

# political affairs

FEBRUARY 1953 • 25 CENTS

HX  
1  
28  
v. 32  
no. 2

**EDITORIAL** [ 1 ] *Defend Political Affairs!*

**WILLIAM Z. FOSTER** [ 5 ] *Stalin and American Imperialism*

**JOHN SWIFT** [16] *The Struggle for a Mass Policy*

**HENRY T. GOODWIN** [35] *Life's Dream Picture*

**KLEMENT GOTTWALD** [46] *The Prague Treason Trials*

**M. KAMMARI and  
F. KONSTANTINOFF** [51] *Science and Superstructure*

## Important New Publications

---

ON CONTRADICTION, by Mao Tse-tung ( <i>International</i> )	\$ .35
BROTHER BILL McKIE, by Phillip Bonosky ( <i>International</i> )	1.50
PARTY VIGILANCE, by Elmer Larson	.10
THE PARTY OF NEGRO AND WHITE, by Pettis Perry	.05
ON CHANGES IN THE RULES OF THE C.P.S.U., by N. Khrushchev	.25
ON THE THRESHOLD OF COMMUNISM, by G. M. Malènkov	.35
FOR COMMUNISM AND PEACE, by V. M. Molotov, L. P. Beria, N. A. Bulganin, L. M. Kaganovich, and K. Y. Voroshilov	.25
AMNESTY, by Marion Bachrach	.05
HOW TO BE A GOOD COMMUNIST, by Liu Shao-chi	.35
ON INNER-PARTY STRUGGLE, by Liu Shao-chi	.25
IN BATTLE FOR PEACE, by W. E. B. Du Bois	1.00

---

### 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. XXX

A T

An Edi

As THESE  
addition  
been fo  
trial and  
like Sn  
bent on  
plans to  
roll of  
This  
against  
because  
very for  
Wall S  
and for  
wrote:  
resolute  
war pro  
people  
gram of  
munists  
to break  
warmor  
This  
the oth  
Comrac  
of book



# political affairs

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

## Defend "Political Affairs"

### An Editorial

AS THESE WORDS are written, thirteen additional Communist leaders have been found "guilty" in a frame-up trial and sentenced under the fascist-like Smith Act. The government, bent on war and all-out repression, plans to make them join the growing roll of American political prisoners.

This is yet another heavy blow against our Party. The blow is dealt because these comrades were in the very forefront of the struggle against Wall Street's aggression in Korea, and for peace. As Comrade Foster wrote: "The Communist Party has resolutely exposed and opposed the war program, and it is organizing the people to insist upon a general program of peace. Therefore, the Communists must be thrown into prison to break up their opposition to the warmongers."

This second Foley Square trial, like the other Smith Act frame-ups, was, Comrade Foster pointed out, "a trial of books and ideas; an attempt to

stifle free speech and to establish thought-control, in order to silence the most active and clear-sighted political defenders of the peace interests of the workers, the Negro people and the whole American nation." The latest jailings of Communist leaders, then, is part of the drive of the ruling class to bring fascism to our country and war to the world.

This latest blow is aimed also with special directness against *Political Affairs*, an action taken with utter disregard for so fundamental a precept of the Bill of Rights as freedom of the press. For among those convicted is Comrade V. J. Jerome, its editor. Moreover, basic to the government's "evidence" of a ferocious "conspiracy," and offered as exhibits of "crime" were 18 articles written for this magazine by the defendants—and by Comrade Henry Winston, characterized as a "co-conspirator." And of the twenty-nine "overt acts" cited in the individual indictments—

which included such nefarious activities as sealing envelopes and leaving a building—eleven were the writing of articles for *Political Affairs*. Nor is that all. In the government's general indictment, it is stated in so many words that "a part of said conspiracy" consisted in the fact that the "defendants . . . would write" in this magazine!

The government's own offer of exhibits to prove "criminal conspiracy" and its own list of "overt acts" furthering such "conspiracy" as culled from this magazine are conclusive evidence of the real aims of its legal frameup. There are articles discussing "The Defense of Labor's Living Standards and the Struggle for Peace," and "International Women's Day and the Struggle for Peace"; analyzing various election campaigns; offering biographical accounts of Lenin, Stalin, and Engels, as well as an appreciation of Comrade Foster's contribution to the American trade-union movement; dealing with the nature of People's Democracy; and explaining how to study Marxism-Leninism. There are articles concerned in particular with the history and work of our Party, especially in the fields of the fight against war, for labor unity and for Negro liberation. These, we repeat, are the government's "exhibits" of crime, the government's conception of "overt acts" substantiating a plot to teach its overthrow!

Two of the "overt acts" show with particular clarity the enormity of this

latest Smith Act conviction. Comrade Arnold Johnson's overt act, which has helped bring him a three-year jail sentence and a \$6,000 fine, was an article appearing in this magazine in July, 1948 entitled: "The Communists Fight for the Traditions of July Fourth."

This article begins with a "directive"—as the Government calls it—of explosive import: "Every American," wrote Comrade Johnson, "would do well to read the Declaration of Independence again this July Fourth." And, as though this weren't enough, the article ends: "Those who live up to the democratic traditions are those who fight for the interests of the mass of the people against the monopolists, the warmakers. These traditions fortify us and all Americans in the tough battle ahead." Clearly, as King George III would agree, such ideas are criminal.

And Comrade Jerome's overt act, which likewise helped bring him a sentence of three years in prison and a \$6,000 fine, was entitled, "Let Us Grasp the Weapon of Culture," and appeared in this magazine in February, 1951. Here is the concluding paragraph of this act of subversion:

The warmongers and their decadent cultural apologists offer the people physical and spiritual impoverishment, the slow death of subservience and the swift death of the atom bomb. Our Party offers the people the science and culture of true human relations based on the guaranteed rights to material satisfaction and cultural fulfillment.

We m  
with th  
of Soci  
Such  
dom, c  
crimin  
to the  
Eisenh  
resist  
ing cla  
war is

Politi  
guidan  
ing cla  
proble  
from t  
ter liv  
for pea  
of the  
ism-L  
to ma  
in the  
imme  
under  
Social

In  
Affair  
inter  
Amer  
create  
is tho  
doubl  
is tho  
war v  
who a  
sake o  
The  
the g  
of the  
this

We must go forward to the people with the message of peace, of freedom, of Socialist humanism.

Such objectives—of peace, of freedom, of Socialist humanism—are not criminal; they are a shining contrast to the criminal objectives of the Eisenhower Administration. Indeed, resistance to the objectives of a ruling class bent on fascism and world war is a patriotic duty.

*Political Affairs* has striven to offer guidance and assistance to the working class and its allies in solving the problems that arise in our country from the day-to-day struggles for better living conditions, for democracy, for peace. It has done this in the light of the theoretical principles of Marxism-Leninism. And it has ever sought to make clear the intimate ties, here in the United States, between these immediate struggles and the basic, underlying, historic course leading to Socialism.

In making these efforts *Political Affairs* has striven to serve the true interests of the vast majority of the American people. It is those who create and invoke the Smith Act; it is those who exploit the workers and doubly oppress the Negro people; it is those who seek fascism and world war who are betraying our country, who are selling out its people for the sake of their profits and their power.

The utter callousness with which the government jettisons freedom of the press in its direct attack upon this magazine cannot cause it to

change its policy, trim its views, or conceal its beliefs.

On the contrary, the brazenness of this assault should strengthen the conviction of the working masses in the validity of these views and beliefs. The Communist Party has said, ever since the Cold War attacks upon it were first launched, that curbing the freedom of Communists leads inevitably, as it is intended to lead, to curbing elementary freedoms—including freedom of the press—for all, and particularly the rights of the whole labor, progressive, and Negro people's movements.

That the attacks have broadened out to include all people of integrity is manifest. If another proof is needed it should be sufficient to point to Senator McCarthy's insistence that the true name of the *Washington Post*, a mildly liberal paper, should be the *Washington Daily Worker*. It is clear, then, that if one truly wants to join in stemming the tide of fascism and war, if one values the Bill of Rights, if one opposes McCarthyism, his own interests and safety lie in supporting our right to publish—and in supporting the effort to guarantee the freedom of our editor and our leading contributors who have been convicted because of their associations with and writings for this publication. Only a general amnesty for all those convicted under the Smith Act will begin to reestablish the guarantees of freedom of the press.

To our comrades we say: the

enemy's new blow against our Party must stimulate us to even greater efforts in its defense. And these attacks upon *Political Affairs* must stimulate our efforts to protect the magazine.

In the recent period, since the magazine has been under attack, our readers have drawn closer and the circulation has actually grown. We call upon our readers to rally to the defense of *Political Affairs*. We want to hear from you. We want your letters with comment, suggestions and criticisms. And we ask for a steady

effort to increase circulation. Help build the circulation of *Political Affairs* as a bulwark in defense of our Party and the cause of peace and democracy.

Years ago Comrade Elizabeth Gurley Flynn wrote: "The present is the period of motion, of activity. The past is gone, the future is on the forge of time. *What comes forth is determined by what we do.*" Together, let us work for a more effective, a more widely distributed, and a stronger *Political Affairs*.

By W

STALIN  
of Soc  
master  
of the  
capital  
ample  
crowd  
worker  
world.  
lished  
and a  
peared  
ber, 10  
fore, i  
full, w  
propos  
decisiv  
Party  
ticular  
dange

THE  
CRI

The  
broug  
of all  
extern  
pressu  
monor  
Amor  
tions  
work

# Stalin and American Imperialism

By William Z. Foster

STALIN'S BOOK, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.*, is a masterful Marxist-Leninist analysis of the situation in the socialist and capitalist worlds. It is a splendid example of creative Marxism, and it is crowded with basic lessons for the workers and the peoples all over the world. This vital work has been published by International Publishers, and a detailed discussion of it appeared in *Political Affairs* of December, 1952. The present article, therefore, instead of dealing with it in full, will single out a few of its major propositions, some of those that are of decisive immediate interest to our Party and the American people, particularly with regard to the war danger.

## THE DEEPENED GENERAL CRISIS OF CAPITALISM

The general crisis of capitalism is brought about by an intensification of all the contradictions, internal and external, of capitalism, under the pressure of the growth of predatory monopoly capitalism, or imperialism. Among these developing contradictions are: the conflict between the workers and capitalists over wages,

hours, etc.; the contradiction between the increasing power of the workers to produce commodities and the shrinking capacity of the world's markets, under capitalist conditions, to absorb this production; the conflicts between the various monopoly groups and between them and the farmers and middle classes; the conflicts between the imperialist countries and the colonial lands, and among the imperialist countries themselves, and the growing antagonisms between the capitalist and socialist worlds.

The beginnings of these conflicts are to be found in the earliest stages of capitalism; but the character of the *present*, monopolist-imperialist era is that the contradictions have become bigger, deeper, more violent and, quantity passing into quality, have become increasingly more unmanageable. During the past generation they have finally developed into a destructive, incurable general crisis of the entire capitalist system.

Two great phases in the development of the general crisis of capitalism were World War I and the October Revolution. World capitalism was, however, able to make at least a partial recovery from these major

disasters. Therefore, the Communist International, in March, 1925, stated that Europe, with the help of American dollars, had succeeded in "relatively," "partially," and "temporarily" stabilizing itself. This stabilization, however, as the C.I. then forewarned, was completely shattered by World War II, which itself was a great climax in the ever-developing general crisis of capitalism.

World capitalism, however, cannot stabilize itself, even partially, after the catastrophe it has suffered in World War II. The removal, in this war, of a number of countries from the orbit of capitalism, the enormous increase in the strength of the Soviet Union, the birth of the People's Democracies in Europe, the establishment of the great Chinese People's Republic, and the undermining of imperialism in Asia and Africa, constitute economic and political disasters to capitalism that have incurably weakened and undermined the foundations of that system internationally. The attempts of American imperialism to rehabilitate world capitalism (under Wall Street domination) through its Marshall Plan, NATO, Point Four, and a projected world war, are foredoomed to failure. The course of history cannot be reversed by wishful thinking and desperation policies in Wall Street.

Stalin, in pointing out the economic phases of the deepening general crisis, sums it up in these words:

Can it be affirmed that the thesis expounded by Stalin before the Second World War regarding the relative stability of markets in the period of the

general crisis of capitalism is still valid?

Can it be affirmed that the thesis expounded by Lenin in the Spring of 1916—namely, that, in spite of the decay of capitalism, "on the whole, capitalism is growing far more rapidly than before"—is still valid?

I think that it cannot. In view of the new conditions to which the Second World War has given rise, both of these theses must be regarded as having lost their validity.

### THE SPLIT IN THE WORLD MARKET

In his book, Stalin deals primarily with the economic aspects of the deepening general capitalist crisis. He develops the fundamental importance of the shattering of the former all-inclusive world market through the development of the general capitalist crisis. He says: "The disintegration of the single, all-embracing world market must be regarded as the most important economic sequel of the Second World War and of its economic consequences. It has had the effect of further deepening the general crisis of the world capitalist system." After showing the development of the two world camps—capitalist and Socialist—Stalin adds: "The economic consequence of the existence of two opposite camps was that the single all-embracing world market disintegrated, so that now we have two parallel world markets also confronting one another" (p. 26).

The loss to the capitalists of the vast markets offered by 800,000,000 people is catastrophic to the capitalist system of the world. For the most

basic weakness of capitalism is precisely the inability of its limited markets to absorb its production. This arises out of the fundamental robbery of surplus value from the workers at the point of production. The toiling masses, exploited by capitalists, are unable to buy back what they have produced. Hence, the burning necessity of the capitalist countries to dispose of their surplus commodities. Therefore, the deep disaster of the loss of the vast potential markets of the Socialist world is fundamental.

The insanity of capitalism in its deepening crisis is graphically exhibited by the fact that it is at present making its fundamental market problem all the worse by deliberately cutting off trade with the Soviet Union and the lands of People's Democracy in Europe and Asia. Under any circumstances, it would be impossible for the capitalist countries to use the Socialist world as a dumping ground for its surplus commodities; nevertheless, a big and flourishing trade is possible between the capitalist and Socialist countries. But American imperialism will have none of this. In its mad drive for power it is destroying such trade, in the foolish belief that it can thereby economically cripple the U.S.S.R. and the Peoples' Democracies. American imperialism, vainly seeking to check the spread of Socialism and to establish its own rule, is cutting the economic throat of world capitalism.

#### THE ECONOMIC FUTILITY OF WAR PRODUCTION

World capitalism, under the pres-

sure of American imperialism, is trying to make up for its shortage of normal world markets by cultivating the production of war munitions. But this is still more economic and political madness, bred of a chaotic, decaying, and desperate capitalist system. Large-scale war materials production, which is now taking place in all the major capitalist countries and which is the basis of their post-war gains in production (also in the United States), can only result, in the long run, in greatly lowered living standards for the masses, mass unemployment, and national economic bankruptcy.

Even worse, it is also the sure road to the ever-greater disasters of fascism and war. For the militarists at the head of the vast war machines now being built up in this country and in capitalist Europe, will, if unchecked by the masses, use their power, not only to cripple democracy but to force the unwilling peoples into war. Those labor leaders, and they are dominant in the A. F. of L., C.I.O. and Railroad Brotherhoods, who believe that munitions making is the road to mass prosperity, are betraying the working class and the nation into the hands of reactionaries and warmongers, the architects of chaos. War materials production, in the end, can only make catastrophic the general crisis of capitalism.

At the present time the warlike Eisenhower Administration, which during the election campaign openly accused the Truman Administration of having created phony prosperity resting on war production, is now

making a show of returning to a "free production system based on the laws of supply and demand." Eisenhower, therefore, has abolished price and wage controls. Many economic "experts" are now saying that this means that the days of the Roosevelt-Truman Keynesian "managed economy" of war production are over—that capitalism, as in the olden days, will automatically find its own price levels, markets, and spontaneous growth.

But this is all an illusion. American capitalism is but a part of world capitalism, and as such it is irretrievably involved in the general crisis of capitalism, including its market crisis. It cannot possibly escape from this crisis on the basis of ballyhoo from the White House. In reality, the basic Keynesian policies of artificially stimulated war production will remain under Eisenhower essentially as they were under Truman. The present Administration, like the old one, is planning to continue war production at a minimum rate of from \$40 to \$60 millions per year. And then, there is the prospect of the world war that they have in mind. This is the golden dream of the munitions makers.

Eisenhower's dropping of price and wage controls does not signify a return to "a free and unfettered capitalism." It is partly an attempt to check the developing economic crisis in this country (especially in agriculture); but mainly it is a move to transfer many billions more in profits into the pockets of the profiteers through inflated prices. And Eisen-

hower, in his first press conference, stated that in case of economic difficulty, he was prepared to apply all controls again. The rotten world capitalist system of today must have wholesale war production in order even to limp along as, in the general crisis, it proceeds from one disaster to another. American capitalism is no exception to this general rule.

#### THE BASIC ECONOMIC LAW OF AMERICAN CAPITALISM

Stalin, in his epochal book, analyzes the basic economic law of Socialism, in contrast to the basic economic law of capitalism. He says:

The essential features and requirements of the basic law of Socialism might be formulated roughly in this way: the securing of the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the whole of society through the continuous expansion and perfection of socialist production on the basis of higher techniques (p. 33).

Stalin sums up the basic law of capitalism in this way:

The main features and requirements of the basic economic law of modern capitalism might be formulated roughly in this way: the securing of the maximum capitalist profit through the exploitation, ruin and impoverishment of the majority of the population of the given country, through the enslavement and systematic robbery of the peoples of other countries, especially backward countries, and, lastly, through wars and militarization of the national economy, which are utilized for the obtaining of the highest profits (p. 32).

