

Political Affairs

AUGUST 1953 • 25 CENTS



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

[1] The Truce in

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

[8] The Explosive Situation in Latin
America

A. B. MAGIL

[15] Mexico: Gathering Storm

CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
C.P. OF BOLIVIA

[29] What Must Be Done in Bolivia

JOHN SWIFT

[37] The Left-Led Unions and Labor
Unity, II

CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
SOCIALIST UNITY PARTY
OF GERMANY

[52] Recent Events and
the Party's Immediate Tasks

HEVELYN T. SAUNDERS

[60] The Leaders of New China
(*Book Review*)

RECENT NEW CENTURY BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

DANGER SIGNALS FOR ORGANIZED LABOR <i>by William Z. Foster</i>	.10
THE ANATOMY OF McCARTHYISM <i>by Mark Logan and Sam Douglas</i>	.10
COMMUNISTS AND THE PEOPLE, <i>by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn</i>	.25
THE COMMUNIST PARTY <i>by Pettis Perry</i>	.25
THE WALTER-McCARRAN POLICE STATE LAW, <i>by Abner Green</i>	.25
RESISTANCE IN SOUTH AFRICA, <i>by Dr. Alphaeus Hunton</i>	.35
LABOR AND ANTI-SEMITISM, <i>by George Morris</i>	.10
WE CAN HAVE PEACE AND JOBS <i>by Bernard Burton</i>	.05
THIRTEEN COMMUNISTS SPEAK TO THE COURT	.35
ISRAEL AND DOLLAR DIPLOMACY <i>by Victor Perlo</i>	.25
THE PARTY OF NEGRO AND WHITE <i>by Pettis Perry</i>	.05
ON CHANGES IN THE RULES OF THE C.P.S.U. <i>by N. Khrushchev</i>	.25
PARTY VIGILANCE <i>by Elmer Larsen</i>	.10

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS, 832 Broadway, New York

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.



A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

The Truce in Korea

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

THERE IS WORLD-WIDE rejoicing among the masses of the peoples that the war in Korea has finally been halted by an armistice. This reactionary imperialist war, which a majority of the American people, according to Gallup polls, long ago condemned as "absolutely useless," and which the world's peoples generally hated, brought about the needless death of at least two million soldiers and civilians, maimed several millions more, orphaned countless numbers of children, caused endless mass suffering, and devastated Korea from end to end.

The cease-fire in Korea constitutes a real victory for the peace-loving masses of the world, including the great bulk of the American people. It shatters the Wall Street cultivated Big Lie that a third world war is inevitable; that, in fact, it had already begun in Korea. It proves that the peoples have the power to pre-

vent war if they will but act in unity and with determination. The Korean truce, if properly followed up, can be a major stride towards ending the whole "cold war," now so threatening to world peace.

The Korean armistice is a basic defeat for arrogant American imperialism, which, besides cleaning up \$100 billions in profits on the war, obviously hoped to use the Korean slaughter as the first phase of a great all-out capitalist war against the countries of Socialism and People's Democracy. The ending of the Korean war is a heavy, if not a fatal, blow to the plans of Wall Street to establish its world domination through a world war. For Wall Street the Korean War was a handy instrument to militarize the American people, to wring out billions of dollars in munitions-making, and to put a score of countries on its dole and under its dictation. This is why,

instead of rejoicing, the Eisenhower Administration and its Wall Street bosses are full of gloomy forebodings. But their cynical mood in no sense reflects the will of the American people, who are glad to be rid of this hated, reactionary war.

The truce in Korea greatly decreases war tension in the world, despite the disgraceful efforts of American political and military leaders to keep up this tension. The prospects of world peace are further improved by the intensified peace policies of the U.S.S.R., People's China, and the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe. These countries, by making definite peace moves upon every front in the cold war, are so strengthening peace sentiment throughout the world as to make it increasingly difficult, if not impossible, for the atomaniacs in the United States to plunge the world into war.

But it would be a grave error to conclude from all this that the Korean armistice ends the danger of another war and that the peace forces can now relax their efforts. The aggressive warlike policies of Wall Street imperialism still constitute a grave danger, and they will continue to do so until the working class, the Negro people and the other democratic elements in this country eventually unite and deal a decisive political defeat to monopoly capital. The great lesson of Korea is not that the peace forces may rest upon their oars but that, encouraged by this

great victory, they should re-double their effort to defeat the Wall Street warmongers.

