are also used up, but, he thought, they are

⁸ Erik Nordenskiöld, *The History of Biology—A Survey* (Knopf, 1928), p. 612. Italics added.

transformed into cytoplasm and not into nuclear material. Hence, he thought the nucleus is not influenced directly by food materials, but only indirectly through the cytoplasm.

On the basis of these correct observations, on the other hand, Dr. Just erected a mechanistic hypothesis, according to which in cell division, certain differentiated genes are removed from the cytoplasm by the nucleus, while the others, left free, determine the character of the cell resulting from the cleavage.

Occasionally, because the dialectics with which he operated was not fully conscious, he was led from his basically correct orientation. Thus, in one place he reflected the idealistic notion of Weismann regarding the rigid isolation of the germ cells from the somatic cells (p. 147): "The reproductive (germ) cells are sharply set off from all other (somatic) cells; they have the special burden of the perpetuation of the species. The sex-cell is therefore a thing apart, a tenant housed by the mortal somatic cells, and like them mortal while the tenancy lasts."

However, his overall findings led him to assert that the cells of the body interact to produce the structure and activity of the body as a whole (which in itself is a unit).

* * *

It is not the author's intent in the present brief article to make any

thorough analysis of all Dr. Just's views. It is a tribute to this eminent Negro thinker that, while not possessing a fully developed knowledge of dialectics, he came so largely to dialectical conclusions in his theoretical discussions by force of his bold and honest endeavors as scientist. That he was able to break through his bourgeois training, with all the ingrained bourgeois "scientific" biases this implies, serves to emphasize the genius of the man and to mark him as one of the outstanding scientists of his day.

The genius of a Dr. Just is indicative of the tremendous creative well-springs of the Negro people. That his energies were hampered, that his research facilities were cramped, that his own life was embittered, reflect the criminal repression of imperialism.

What great cultural and humanist potentials will be liberated with the smashing of Jim Crow and the ending of the oppression of the Negro people! How immeasurably enriched and ennobled will be human life in our country, and in the world!

The working class, and all creative, artistic and scientific people, in behalf of their very lives and their careers—and their honor—must join with the Negro people in a powerful offensive against all forms of Jim Crow so that it is burned out of every facet of American life.

By

Ame
Int

Th
our c
thro
ican
classi
—77
Victo
the r
capit
mode
It do
tal th
ism
our
does
ful i
cratic

Ar
be w
by Pe
econ
the
drive
made
arm
count
of th
this
of al
the
destr
the g
the

American Imperialism (Book Review)

By Doxey A. Wilkerson

American Imperialism, by Victor Perlo.
International Publishers, \$2.25.

The fight for peace and democracy in our country can be greatly strengthened through wide and effective use of *American Imperialism*. Based on V. I. Lenin's classic theoretical analysis, *Imperialism—The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Victor Perlo's book interprets concretely the rise and development of monopoly capitalism in the United States and its mode of operation on the world scene. It does not represent "the" fundamental theoretical analysis of U.S. imperialism which the Marxist movement in our country will yet produce; but it does provide us with an extremely useful ideological weapon in the democratic struggles of today.

American Imperialism simply had to be written during this period—if not by Perlo, then by some other progressive economist. The post-war dominance of the U.S. trusts and their unbridled drive toward global conquest and war made increasingly urgent the task of arming the democratic forces of our country with theoretical understanding of the nature and specific features of this most colossal and most predatory of all imperialist powers—and also of the "clay feet" which guarantee its destruction. This book provides both the general theoretical framework and the thorough factual documentation

necessary for accomplishing that task. It satisfies a long-felt need whose fulfillment could not be further delayed.

The comprehensive scope of *American Imperialism* is remarkable for a book of 256 pages. It traces the historic rise and world-wide expansion of U.S. imperialism (Chapters I-II). It reveals concretely the enormous super-profits which the U.S. trusts extract from the labor of oppressed peoples the world over, with special attention to the techniques of super-exploitation of the Negro people of the United States and the colonial and semi-colonial countries of Latin America (Chapters III-V). It outlines and documents the strategy, progress, and also the inherent bankruptcy of U.S. imperialism's program for world domination, especially its conquest of European markets and the colonial empires of European powers, and its war drive to suppress the rising national liberation movements, to hold down the developing proletarian revolution in Western Europe, and to destroy the Soviet Union and the new Peoples' Democracies (Chapters VI-X). Finally, it analyzes the oppressive impact of U.S. imperialism and its aggressive military program upon the people of our country—particularly the working class and the Negro people—and calls for "a great and representative peace mobilization" to "hasten and insure the final

victory of the democratic and peace-loving forces over the threat of fascism and war" (Chapter XI).

Merely to outline the broad scope of this book is to indicate that its analyses are either superficial or very tightly-written and compact. For the most part, the latter is the case. Indeed, *American Imperialism* might well be taken as a model in its economy of words, conciseness of style, and concreteness of documentation.