This is an accurate analysis of imperialist capitalism in general and a perfect statement of United States imperialism in particular. But it is one which goes flatly contrary to the benign picture of capitalism in this country, as painted by its protagonists. They would have us believe that the economic system in this country is not really capitalism at all but a special system designed by Providence in the interests of all the people: that the Marshall Plan, Point Four, and military appropriations to other countries, are given out of the goodness of our hearts; that the vast military machine that Wall Street has built up in this country and throughout the world is purely for the defense of world peace and our national independence; that Wall Street's desperate graspings for international domination are merely the exercise of a world leadership that history has thrust upon an unwilling and unprepared United States; and that this country, far from being imperialist, is the great champion of democracy and the self-determination of all nations. The cultivation among the masses of such notions, utterly alien to reality, is Point One of Wall Street's militarization program of world aggression and domination. To liquidate them is our greatest educational task.

That the United States capitalists are utilizing "wars and the militarization of the national economy," as Stalin says, "for the obtaining of the highest profits," is amply demonstrated by the fact that from 1940 to 1950, years of war and "cold war,"

corporations reported a total net profit of \$145 billions, and during the past two years they have netted \$35 billions more. The basis of all this is munitions making. These profits are fantastic, utterly beyond even the remotest contrast with other amounts of profits made anywhere during the entire history of world capitalism. But, so thoroughly does monopoly capitalism have control of the means of public information in this country that it is able almost completely to prevent serious mention of its fabulous profits and to create the general impression that the benign capitalists are in bad straits financially.

The essence of Wall Street's present bid for world domination is precisely that it wants to further extend its maximum profits principle (all the traffic will bear) to all parts of the world. Its allotment of \$35 billions to European governments since the war's end under the Marshall Plan and war preparations aid, were no gifts out of a good heart, as American government spokesmen and European sycophants would have us believe, but cold, hard-fisted capital investments. The same can be said of the scores of billions that this country is spending yearly on building up its war machine. These tremendous outlays in no way contravene Stalin's basic economic law of capitalism, to secure the maximum possible profits. They are but gigantic investments made in the hope that Wall Street eventually will be able to subordinate the entire world to its direct profits-bleeding. Meanwhile, as remarked, the whole war preparation process is

immensely profitable to the monopolists.

### THE MONOPOLIES AND THE STATE APPARATUS

In his book, Stalin also states another proposition which is of great and immediate importance to Americans. This is his theory of "the subjugation of the state machine to the monopolies" (p. 35). He says that it is not correct to characterize this merging process as simply a coalescence between the monopolies and the state, as we have done in the past. It is in fact nothing less than "the subjugation of the state machine to the monopolies."

This process, at the present time, is being vividly illustrated by the Eisenhower Administration. Here we see the Government apparatus being loaded up by direct representatives of big capital, as never before. In his Cabinet and the various departments at the top, Eisenhower has gathered together an unparalleled collection of big businessmen. John Foster Dulles, notorious international cartellist; C. E. Wilson, President of General Motors; Lucius Clay, Continental Can; J.M. Dodge, banker-industrialists; W. W. Aldrich, Chase National Bank; H. Brownell, corporation attorney; A. E. Summerfield, General Motors; G. Humphrey, M. A. Hanna Co.; Sinclair Weeks, Carnegie-Illinois Steel, are only a few of them. It is brazenly the Morgan-Dupont-Rockefeller monopoly group in control.

Walter Reuther has described the Eisenhower Cabinet as "sixteen millionaires and a plumber." But in

making this glib characterization, Reuther left out a most vital fact; namely, that Mr. M. P. Durkin, Secretary of Labor in the Cabinet (supposedly the representative of the workers) is just as imperialist-minded as are the big capitalists themselves. Mr. Durkin's presence in the Cabinet is a tragic symbol of the subordination of the top leadership of the A. F. of L., C.I.O. and Railroad Brotherhoods (including the wisecracking Mr. Reuther) to the Wall Street warmakers.

The significance of the wholesale invasion of top government posts by big businessmen is that the monopolies want to take over directly the business of managing the government. They, by-passing the usual device of politician representatives in government, will attend themselves to the making of foreign and domestic policy, and especially the allocation of fat government contracts. This is a sign of the growing war danger, of the increasing fascist menace in this country.

A sinister part of this whole process of Wall Street's subjugating the government to its direct control, is the loading up of the government apparatus with military men, starting with Eisenhower at the top. Premier Nehru of India, in his statement of February 18, was directly, and correctly, referring to the menace of American jingoistic militarism, expressed by Eisenhower and his clique of Wall Street generals in government, when he stated that "this intrusion of the military mentality into the channels of the world presents a

very great danger."

One of the real danger signals in the present situation is the relatively small mass protest being made against the wholesale seizure of government posts by the Wall Street Big Business executives, generals and corporation attorneys. The entire propaganda apparatus of the bourgeoisie has striven day and night to create the impression that this gang of capitalist exploiters are in reality a body of highly patriotic citizens, entirely devoid of class significance and selfish, profit-seeking motives. The whole sinister business has sent a shiver of apprehension through the democratic masses of the people, but the top leaders of labor who themselves are well-to-do and thoroughly saturated with imperialist propaganda, have made only minor objections to it. After all, the Dulles', Wilsons, *et al.*, are their friends and co-workers in the great anti-Communist "crusade." The protest has been confined pretty much to the Left.\*

#### THE QUESTION OF AMERICAN WORLD HEGEMONY

A major development of the post-war period, of the very greatest significance, has been the achievement by the United States imperialists of a shaky domination, or hegemony, over the sick capitalist world. That is, the United States, because of its greater wealth and productive power, and because of its immunity from property destruction during the recent world war, has been able to set

up a certain amount of control over the other capitalist countries, all of which were more or less ravaged and bankrupted by World War II. Wall Street has become the arrogant boss of the capitalist world, and it has as its supreme aim to expand this capitalist hegemony into a domination over the whole world, including its great Socialist sector.

American world capitalist hegemony, as our Party has repeatedly indicated, is a product of the deepening general crisis of capitalism. It could not have developed, except on the basis that many capitalist countries, weakened by the war, have had to bend their knees to American aggression. This American domination is a grave danger to world peace and democracy, as has been demonstrated by the Korean war policy that Wall Street has been able to force upon the United Nations. But American capitalist hegemony, besides being a product of the deepening general crisis of capitalism tends to deepen that crisis by sharpening up the antagonism between the capitalist countries of the world, as our Party has also pointed out.

In dealing with this vital question, Stalin especially stresses the inherent weakness of American capitalist hegemony, which means, of the anti-Soviet war alliance. This stress tends to correct overestimations of the power of American imperialism and the so-called pro-war unity of the capitalist world. It is in line with Zhdanov's famous statement that the worst mistake the world's workers and the anti-imperialist forces gen-

\*An exception is the Railroad union paper, labor, which has become openly critical of Eisenhower's foreign policy.

erally could make in this period would be to underestimate their own forces and to overestimate those of decadent capitalism.

In dealing with American capitalist hegemony and its perspectives, Stalin thus puts the question:

Outwardly, everything would seem to be "going well": the U.S.A. has put Western Europe, Japan and other capitalist countries on rations; Germany (Western), Britain, France, Italy and Japan have fallen into the clutches of the U.S.A. and are meekly obeying its commands. But it would be mistaken to think that things can continue to "go well" for "all eternity," that these countries will tolerate the domination and oppression of the United States endlessly, that they will not endeavor to tear loose from American bondage and take the path of independent development (p. 28).

Speaking concretely of Great Britain, Germany, France and Japan as being under American hegemony, Stalin says cogently: "To think that these countries will not try to get on their feet again, will not try to smash U.S. domination and force their way to independent development, is to believe in miracles."

He also points out that these antagonisms could well lead to war between the capitalist countries, and he polemizes sharply with those comrades who "hold that owing to developments of new international conditions since the Second World War, wars between capitalist powers have ceased to be inevitable." Stalin restresses the Leninist principle of the inevitability of capitalist war so long

as imperialism continues to exist.

This general conception of Stalin's goes further than that which we had worked out independently in our Party. In the Party *History* (pp. 452-453), while pointing out that American capitalist hegemony "is a very shaky rule, and the ramshackle edifice is instantly threatened with collapse," and that the sharpening of the economic contradictions "will blow the whole capitalist war alliance to smithereens and with it American world capitalist hegemony," we nevertheless failed to indicate the continuing validity of the principle of the inevitability of war among the capitalist powers. This was definitely a mistake.

Stalin's stress upon the importance of the depths and sharpness of the contradictions among the capitalist powers is, at this writing, receiving striking confirmation. The United States is definitely striving to expand the Korean war into an all-out attack upon People's China, as a prelude to the third world war which it is contemplating. But it knows very well that it cannot possibly wage such a war successfully alone. It wants to repeat its experiences of World Wars I and II, when, after other countries had done the bulk of the decisive fighting, the United States stepped in to claim the victory. This is the purpose of Wall Street's attempt to rebuild the Nazi war machine (the so-called European army) and also of Eisenhower's cynical plan of letting "Asians fight Asians"—to have the peoples of Europe and Asia do the fighting for the United States.

This war-ject ican-jecte  
N  
tion,  
the  
bran  
dicta  
force  
wide  
arati  
the  
sist  
the  
Dull  
cour  
they  
prep  
cut  
T  
are  
ples  
dern  
Am  
The  
Indi  
the  
how  
only  
and  
peop  
that  
ern  
in t  
ings  
tual  
form  
gove  
T  
not  
wor

This, of course, these democratic and war-weary peoples emphatically object to and the war alliance (American capitalist hegemony) is subjected to the severest strains.

Now, the Eisenhower administration, with the atomaniac Dulles in the State Department and the firebrand MacArthur in the background dictating military policy, is trying to force the unwilling peoples into a wide Asian war and into active preparations for a world war. This is the meaning of the proposal to assist Chiang Kai-shek forces to invade the mainland of China, and also of Dulles' arrogant ultimatum to the countries of Western Europe that if they did not speed up their war preparations the United States would cut them off its financial dole.

These are desperation moves. They are violently antagonizing the peoples of the world, and they are undermining the whole structure of American world capitalist hegemony. The present protests of the British, Indian and other governments against the ultra-aggressiveness of Eisenhower and his co-atomaniacs, are only indications of the deep alarm and resentment among the various peoples. It is clear from these events that should the United States Government force an Asian or world war, in the face of these significant warnings, it will have to fight the war virtually alone, regardless of possible formal endorsements by lickspittle governments.

The world capitalist system could not survive, much less win, a third world war. It has been mortally

wounded by World Wars I and II and by its ever-worsening internal contradictions. If Wall Street can hold together its war "alliance" and force it into a world war, despite all its internal weaknesses and creakings, this could only lead world capitalism to overwhelming disaster. And if the United States, breaking up its war alliance by arrogant demands upon it and its peoples, should try to make the fight alone, this would only make the disaster to world capitalism all the surer, sooner, and more complete.

#### THE QUESTION OF PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

One of the most important phases of Stalin's book is his demonstration that peaceful co-existence is possible between the capitalist and Socialist worlds. He brilliantly refutes the bourgeois lie that the Communists hold to the inevitability of a great war between the world forces of Socialism and those of capitalism. The reality, as Stalin indicates, is, of course, precisely the reverse. The Wall Street monopolists base their entire policy upon the assumption that world war is inevitable—indeed, it is their determination to make it inevitable—whereas the whole effort of the Communists all over the world is to prevent the outbreak of such a war.

Stalin, while stressing the inevitability of wars among the capitalist powers, so long as imperialism lasts, at the same time demonstrates that war between the capitalist world

and the Socialist world is not inevitable. He definitely resolves this apparent paradox as follows:

... Yet the Second World War began not as a war with the U.S.S.R., but as a war between capitalist countries. Why? Firstly, because war with the U.S.S.R., as a socialist land, is more dangerous to capitalism than war between capitalist countries; for whereas war between capitalist countries puts in question only the supremacy of certain capitalist countries over others, war with the U.S.S.R. must certainly put in question the existence of capitalism itself. Secondly, because the capitalists, although they clamor, for "propaganda" purposes, about the aggressiveness of the Soviet Union, do not themselves believe that it is aggressive, because they are aware of the Soviet Union's peaceful policy and know that it will not itself attack capitalist countries (p. 29).

This, of course, does not mean to say that there is not the most serious danger of war between the United States and the Soviet Union and the lands of People's Democracy. Obviously, such a grave danger does exist and it must be fought resolutely and ceaselessly. The situation is such that the men now at the head of the United States, at the behest of the big monopolies which they represent, are deliberately trying to precipitate war against the U.S.S.R. and its allies, hoping, by a desperate gamble, to avert the certain disaster lying ahead. They are driven on to this insane course by the deepening crisis of world capitalism and by their own monopolistic greed for ever-greater profits and domination over other

peoples. Unless these war-makers are definitely halted by the mass resistance of the peace-loving peoples, they will develop a third world war. This danger, as Stalin points out, will exist as long as imperialism itself lasts.

#### AS TO THE PERSPECTIVE

In the immediate future we may expect a general stepping up of the development of the two great antagonistic forces. First, there will be a further intensification of the efforts of Wall Street to bring about the world war, upon which it is basing all its hopes and policies. Second, there will be a still more rapidly rising resistance of the people, in this country and all over the world, against the insanity of a third world war. In our country we may also expect further governmental repression against our Party and the peace forces generally.

It is by no means written in the stars that the Eisenhowers, Dulleses, Tafts, MacArthurs, and their many Democratic Party and labor leader allies will succeed in their purpose to bring about an anti-Soviet war. On the contrary, the peace-loving masses have not only the potential power to halt this mad course, but also the increasing will to maintain world peace. Had it not been for mass resistance, here and in Europe, the warmongers in Wall Street, through their Washington Government agents, would have long since used the atom bomb in Korea and spread that murderous war into People's China.

Stalin thus states the possibilities of the peoples, acting through a broad peace movement, to halt the warmaking and eventually to abolish war itself:

What is most likely, is that the present-day peace movement, as a movement for the preservation of peace, will, if it succeeds, result in preventing a *particular* war, in its temporary postponement, in the temporary preservation of a *particular* peace, in the resignation of a bellicose government and its supersession by another that is prepared temporarily to keep the peace. That, of course, will be good. Even very good. But, all the same, it will not be enough to eliminate the inevitability of wars between capitalist countries generally. It will not be enough, because, for all the successes of the peace movement, imperialism will remain, continue in force—and, consequently, the inevitability of wars will also continue in force. To eliminate the inevitability of war, it is necessary to abolish imperialism (p. 30).

The Communist Party's draft resolution (*Political Affairs*, December 1952) correctly stresses that the fight to prevent the outbreak of a great war is the supreme task of the working class, the Negro people and all the democratic organizations of the people, acting through a broad peace coalition. This policy of our Party is based upon a realistic Marxist-Leninist appraisal of the political situation and also upon the most urgent need of the peoples of this country and the world.

The struggle for world peace is

facing a great crisis in the meeting of the United Nations which is about to open as this article is being written. The sinister Dulles, Eisenhower's man, is obviously going to try to compel the unwilling nations of Western Europe and Asia, in the U.N., to support his criminal project of spreading the Korean war into China, by establishing a tight naval blockade around that country (which would be an act of war), by organizing the forces of Chiang Kai-shek to invade the Chinese mainland (which would be another act of war), and, if he can get away with it, by opening up a big atom bomb offensive against China itself. This war program, of course, will be heavily veiled with the usual demagoguery of peace. But Eisenhower and Dulles will be surprised at the resistance they will encounter.

The highly dangerous international situation makes it more urgent than ever to arouse the masses to demand an immediate cease-fire in Korea, with the prisoners-of-war issue left to further negotiations. This is what the peoples of the world want. It is the only practical way to prevent the extension of the war. Let our slogan be: "Don't Spread the War, Cease-fire Now In Korea!" Let us carry this slogan to all parts of the country. The people must prevent Eisenhower, Dulles, Stevenson, *et al*, from making the current session of the United Nations the prelude to a great war.

# The Struggle for a Mass Policy

By John Swift

As COMMUNISTS, we know that the reactionary ruling class has been trying to destroy our Party. What we have not always been so aware of is, that this objective includes far more than the imprisonment of Party leaders, or even the outright illegalization of the Party itself. Central to this objective is the drive to bring about the *complete isolation* of the Party from the masses, to break its ties with the popular movements of the people, and, in the first place, the organized labor movement. If the reactionaries achieve this, then they believe they can achieve their objective of destroying our Party. For they know, as do we, that while a Communist Party can live and even flourish without legal rights, it cannot live if its roots in the working-class and people's movements are severed.

If what we have just noted is true, and it certainly is, then there can be no real defense of the Party without the most painstaking attention to the problems of mass work, of the relations between the Party and the working class, between the Party and the Negro people, between the Party and the poor farmers, etc. There can be no defeat of the at-

tempts of the enemy to destroy our Party without finding the way to daily establish and re-establish anew, and on an ever widening scale, close ties with the masses.

In fact, the strategy of reaction is to deliver repeated body-blows at our Party in order to keep it off balance, to disrupt "normalcy" in its work, to keep it constantly engaged within the narrow confines of "defense" tasks, and, thereby, to force it to neglect the prime task of guarding its ties with the masses, of leading mass struggles around the people's daily needs.

The task of *consciously* combating isolation, of daily *fighting* for closer links with the masses, is not a task flowing from any narrow interests. It has never been more true than today, that the interests of the Party and the interests of the working class and the American nation are one and inseparable. For if the reactionaries are out to destroy our Party, this is not merely because they dislike the word "Communist." It is because they fear the inevitable awakening of the American people to how this great land is being taken down the path to war, fascism and economic

disaster. It is because they fear, and justifiably so, the *potential* strength of our Party as the single force giving voice, courage and leadership to this awakening.

\* \* \*

The Republican election victory of last November places even greater emphasis on the all-importance of strengthening the Party's ties with the masses. The Draft Resolution of the National Committee of our Party (printed in *Political Affairs*, December 1952) correctly places both the new dangers and the new opportunities arising from the election. The new dangers are inherent in the fact that "the Republican election victory has strengthened and emboldened the forces of extreme reaction." The new opportunities stem from the fact that the masses, particularly the organized working class, the Negro people, the poor farmers, will *inevitably* counter the attacks of extreme reaction with a growing resistance. From this "opens the perspective of broader and sharper class struggles."