Made desperate by their defeat in Korea, the Wall Street fomenters of war are ready for every reckless war adventure. In this respect we especially warn the American people against the Eisenhower-Dulles so-called "liberation" policy. This policy, which is the Truman Doctrine under a new name, aims at instigating civil wars in all those countries that refuse to kneel to Wall Street. It is a dangerous interference in the internal affairs of other countries. Among its worst manifestations were the recent State Department inspired riots in East Germany. These (as the instigators hoped) could have resulted in a general civil war in Germany, with the consequent grave menace of a third world war. The sharpest point at present of the war danger is precisely the hypocritical "liberation" policy of the Eisenhower Administration.

The responsibility for the Korean war rests squarely at the door of the Truman Administration. The war was directly precipitated by the firebrand Syngman Rhee clique at the instigation of the Washington warmongers. This puppet gangster would not have dared his war provocation had he not known that he had strong State Department backing. And once the war was under way, President Truman arbitrarily plunged the United States into it without even asking the permission

of Co
also
mot
abroa
war l
ing c
towns
by hi
cities.
tions
the in
cease-
at on
Korea
Admi
deepe
not h
tinues
more
butch
Th
upon
set o
upon
ing a
It ca
negot
inten
Chin
imum
shek
out a
jingo
called
from
All
wave
throu
howe
horns
negot

of Congress. Mr. Truman thereafter also did his best, in the face of mounting peace opposition here and abroad, to intensify and extend the war by his indiscriminate air-bombing of unfortified North Korean towns, waging of germ warfare, and by his proposals to A-bomb Chinese cities. And when the truce negotiations were begun two years ago at the instance of the Soviet Union, a cease-fire should have been instituted at once, as the Chinese and North Koreans proposed; but the Truman Administration, in its eagerness to deepen and spread the war, would not hear of this. So the war was continued, with countless thousands more on each side being needlessly butchered.

The Eisenhower Administration, upon assuming office, immediately set out, with even greater vigor, upon the Truman policy of extending and deepening the Korean war. It cancelled the Panmunjom truce negotiations altogether, declared its intentions to spread the war into China, and arranged to give maximum support to the Chiang Kai-shek bandits in Formosa for an all out attack upon People's China. The jingo General MacArthur was called in to shout these menaces from the housetops.

All this raised such a compelling wave of war fear and opposition throughout the world that the Eisenhower government had to pull in its horns and once more resume truce negotiations. But the State Depart-

ment did its best to stymie these peace parleys. The principal means to this effort was the war criminal Syngman Rhee, President of the South Korean Government. Rhee had the open support of such men as Senators McCarthy and Knowland, and the not so covert backing of Dulles and Eisenhower. His outrageous release of the war prisoners and demand for a continuance of the war had their roots in Washington policy well-known to him. If the United States leaders finally signed the truce (with their secret sabotage agreement with Rhee in the background), it was only because they were forced by mounting peace pressure to take this step.

Of decisive effect in bringing about the Korean truce was the resolute peace stand of the U.S.S.R., People's China, and the European People's Democracies, comprising 800,000,000 people. They were undeterred by the atombomb threats that were levelled against them by the United States and those capitalist countries following its lead and on its dole. The Wall Street imperialists itched to attack the U.S.S.R. and its friends, but they never could bring themselves and their allies to the sticking point. There was always the haunting fear that an attack upon the U.S.S.R. would, as Stalin said, put the life of their system at stake, and would end in the abolition of the whole capitalist system. Besides, the wolf-like antagonisms among the capitalist

powers prevented them from developing the needed unity in their aggression.

The basic credit for the peace victory of the armistice is due to the heroic armed fight made by the North Korean and Chinese peoples. They fought to a standstill the strongest armed forces that the capitalist world could bring against them. President Truman, in true imperialist fashion, thought at the outset that a "police action" would suffice to crush the North Koreans and to cow the Chinese; but even a full scale war has been unable to accomplish this. Korea is a bold warning to the world that the days are forever past when the imperialists could trample roughshod upon the lives and liberties of colonial and semi-colonial peoples.

Another elementary factor in forcing through the Korean peace was the pressure of the masses of the peace-loving peoples in many capitalist countries, notably those supposedly tied to the war chariots of American imperialism. These peoples in Europe, Latin America, Africa and Asia—have never been deceived by the Wall Street Big Lie that the capitalist countries are in danger of a military attack from the U.S.S.R. They especially have no taste for the war that Wall Street is trying to prepare for them. If Mr. Churchill and other capitalist statesmen have recently urged that the United States accept the North Korean-Chinese proposals to end the

Korean war, they did it under the sharpest pressure of the masses of their peoples, who have no wish to be cannon fodder for Wall Street.