The first chapter on "The Rise of American Imperialism," for example, uses Lenin's five main characteristics of imperialism as the framework for tracing the historic development of monopoly capitalism in the United States. It analyzes and illustrates the military, economic and political methods of U.S. imperialist expansion; explains why the emerging U.S. imperialism had to rely mainly on semi-colonial forms of rule, rather than direct colonial domination; illustrates both patterns with a highly illuminating 6-page account of our country's relations to the Philippines since 1898; analyzes concretely the chief factors which led to the dominance of the United States among imperialist powers; interprets the decline of the world capitalist system in the period of its general crisis, and the corresponding rise of the Socialist system; and finally shows the enormity of the impossible task which the U.S. trusts and their government have now undertaken—"to stop the process of disintegration, to resuscitate the world system of imperialism and to patch up its weakest links." All this the first chapter does effectively in 26 pages! It is a masterful demonstration of concise, concrete, theoretical analysis; and it illustrates the compactness with which the entire book is written.

The fundamental merit of this book lies in its functional use of the Leninist theory of imperialism to illuminate the whole period in which we live. There is hardly any major *current* political development on the world scene which cannot be better understood in the light of analyses provided in *American Imperialism*. Reading this book one is impressed with the absolute indispensability of Marxist-Leninist theory in general, and of its application to U.S. imperialism in particular, for those who would understand and thus be in position to help shape the great historic changes now under way in our world.

The concreteness with which the development and role of U.S. imperialism are here documented makes this book a valuable arsenal of "facts to fight with." One finds here precise quantitative data, taken chiefly from reliable primary sources, on the decline of private foreign investments during recent decades; the demonstrated superiority of the Socialist system in iron and steel production; the far-flung industrial empires of Standard Oil, Anaconda Copper, United Fruit and other U.S. trusts; the composition and role of the U.S. financial oligarchy, and the trade and territorial empires which it dominates; amounts and rates of profit on foreign and domestic investments; together with hosts of related questions. One also finds here a wealth of specific documentation, likewise mostly from primary sources, on the clear-cut imperialist aims and effects of the Marshall Plan, North Atlantic Pact, and "Point Four"; on the intent and accomplishments of the U.S. trusts in grabbing up the material assets of their rival imperialists; and on the deliberate plans and definite steps taken by the United States to wage war on the Soviet Union

and its allies. The honest skeptic who finds it hard to believe that "our" government is the leader of a gigantic plot to conquer the world in the interest of corporate super-profits—who demands "facts, not opinions"—can generally be convinced on the basis of the abundant documentation which supports the analyses of *American Imperialism*.

One outstanding contribution of this book is its proof that "the original base of Wall Street's super-profits, and still a larger source than any single foreign country, is the oppression of the Negro people within the United States." Chapter IV documents the revealing and tremendously important fact—already picked up and used in the slogans of many progressive organizations—that U.S. trusts extract more than \$4,000,000,000 *extra* profits annually out of the labor of the Negro working people. Here is the material basis of the horrible record of Jim Crow oppression detailed in *We Charge Genocide*, the petition to the United Nations sponsored by the Civil Rights Congress.

Especially noteworthy in this connection is Perlo's concrete analysis of the disguised Northern counter-part of the Southern Negro-white wage differential—the common practice of assigning low classifications to skilled and difficult jobs in which Negro industrial workers predominate, and of rationalizing the low wages paid these workers on the ground of their arbitrarily determined "unskilled" classification.

The author goes on to draw certain political conclusions from his economic analysis—that the trade-union movement, in its own interest, must fight against the special oppression of Negro workers; that "collaboration with Jim Crow in the United States leads to col-

laboration with imperialist expansion and aggressive war abroad"; that "the oppression of the Negro people is the Achilles heel of United States imperialism"; and that "white workers must take the initiative" in developing close alliance between the mounting Negro liberation movement and the labor-progressive movement. But the *national* character of the Negro question is only implicit in this analysis. It is a major weakness that Perlo never draws the full political conclusion that the essence of the matter is U.S. imperialism's oppression of the Negro nation in the Black Belt, and that Negro liberation can ultimately be realized only along the path of self-determination.

American Imperialism is a frankly partisan book; it is *against* imperialist oppression and *for* the working class and peoples who are its victims. It differentiates sharply between the people of our country and the men of the trusts: "The American people are not imperialists. The imperialists are only the tiny group of those who own and control America. . . . They are not only different from, but they are the bitterest enemies of, the people of the United States." And it proceeds throughout mercilessly to expose imperialist decadence, deceit and plunder, and vigorously to champion the cause of people's liberation and freedom.

The reader of *American Imperialism* gains not only a fuller understanding of the decadence and murderous greed of the U.S. trusts, but also a firmer confidence in their coming defeat by the democratic forces of progress. One is impressed with the attention Perlo gives throughout to the inherent contradictions which ever more clearly sound the death-knell of the imperialist system, and to the progressive political

forces which they catapult into motion—especially the growing strength of the revolutionary proletariat in Europe, the mounting resistance of the working-class and Negro liberation movements in our own country, the tremendous upsurge of national-liberation struggles in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and the historic rise of the vast and powerful movement for peace on a world scale. It is notable that almost every chapter of *American Imperialism* concludes with emphasis on the inherent and fundamental weaknesses of the imperialist system and the growing democratic power of the people's resistance.