But, warns the Resolution, this perspective of broader mass struggles must not lead to reliance upon spontaneity. In the first place, it will not take place over night or in a straight line development. The bourgeoisie will continue to employ a combination of attack and concession as its method of rule. In the second place, "Struggles must be participated in, organized and led." The reformist and Social-Democratic

trade union officialdom will not "reverse their class collaboration role and policies." In the last analysis, what will be decisive, is "the role of our Party as the foremost force stimulating, organizing and influencing the development of mass united front struggles on the key issues confronting the working class" and the American people.

If our Party is to play this role, it must have close links with the masses. The Party must be able to "link itself with, to keep in close touch with, and, to a certain degree if you will, merge itself with the broadest masses . . ." (Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. X, p. 61). Any failure to establish or to maintain such close ties with the non-Party mass, particularly the organized labor movement and the Negro people's movement, must inevitably translate itself into a failure to play the role of "stimulating, organizing and influencing" the struggles of the people.

Does our Party have such close links with the masses today? It does not. In fact, it must be said quite frankly and openly that in the past few years our Party has suffered considerable isolation from the masses, especially the decisive sections of the organized labor movement. This is to be noted in many ways and most recently and concretely in the results of the November elections.

We are proud of the firm, staunch and correct position which our Party took in opposition to the Presiden-

tial tickets of both major parties. Yet, the harsh truth nonetheless is, that the elections were something of a barometer which registered the ability of the Left to win support for its position and candidates. Certainly we would not hesitate to draw this conclusion were the vote for the Left a high one. We should not hesitate to draw it when the opposite is true, painful as that may be. For only by facing facts, honestly, squarely, and realistically, can we become a *conscious* force for changing the present growing isolation of our Party. Unless we do so, we face the grave danger of missing even greater opportunities to break our isolation than have been true for a good number of years.

If we cannot rely upon spontaneity to develop a broad united labor and peoples' movement, we can even less depend upon spontaneity to break our Party's isolation from the masses. It is necessary to make this point, because in our ranks there are some comrades who actually believe that changing objective conditions will *automatically* and *spontaneously* break our isolation. Thus these comrades resist facing the hard facts as they are, try to soften them a bit, ignore the danger of isolation as a grave one, and hence prove quite incapable of struggling against the pernicious manifestations of sectarianism and self-isolation in our ranks.

The term "self-isolation" is used advisedly. For it must be plainly understood that no matter how vicious the attacks of reaction against

our Party, these cannot, in and by themselves, bring about the isolation of our Party from the masses for any length of time. This is so, because every attack leveled against us is also an attack upon the working class and the entire American people—upon their standard of living, their democratic rights, their peace and their liberty. Thus the more vicious and brutal the assault of reaction, the more does it create the very objective conditions for teaching a larger number of people the correctness of what the Party has been saying and the one-ness of the Party with them.

Of course, objective conditions create only the *possibilities*. In order to transform these into *actualities*, there must be a Party capable of doing so. There must be a Party which tenaciously fights to strengthen its ties with the masses, which combats all manifestations of Right opportunism as well as all "Left" sectarian moods of self-isolation.

If, however, new objective developments will *automatically* break our isolation, then there is really nothing to worry about. In fact, if this is true, then it must also be true that our present relative isolation is caused entirely by unfavorable objective conditions and that nothing can be done about this. Therefore, we should just relax and wait for the ebb tide to turn. This is how some comrades fallaciously reason. That is why they feel no gnawing concern over our growing isolation. They even glory in it. Like typical sectarians, they

are  
own  
day  
mor  
The  
feel  
our  
corre  
In  
wait  
chan  
with  
wise  
the  
ency  
even  
face.  
freq  
peop  
fashi  
the  
there  
mist  
to n  
olog  
tive  
Vol.  
prov  
do  
read  
blam  
lead  
right  
whic  
Is  
that  
follo  
had  
the r  
of t  
but  
win

are content to find solace in their own puritanism, and only await the day of the Messiah, when ordinary mortals also will see the light!

The majority in our ranks do not feel this way. They are disturbed by our weaknesses and want to find the correct way to overcome them.

In criticizing the viewpoint which waits upon objective developments to change spontaneously our relations with the masses, it is necessary likewise to criticize the opposite side of the same ideological coin—the tendency to close our eyes to objective events and to attempt to fly in their face. Both of these tendencies are frequently expressed by the same people in something of a see-saw fashion. First, they wishfully see in the objective picture what is not there. (And “the most dangerous mistake revolutionaries can make” is to mistake “*their desire*, their ideological-political attitude, for objective reality,” Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. X, p. 99). When the events prove them wrong, these comrades do not blame themselves for misreading the objective situation; they blame the objective situation for misleading them. Thus, they are always right. It is the objective situation which is wrong!

Is it not true, to a certain extent, that this is exactly what we did following the 1948 elections? Events had proven our general analysis of the role of American imperialism and of the two-party system as correct, but it also had proven our *specific* estimate of a mass breakaway from

the two old parties as premature. Having been proven wrong in this specific estimate of the mood of the masses, we placed our confidence in *future* developments to prove us right. Thus we did not stop and re-examine our position. Instead we concluded that the election results were only a flash-in-the-pan, that within a short period of time the masses would break from the two-party system and flock to the banner of the Progressive Party. We compared the election results for the Progressive Party with those of the Republican Party in 1856, leaving the clear inference that just as the Republican Party emerged as the election victor four years later, so could the Progressive Party today.

What was wrong with this reasoning was that it over-simplified the course of development, saw it as a straight line instead of a zig-zag one. In the first place, it permitted wishful-thinking to exaggerate the tempo of development. In the second place, it underestimated the ability of the bourgeoisie and of the Truman Democrats to maneuver by making concessions to the masses, and of the labor and Negro reformists to “cash in” as a result of these concessions. In the third place, it forgot that the masses would not “give up” what they still considered to be a bird in the hand for the offer of two in the bush. In other words, the masses would continue to stick with their present organizations and parties until they had become convinced *as a result of their own experiences* of

the need for a change. Therefore, the masses would express their opposition to reactionary policies, first of all through the medium and inside of these organizations and parties. Therefore, also, if we wanted to help break them away from old political and ideological moorings, the struggle would have to be conducted *where the masses were*. It could not be done by calling upon them or wishing them to be where they were not.

Even had events moved more rapidly than they have, even had mass disillusionment with the two old parties set in, this would not have meant, ipso facto, a flocking to the Progressive Party. Why? Because under such circumstances the demand for a new party led by labor would have been echoed more and more by sections of the labor movement. As a consequence of this, the position of many of the reformist and Social-Democratic labor leaders also would have undergone alteration. To maintain their positions over the workers, these gentlemen would have stepped forth as the leaders of a new party in order to keep the masses tied to the policies of the old parties and away from Left influence and leadership. (The Liberal Party in New York is an example of this.) Thus, in this hypothetical case the Left still could have found itself completely isolated from the living, concrete development which it had foreseen.

To give an example of this from the actual history of our Party, one

can cite the experience of the early '30s when our Party nearly alone championed the cause of the organization of the unorganized workers in the mass production industries. But this in and by itself did not guarantee Party influence and leadership over the workers when the movement for industrial unionism began to sweep the ranks of the working class. In fact, our Party was called upon to adjust its tactical line to the new situation. It was called upon to urge the Left-led independent unions to re-enter the A. F. of L., so as to affect positively, and *from within*, the emergence of the Committee for Industrial Organization. In other words, had we not taken the necessary steps to strengthen our contacts with the decisive sections of the labor movement, we would not have been able to play the role we did in the C.I.O. development, and this could have meant the difference between success and failure. (Read Foster's *History of the Communist Party of the U.S.*, chapter 21.)

From this it can be seen that there can be no substitute for being *with* the masses at all times. This does not mean succumbing to the backwardness of the masses. On the contrary, close contact with the masses is needed in order *to be in a position* to raise their level of understanding and to counter-act their illusions. Otherwise old illusions merely become exchanged for new ones. Only by being with the masses, only by taking into account the actual state of affairs, only by taking the real

level of  
our st  
role of  
influen  
tion. V  
ing m  
Of  
with  
time r  
ciple  
easy. I  
is par  
States,  
illusio  
class, a  
for op  
nomic  
The f  
it is m  
betwe  
(theor  
masses  
its nee  
both t  
the re  
leader  
Wh  
munis  
which  
Marxi  
capabl  
a fres  
concre  
gle in  
will d  
Wh  
Leonis  
sociali  
the o  
that d  
letter  
wetsky

level of the mass understanding as our starting point, can we play the role of "stimulating, organizing and influencing" them in a correct direction. Without this, we become nothing more than a propaganda sect.

Of course, maintaining close links with the masses, and at the same time maintaining a consistent principled class position, is not always easy. It is most always difficult. This is particularly true for the United States, a country in which bourgeois illusions are still rife in the working class, and in which the material basis for opportunism, in the form of economic bribes, is still considerable. The fact that in the United States it is more difficult to attain the unity between firm adherence to principle (theory), and close links with the masses (practice), does not eliminate its need. For only a combination of both these ingredients can provide the recipe for correct Communist leadership.

What is needed for this is a Communist Party of high quality, a Party which is so firmly grounded in Marxist-Leninist theory, that it is capable of applying this theory in a fresh creative way to the practical concrete conditions of the class struggle in the United States. Nothing less will do.

When the "ultra-Leftism" of DeLeonism was splitting the advanced socialist-minded workers away from the organized labor movement of that day, Frederick Engels wrote a letter to Florence Kelley Wischniewsky in which he said: "I think

that all our practice has shown that it is possible to work along with the general movement of the working class at every one of its stages without giving up or hiding our own distinct position and even organization, and I am afraid that if the German-Americans choose a different line they will commit a great mistake."\* (Read Foster's *History of the Communist Party of the U.S.*, Chapter 6.)

In this formulation Engels stresses the two-sided character and role of Marxist leadership, the need "to work along with the general movement" and at the same time "without giving up or hiding our distinct position and even organization." In this combination is to be found the "inseparability of identity and difference" which is at the heart of the Leninist concept of the Party as a vanguard organization.

The Party must be an integral part of the working class. It is impossible to be a vanguard without being a part, for the very term "vanguard" presupposes vanguard of something—the masses. By the same token, just to be another part, without being a distinctly different kind of part, is to cease being a vanguard, to surrender that which distinguishes the Party from the class.

Our big problem in the labor movement is precisely how to maintain our common identity with the mass and at the same time our dis-

\* Letter dated Jan. 27, 1887 in *Selected Correspondence of Marx and Engels*, International, 1942, p. 455.

tinctiveness. Just to be different spells isolation. Just to be identical spells capitulation to opportunism. We face this problem everywhere. How, at a time when the masses are still ideologically confused and even poisoned, can we stand forth clear and unsullied, and at the same time be an integral part of the masses and their movement?

In 1925, dealing with the role of the Party, Stalin wrote:

It is necessary that the Party be able to combine in its work the greatest adhesion to principle (not to be confused with sectarianism!) with a maximum of contacts and connections with the masses (not to be confused with "tailism"!), without which it is not only impossible for the Party to teach the masses but also to learn from them, not only to lead the masses and to raise them to the level of the Party, but to listen to the voice of the masses and divine their sorest needs.

Here Stalin adds something significant to our full understanding of the importance of close contacts with the masses. This is important, says he, not alone so that the Party can *teach* the masses, but also so that the Party can *learn* from the masses. For in order to teach the masses concretely, on the basis of their own experiences, and not in an abstract academic fashion which preaches to them over their heads, the Party must know the mind of the masses. It must know how to heed it and to learn from it. It must learn if it is to teach.

Is it not true that one of the

reasons why our Party frequently errs in its estimate of the mood of the masses is that its links with the masses are not as close as they should be? Is it not further true that we often give little heed to what our closest contacts among the masses do tell us, preferring to hold on to our own preconceived dogmatic estimates? It is because of this that our mass contacts many times fear to tell us those things we do not like to hear. Thus we still have much to learn from Stalin's wise admonition "to listen to the voice of the masses."

\* \* \*

We have stated that it is not always easy to maintain a principled class position and at the same time close ties with the masses. And we know from our own personal and often sad experience that it is much easier to state a generally correct proposition than to apply it correctly in practice. It is certainly true that where we do have the closest links with the masses, and actual leadership over them, there the danger of Right opportunism is more pronounced. In fact, to the degree that our Party breaks its isolation, to the degree that it enters more fully into the main stream of the mass movement, to that extent will the pressure of Right opportunism likewise grow. This is particularly so if the Party fails to conduct a two-pronged simultaneous war against both Right opportunism and "Left" sectarianism, making the main target that danger which is uppermost at each moment

and in each concrete situation. We shall have more to say about this later.

In the given situation of the election campaign it must be said that the main error of our Party was that of "Left" sectarianism. This expressed itself in a dogmatic, inflexible, one-sided position, which in practice based itself almost exclusively on the theoretically correct premise that both old parties had outlived their usefulness, and from the point of history had become obsolete. But as Lenin so well put it, "it is a crying theoretical mistake to measure questions of practical politics with the scale of world history," for from that point of view "capitalism could have been rightly declared to be 'historically obsolete' many decades ago," (*Selected Works*, Vol. X, p. 97). Yes, from the point of view of history the two old parties have become obsolete, but unfortunately, not yet from the point of view of the masses, not from the viewpoint of *practical politics*.

What does this mean more concretely? Does it mean that we should have supported Stevenson and the Democratic Party? No, to have done that would have been tantamount to betraying a principled class position. It would have meant feeding the illusions of the workers, the Negro people and other progressive masses, instead of counteracting these illusions. It was necessary to stand forth and tell the masses the bitter truth, that both Eisenhower and Stevenson represented Wall Street and were

pro-war candidates.

The mistake we made was elsewhere. It is that our tactical line did not sufficiently take into account the concrete situation, particularly the actual mood of the masses. For had we done so we would have had to reckon concretely with the following stubborn facts: 1) that there were no immediate indications of a mass breakaway from the two old parties; 2) that the Democratic Party still held the allegiance of the organized labor movement and the Negro people, and that these feared a Republican victory and, in particular, the danger of McCarthyism and Taftism; 3) that the Progressive Party had become even narrower than in 1948; that the masses would not accept its Presidential ticket as a practical alternative; and, that its vote for President and Vice President would be only token in character.

Had these facts been recognized, and they were obvious for all to see, the question of a large vote for the P. P. ticket would not have emerged in practice as the *single* or *main* objective for which the Left fought. Instead we would have seen the main role of the Hallinan-Bass ticket as that of a catalytic agent which produced chemical changes by injecting the *real* issues into the campaign, utilizing the public forum of the elections to speak out boldly and unequivocally for peace.

The other side of our electoral policy should have been to seek out the ways and means by which to march side by side with the great

mass of organized labor and the Negro people in their opposition to McCarthyism and Taftism. We should have grasped every opportunity to work with and within the labor movement and its political action bodies. We should have given support, of a qualified and critical nature, it is true, but still support, to the candidates who were considered to be pro-labor and who while not progressive, were certainly more amenable to progressive pressure.

In practice, in most states, we did not pursue an electoral united front or coalition policy, one which sought out points of agreement with the bulk of organized labor and the Negro people. On the contrary, in many places we pursued a tactical line in an opposite direction. With some notable exceptions our talk of coalition usually meant coalition only of the Left. For example, to have said that a basic condition for the support of any candidates for Congress was how they stood on peace, in practice, frequently meant support only for P. P. candidates. If any Democratic or Republican candidates for Congress came forth with a progressive stand for peace, they were certainly few and far between. The Democratic opponents of McCarthy, Jenner and Potter, to single these out, did not depart from Truman's foreign policy. Yet, it was imperative to join with organized labor and with other anti-fascist forces to help defeat the McCarthys, Jenners, Potters, and Cains. In the eyes of the masses, and in fact, such men were

and are the open symbols of extreme reaction and arch-anti-communism, of American fascism. Their defeat would have had the *objective* significance of a repudiation of McCarthyism and blatant anti-Communism in the eyes of the world and national opinion. This despite the *subjective* position of their Democratic opponents on the issues of peace and Communism.

Of course, to have joined in an *active* struggle to defeat these open symbols of extreme reaction and fascism, required considerable skill on our part. It required the flexibility of being able to work with the movements for their defeat. At the same time, while part of the common fight, it was necessary to find the ways and means of expressing our own distinctly critical position of official policies. It is quite clear that the McCarthyites could not be defeated so long as the Democrats accepted McCarthy's main thesis of the "Communist menace" and strove to out-McCarthy McCarthy in their Red-baiting. The Democrats, by pleading their agreement with McCarthy's "motives," and their disagreement only with his "methods," gave up their chance of beating him. It is impossible to separate motives from methods. The failure to challenge McCarthy's *fascist motives* as well as his *fascist methods* must lead to the strengthening of McCarthyism.

But this kind of argument could best be made while fighting side by side with the labor and progressive movement to defeat the McCarthy-

ites,  
sideli  
forces  
When  
tered  
ment  
also  
imme  
It i  
Left  
ment  
it is  
discu  
lessor  
is tha  
howe  
discr  
the d  
collis  
it wi  
the r  
And  
for F  
for a  
rectly  
...  
ing  
trend  
to ha  
of th  
ment  
in th  
gener  
A  
elect  
place  
that  
stron  
out"  
thing  
was  
unio

ites, and not by standing on the sidelines. In many states the Left forces did stand on the sidelines. Where they did not, where they entered the fray, they not only cemented ties with wider masses but also influenced the course of the immediate struggle itself.