Last, and vitally important, of the major peace factors that brought about the truce in Korea was the stubborn peace-will of the American people themselves. The people in this country, since the end of World War II, have been subjected to the most intense and cunning war propaganda. All the means of mass information has been prostituted to an unheard-of degree to push forward the military preparations of American Big Business, and the imperialist propaganda has been skillfully disguised as a defense of peace and world democracy. To their shame, the conservative top leaders of the people's democratic organizations—trade unions, Negro organizations, farmers' bodies, youth and women's movements, and others—betraying the fundamental interests of their people—have almost unanimously joined in pumping the Wall Street war slogans into the minds of the masses.

Nevertheless, the American people, although largely confused by cunning imperialist warmongering, have never been won to an active support of the Wall Street war program. They have reluctantly submitted to high taxes and to other restrictions; the workers have struck freely in all industries to protect their wage rates; the masses have resisted the introduction of universal military

train
ener
Kore
cities
Ame
been
to th
peace
spite
offici
impo
prese
Th
Unit
wave
war
In th
the A
this
nist
impe
to p
milit
every
try w
—is t
nis, I
of ou
into
stifle
peace
that
advoc
the U
transp
frame
Th
by th
tensif
Peopl
peace,

training, military control of atomic energy, the use of the A-bomb in Korea, and the bombing of Chinese cities. All the propoganda power of American imperialism has never been able to justify the Korean war to them. This stubborn clinging to peace by the American people, despite the rankest betrayal of their official leaders, has been of decisive importance in bringing about the present cease-fire in Korea.

The Communist Party of the United States takes pride in its unwavering opposition to the Korean war and its tireless fight for peace. In this it was a true spokesman of the American people. No sooner had this war begun than the Communist Party condemned it as an unjust imperialist war and launched a fight to put an end to it. Our Party's militant fight for peace when almost every other organization in the country was supporting the Korean war—is the basic reason why Gene Dennis, Ben Davis, and so many others of our leaders have been kangarooed into jail. They were imprisoned to stifle their powerful voices for peace. The Government's charge that they conspired "to teach and advocate the violent overthrow of the United States Government" is a transparent lie and a deliberate frame-up.

The new world situation created by the truce in Korea and by the intensified efforts of the U.S.S.R. and People's China to establish world peace, confronts the workers and

other democratic forces in this country with a whole series of urgent political tasks relating to the preservation of peace, the maintenance of jobs for the workers, and the restoration of civil rights, as indicated in our Party's main resolution, appearing in *Political Affairs* for July.

1. *Peace*: To lessen international tension and to free the American people from the weight of militarization, there needs to be: establishment of a five-power pact to ensure world peace; seating of People's China in the Security Council of the United Nations; slashing of the United States military budget; return of American soldiers from Korea and from the 46 other countries where they are now stationed; refusal of all arms to the reactionary, war-like Rhee Government; dismantling of all American airbases in foreign countries; lifting of the trade embargo against the countries of Socialism and People's Democracy; world armaments reduction and outlawing of the atom bomb; unification of a democratic Germany and Korea; U.S. hands off Indo-China, Indonesia, and Malaya; no American interference in the liberation movements in Africa and Latin America; granting of independence to Puerto Rico; admission en bloc of all states with applications now pending into the United Nations; liquidation of the NATO as an aggressive military alliance. The United Nations must be made an organization for world peace, instead

of an aggressive anti-Soviet military alliance under United States control. Especially the Korean armistice must be strictly enforced and not distorted by Eisenhower, Dulles, Rhee, *et al.*, into an excuse for re-opening the war.

2. *Jobs*: To combat the growing danger of an economic crisis, it is imperative that the trade unions map out programs to protect the jobs and living standards of the workers, and then to fight for them in the political arena and in their negotiations with the employers. Among the measures most urgently needed are: trade-union unity, both on a united front and an organic basis, among the A. F. of L., C.I.O., Miners, Railroad Brotherhoods, and progressive independent unions; an all-out defense of the workers' wage rates; establishment of the 30-hour working week; sharp reductions in taxes of workers and other low income groups; price and rent controls where necessary; overhauling of the social security system to provide more adequate benefits and wider coverages; development of a broad program of government works of all kinds to meet the menace of mass unemployment, including housing, education, flood control, reforestation, etc.; systematic expansion of East-West trade—with the U.S.S.R., People's China, and the European People's Democracies.