In this connection, one wishes that the final chapter on "Imperialism and the American People" had been extended to include a fuller and more concrete analysis of important recent developments in the labor movement, the Negro liberation movement and the peace movement of our country. One finds here an illuminating discussion of the depressing impact of imperialist decadence and parasitism upon the living standards of the United States people, the opportunist role being played by the labor bureaucracy and Social-Democracy, the growth of chauvinist reaction and the threat of war, and the primary responsibility of the people of the United States in the struggle for peace: "So long as Wall Street believes that it can count on the 7 per cent of the world's people living in this country, it is likely to thrust that 7 per cent into the disastrous course of fighting the rest of the world."

But only three or four brief paragraphs are devoted to the "fight back" movement among the United States workers, the Negro people and the growing peace coalition. It is an important weakness of *American Imperial-*

ism that neither this nor any other chapter provides a strong, clear outline of the developing progressive forces in our country which will yet fulfill their historic responsibility in the struggle against U.S. imperialism.

Not unrelated to this weakness is the complete failure of the book to describe and interpret the growth of the Communist movement on a world scale and in the United States as the guiding force in the developing struggle against U.S. imperialism. There are no more than eight or ten scattered references to the Communist movement in the entire book; and they consist chiefly of passing comments on the 1947 expulsion of Communists from European and Latin-American governments, the Communist vote in the 1945 French elections, and reactionary attacks upon Communists in our country and abroad. In only one brief sentence—describing the growing Philippine liberation struggles, "fortified by the increased role of organized workers under Communist leadership"—is there even a hint of the leading role of the Communist movement in the anti-imperialist struggle.

This is curious, indeed, especially in a book which starts from the premises of Lenin's *Imperialism*, proceeds devastatingly to expose the decadent nature and aggressive, expansionist role of U.S. imperialism, and calls for the building of a powerful anti-imperialist peace movement. It is a fundamental weakness that such a book practically ignores the indispensable role of the Communist movement in the United States and throughout the world in mobilizing and guiding the growing peoples' struggles against imperialist reaction.

This virtual black-out of the Com-

unist Party and its role is paralleled by (probably stems from) an even more basic theoretical weakness of *American Imperialism*—its failure to interpret Socialism as the inevitable successor of imperialist capitalism in the United States as in all the world. The last two sections of Chapter I almost do this—in their analysis of capitalist decay and Socialist advance in the period of general crisis, and of the enormous contradictions which confront U.S. imperialism as it “tries to stop the process of [capitalist] disintegration.” But here the analysis stops abruptly. The outcome of this historic conflict is left to the reader’s own deductions.

Perlo’s failure to go ahead and draw the full political conclusion from his analysis leaves out of the book, except by implication, the most fundamental insight any Marxist-Leninist analysis of imperialism should provide; namely, that the oppressive world system of imperialism is doomed, that it must and inevitably will be replaced completely by world Socialism, and that the sooner this is understood by the U.S. working class and its allies, the sooner will the peoples of the entire world move toward achievement of that freer and abundant society the material foundations of which are already at hand. The scientific proof and the popularization of this basic insight are especially needed in today’s ideological struggle in our country, where theories of “American exceptionalism” are constantly dinned into the minds of our people. That *American Imperialism* stops short of drawing this conclusion must be appraised as a fundamental weakness.

There are “missing” from this book several other relevant and important questions which one should expect to find discussed in a Marxist-Leninist study of U.S. imperialism. *First*, one finds here no mention of the special oppressive impact of U.S. imperialism on women and the family, or of the special role of women in the struggle against imperialist reaction. *Second*, Puerto Rico—the main direct colony of the United States, key nation in the whole struggle against U.S. imperialism in Latin America, and especially important because of the large Puerto Rican minority in New York—receives only incidental attention. In all the book there are but two brief summary paragraphs and seven or eight scattered, passing references to Puerto Rico; whereas the special importance of this island in the anti-imperialist struggle certainly warrants, at least, as substantial an analysis as that given to the Philippines. *Third*, the role of U.S. imperialism in the neighboring islands of the West Indies is hardly mentioned at all.

These shortcomings restrict the theoretical adequacy of *American Imperialism* and weaken its impact in the ideological struggle. At the same time, this book, with all its limitations, provides by far the most comprehensive analysis and the most thorough, up-to-date factual documentation of the development and world role of U.S. imperialism that are available to us today. It is an extremely valuable weapon in the struggle for democracy and peace. It should receive the widest distribution and use.

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 June Publication
•

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS
832 BROADWAY, NEW YORK 3, N. Y.

T
S

s
of
p
d
h
e
n,
at
at

ly
e
:"
52