It is quite obvious that where the Left did join with the labor movement and with others in joint effort, it is today in a better position to discuss with the workers the vital lessons of the elections and why it is that labor suffered a defeat. Where, however, the Left ran candidates indiscriminately, paying no heed to the danger of running into head-on collision with the labor movement, it widened the rift between it and the ranks of the organized workers. And this in its turn did not win votes for Hallinan and Bass. It lost them, for as the National Resolution correctly states, "a rigid third party line . . . had no foundation in the existing alignment of forces and mass trends." To have pursued it, meant to have lost touch with the realities of the situation in the labor movement, among the Negro people, and in the organized mass movement generally.

A proof of the narrowness of the electoral tactics employed in most places by our Party and the Left is, that it became necessary to combat strong tendencies in our ranks to "sit out" the elections. The most striking thing about this tendency is that it was most prevalent among our trade union and shop workers and among

our mass workers generally.

It is our opinion that the *main* reason for this tendency, and the main obstacle also to the successful combating of Right-opportunist tendencies, was the narrowness of the tactical line pursued. The truth is that many of our comrades, particularly those in Right-wing led unions and mass organizations, found themselves incapable of applying the tactical line for fear of completely isolating themselves. Nor is it surprising that in many industrial areas, unions under Left influence did less to activate their rank-and-file in political action than did conservative-led locals. Thus the cropping forth of an "anti-parliamentary" tendency must be seen as a reflection of the one-sided and narrow tactical line pursued in the elections.

Communist and Left workers must never "sit things out." They must always be in the heart and center of every real movement and struggle. To sit on our haunches until the masses "are ready for us" is to wait both endlessly and aimlessly.

Engels, in his classical work, *Anti-Duehring*, made the penetrating observation that a mere knowledge that the barley plant is governed by the "negation of the negation" as the general law of development, does not enable one to grow barley successfully, any more than the knowledge of how different sounds are produced by the different thickness of strings, enables one to play the violin. One also must learn the *peculiarities* of each *particular* process

of development as a result of *practice*.

To know that labor must break from bourgeois politics, must play an independent class role on the political arena, is one thing. To know *how* to begin, concretely, practically, to *move* labor towards this position, is quite another thing. For the united labor movement of tomorrow can only grow out of the divided labor movement of today. Similarly labor's independent class organization and action on the political field can only grow out of the present-day political action of the labor movement, narrow, restricted, and tied to bourgeois politics though it still is.

The question of working inside of, and with, the labor movement, while playing a distinct vanguard role, does not mean putting aside the goal of a new mass party of the common people led by labor, as some comrades may fear. It is bringing that goal closer, for the *only* way to attain it, is by, and through, the organized working class, in alliance with the Negro people, the poor farmers and other progressive masses.

In a letter addressed to August Bebel, Engels once wrote that "Whoever expects a 'pure' social revolution will *never* live to see it." How true is this of every great mass movement! A "pure" mass movement is only a figment of a sectarian's imagination. Every truly mass movement is a mixed movement, a medley of different, frequently conflicting currents and tendencies. The third party move-

ment when it takes shape also will be such a movement. There is nothing to fear in this, so long as we always remember the two fold nature of our task as a vanguard Party. What we should fear is the danger of being isolated just on the eve of new developments which are bound to bring about important political changes.

\* \* \*

In analyzing the weaknesses and errors of the Party and the Left in the elections, it must be noted that the danger of a narrow sectarian policy, of a "rigid third party line" which would bring us into head-on collision with the labor movement, was seen in advance. Attempts were made at the outset of the campaign, and in various stages of it, to broaden the Party's tactical line. The articles by Paul Mercer, which appeared in the columns of the *Daily Worker*, both prior to the Republican, Democratic and Progressive Party conventions, as well as after them, were on the whole sound estimates of the actual situation. They presented a correct line of policy. But these did not become the line of the Party in *practice*.

Why is this so? The first reason is stated in the Draft Resolution. The leadership failed to self-critically examine "the root of the resistance to such a policy which flowed primarily from the mistakes in the 1948 election campaign." The failure "objectively and fearlessly" and also *publicly* to draw all the lessons from the 1948 elections made it difficult

for the whole Party to understand the *difference* in the tactical approach proposed for the 1952 elections. It must be said, however, that if we failed to bring about a correction of the Party's electoral policy in practice, this represented not merely a repetition of the '48 mistake but a compounding of it. For, unlike '48, there was not even the slightest grounds for believing that a mass breakaway from the two parties would take place.

This difficulty became even more pronounced when nothing was done by the Party leadership to criticize publicly the numerous sectarian applications of the Party policy. For example, at the Progressive Party Convention there were various narrow views expressed, and in some cases by individuals who were erroneously viewed as speaking for our Party. Yet these received no public criticism on our part. Or, one can cite the errors made in the State of Washington. There the Progressive Party swung from the extreme of believing that no independent ticket for President was needed, to that of filing candidates for all major offices. It thereby stood apart from the labor movement and other forces in what proved to be a successful struggle to defeat the McCarthyite Senator Cain. Nor was there any public criticism of what was undoubtedly a mistake on the part of the American Labor Party in New York City in running its own candidates in every congressional district but one.

Speaking out publicly on these political errors, was all the more

necessary, and yet more difficult to carry through. This is so because the semi-legal conditions in which the Party had to function made it impossible to convene a national plenum or national conference at which policy could be debated and clarified for the whole Party.

There is a second reason for the resistance in our ranks to a broader mass policy. For some period of time there has grown up a point of view which believes that the Left, by a policy of head-on collision with the existing Right-led mass organizations, and by establishing its own independent Left-led organizations, will successfully undermine the positions of the reformist and Social-Democratic leaders and take the leadership of the masses from them. Expressions of this point of view are to be found in every field of work—in trade union work, in work among the Negro people, in work on the political field, in work among nationality groups, etc. *It is the root cause for the strong resistance in our ranks to work among masses and in organizations not under our leadership.*

What is wrong with this point of view? As we have remarked previously, it is basically false to set up artificial barriers which separate us from the masses. We must be where the masses are, wherever they are! Lenin, in his "*Left-wing Communism*", explains how the Russian Bolsheviks worked even within the Czarist police-sponsored societies for

working people, trying to work legally in the most reactionary-led organizations, so long as these organizations were made up of working people.

In the second place, we must bear in mind that the masses are better organized today than in any other previous period. And it is a serious error to assume that those not organized are more militant necessarily and more to the Left than those who are. Thus, to point to the large number who are unorganized as "our base" is over-simplifying matters. As we have shown previously, even in the '30s when the mass of unorganized workers moved in the direction of union organization, this development found its expression in a mass movement and an explosion *within* the old craft-led A. F. of L. It was not alone, nor even mainly, in a movement towards independent Left-led unions.

Furthermore, it would be a mistake to ignore the mass intimidation and terror which exists today. Every organization established by the Left is branded as "subversive" by the real subversives. Under such circumstances to expect a *mass* influx into these organizations at this time, would be to indulge in wishful thinking.

Of course, it cannot be precluded that large masses will at certain points along the way be compelled to leave some of the present reformist-led organizations, when they can no longer influence the policies and leadership of these organizations.

This can only come about through a *revolt from within*, and only when the rank-and-file in these organizations feels compelled to take this action.

Nor does this mean that the present organizations led by the Left are unimportant. *They are of great importance.* They give a lead, exert pressure and guarantee that masses are not left leaderless. Their very existence becomes a factor influencing larger masses and larger mass organizations. Thus, the existence of the Civil Rights Congress, for example, has been of great importance in giving leadership on a whole number of struggles and issues. It has exerted pressure upon such organizations as the N.A.A.C.P. and the Civil Liberties Union to act more vigorously in behalf of civil rights and civil liberties.

But Left-led organizations can become obstacles to reaching the masses. This will be so if and where they are seen as the *main* mediums for our work. Or, if their needs are counterposed to the main task of working within, and influencing the larger mass organizations of the people now led by reformists and Social-Democrats in a constructive and progressive direction.

Thus it can be said, that one of the major reasons for the resistance to a broader tactical line in the elections is the fact that sectarianism does exist in our ranks. High sounding "Left" phrases are used to conceal what is essentially a Right-opportunist fear of working among masses

not directly under Communist or Left leadership.

How sectarianism warps the thinking of sections of the Party can be seen in a crass and even shocking example. In one state organization of our Party all Party clubs were asked what perspectives they saw for mass work in their own areas and fields of work. A majority of the clubs replied that they saw no possibilities for mass work. Imagine! No possibilities for mass work in this day and age!

It does not take much thought to figure out how comrades could draw such completely erroneous and impotent conclusions. In the first place, they apparently live in a world unto themselves, completely separated from the existing mass organizations and movements. And there are mass organizations and movements everywhere on one level or another. In the second place, these comrades apparently conceive of mass work as consisting merely of the projection of some Left-led organization or Left-led campaign. *They do not think of mass work as starting with the masses themselves and the issues that are uppermost before them.* They do not think of mass work as the work of being with the masses, of patiently, tirelessly, step by step, drop by drop, and not all in one leap or in one dose, bringing them heightened understanding. What, may we ask can the perspective of such comrades be? Apparently, to wait for the tide to turn and for the masses to come to them!

\* \* \*

While treating the subject of "Left" sectarianism, it is important to touch on the relationship between the struggle against sectarianism and that against Right opportunism. We do so, because in our opinion there is widespread confusion in our ranks on this score. Such confusion hinders and harms both the struggle against sectarianism as well as Right opportunism. This confusion is frequently expressed in a lifeless, dogmatic and pedantic discussion over which of these dangers constitutes the main one.

A few months ago, in the publication of one of our state organizations, the following query appeared: "In the August issue . . . you emphasized the fight against sectarianism. Does this mean that Right opportunism is no longer the main danger?" The editor of this publication replies to this question with a most emphatic, "Absolutely not. To the contrary, Right opportunism remains the main danger."

Is this a correct answer to the question? It is not. In the first place, the very posing of the question in that form is incorrect. It is a general abstract way of posing a question which can only be answered correctly in a *concrete* way. It asks whether Right opportunism is still the main danger. Where? In the labor movement? In the Party? If in the Party, under what concrete conditions? In what field of work? To what concrete struggle or set of conditions is it referring? Apparently to all in general, and therefore to

none in particular.

The comrade editor who answers the question, gives reasons for his (or her) reply. He writes: "So long as the American ruling class follows policies aimed at world domination, militarism and force (both at home and abroad), and so long as the official leadership of the labor movement continues to capitulate to these ruling class policies, so long will Right opportunism continue to be the main danger facing the working class, its organizations and its vanguard Party. For the Party cannot be separated from the working class and the labor movement of which it is a part."

This is indeed a simple measuring rod. But we fear this yardstick is a bit too stiff and brittle to measure an object which is not straight but multi-curved.

The first error made by this comrade is that he sees the identity between the Party and the working class in a mechanical and non-dialectical way. He says that since the Party cannot be separated from the working class, therefore that which constitutes the main danger in the working class must also be the main danger in the ranks of the Party.

Lenin declared many years ago that "the principal enemy" of the Communists in the working-class movement, the enemy which "has claimed, and still claims, most of the attention" is, opportunism. But Lenin wrote this precisely in a booklet in which he was singling out "Left" sectarianism as the main danger

within the world Communist movement of that day (1920). Lenin hit out so sharply and so scathingly against phrasemongering and "Left" sectarianism in the young Communist Parties because he realized that this "disease" was the *main obstacle* at the time to a *successful* struggle against opportunism within the labor movement as such.

In other words, Lenin never forgot that in the imperialist countries the main enemy in the working-class movement was opportunism. But he also understood that the reflection of this opportunism within the parties of the working class could and did frequently take the distorted form of "Left" sectarianism. "Leftism," Lenin said, "was often a sort of punishment for the opportunist sins of the working-class movement. Both monstrosities mutually supplemented each other" ("*Left-wing Communism in Selected Works*, Vol. X, p. 71).

This last sentence deserves special attention. How these "monstrosities" mutually supplement each other, mutually feed upon each other, is too little understood in our ranks. Were it understood, there would not be so much smug feeling that Right opportunism is a crime and abomination, but "Leftism" only "a little bit bad."

In Comrade Foster's latest book there are a number of vivid examples from the history of the American working class and our own Party of how Right opportunism fed "Left" sectarian views, and how "Left" sec-

tarianism, in turn, only further entrenched and strengthened the tendency of Right opportunism. In 1903, for example, the socialist-minded workers introduced a resolution in the A. F. of L. Convention which called upon the trade-union movement to "advise the working people to organize their economic and political power to secure for labor the full equivalent of its toil and the overthrow of the wage system" (Foster's *History of the Communist Party of the U.S.*, pp. 98-99). This socialist-sponsored resolution got tremendous support, being defeated by the narrow margin of 4,899 to 4,171 votes. Yet two years later, in 1905, the Gompers opportunism which held sway in the A. F. of L. became so unbearable for the Left-wing and socialist militants, that they decided to depart from its ranks. They took the path of dual-unionism, forming the I.W.W. Thus the Right opportunism of the labor officialdom led to "Leftism" among the class-conscious workers.

What was the consequence of this development? Did it weaken or strengthen the dominant current of opportunism in the labor movement? It strengthened it. It withdrew from the ranks of the A. F. of L. the very workers who were cognizant of the danger of opportunism and could give battle to it. It therefore turned over the bulk of the organized workers to the tender mercies of the labor bureaucrats.

Today we can see all this. We are plainly and unalterably opposed to

dual unionism. And yet, here and there, within unions in which opportunism on the part of the official leadership must be fought, we have frequently weakened this fight by narrow and sectarian policies on our part. We have thus inadvertently strengthened opportunism. *It must be understood that to fight opportunism in a sectarian way is to strengthen opportunism!*

The comrade who wrote the reply to the question about the "main danger," seems to believe that the main danger within the Party can be established for a whole period of time as something fixed and immovable. The logic of his answer, in fact, would be to assume that Right opportunism must inevitably be the main danger in the ranks of our Party until the leadership of the working class is won. And after it is won, does "Leftism" then become the main danger? Obviously, this is mechanical and false.

As against attempting to find the main danger in an abstract way, and for whole periods of time, it would be better to accept the more scientifically accurate characterization of this problem by Stalin. In his report to the 17th Party Congress, delivered in January 1934, Stalin explained that: "It would be absurd to attempt to give ready-made recipes suitable for all times and for all conditions as regards the major and minor danger. Such recipes do not exist. The major danger is the deviation against which we have ceased to fight. . . . The question as to which is the

major danger . . . is determined not by futile, formal controversies, but by a Marxian analysis of the situation at the given moment, and by a study of the mistakes that have been committed in this sphere" (*Leninism, Selected Writings*, pp. 348-9).

The "sphere" of which Stalin was speaking was that of the "national problem," but he added: "The same should be said of the *Right and the 'Left'* deviations in the sphere of general policy. Here, too, as in other spheres, there is no little confusion in the views of certain members of our Party. Sometimes while fighting against the Right deviation, they turn away from the 'Left' deviation and relax the fight against it, on the assumption that it is not dangerous, or hardly dangerous. This is a grave and dangerous error. This is a concession to the 'Left' deviation which is impermissible for a member of the Party" (*Ibid*, p. 349).

Why is it impermissible? Because, adds Stalin, "We have always said that the 'Lefts' are also Rights, only they mask their Right-ness behind Left phrases." How true this is! Those in our ranks who refuse to work with the masses *as they are*, in reality are only capitulating to opportunism, are *afraid* to fight it in the ranks of the masses.

How concrete one must be in determining which danger is uppermost and must therefore receive the major blow at the given moment, can be seen by the way in which Lenin fought against both Right opportunism and "Leftism." In July,

1921, at the Third Congress of the Communist International, Lenin hurled his sharpest lance against what he termed 'Left' absurdities." A few months later, after the "ultra-Lefts" had been defeated at the congress, the Right opportunists within the German Communist Party began to raise their heads more openly and more boldly. Lenin then shifted his main attack in that direction, while defending his position at the Third Congress, where, as he put it, "I was on the extreme Right flank" (*Selected Works*, Vol. X, p. 310).

Earlier, in the midst of the intense terror following the defeat of the 1905 Revolution, the Bolsheviks under Lenin's leadership conducted an endless struggle against all tendencies towards Right opportunist capitulation and liquidation. But they just as zealously fought for close ties with the masses, for mass policies. In 1908, they were compelled to wage a *major* struggle against the "Left" sectarians who opposed participation in "the most reactionary 'parliament'" (the Duma), and who likewise opposed working in the legal workers' societies "which were restricted by the most reactionary laws." In this struggle Lenin did not hesitate to admit that the Bolsheviks had been mistaken in their boycott of the Duma in 1907, and "that in this *single*" case "the Mensheviks were right as against the Bolsheviks."

We should learn to display the same concreteness in the struggle against Right opportunism and "Left" sectarianism in our own

ranks. And it is not too difficult to find numerous expressions of both these tendencies. Each particular situation and struggle must be examined concretely in order to ascertain the specific errors made. What may be the main danger in one place may not be in another. For example, in Right-led unions in which our forces are in the main isolated and hold no leading posts, the main tendency most frequently, although not always, is that of "Left" sectarianism. This is expressed in a narrow approach to the union, in a failure to see and think of the union "as our own"—not in a partisan sense, but in the broadest working-class sense.

Where, however, Communists hold positions of leadership in trade unions and in mass organizations generally, there the main tendency frequently is that of Right opportunism, although this too is sprinkled liberally sometimes with sectarian practices. Particularly in trade unions where Communists are in posts of leadership they must beware of a certain danger of isolation arising from the Right opportunist tendency to base themselves on the more highly-paid workers, and not on the great mass of unskilled, semi-skilled and new workers, which includes in the first place the Negro workers, but also the women and young workers. This type of isolation can arise where Communists in the leadership of unions work exclusively through top "maneuvers," do not base themselves always upon the rank-and-file, resist following broad united front

policies, and work in a bureaucratic way typical of the style of the reformist trade-union officials.

Thus it is necessary to be concrete, for even the danger of isolation need not always arise from the "Left."