3. *Democracy*: Under cover of the fake war emergency, there has been growing in our country a broad fas-

cist-like attack upon the Bill of Rights. The chief expression of this is McCarthyism. The attack is against trade unions, schools, churches, political and cultural organizations. This sinister assault constitutes a real menace to the people's freedom. Among the major means necessary to combat the growing fascist threat are: repeal the Taft-Hartley, Smith, McCarran, and McCarran-Walter and similar pro-fascist laws; abolish the McCarthy, Jenner, and Velde Congressional thought-control committees and also the big brood of their kind on state and local levels; defeat the Goldwater-Rhodes bill; adopt the civil rights program, including anti-poll tax and anti-lynching laws; establish the right to vote and full representation for Negroes; put an end to the deportation hysteria; grant amnesty for all Communists and others in jail or indicted under the Smith and other thought-control laws.

The basic issues of jobs and popular freedom are all tied together with the struggle for peace, with peace as the key question. In the changing situation confronting our country and the world after the Korean truce, there is the greatest need for organized labor and its allies to fight along the lines indicated above. The Communist Party calls upon the labor movement and all people's organizations to develop the closest cooperation in this

fight.
up a
ment
progre
for a
and t
most c
intern
date t
worke

fight. The Korean truce has opened up a new prospect for the development of the broadest united front progressive coalition movements; for a general democratic advance, and the masses should make the most of it. Now is the time to ease international tension and to liquidate the war danger, to protect the workers from being thrown out of

work by millions to starve in a great economic crisis, to free our country from the growing fascist menace of McCarthyism.

FOR THE NATIONAL
COMMITTEE

William Z. Foster
Elizabeth Gurley Flynn
Pettis Perry

The Explosive Situation in Latin America

By William Z. Foster

AMONG THE MOST important expressions of the revolutionary situation following World War II is the accentuation, in many parts of the world, of the national liberation movements of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples. In the Far East this great movement, with revolutionary People's China as its center, is fast wrecking the colonial systems of Great Britain, France, Holland, and the United States, in India, Pakistan, Indo-China, Korea, Malaya, Indonesia, and the Philippines. In the Near and Middle East the colonial and semi-colonial peoples in Egypt, Iran, Libya, etc.—all the way from Afghanistan to Morocco—are on the march against their imperialist exploiters. The same is also true, in an ascending degree, of the Negro people of Central and Southern Africa, who are striving to overthrow the domination of the white imperialists. And closer to home, the colonial and semi-colonial peoples of Latin America are also beginning to stir, indicating that they, too, are feeling and responding to the world-wide national-colonial revolutionary movement.

Conditions are fast ripening in Latin America for a revolutionary, anti-imperialist upheaval. John Foster Dulles is not basically wrong when he fears Latin America soon going the way of Asia. Hunger, disease, illiteracy, and boundless poverty prevail on a profound mass scale among the 160 millions of people throughout the immense areas constituting Latin America—all the way South from the Rio Grande to Cape Horn. Economic conditions, always bad for the great masses of the people, are now steadily worsening. Inflationary conditions prevail in most of the countries. Foreign trade, vital for the peoples, with their heavy surplus of export commodities, is declining. They are getting lower prices for what they sell to their main customer, the United States, and are paying higher prices for the machinery and other goods that they have to buy. With few exceptions, the countries are autocratically ruled by a combination of big landowners in alliance with United States imperialism, and more than half of them, especially, Argentina, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Costa Rica, El

Salvador
Guay,
bia, ar
ary di

YANK

The
archite
exploit
people
its er
rivals
ist gri
and F
weak
which
the U
Argen
to a
few co
Argen
invest
lars, is
all of
its im
oration
dictato
most
genera
that t
ment
closely
domin
The
full us
text f
imper
ca. Or
prices
goods
It has

Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Venezuela, Peru, and Colombia, are dominated by ultra-reactionary dictatorships.

YANKEE IMPERIALISM

The United States is the main architect of the imperialist super-exploitation of the Latin-American peoples. It has largely vanquished its erstwhile powerful imperialist rivals in this vast area. The imperialist grip of Germany, Japan, Italy, and France, once strong, is now very weak and limited; and Great Britain, which once aggressively challenged the United States from Mexico to Argentina, is being steadily reduced to a defensive role, and in but a few countries—especially Brazil and Argentina. The United States, with investments there of six billion dollars, is out to solidify its control over all of Latin America. It maintains its imperial power by active collaboration with the most reactionary dictators in Latin America. Indeed, most of them are its puppets. The general rule is, with few exceptions, that the more reactionary a government is in Latin America the more closely it is affiliated to, that is, dominated by, the United States.