It is the opinion of this writer that *at this particular moment* the main danger in the ranks of our Party is that of "Left" sectarianism. But this does not mean that we can become complacent about the many manifestations of Right opportunism, for to do so would only mean to swing from one extreme to another, and inevitably to create the conditions in which Right opportunism would assume the proportions of the gravest danger. The sad experience of our Party with Browder Right-opportunist revisionism should still be fresh in our memories.

This means that the struggle should never be conducted on one front to the exclusion of the other. Can we, for example, ignore the continued manifestations of white chauvinism in our ranks? Or, those of Negro nationalism? Can we overlook the hesitations to defend our Marxist-Leninist principles from the attempts of the enemy to distort and discredit these in the eyes of the people? Can we close our eyes to the tendency to give way to the difficulties of circulating our Communist press and literature to larger numbers of workers? Or, to hide the face of our Party? Can we continue to tolerate the low theoretical level of our Party and the still strong influence of narrow practicalism upon our thinking? No,

these opportunist tendencies cannot be overlooked.

\* \* \*

The Draft Resolution of the National Committee should bring about the most intense, thorough and self-critical review of the work of our Party in every field of activity and from top to bottom. It should open up a period in which the struggle for correct mass policies, for close ties with the masses, is one participated in by every Communist and every Party organization. Every Party club should ask itself: What are our links with the masses? How are we working among and influencing masses? What lessons are to be drawn from our own work?

In this way we can thwart the attempts of the enemy to isolate our Party from the working class and the American people. In this way we can strengthen the ideological clarity and unity of our Party around

its National Committee headed by Comrades Foster and Dennis. In this way we can take to heart and translate into deeds the words of Georgi Dimitroff: ". . . the leadership of the working class by the Communist Party cannot be attained by a process of spontaneous development. The leading role of the Communist Party in the struggles of the working class must be won. For this purpose it is necessary, not to rant about the leading role of the Communists, but to *merit and win the confidence of the working masses* by everyday mass work and correct policy."\*

In the period ahead, with its sharpening class struggles, we shall have every possibility "to merit and win the confidence of the working masses" if, however, we do not forget the need for "everyday mass work and correct policy."

\* *The United Front Against Fascism*, New Century, N. Y., 1935, p. 85.

### A CORRECTION

A typographical error occurred in the "Draft Resolution on the Situation Growing Out of the Presidential Election," by the National Committee, C.P.U.S.A., as published in *Political Affairs*, December, 1952. The line reading: "It placed the professed party of monopoly capital, the Republican Party, in control of the government" (p. 5) should have read: "It placed the preferred party of monopoly capital, the Republican Party, in control of the government."—Ed.

## "Life's" Dream Picture

By Henry T. Goodwin

"PRIDE GOES BEFORE A FALL!" It is an old adage, but true nonetheless. For it is the collective folk experience that, exactly when individuals, institutions or systems feel their weaknesses growing to the danger point, they seek to reassure themselves and their dependents by boasting of their perfect health and of their triumphant solution of all problems.

This is the significance of the New Year's edition of *Life* (January 5). In a special issue, "The American and His Economy," *Life* paints for its ten million readers a booming Horatio Alger picture of our "one trillion, three hundred billion dollar economy": "We have a good system for making hard work worthwhile for anybody who wants to try it. . . its right name is capitalism modified by democracy. . . We are moving, not towards socialism, but past socialism. . . Our system is adapted, not to the past, but to the present and future."

Of course, this high-power boasting that the American economy has solved all its problems is nothing new. For it is a characteristic of the capitalist economic cycle that crises are preceded by booms, and that in these booms the capitalist, intoxicated by large sales and high profits, feels

that all problems of past and future are but the ghosts of forgotten fears. That is why on reading *Life's* paean of praise to the American economy one gets a distinct feeling: "This is where we came in—in 1928 and 1929."

Comrade Foster says:

It was in this spirit that Herbert Hoover . . . assured the people after his election in November, 1928, that the United States was then on the verge of abolishing poverty. . . .

The substance of what all these exuberant boosters of American capitalism were saying was that capitalism in this country, by the natural processes of its evolution, was turning into socialism, if not something far superior. Capitalism in the United States, distinct from that in Europe, had overcome its internal contradictions, had "come of age," was being democratized, and had entered upon an endless upward spiral of development and mass prosperity. . . . Henry Ford had superseded Karl Marx.\*

But despite the pat similarity of today's boasting—almost like reviving an old hit tune of a past generation—there are certain differences that are of historic importance:

First: among the big capitalists, their economists, publicists, advisers

\* W. Z. Foster: *History of the Communist Party of the United States, International*, 1952, p. 241.

and politicians, few believe it themselves. On the contrary, there is widespread concern and foreboding about the economic prospects, temporarily toned down so as not to becloud the happy return of a Republican administration—a consummation that was supposed to solve exactly the problems of “the nation’s business.”

Second: there is no comparison as to the vast volume of material directed at the masses today, aimed not only at getting them to accept one or another measure of capitalist policy, but at winning them over as *active believers* in the capitalist system as a whole.

Why this vast increase and more sweeping aim? Because in the course of the past generation great changes have taken place in the United States and on a world scale.

Here at home, while the organized movement for Socialism still appears to be weak, the capitalists know that the great depression of the '30's shook the faith of the American working class in the capitalist system; that despite the New Deal, the “recoveries” and the “booms,” the experience remains. (True, it is no Freudian “compulsion,” as the Democrats and the labor leaders found out when they thought that merely by saying “Remember the Depression!”, the masses would forget even the issue of peace.) But the fact remains that depression and war are the outstanding social memories of most adult Americans. This is no secure basis for faith in a system.

A major outcome of the fierce struggles of the depression period

was the historic victory of the workers in organizing the basic industries. Thus, whereas in the '20's the capitalists faced a basically unorganized working class, today the working class is basically *organized*. As the workers broke their way through the fog of class-collaborationist open-shop and company union propaganda to trade-union organization, so they can break through the class-collaborationist propaganda of today to independent *political* action, and eventually to Socialism.

The American workers are not yet disillusioned with the capitalist system, nor do they yet understand the perspective of Socialism. But they are *watching*—and will gain new experience in future struggles.

On a world scale the historic change is the magnificent expansion and strength of the world of Socialism. Thirty years ago, the capitalists could still comfort themselves by talking of “the Soviet experiment.” An experiment can always fail. But today, a short 35 years after the advent of the first socialist government, Socialism has *replaced* capitalism in one-third of the world—800,000,000 people have gone forever beyond the clutches of capitalism. The Soviet Union, under the superb leadership of Lenin and Stalin, has surmounted incredible difficulties placed in its path by world imperialism—by history itself—and has shown the way that other great countries have been able to follow. Before the eyes of every people of the world, Capitalism and Socialism are demonstrating their nature and character and what

they  
Th  
the r  
avert  
peopl  
on th  
verdi  
and  
one  
camp  
Social  
the a  
Amer  
to ga  
the w

Let  
this o  
the  
organ  
cation  
for t  
illusio  
It i  
least  
are  
work  
groun  
a “ho  
execu  
ecutive  
man,  
tagon  
Econ  
tries s  
of C  
opera  
in sig  
“Vi  
and y  
to be  
(page

they have to offer the people.

The capitalist propagandists have the task of seeking by all means to avert that day when the American people, as well as others, will render on the capitalist system the ancient verdict: "Counted, counted, weighed and wanting!" The result is, on the one hand, the terrific propaganda campaign to distort the picture of the Socialist world; and, on the other, the advertising of a dream-picture of America that the people are supposed to gaze at and imagine that this is the world they live in.

## II

Let us now take a brief look at this dream-world presented by *Life*, the outstanding mass propaganda organ of Big Business, for the edification of the petty-bourgeoisie and for the feeding of petty-bourgeois illusions among the working class.

It is a world without classes, or at least where classes and class struggle are disappearing. The industrial working class is kept far in the background, in favor of presentation of a "house-buyer," a model, a business executive, a chemist, a business executive (again!), a "hair-cream pitchman," a teacher, etc., as typical protagonists in "The American and His Economy." The only heavy industries shown (to illustrate "The Reign of Chemistry") are plants which operate with practically no workers in sight.

"Visit a really up-to-date factory and your first question will be likely to be 'But where are the men?'" (page 49). The capitalist's dream: if

only we could have industry without a working class!\* But *is* the working-class decreasing? A little further on, the same article admits: "Fewer Americans work for themselves than formerly; more work for somebody else. . . . It is likely to be a corporation that commands their labors."

The only discussion of capital-labor relations is not in auto, steel or any basic industry, not on a nation-wide scale, but in a secondary industry—the Crown-Zellerbach Paper Mills at Camas, Washington. ("The Company of Smiling Employees," p. 84-5). The smiles are duly photographed, but the relations seem a little weird—or, shall we say, "non-typical."

Foremen are called "key men," so they belong to the A. F. of L., but can hire and fire. *Life's* "full reporting" doesn't consider it worthwhile to say anything about wages, hours or conditions, or even to mention the name of the union or the number of workers. In the central picture a worker is getting a 10-year pin and a handshake from the vice-president of the company! "Corsages were given to all women receiving pins." A "key man" and some workers are on a picnic with Vera Berney, personnel director. "How could I get mad at Vera?" says Charlie. . . . "She's a friend." And finally, a touch of Freud: "U.S. corporations are

\* Can it be considered unrelated that *Life* also carries three pages of "portraits of machine tools" by Artzybasheff: "In combination they are the tools capable of reproducing themselves. . . . the artist has portrayed them with human-like arms, legs and features." (p. 59). The workers are not to be seen, but the machines are personified.

taking up . . . a hard-headed recognition that employees work better if they feel useful and happy instead of *lost and unwanted*."

Such is the picture of Labor and Capital relationships in the United States!

*Life* is of course a past master at the art of *genteel* suppression and falsification of facts. A fact may be *mentioned*, but left as unimportant, non-typical or insignificant in the midst of a welter of words and pictures presenting—the opposite of the facts. Conscious a little perhaps, that the "smiling employees" will hardly get by as a picture of the class struggle in America today, *Life* presents two tiny additional pictures of labor relations: a deputy assaulting an auto striker in 1937 and Reuther shaking hands with GM representatives today "after peacefully negotiating a new contract."

Of course this is also to show how "things have improved." But it covers up the fact that it was the auto strikers' resistance to the deputies and their readiness, if need be, to face deputies again, that *makes possible* the contract; and that, whatever may be his own role, Reuther's handshake, *as far as the union is concerned*, represents not class-collaboration but a *contract*—a relative truce between two powerful class forces—based on the union's strength and ability to fight.

But not only is the working-class and class struggle disappearing in *Life's* mythological world. The Negro people are just wished out of existence! Perhaps it is not surpris-

ing, since this is the common outrageous practice in advertising, and this whole issue of *Life* is nothing but advertising for the "American system" with the morals and reliability characteristic of the advertising industry. Yet from cover to cover there is not one mention of the word Negro! In dozens of pictures not one Negro appears! A picture of "The American and His Economy" from which 15 million Negro Americans are excluded!

Does not this show the extent to which the Negro question is the Achilles Heel of American imperialism, and the conditions of the Negro people the most shameful part of the picture, which would spoil its advertising value? And what does this show of the South, where 10 million of the Negro people dwell? The South is brushed off as a main beneficiary of "an agricultural revolution" (through mechanization). "Once a two-crop land worn out by cotton and tobacco, but now a flourishing food-belt for poultry, cattle, fruits and vegetables!" (p. 62). This is *Life's* picture of what President Roosevelt aptly termed "the nation's No. 1 Economic Problem."

What of the people's income? "There has been a great social revolution that has spread prosperity far and wide. . . . We have opened up for American industry a new frontier—the purchasing power of the formerly poor" (p. 48). "A trend towards people getting more and more on a level with each other in what they earn" (p. 7).

Yet: "75 percent of American fam-

ilies still earn less than \$5,000" (p. 17). "In recent years at least 10 percent of American families have been trying to live on incomes of less than \$1,000 a year and another 15 percent on incomes of between \$1,000 and \$2,000" (p. 47).

Twenty-five percent—one quarter of all American families—getting less than \$2,000 a year! The writer is put out by the reprehensible poverty of these families who spoil the American picture. "But who are these people? They are not 'the masses.' They are not a proletariat. They are a lot of widely-separated people who *happen to be in a jam* (!)—stranded old people, stranded widows, deserted families, migrant workers, sharecroppers, ineffective workers and physically or mentally disabled people." (!)

Considering that the overwhelming mass of the (unmentioned) Negro people earn less than \$2,000, it is clear that the Negro people *are in a jam*! Sharecroppers are obviously in a perpetual jam. In fact, the whole question at issue is whether or not the mass of the American people are not in a jam under the present system.

Despite the contemptuous brushing aside of one-quarter of the population as people of no account, the fact is that in 1948 only one-third of the people were getting an income equal to the Heller Budget of \$79.04 for an average worker's family. The average wage in manufacturing was only \$54.48.\* In 1952, according to

the A. F. of L., the average weekly purchasing power of an unmarried worker in industry had declined from \$56.39 in 1950 to \$55.53 (*N. Y. Times*, Feb. 9, 1953).

Are people "getting more on a level"? These figures are in a period of "prosperity"! They indicate rather, as Comrade Foster points out, "the perspective of intensification and extension of mass *absolute* impoverishment in the United States."\*\* In contrast to *Life's* dream picture, *real* life bears out the law of Marx: "In proportion as capital accumulates, the lot of the laborer, be his payment high or low, grows worse."\*\*\*

Now let us look at the other side of the class balance. "1929 was never like this!" boasts the feature writer Frederick Lewis Allan. "The total *per capita* income of the people of the United States was 40 percent larger in 1950 than in 1929, even making full allowance for the rise in the price level" (p. 46). But before we let loose with the hurrahs, let's see which *capita* gets what.

"The top 5 percent of the population . . . between the two world wars got about 28 percent of the total take, even after taxes. In recent years, they have been getting only (!) 17 percent of it after taxes." (p. 47). What a world of shamelessness is revealed by that "only"!

Yet even if we accept these figures at face value, 17 percent of something 40 percent larger is equal to nearly 24 percent of the earlier figure, so

\* L.R.A., *Trends in American Capitalism, International*, 1948, p. 92.

\*\* W. Z. Foster, cited work, p. 547.

\*\*\* Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 661.

the absolute decrease is small. And, says the writer, apparently thinking he is proving something on his side of the argument, "Ask . . . how many are spending the company's money by way of an expense account. . . . Much of what passes for personal wealth these days is corporate spending." Exactly! When they spend money personally it isn't from their income at all; it's charged to corporation expenses.

Nevertheless the central editorial entitled "What Makes the Economy Tick?" draws a solemn and basic conclusion from the whole picture of "the American and His Economy": that income taxes on the wealthy must be cut. "Taxes have almost destroyed what was once the leafiest carrot in the whole American bundle of opportunities: the hope of getting rich. . . . In a classic but not unrepresentative case, the former head of Dupont, Walter Carpenter earned (!) \$78,570 in 1923 and \$175,000 in 1947. But his net after taxes in the same period shrank from \$60,843 to \$48,251."

A place in the poorhouse for Mr. Walter Carpenter! Poor fellow, perhaps a lawyer could show him a trick or two. Obviously he could no longer afford to remain as head of the Dupont Corporation.

And what *are* these corporations after all? "Some of them have so many owners that none can be a power by reason of his ownership; to take an extreme example, American Telephone and Telegraph has over a million owners and no individual holds more than 1/20 of one

percent of the stock" (p. 50).

Here is the biggest fraud of all—that the corporations act on behalf of the "million stockholders." If (to accept the figures) the individual biggest capitalists in this admittedly "extreme example" own only 1/20 of one percent of the stock, then this only shows their extreme cleverness in comparison with their predecessors of fifty years ago; that today they have advanced immeasurably in their skill in controlling and manipulating other people's money, in building interlocking directorates, in spreading their own capital among *the most decisive* corporations which control others. And the larger the *number* of stockholders that "own" the corporation, the *smaller* the individual block of capital required to control it.

But A. T. & T. is admittedly an "extreme example." What of the far more typical case of the huge Dupont Corporation, where *absolute majority* control is held tightly within the various branches of this one family? This is far closer to the real picture of the huge monopolies in our country.

"Actually, 200 super-wealthy families dominate the industries and organized wealth of the United States."\*

So in *Life's* dream picture, there are no bosses who *own* the industries. And there are no bosses who *run* the industries. "The modern corporation is so complex . . . only a professional manager can . . . run it. So today, generally speaking, it is *management* that is in the sad-

\* W. Z. Foster, cited work, p. 546.

dle." *Life* gives examples of "management": "Dupont's Greenwalt, RCA's Sarnoff, Ford's Henry II, U.S. Steel's Hood." Could these by any chance be bosses who *own* chunks of these corporations?—Henry Ford for instance?

They are "flexible executives . . . captains of a smooth-working team of people who can decide" . . . (among other things) "how to achieve a mutually respectful understanding with union representatives." It is so much easier when instead of the bosses, the capitalists, they are just "management"—just impersonal hired executives bound by the policies of the corporation and just as helpless to depart from them as any other employe. Any union leader who talks about bargaining with "management" is, whether he knows it or not, helping the bosses to put across this invaluable perversion of the facts of the class struggle.

In contrast with the modern "representatives of management" *Life* shows four cartoons from the nineties. "The low repute in which business was held by much of the American public in the late 19th Century is indicated by these scurrilous cartoons of the tycoons of the period." (Morgan, Rockefeller, Gould, and Vanderbilt). "Gould is portrayed as a monkey . . . Vanderbilt as the head and brains of an evil octopus."

In the nineties large numbers of average capitalists were fighting with considerable mass support against the ruthless destruction threatening them on the part of the growing power of the monopolists who were ushering

in the stage of imperialism. The mass hatred of the Morgans and Rockefellers was expressed in numerous capitalist journals. Today only the working-class can lead a serious struggle against the domination of the trusts. In addition the trusts have now bought up, swallowed up, or started their own press and radio, and manufacture their own "public opinion." So, except in the working-class press, disrespectful cartoons are out! The Fords, Sarnoffs and Greenwalts are "held in high repute."

But all this structure of "conspicuous waste," of high spending of the wealthy, of "high standard of living" rests on the backs not only of the mass of underpaid workers in industry and agriculture, but more particularly, of the Negro people, and of the peoples of the colonies. Directly exploiting Puerto Rico, participating with Britain and France in the exploitation of Africa and Southeast Asia, keeping semi-colonies, U.S. imperialism extracts maximum profits and throws a small portion as a bribe to the American middle class and upper layer of the working class.

The obscenity of the boasting about high American living standards stands out in the light of the starvation not only of the colonies but in Europe also (where it is called "austerity"). Whistling over other people's graves, *Life* joyously quotes a story of a Japanese visitor in a U.S. supermarket who was amazed over the canned dog food on sale. "To him it was remarkable enough that Americans could afford to feed their dogs something better

than scraps from the table and that tin and paper should be available for packaging dog food. But what he couldn't get over was that such a great variety of provender should be supplied for dogs!" (p. 48).

*Life* is so flabbergasted by the wonders of the "new" system that it just can't find a name for it. Finally with due hesitation it comes out: "The right name for the American system is Capitalism modified by democracy." For all this class of nonsensical "discoveries," Lenin once made a salient point: "Such simplicity of mind on the part of the bourgeois economists is not surprising. Besides, *it is in their interests to pretend to be so naive.*"\*

This definition is of course intentional hash. The economic system is capitalism. Bourgeois democracy is the political system that arises on the foundation of capitalism as the system most adapted to the needs of developing capitalism. It is the system of government through which the capitalists exercise their rule. Has American capitalism been "modified"—or changed? Yes. Half a century ago it had matured and entered its final, decaying stage—imperialism, based on the domination of the monopolies and bringing with it "reaction all along the line" (Lenin).

Has democracy been "modified?" Yes. Bourgeois democracy, limited at best as far as the masses are concerned, and increasingly restricted as capitalism matures, is now in

danger of being *transformed* into fascism by the monopolists and their agents and only the determined struggle of the masses will reverse that process and save it. But not one word of the frenzied attack on civil liberties, of the contemptuous trampling on the Bill of Rights, of the inquisition mania, of the deportation delirium, of the mass arrests of Communists, of the increased attacks on the Negro people, of the reduction of culture to sadism and pornography, of the preparations to destroy the unions—not one word of this leaks into *Life's* picture.

Perhaps it is not part of the picture of "The Economy?" On the contrary. It is exactly the climate created by capitalism today in fulfillment of its basic economic law—the drive for maximum profits.

"The state," says *Life* "has become an empire state" (p. 55). Actually, the domination of the state by the monopolies has been virtually made into a symbol by the selection of the Eisenhower cabinet. The heads of General Motors, the Chase National Bank, etc., have been graciously "granted leave" by the corporations they own to run the government directly.

*Life's* "Picture of the Week" presents the touching scene as Winthrop Aldrich "Took formal leave of the world of business to enter the world of government . . . attending his last Christmas concert of the Chase employees' choral society. . . . The choir sang . . . *Hark the Herald Angels Sing*. Then . . . Aldrich spoke. 'I would not leave if I did not feel I

\* Lenin: *Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism, Selected Works, International, 1945*, V, 103.

could serve my country.'” And then the man who, as Wall Street's agent, bought the nomination for Eisenhower, departed as Ambassador to London to demand that “our” major ally intensify its preparations to take part in Wall Street's plans for World War III.

### III

One might well ask: How can *Life* expect to get away with this fraudulent claim that capitalism in America has reached a new stage? In his final speech as President, devoted to the subject of how the world revolved around me, Truman made the same claim: “History will record . . . that we in America have learned how to attain real prosperity for our people.” Both Truman and *Life* exploit certain transitory aspects of the present situation (“62,000,000 jobs” etc.) while entirely suppressing the decisive fact that the economy of the U.S. today is a war economy. A war economy is morally monstrous and economically hollow. “It gives industry” as Stalin pointed out, “a one-sided war direction . . . and confronts the country with an economic crisis.” While *Life* makes reference to “defense spending,” there is complete suppression of the fact that only the huge production of arms has staved off a major depression.

In an analysis especially prepared by the editors of *Fortune*, *Life* points out how our economy carries out “corrections”: “A good example of such a ‘correction’ is the now almost forgotten ‘recession’ of 1949. . .

Steel production fell to about 75 percent of capacity. Unemployment rose to 4 million in the summer of 1949 and to more than 4.5 million early in 1950. The recession was sharp, but it was short lived. For business . . . reduced prices, improved quality and . . . began to sell hard. . . . By the spring of 1950 the correction was over. It was, by common consent, just about the pleasantest recession the country had ever suffered” (p. 86).

Isn't this suppression and fakery? Isn't it common knowledge that the summer of 1949 was just when the arms spending began on a major scale, and that June, 1950 was when the Korean war just “happened” to get started, and the arms production went into high gear? Not “corrections” by “business,” but arms and war staved off the depression.

*Life's* Pollyanna picture is for mass consumption. It is of a piece with the demagogic campaign speeches of Eisenhower that were written by *Life's* writers. But in their own business journals the capitalists talk differently. The “defense” spending cannot go on indefinitely. Its peak is in sight, and what follows then?

*Life* is too clever to attempt to deny what all business circles are beginning to admit: that a recession of unknown extent lies ahead. The thing is to treat it *gaily* (over-the-teacups style): “We may even soon have something that looks almost like a mild recession” (p. 7); *confidently* (presidential announcement style): “Prolonged mass unemployment . . . can neither be theoretically

justified nor politically tolerated; it is extremely unlikely to recur here" (p. 16); and "scientifically" (economic experts style): "The 1953-54 'recession' in short, will probably last longer than that of 1949, but won't be felt as much. . . . Farmers, with a little less to spend, will be more cautious. . . . Labor will suffer little" (p. 87).

But when defense spending levels off? "This is one of the most portentous questions of our time. . . . Some 5 million people might be out of work. . . . Won't everything start collapsing? No. Our economy has been equipped with a number of stabilizers. . . . First and most important, by all odds, is defense spending itself. Continuing at an estimated \$40 billion, it is a colossal balancer" (p. 88). Then "exports which probably will increase, contracts which keep up wages, supports which maintain farm prices, and public works" (p. 87).

But exports, in the present stage of division of the world into two world markets is exactly what U.S. imperialism can *not* increase without running into ever sharper clash with its imperialist rivals (beg pardon—"allies").

Union contracts that keep up wages? Fine! But the capitalists are bending their strength *right now* towards hamstringing and destroying the unions, breaking up national bargaining and contracts, and driving down the workers' standard of living. Let *Life's* economists take this story into the NAM and listen to the guffaws! Only if the unions fight as

never before will they maintain their organizations and keep up wages.

"Supports for farm prices?" But the whole country is concerned over the fact that farm prices have already dropped twelve percent in the past year. And, in the face of this, Secretary of Agriculture Benson told an alarmed audience of farmers in St. Paul, Minnesota, that the Federal Government should not intervene to prop up prices except in disaster conditions and should take all possible restraints off the "free enterprise" system.

Nor is there much difference as far as the purchasing power of the farmers is concerned. As for public works, again fine! But have we forgotten how Big Business campaigned against the public works programs day in, day out, under the New Deal, till they either destroyed them, or transformed them into war production? Thus the first requisite to improve the perspective is *struggle* by the masses of the people for such a program and first of all to maintain and improve their own conditions.

Nor can the capitalists solve their problems through increased exploitation of the colonies. Malenkov points out, ". . . as a result of the war and the new upsurge of the national liberation struggle in the colonial and dependent countries, the disintegration of the colonial system of imperialism is actually taking place."\*

Thus the danger grows that the imperialists will attempt to again

\* G. M. Malenkov, *On the Threshold of Communism: Report to XIX Congress of the C.P.S.U.*, New Century, 1952, p. 16.

stave off economic crisis by starting new wars under the pretext of "holding back Communism."

But this is not the only path and the American people do not have to face the alternative of war or crisis. Once again last Christmas Eve, Stalin pointed out in his letter replying to James Reston of the *N. Y. Times*, the path of peaceful co-existence, and offered to meet to negotiate all outstanding questions. And Malenkov declared at the XIX Congress:

"While American and British bellicose circles keep reiterating that only the armaments drive keeps industry in the capitalist countries going at full capacity, *there is in actual fact another prospect*: the prospect of developing and extending trade relations between all countries, irrespective of the differences in their social systems, which could keep the factories and mills in the industrially developed countries working to capacity for years. . . ."

This is realism! And it is in sharp contrast with *Life's* propagandanononsense about the "unpredictable consumer" who will decide what happens. "The reluctant consumer presents a challenge to American salesmanship." As the A. F. of L. Executive Council pointed out recently, there *is* a real reluctance to buy, which stems from the decline in real wages in this period of "prosperity"—a decline which signalizes "an ominous disparity . . . between how much

workers were able to produce and how much they were able to buy."

But *Life*, of course, has a different answer to this problem of "reluctance." Business research and development must stimulate the urge to buy" (p. 92). And what's the direction of this scientific research? "American businessmen . . . have come to rely more and more heavily on the feminine face and figure . . . sex appeal is sales appeal" (p. 3).

Here we are back again in the dream-world for the petty-bourgeoisie. *This* is the system that has solved its problems! "The problems which socialism and communism were invented (!) to cope with have already been surmounted here. . . . We are moving not toward Socialism but past Socialism" (p. 57).

The next step will be to call all supporters of Socialism "reactionaries." But, in general, this is the same exceptionalism as in 1929—the pretense that American capitalism has magical features that exempt it from the ills of capitalism in other countries. It was a costly mirage in 1929. It is a costly mirage today.

In fact an overall judgment of *Life's* shallow dream picture can be given in the words of Karl Marx himself: "The desire to day-dream contradictions out of the way is at the same time the expression of contradictions that are really present, but which they vainly desire *should* not exist."\*

\*Malenkov, cited work, p. 28, italics added.

\*Karl Marx, *Theories of Surplus Value*, International, 1952, p. 397.

## The Prague Treason Trials\*

By Klement Gottwald

*Chairman, Communist Party of Czechoslovakia*

AS YOU KNOW, none of us expected that after the victory of February 1948 the struggle against the American fifth column would be ended. We knew that though reaction had been defeated in February, it was not finished. We foresaw that the American imperialists would mobilize further reserves of their agents, that with their help they would intensify their undermining activities in our country. Having learned from the experiences of the other People's Democracies, we took for granted that the American imperialists would activate also their agency within the Communist Party. True, what we did not know at that time, and could not know, was the make-up of the subversive American agency within the Communist Party, and the extent of that agency.

Nonetheless, shortly after February we began to unwind the ball of snakes which the enemy had planted in our household. Already in 1949 the first of the important traitors were arrested. Thus we caught the

first links of the traitorous chain, and this we gradually unwound downward and upward, until the circle was finally closed. It became clear that the anti-state conspiracy was organized within the Communist Party. It was disclosed that the anti-state conspiracy was led by a conspiratorial center, and that it was headed by the former general secretary of the Communist Party, Rudolph Slansky. It was disclosed that this anti-state conspiracy was directed by the American imperialists and that it served all the imperialist services. It was disclosed that the final aims of this conspiratorial center were in essence the same as those pursued by the reactionary putschists in February 1948. It also was disclosed that the subversive work of the conspiratorial center was all the more dangerous since it was being realized within the Communist Party by people in very responsible posts, by people whom we considered to be comrades. It is well known that a hidden enemy is always more dangerous than an open enemy.

Now the anti-state conspiracy has been rendered harmless. The public

\* Extracted from the Report to the National Conference of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, held in Prague, December 16, 1952. Translated for Political Affairs by A. Krcmarek.

trials held at the end of November exposed the full depth of the shame, degradation, the murderous backstabbing of this traitorous band. Our people followed the trial with the greatest attention and with passionate anger against the traitorous criminals. One expression of this among others, was the sending of more than 10,500 resolutions from all sections of the population demanding strict punishment of the convicted criminals. That was carried out. The law, justice, the will of the people was given its due.

However, the matter does not end there. We must draw from this case all the necessary lessons for the present and for the future, and we must also remove with great determination the great damage caused by this American fifth column.

I will not repeat all the facts that were disclosed in the course of the trial. I do want to stop at some of the questions which probably require some explanation.

Some people ask, "How is it that these traitors could carry on so long?" This has a number of causes. First of all: from liberation in May, 1945 to February, 1948, the main attention of the leadership of the Party was directed to the actions of open reaction which, as we knew well, was preparing a reactionary putsch, a repetition of 1920, and which wanted to take from the people everything brought by their liberation and to return the republic under the capitalist yoke. Everything was at

stake. That was the main, immediate danger and everything depended on its repulsion.

February 1948 proved that the leadership of the Party worked correctly then in turning the main attention in this direction. True, this was utilized by the traitorous Slansky band to spread and unfold its conspiratorial nets within the Party. So long as the leadership of the Party and the Party as a whole were fully occupied with the struggle against open reaction, a struggle on whose outcome hung the fate of people's democratic Czechoslovakia, the traitor Slansky organized within the Party a new American fifth column, a new reactionary and imperialist reserve. This, it is true, we know now but we did not know it then.

Furthermore: after sweeping out the February reactionary putschists the Communist Party became the governing party. Many of the reactionary elements "out-actionized" themselves. The Party took over the entire burden of responsibility in all sectors of public life. Also the responsibilities of Party members in leading posts increased. They could no longer make excuses that reactionary managers or reactionary surroundings placed obstacles before them. Under such circumstances the Party leadership came relatively soon on the tracks of the new and very important traitors and saboteurs with a Party book in their pocket. As I stated, the first of these rascals were arrested already in 1949. That means

that as soon as the Party was finished with the open traitors and agents of the enemy, it gradually began to expose and render harmless the traitors and enemy agents who had penetrated into its own ranks.

Furthermore: the reactionary conspirators were able to mask themselves very well. They never came forward with their own "platform." They never took an open stand against the line and the decisions of the Party. On the contrary, "they agreed with everything." However, in their sector of activity they distorted, twisted and carried them out "on their own," which means that they often turned them inside out. Their two-facedness and double-dealing simply knew no bounds.

Furthermore, the exposure of the traitorous conspirators was made more difficult by the fact that their nets were spread very wide. From their positions in the Party they bureaucratically and dictatorially strangled criticism from below. From their positions in the economic and in the public apparatus they played ball together, covering up and erasing the tracks of their criminal machinations and they all worked to deceive the public and the Party. From their positions in the organs of National Security they maintained a protecting hand over the entire band and "did away" with everything that could lead to their exposure. In short, it was a broadly based group of criminals, with unlimited opportunities.

And finally: there was no regular, concrete, systematic, day to day check-up and control of the work and activity of every Communist, and especially Communists in responsible positions. There was no systematic control as to how each carried out the decisions of the Party and the government. It happened often that we judged people more on what they said and less on what they did. Those, comrades, are some of the reasons which made more difficult the exposure of the anti-state conspiratorial center.

#### ZIONISM

In the course of the investigations and the trials of the anti-state conspiratorial center there was uncovered a new channel by which treason and espionage penetrates into the Communist Party. It is Zionism. Why? Simply because after the establishment of the State of Israel and its passing over under the control of America, Zionist organizations of all kinds became the offshoot of the American espionage service. They are simply an ideal instrument for the penetration of the working class movement, for the recruiting of agents within the Communist Parties.

The Zionist organizations and their American principles shamefully misused the sufferings of the Jewish people brought on by Hitler and the other fascists. It can be said that they want to make capital out of the

ashes  
No  
owne  
lak  
Party  
ing p  
of pe  
istic  
taken  
origin  
the r  
Semi  
the r  
Jews  
Ear  
was  
when  
the Z  
servic  
the s  
day Z  
hand  
Do  
Jewis  
and  
The  
perso  
tude  
and h  
the  
nothi  
tism.  
of ba  
as it  
exam  
men"  
mens  
the c  
-nat  
that  
ican

ashes of Oswiecim and Maidanek.

Normally, a former banker, factory owner, big landowner or even a kulak cannot get into the Communist Party, and certainly never into a leading position. However, in the case of people of Jewish origin and Zionist tendencies, less account was taken in our country as to their class origin. This was helped along by the natural revulsion against anti-Semitism, and after World War II, the respect for the suffering to which Jews had been subjected.

Earlier, before the war, the danger was not so great. But after the war, when the Zionist organizations and the Zionists became agents in the service of American imperialism, the situation changed basically. Today Zionism is a dangerous, underhanded enemy.

Does this mean that a person of Jewish origin and a Zionist are one and the same thing? It does not! The class origin of the particular person is decisive, as well as his attitude to his native land, his loyalty and his work for Socialism. Similarly the struggle against Zionism has nothing in common with anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism is the offshoot of barbaric racism: barbaric racism as it is being practiced today, for example, by the American "supermen" (according to Hitler *ubermenschen*) toward the Negro and the colonial—and not only colonial—nations generally. Anti-Zionism, that is a defense against the American espionage, diversionist and dis-

ruptive agency. They are two entirely separate things.

In the course of the trial many people expressed surprise that the accused testified so "willingly," how they "admit everything," etc. That is a mistake.

First of all, the traitorous conspirators admitted only that which they could not deny, where their guilt was proven. At the beginning they all stiff-neckedly denied everything. Their guilt had to be proven step by step. Proven by facts, by documents, by the testimony of other witnesses, by confrontations, etc. Time and again they tried, in the course of the investigations, to throw the investigation authorities off the trail.

This was especially true up to the time of the arrest of Slansky who would, they expected, pull them out of the water with a dry skin. In the first phase of the investigations some of the accused went so far in their deceitful testimony, that they described the matters as if the entire conspiracy were directed against Slansky. It is possible to judge from their denials, deceit and evasions, that they did not tell everything even during the trial. They admitted only what they had to, only what could not be denied, only that which had been proved beyond question. The rest of it they cloaked in vague general declarations and declamations.

That is the way all proven criminals act. That was how the Trotskyite-Bukharinite criminals acted in the

pre-war trials in the Soviet Union. There is no evidence to think that the members of the anti-state conspiracy acted otherwise.

In connection with the exposure of the anti-state conspiratorial center, our enemies shout something about the weakness and the disintegration of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. They sang a similar song about the Communist Party of the Soviet Union when it settled matters with the Trotskyite-Bukharinite gang. What the final result was everyone knows. If these gentlemen really believed their own talk we could say: let them console themselves, let them build their plans on this consolation. But they do not believe that themselves. That is why they are screaming so fiercely. Because we have thrown out from our midst their agents, their creatures, their instruments.

Were we by any chance stronger when amongst us there moved about traitors and foreign agents, when the American fifth column moved freely about in our ranks? Definitely not. But we will be stronger when we now cut off the head of the American

fifth column. No organism is immune to infection. A person can be infected. But when he overcomes the infection, when he gets rid of the causes of infection, and cuts out the infected parts—that testifies to his healthy constitution and his strength. And what about the Party as a whole and its leadership? Does this not prove that the leadership was able to settle accounts with the traitors without regard to their persons or positions—does this not testify to our unshakable loyalty to the working class, to the people, to the nation, to Socialism? Does this not prove how seriously we meant our warning that in our country the trees will not grow to the heavens for any traitors, that sooner or later their time will come? I believe that is so.

Much was said at the trial that the conspirators wanted to take "the Tito path." It is necessary to correct this; to correct it in the sense that in our country there is no room for traitors of the Tito type. Anyone who will try to emulate the traitor Tito will end up where Slansky ended. I repeat: No. Czechoslovakia will not be another Yugoslavia.

## Science and Superstructure\*

By M. Kammari and F. Konstantinoff

Never has science played such a tremendous role in the life of society as it does under Socialism. Under capitalism, science in the hands of the bourgeoisie serves as a weapon of exploitation of the toilers and as a weapon of destruction. In socialist society the role of science and the conditions of its development are radically changed; science then becomes a weapon of creation, a powerful means for the development of the economy and culture in the interests of the laboring people. In the Soviet Union, where science has become a potent weapon in the construction of Communism, there is a growing interest among the broadest masses of the laboring people in science, and a desire to grasp its place and role in society and the laws of its development. To clarify these questions, one must be guided by the principles of historical materialism concerning the conditions of the material life of society as the source of its spiritual life.

In his great work *Marxism and Linguistics*, which laid a firm foundation for Marxist linguistics, Comrade Stalin has developed further the doctrine of dialectical and historical ma-

terialism, the theory of the foundation and the superstructure, the theory of culture, and has stressed the need of decisively overcoming the erroneous, oversimplified views in the realm of language and culture. Comrade Stalin pointed out the need of studying the specific character of various social phenomena, of their functions and role, stressing the point that all social phenomena, besides their common quality that they all serve society, "have specific characteristics which distinguish them one from another and which are most important for science."

But in the discussions regarding the place of science among other social phenomena this point stressed by Stalin was not infrequently disregarded. Some comrades, classifying science as superstructure, disregarded the fact that science, unlike the superstructure, is not liquidated with the liquidation of the old foundation, that science as a special form of consciousness, as a phenomenon of intellectual life, besides the common characteristics which link it to the ideological part of the superstructure, has also its special tasks, functions and laws of development. Other comrades, conversely, stressing the specific character of science, divorced it completely

\* Translated, and condensed, from *The Bolshevik*, (Moscow), February, 1932.

from the superstructure. Failing to see the common characteristics which link science to the superstructure, to the philosophical, political, legal, esthetic and other views of society and the corresponding institutions, these comrades forgot the struggle of materialism and idealism, of progressive and reactionary ideas and theories in science; they forgot the connection of this struggle with the class struggle and politics, and the role of science, particularly of social science, in the class struggle. They failed to take into account the fact that the social sciences supply to society the ideas which are part of the superstructure. From the standpoint of these comrades it would seem that science, like language, contains no element which belongs to the superstructure, that everything that is really scientific cannot be part of the superstructure. They "forgot" in this connection that, for instance, the philosophic, political, juridical, and esthetic views of Marxism-Leninism, which predominate in a socialist society, while they are truly scientific, belong to the superstructure of socialist society.

In order to overcome these erroneous views it is necessary to approach science concretely, historically. It is necessary to see both the characteristics which it has in common with other forms of consciousness and with the ideological superstructure, as well as the specific characteristics which distinguish science from other forms of consciousness and from the superstructure.

Science is the most important element of intellectual culture, the specific form of the cognition of the world, which arose historically and which develops constantly in the process of social practice. It represents a system of knowledge of nature and society, knowledge which serves social practice, which is tested and verified by practice and which has the value of objective truth. Social practice is not only the criterion of truth but also the basis of knowledge; it determines the needs of mankind and what direction cognition should take.

Science is the complex *product* of cognition and at the same time the process of cognition. In the body of science it is necessary to distinguish, first, the accumulated and verified data; secondly, laws, formulas, tested and proved by practice, theorems, axioms; thirdly, scientific assumptions, hypotheses, based on facts and antecedently discovered laws which may be confirmed or refuted by the further development of science. Finally, science contains general theoretical deductions from laws, their philosophical interpretation. Of great importance is the method of cognition.

Science develops in constant struggle of the advanced, progressive, materialist ideas and theories against the backward, reactionary, anti-scientific, idealist ideas and theories. Idealist philosophy is irreconcilably opposed to science, and, conversely, genuine science is opposed to idealism. The methodological foundation of modern advanced science is dialectical

tical m  
alism,  
Lenini  
science  
for kno  
laws o  
genera  
though  
questio  
scientific  
knowle  
Scien  
gion i  
ness, o  
of prim  
prehens  
nature  
the ro  
nation  
and h  
nation  
unemp  
perstit  
ests o  
history  
contin  
against  
In c  
capital  
action  
geois  
"recon  
falsify  
and s  
with  
astron  
has a  
physic  
leads  
lyptic  
tists v  
"proo  
unive

tical materialism. Dialectical materialism, the world-view of the Marxist-Leninist party, is a philosophical science which *generalizes all scientific knowledge*, discovers the universal laws of all development, the most general laws of nature, society and thought, a science which elaborates questions of the world-view, of the scientific method, of the theory of knowledge, of logic.

Science is opposed to religion. Religion is a distorted, false consciousness, engendered by the impotence of primitive man before the incomprehensible and overawing forces of nature. In an antagonistic society the roots of religion lie in the domination over man of uncomprehended and hostile social forces (social and national oppression, wars, crises, unemployment, etc.). Religious superstitions are reinforced by the interests of the exploiting classes. The history of science is the history of its continuous, irreconcilable struggle against religious superstition.

In connection with the decay of capitalism, with the advent of reaction all along the line, the bourgeois scientists try fraudulently to "reconcile" science and religion, they falsify the achievements of science and supply idealism and the clergy with new arguments. The British astronomer Eddington, for instance, has attempted to construct such a physical picture of the world which leads directly to belief in the apocalyptic number 666. Bourgeois scientists with pretended seriousness offer "proof" of the finite character of the universe, of the "free will" of

the electron, discarding the concepts of casuality, of objective laws, of objective truth. American philosophers, the pragmatists, instrumentalists, semanticists and other idealists, assert that science is not knowledge of the objective world, but a system of conditional symbols, of fictions which reflect nothing, but facilitate enrichment. The "instrumentalist" Dewey, for instance, states that science is merely a search, an undertaking, a means for the effective conduct of business; . . . according to the pragmatists, causality, laws, are but in the nature of concepts, they exist only in the consciousness as concepts which, they contend, do not reflect casual interconnections or laws of the objective world. Lenin exposed the reactionary essence of the idealist sophistries of the empirio-criticists, Machists, pragmatists, who contended that any idea, including that of religion, is "true" if it is "useful", if it is "expedient" for any purpose. Marxism-Leninism teaches that that idea is true which correctly reflects reality. Knowledge is useful to mankind "when it reflects an objective truth independent of man."<sup>1</sup>

Marxism-Leninism rejects the idealist attempts to erase the principled difference between scientific and religious ideology. The idealists, denying the objective truth expressed by scientific ideology, assert that any truth is conditional, subjective, that there is no objective truth. Lenin, in exposing the Machists, stressed that "every ideology is historically

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. XI, p. 202.

conditioned, but it is unconditionally true that to every scientific ideology (as distinct, for instance, from religious ideology) there corresponds an objective truth, absolute nature."<sup>2</sup> Science will always progress, increasing the power of mankind; but religion will die when the causes engendering it will disappear.

In the beginning of its historical development science represented an undifferentiated whole together with philosophy, and only later, with the development of scientific knowledge of nature and society, did one special science after another break away from philosophy. This was a progressive process for all sciences, as well as for philosophy itself. At present, science, as a system of objective, true knowledge of nature and society, embraces a large number of various special branches of knowledge.

Each special science studies some distinct, particular form of motion of matter, a form or aspect of social development, or a series of interconnected forms of motion. Engels states: "Just as one form of motion develops out of another, so their reflections, the various sciences, must arise necessarily the one from another."<sup>3</sup>

The natural sciences aim at the discovery of the laws of nature, in order to enable man to subjugate the forces of nature, to utilize them for the production of material goods, of the means of subsistence. Marxism-

Leninism teaches that so long as we do not know it, a law of nature, existing and acting independently and outside of our consciousness, makes us slaves of blind necessity. "But once we come to know this law, which acts (as Marx pointed out a thousand times) *independently* of our will and our mind, we become the lords of nature. The mastery of nature manifested in human practice is a result of an objectively correct reflection within the human head of the phenomena and processes of nature, and is proof of the fact that this reflection (within the limits of what is revealed by practice) is objective, absolute, and eternal truth."<sup>4</sup>

These tenets apply also to social science, since the development of society is a natural-historical, law-governed, necessary process, and its laws are as objective as the laws of nature. Marxist-Leninist science, revealing the laws of the development of society, which exist independently of the mind and will of men, help the working class and its Marxist party to orient itself in the existing situation, to understand the essence of current developments and to foresee the course of events. Marxist-Leninist science serves, in the hands of the working class, as an instrument for the revolutionary transformation of the world, as an instrument for the construction of Socialism and Communism. Relying on Marxist-Leninist science, the working class is enabled to guide the development of society consciously, planfully, in ac-

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 198.

<sup>3</sup> Frederick Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*, International, 1940, p. 179.

<sup>4</sup> Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. XI, p. 250.

cordance with the known objective laws of this development.

Marxism-Leninism—the science of the laws of development of nature and society, the science of the revolution of the oppressed and exploited masses, the science of the triumph of Socialism in all countries, the science of the construction of communist society—is a truly advanced science, a great revolutionary force, which not only interprets but transforms the world.

• • •

Science is a product of the practical needs of society, in the final analysis of the development of production. Production always exists in the form of a historically concrete mode of production, which is the principal force determining the character of the social system of the given epoch and the transition from one system to another, higher system.

The mode of production has two aspects: one of its aspects consists of the productive forces, the other of the relations of men in production. The development of science is conditioned by these two aspects of the mode of production, by the whole rise and development of mathematics, of the natural and technical sciences, is directly connected with the development of the productive forces of society, of the tools of production and of men themselves, who effect the production of material goods thanks to a certain experience in production. The natural sciences grew directly on the basis of study-

ing and generalizing the production experience of men, who in the process of production acquire knowledge of and utilize the properties of things and the forces of nature.

In refuting Dühring's idealist theories of "pure mathematics" which held that the concepts of mathematics were a priori concepts originating not in practice, but in "pure thought", Engels wrote: "Like all other sciences, mathematics arose out of the *needs* of men; from the measurement of land and of the content of vessels, from the computation of time and mechanics."<sup>8</sup> Describing the connection of the natural sciences with production and the dependence of the development of one branch of science on the other, Engels states: "The *successive development* of the separate branches of natural science should be studied. First of all, *astronomy*, which is only an account of the seasons, was absolutely indispensable for pastoral and agricultural peoples. Astronomy can only develop with the aid of *mathematics*. Hence this also had to be tackled. Further, at a certain stage of agriculture and in certain regions (raising of water for irrigation in Egypt), and especially with the origin of towns, big building operations, and the development of handicrafts—*mechanics*. This was soon needed also for *navigation* and *war*. Moreover, it requires the aid of mathematics and so promotes the latter's development. Thus, from the very beginning the origin and develop-

<sup>8</sup> Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, International Publishers, 1939, p. 48.

ment of the sciences has been determined by production."<sup>6</sup> Emphasizing the close and direct dependence of the natural sciences on production, Engels pointed out that the whole hydrostatics of Torricelli arose out of the practical need to regulate the mountain streams in Italy, to build water works; the study of electricity made particularly rapid advances after men had begun the practical application of electric power to the needs of production. The needs of technical progress pose before science ever new tasks and impel it forward. "If technique largely depends on the state of science," Engels wrote, "science depends far more still on the *state* and *requirements* of technique. If society has a technical need, that helps science forward more than ten universities."<sup>7</sup>

Modern large-scale production is based on the conscious application of the data of natural science. It requires the studying of the mechanical, physical and chemical properties of things, and a scientific analysis and generalization of the entire production practice of industry and agriculture.

The discovery of the power of steam, electricity, atomic energy, the greatest discoveries in chemistry, conditioned by the development of production and technique, in their turn influence production, leading to the rise of new branches of industry, and facilitating a powerful development of the productive forces.

<sup>6</sup> Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*, International Publishers, 1940, p. 214.

<sup>7</sup> Marx-Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, International Publishers, p. 517.

However, the growth of science is determined not only by the growth of the productive forces but also by the development of the production relations, of the economic system of the given society, of its foundation. With the rise of antagonistic production relations comes a deepening of the antithesis between intellectual and physical labor, science becomes separated from the producers of the material goods and lines up as an inimical force against them, as a weapon of their enslavement by the exploiting classes, as a monopoly of the propertied classes.

The mode of production not only determines the whole social system, but also the conditions of the development, dissemination and utilization of scientific knowledge in the interests of certain classes. In an antagonistic society, consequently, the development of science is also conditioned by the class struggle, by the interests and policies of the ruling classes.

In slave society, science served the slave mode of production, the needs of the slaveholders, and was monopolized by this class. Under feudalism, science served the feudal mode of production. The building of feudal castles, of churches, the expansion of commerce and sea traffic, the development of more complex military technique, all of this required the development of mechanics, mathematics, astronomy and other sciences. Owing to the inertia and stagnation of the feudal system, and of the domination of the church in spiritual life, science developed very slowly;

but it progressed nonetheless. The development of industry and trade and the growth of the cities led science to revolt against the church and religion. The bourgeoisie, then the rising class, needed science for the development of industry, and through the agency of its advanced thinkers it participated in the revolt of science against the church. But even then, while it played a revolutionary role in the struggle against feudalism and its bulwarks, the bourgeoisie as an exploiting class continued to use religion for the subjection of the exploited masses, as a means of beclouding their minds.

True, advanced science is by its nature irreconcilably inimical to dogmatism, routine and stagnation, and courageously raises its voice against outworn, outmoded views which conflict with truth tested by practice. In an antagonistic society, science, in facilitating the development of the productive forces, thereby also accentuates the conflict between the new productive forces and the old production relations, which become fetters for the increased production forces.

Knowledge of the laws discovered by the natural sciences and the so-called applied, technical sciences can and does serve different modes of production. Euclid's geometry served the slaveholding, feudal, and capitalist modes of production; and it serves also socialist production. The laws of chemistry discovered by Lomonosov and Mendeleyev are utilized both in capitalist and in socialist economy.

But all sciences, including the natural sciences, besides facts and laws, contain, as we have already mentioned, philosophical principles, philosophical interpretations of the discoveries and laws, and philosophical deductions from them. The character of the study and interpretation of the facts and phenomena depends on the world-view. But in a class society the world-view is different among the different classes. In a class society, the underlying philosophical principles of science acquire a class, partisan character, and every scientist consciously carries into his work ideas that reflect the interests and the world-view of a definite class. Science presents a picture of the bitter struggle of materialism against idealism, of dialectics against metaphysics. The blurring of this fact is tantamount to a renunciation of the struggle against the reactionary bourgeois ideology in the domain of science and to propagation of bourgeois "objectivism", of the false bourgeois ideas of the "neutrality" of science.

The struggle of the Soviet pro-Michurin biologists headed by T. D. Lysenko against the Mendel-Morgan followers, the struggle of the followers of I. P. Pavlov against the reactionary, idealist trends in physiology, the struggle against the idealist vacillations of some Soviet physicists, the struggle against idealism in chemistry—all of this is a struggle against the influence of reactionary, bourgeois ideology and for a socialist ideology, for dialectical materialism, for Communist ideological consis-

tency in science. Particularly sharp is the struggle of materialism against idealism, of Marxism-Leninism against bourgeois ideology, in the social sciences.

• • •

The social sciences differ from the natural sciences in the subject matter of their studies. They have in common the characteristic that all of them have as their task the correct cognition of the laws of the objective world. Just as man's cognition reflects nature existing independently of him, that is, developing matter, so does man's social cognition reflect the social being. The development of society is just as knowable as is the development of nature; scientific knowledge of the laws of social development is authentic knowledge, having the value of objective truth. As Stalin writes: "Hence, the science of the history of society, despite all the complexity of the phenomena of social life, can become as precise a science as, let us say, biology, and capable of making use of the laws of development of society for practical purposes. Hence, the party of the proletariat should not guide itself in its practical activity by casual motives, but by the laws of development of society, and by practical deductions from these laws."<sup>8</sup>

The social sciences study the conditions of the material life of men, the development of the base and superstructure, various forms of social consciousness, the development of language, of the living mores, of

culture. The social sciences study phenomena which directly involve the interest of classes. For this reason the class struggle and class interests impose a particularly sharp imprint on the whole content, the whole character and direction of social science, endowing it with a class, strongly partisan, character. The interests of the exploiting classes impose extremely narrow limits on, indeed in the present epoch render impossible for the bourgeoisie, an objective inquiry into social phenomena, particularly of the relations of private property and exploitation, and hinder the cognition of the laws of development of society. In the preface to *Capital* Marx wrote: "In the domain of Political Economy, free scientific inquiry meets not merely the same enemies as in all other domains. The peculiar nature of the material it deals with summons as foes into the field of battle the most violent, mean and malignant passions of the human breast, the Furies of private interest."<sup>9</sup> The bourgeois philosophers, sociologists, jurists and economists proclaim the sanctity and inviolability of private property and of the exploiters' state, they glorify this state which is an instrument for the subjection of the laboring people. It is not surprising that the ideologists of the exploiting classes were unable to create a true science of society.

Marxism for the first time raised philosophy, sociology, historiography, jurisprudence, Socialism to the level

<sup>8</sup> *History of C.P.S.U.*, International Publishers, 1939, pp. 114-115.

<sup>9</sup> Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Kerr, Chicago, 1906, p. 15.

of a science. Everything that had been created in social science before Marxism did not yet have a true scientific philosophic basis; the prevailing interpretation of history was non-scientific, idealist. "Pre-Marxian 'sociology' and historiography," Lenin wrote, "at best provided an accumulation of raw facts, collected at random, and a depiction of certain sides of the historical process."<sup>10</sup>

The so-called "classical" bourgeois Political Economy, which contains elements of scientific knowledge, belongs to the period when the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat had not yet developed, when the struggle against the feudal order was in the forefront. But when the bourgeoisie came to power in France and England, the sharpened class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, as Marx points out,

... sounded the knell of scientific bourgeois economy. It was thenceforth no longer a question whether this theorem or that was true, but whether it was useful to capital or harmful, expedient or inexpedient, politically dangerous or not.<sup>11</sup>

This was true also of bourgeois philosophy, sociology, jurisprudence, etc.

Arguing for the principle of partisanship in Marxist philosophy and science, Lenin pointed out that to expect social science to be "impartial" in a wage-slave society is as silly and naïve as to expect impartiality from manufacturers on the question whether wages should be raised at

the expense of the profits of the capitalists. Lenin emphasized that bourgeois science in one way or another "defends wage slavery, whereas Marxism has declared relentless war on wage-slavery."<sup>12</sup> Regarding bourgeois professors, Lenin wrote: "Not a single one of these professors, who are capable of making very valuable contributions in the special fields of chemistry, history, or physics, can be trusted one iota when it comes to philosophy. Why? For the same reason that not a single professor of political economy, who may be capable of very valuable contributions in the field of factual and specialized investigations, can be trusted one iota when it comes to the general theory of political economy. For in modern society the latter is as much a *partisan* science as epistemology."<sup>13</sup>

The principle of the partisanship of science, in the Marxist-Leninist conception, does not mean that there can be no objective social science, as has been held by idealists, starting with the Kantians, the Narodnik subjective sociologists, Machists and Bogdanovists, and ending with present-day American pragmatists, instrumentalists, etc. True, objective social science is that science which expresses the interests of the proletariat, the most advanced, progressive class. Such is Marxist-Leninist science. The partisanship of Marxism-Leninism signifies the true objectivity of science, for Marxism-Leninism demands that reality shall be depicted as it is.

<sup>10</sup> Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. XI, p. 19.

<sup>11</sup> Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 19.

<sup>12</sup> Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. XI, p. 3.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 392.

the servants of capital have tried to refute and annihilate Marxism. But their efforts are in vain. The Marxian doctrine is omnipotent, Lenin declares, because it is true. "It is complete and harmonious, and provides men with an integral world conception which is irreconcilable with any form of superstition, reaction, or defense of bourgeois oppression."<sup>14</sup>

Marxian social science originated in the womb of capitalism as a scientific, revolutionary critique of capitalism from the standpoint of the interests of the working class. Marxism emerged historically as the legitimate successor to the best that had been created by mankind in the nineteenth century as represented by classical bourgeois philosophy, political economy and utopian Socialism. Since social science before Marx was developed, as Lenin points out,

in the first place, by the classical economists, with the discovery of the law of value and of the basic division of society into classes; since this science was further enriched, in connection with the classical economists, by the Enlighteners of the eighteenth century in the struggle against feudalism and clericalism; since the historians and philosophers of the beginning of the nineteenth century, despite their reactionary views, moved this science forward, in that they elucidated further the question of the class struggle, developed the dialectical method and applied it or began to apply it to social life; therefore Marxism, which made a number of

tremendous steps forward precisely on this road, is *the highest development* of the entire historical, economic and philosophical science of Europe.<sup>15</sup>

At the same time Lenin and Stalin emphasize that Marxism is not simply a continuation of preceding science. Marxism effected a radical change, a revolution in philosophy, in political economy and in the doctrine of socialism. Marxism is the scientific world-view of the working class, of the most revolutionary class in history, destined to abolish capitalism and all exploitation of man by man, and to erect the communist society. It is the task of Marxists, Lenin said, "to forge the steel of the Marxist world-view and of the superstructures corresponding to this world-view."<sup>16</sup>

On the granite foundation of the scientific ideology of Marxism-Leninism the Communist Party is molded as the vanguard of the working class; in accord with this ideology are being created the political, legal and other institutions of the socialist society, and all its superstructure.

\* \* \*

In order to establish the relation of science to the superstructure, one must be strictly guided by Stalin's characterization of the superstructure. "The superstructure," Stalin states, "consists of the political, legal, religious, artistic, and philosophical views of society and the political, legal and other institutions corresponding to

<sup>15</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, 4th Russian edition, Vol. 20, p. 184.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 16, p. 343.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3.

them."<sup>17</sup> The superstructure provides to society the political, legal and other ideas and creates the political and other institutions corresponding to them. The characteristic features of the superstructure consist of this, that it is generated by a given base, and that it changes or is liquidated and disappears with the liquidation and disappearance of the base which produced it; the superstructure is the product of one epoch. The superstructure is not only engendered by a given base; it also actively serves its base, helps it to shape and consolidate itself, and to finish off the old base. In a class society the superstructure has a class character and serves the dominant class. It cannot be neutral towards its base or towards the class which is its creator, else it would cease to be a superstructure. The superstructure is not connected with production directly, but indirectly, through the medium of the base. The sphere of action of the superstructure is narrow and limited. Consequently, the relation of science to the superstructure is determined by the nature of its connection with production and the foundation, by its relation to different classes, by its sphere of action, social functions and laws of development. The natural sciences are directly connected both with production and the foundation, their sphere of action is wider than the action of the superstructure. Taking into account the significance and role of the natural sciences, mathematics, and the technical

sciences in the development of production, particularly of large-scale production, Marx defined science as the intellectual potential of production; this, according to Marx, when applied to the technology of production, is transformed into a new productive force. This does not mean, however, that natural science should be included among the *material* productive forces of society, which determine the development of its economic, production relations, of its foundation. Science is by its nature a most important element of intellectual culture, which serves various domains of social life.

The conditions of the development of science and the character of its utilization in an antagonistic society depends on the level of development and the condition of its foundation, on the acuteness and depth of the class contradictions and the class struggle, on the policies of the class which heads the given society.

A decaying social system hinders not only the development of the productive forces, but also the development of science. The interests of the reactionary forces and classes inevitably come into conflict with the advanced social forces and advanced science.

In the epoch of imperialism, the bourgeoisie limits the application of science and of scientific inventions, since they lead to the depreciation of the existing fixed capital. But inasmuch as competition is maintained also under the domination of the monopolies, and since large-scale mechanized production requires the

<sup>17</sup> Joseph Stalin, *Marxism and Linguistics*, International Publishers, 1951, p. 9.

utilization of the achievements of science, the imperialist bourgeoisie is compelled, in the interests of profits, to facilitate the development of certain branches of science, especially those which are directly or indirectly connected with war-making.

Even in the ascending period of the history of capitalism the bourgeoisie acted as promoter of scientific and technical progress only to the extent that such progress was necessary for its enrichment, for the intensification of the exploitation of the laboring masses. An increase in the production of relative surplus value is achieved under the conditions of capitalism, as Marx has shown, through the development of the technology, and this depends in the greatest degree on the development of science, since modern technology rests on scientific discoveries. The bourgeoisie has therefore an interest in the development of science to the extent that science can increase the production of surplus value. Hunger for enrichment, such is the motive force of bourgeois society and its "civilization", based on private property and oppression of the people. Under the conditions of an antagonistic society the achievements of science and technology serve first of all the enrichment of the possessing classes.

to improve the conditions of men's life, to enhance their power over nature. But in the hands of the slave-owners, feudal lords and particularly of the capitalists, science is but a weapon for the enslavement and exploitation of the laboring people.

Utterly false are the bourgeois theories which blur the class nature of bourgeois civilization, asserting that the benefits of science, technology and culture under the conditions of capitalism are allegedly equally accessible to all, to capitalists and proletarians, to billionaire bankers and unemployed workers. "Progress of technology and science in capitalist society," V. I. Lenin wrote, means progress in the art of making the workers sweat."<sup>19</sup>

The social sciences fulfill the functions of an ideological superstructure, inasmuch as they supply society with ideas which facilitate the strengthening of a definite foundation and of the dominant class in society. Bourgeois science defends the bourgeois system. Marxist-Leninist science, having arisen in the conditions of the bourgeois system, is a powerful weapon of the working class in the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism. It facilitates the destruction of the capitalist foundation and its superstructure, and of the rise, entrenchment and development of the socialist foundation and a socialist superstructure. Marxism-Leninism, as the scientific world-view of the working class, fulfills the function of the ideological superstructure on the socialist foundation.

The superstructure of the slave, feudal and bourgeois societies are pervaded with an anti-scientific, reactionary, idealist and religious ideology. In socialist society, on the contrary, the whole dominant ideology

<sup>19</sup> Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XIII, p. 551, Russian edition.

is scientific. The Marxian political, legal, philosophic, and esthetic views, which are dominant in socialist society, are comprised in the superstructure resting on the socialist base.

From the foregoing it is clear what the relation of science is to the base and superstructure. The superstructure, according to Comrade Stalin's definition, is engendered by a given foundation, serves only that base, changes and is liquidated together with its base, and its action is limited by the given base. Science, on the contrary, is the product of many epochs. Science has a content of objective truth, which is independent of man or mankind, a content which does not change and is not liquidated in the wake of the changing or liquidation of the mode of production in the womb of which this true knowledge was achieved. To be sure, the science which developed in the old society has to be adapted to serve the new social system; therefore, upon the transition from the old, capitalist, system to the new, socialist, system science and the scientific institutions undergo a reconstruction. But this by no means signifies the liquidation of the former science.

On the question of science Marxism-Leninism has waged and is waging a struggle both against bourgeois objectivism and against the vulgarization of Marxism. In his day, Bogdanov, distorting Marxism in the spirit of Machism, denying the existence of objective truth in science, and blurring the difference in principle between science and religion, contended that science was but a sub-

jective ideological form of human experience. The proletcultists proceeded from this approach when they proposed that all previous science and culture be discarded. Bogdanov and the adherents of proletcult demanded, for instance, the replacement of "bourgeois" geometry with a "proletarian" geometry. The vulgarizers of Marxism contended that the proletariat must build a new, "proletarian" science and technique in a void as it were. Exposing these contentions, Lenin and Stalin taught the Party and the working class to take all the achievements of science and technology created under capitalism and develop them further, to utilize critically the culture of the past for the construction of Socialism and Communism.

Lenin, addressing the youth at the third congress of the Komsomol, declared:

You would be committing a great mistake if you attempted to draw the conclusion that one can become a Communist without acquiring what human knowledge has accumulated. It would be a mistake to believe that it is sufficient to learn Communist slogans, the conclusions of Communist science, and that it is not necessary to acquire the sum of knowledge of which Communism itself is a consequence. Marxism is an example of how Communism arose out of the sum total of human knowledge.<sup>19</sup>

Lenin said that Communist society can be built only on the basis of the highest achievements of science and

<sup>19</sup> V. I. Lenin, *The Tasks of the Youth Leagues*, Co-operative Publishing Society of Foreign Workers in the U.S.S.R., pp. 3-4.

technique. Developing these ideas of Lenin, Stalin in his address to the first All-Union conference of proletarian students posed before the student youth of the Soviet Union the task:

... to master science and to create new successors for the old professorial staff, consisting of new, Soviet people.

Thus, the Communist Party line in the field of science calls for mastering critically the whole treasury of accumulated human knowledge, taking from this sum total of knowledge everything that is valuable, progressive and true, and utilizing it for the building of Communism. Lenin and Stalin proceed from the premise that verified and practice-tested scientific knowledge of the laws of nature and society is authentic knowledge, that the laws discovered by science have the value of objective truths. Acquired knowledge must be preserved in the interests of the further development of science, because new scientific ideas and theories do not arise in a void. Scientists utilize in the interests of a given society, of a given class, the previously accumulated scientific material—verified data, deductions, laws. Furthermore, as new data and discoveries are accumulated, the earlier data should be checked, the old deductions, hypotheses and theories should be re-examined, the formulations of laws deepened, and so on. The conditions, means and direction of cognition are determined by the character of the

social system and its mode of production, by the foundation of society. But this must not be interpreted as meaning that scientific concepts and discoveries arise by themselves, automatically, from the economic foundation, as is assumed by the vulgarizers of Marxism. Scientific discoveries are the result of a complex and painstaking process of cognition of the laws of nature and society, the result of observations, experiments, scientific analysis and synthesis, clarification of the inner connections and laws of phenomena, verification of theories by practice. In the domain of ideology in general and scientific ideology in particular the economic foundation does not create anything automatically, it only determines the conditions, means, tasks and direction of science, and the character of the utilization of the already acquired scientific knowledge. While scientific cognition is determined by the development of society, it has its relative independence, its inner laws of development; one of the inner laws of the development of science requires the overcoming of previous deductions, theories and hypotheses which are contradicted by new facts and discoveries. New facts and discoveries lead to the deepening, re-examination, radical readjustment and even complete refutation of a number of earlier deductions, hypotheses and theories and the affirmation of new, deeper and truer theories and deductions. This is the specific form of the movement of scientific knowledge. A struggle of opinions, criticism of out-moded, erroneous, re-

<sup>30</sup> Joseph Stalin, *The Tasks of the Youth*, Little Lenin Library, Vol. 27, International Publishers, 1940, p. 18.

actionary views and theories, and the affirmation of new, advanced, progressive theories—such is the specific manifestation in science of the general law of development, the law of struggle between the old and the new.

The contradictions in the development of science under the conditions of the decaying bourgeois society are utilized by reaction and do not find a correct solution. This determines the deepening of the crisis in bourgeois science.

Lenin, analyzing the crisis of natural science in bourgeois society in his masterful work *Materialism and Empirio-criticism*, pointed out that science in its development is giving birth to dialectical materialism, but that under the conditions of decadent capitalism the process of child birth is painful. "In addition to a living healthy being," he wrote, "there are bound to be produced certain dead products, refuse fit only for the garbage heap. And the entire school of 'physical idealism,' the entire empirio-critical philosophy together with empirio-symbolism, empirio-monism, and so on, and so forth, must be regarded as such refuse."<sup>21</sup>

Comrade Stalin, in his *Anarchism and Socialism*, gave a remarkable example of how Marxists should approach the achievements of all preceding science. Lenin and Stalin have shown how to approach science created in bourgeois society, taking from it everything that is positive, authentic knowledge that has the value of objective truth, and discard-

ing everything that is idealist, metaphysical, scholastic bourgeois refuse.

The socialist revolution, liquidating the capitalist foundation and its superstructure and creating a socialist foundation and a corresponding superstructure, establishes the prevalence of socialist ideology, of the scientific ideology of Marxism-Leninism, overcoming the remnants of capitalism in the mind of men and the manifestations of bourgeois ideology in philosophy, in the natural sciences, in the technical sciences. The socialist revolution liquidates the bourgeois distortions, the bourgeois pseudo-science, but not the genuine science created in the old society. The reactionary classes—not the proletariat—are interested in the liquidation of science and the substitution of mysticism, idealism, religion. The proletariat, on the contrary, is interested in taking over all science, all scientific knowledge, and placing it in the service of the new social system, in the service of the laboring people, and against the exploiters.

While it preserves all the positive content of science and frees science from the shackles of capital, the socialist revolution liquidates various reactionary, anti-scientific, metaphysical and idealist theories, which distort and hinder the development of science. The erection of the economic foundation of Socialism was accompanied by the smashing and uprooting of bourgeois theories, of the reactionary bourgeois ideology, and the entrenchment of the prevalence of the scientific, socialist ideology.

<sup>21</sup> Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. XI, p. 365.

**JUST PUBLISHED!**

# **THE VOLUNTEERS**

**By STEVE NELSON**

***A Personal Narrative of the Fight  
Against Fascism in Spain***

Here is the deeply stirring story of one of America's outstanding fighters for labor's rights, freedom and peace, the story of the man from Pittsburgh who heard the cry of Madrid.

This book describes his life as a leader of the American volunteers who fought for the Spanish Republic against Franco, Mussolini and Hitler. His own story in that war is history and it is literature. The men live in his book as they lived, dreamed, fought and died.

The reader will understand the more readily the epic of Steve Nelson's fight today against those who seek to smash democracy in our country.

*Popular Paper Edition* \$1.00

*Regular Cloth Trade Edition* \$2.50

*Special Autographed De Luxe Edition* \$5.00

AT YOUR LOCAL NEWSSTAND OR BOOKSTORE,

OR BY MAIL FROM

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