The State Department has made full use of the "cold war" as a pretext for intensifying its repressive, imperialist activities in Latin America. On this basis it has slashed the prices of Latin-American export goods and raised those of imports. It has redoubled its efforts to set up

a direct military control of the countries through the so-called mutual military assistance pacts. It has rammed through such pacts in Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Peru, Ecuador and Uruguay. In the 1952-53 fiscal year \$51,685,750 was allotted by the United States as "military aid" to Latin-American countries.

Yet the widespread popular opposition to these policies is indicated by the fact that it took the State Department over a year to browbeat the Brazilian Congress into ratifying the military pact signed by its government; in Uruguay it took a year to get the pact ratified; in Ecuador and Chile the governments that signed the pacts were later beaten in national elections, and that in Cuba, also a pact signer, was overthrown in a reactionary coup by Batista, who demagogically exploited anti-Yankee sentiment.

During the period since the end of World War II the United States has been behind every major reactionary movement in Latin America. It is everywhere tied in locally with the big landowners, the pro-imperialist sections of the bourgeoisie, and other reactionaries. It was the State Department that brought about the split, several years ago, in the Latin-American Confederation of Labor, with the direct assistance of the heads of the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. The F.B.I. also has organized a big spy system in many Latin-American countries, especially in the Caribbean area and in Mexico. Its agents

are snooping around everywhere and it is arrogantly trying to terrorize these peoples with McCarthyite systems of thought control and intimidation. F.B.I. agents were responsible for the kidnapping of Gus Hall across the line from Mexico into the United States, in violation of the Constitution of Mexico.

The State Department has also had a hand in the several putsches and fake elections that have taken place in recent years in Latin America—the latest examples, within the past two years, being the violent overthrow of the government in Cuba in March, 1952, and the wholesale steal of the Mexican election last year by the conservative forces, and the election steal and reactionary coup in Venezuela. The United States is also basically responsible for the reign of terror that has existed in most of Latin America since the end of the world war—with the assassination of many workers' leaders and the jailing of hundreds of others. The struggle for civil liberties in the United States is bound up with that in Latin America; it is a joint struggle against the same reactionary forces.

In Puerto Rico, which for over half a century has been an outright colony of the United States, there exists a most outrageous exploitation of the people and a widespread pauperization comparable only to that found in Asia. There has long been a strong liberation movement in the island demanding national independence, in which the Communist

Party plays an important role. The United States, which poses all over the world as the friend of colonial liberation, has steadily refused to grant independence to its own colony, Puerto Rico. Its latest step to keep the island people in chains was the promulgation of its so-called new constitution of last year, under which the United States maintains its military bases in the island, enforces the Taft-Hartley, Smith, and other reactionary laws, and reserves the right to veto any legislation adopted by the legislature of Puerto Rico—in short Puerto Rico remains a United States colony.

THE GROWING RESISTANCE MOVEMENT

During the past couple of years there has been a growing renaissance of the anti-imperialist, national-liberation movement in many Latin-American countries. This is primarily directed against the leading imperialist aggressor, the United States. The slogan, "Yankee, Go Home," is as popular throughout Latin America as it is in Europe, Asia, and other parts of the world. In Brazil, a year ago, Secretary Acheson found this out to his embarrassment, with the police trying in vain to eliminate the countless anti-Yankee slogans which decorated the walls of building all over Rio de Janeiro. And at present writing, Milton Eisenhower, special envoy from the United States to Latin America, is receiving anything but an enthusiastic greet-

A cle
Yankee
rapidly
the begi
on the
delegati
For the
the exis
these de
ception
as a blo
thing p
regardle
Departm
though
Americ
times, a
the Ur
the situ
Latin-A
of Janu
in the U
of a to
23 tall
were v
countri
result,
a numb
in prev
And it
the Eco
mittee,
mitted
serting
countri
sources
against
found i
The
tion in
dramat
ring ev
via. In

A clear indication of the anti-Yankee imperialist sentiment now rapidly rising in Latin America is the beginning of a changed attitude on the part of the Latin-American delegations in the United Nations. For the first three or four years of the existence of that organization, these delegations, with the partial exception of Argentina, voted virtually as a bloc in support of nearly everything proposed by the United States, regardless of its merits. The State Department arrogantly acted as though it had the whole Latin-American vote in its pocket at all times, and with it a sure control of the United Nations. But recently the situation is radically changing. *Latin-American Facts*, in its issue of January-February 1953, says that in the U.N. Seventh Assembly, "Out of a total of 460 possible votes (on 23 tallies), 218, or almost one-half, were withheld by Latin-American countries from the U.S. side. As a result, the U.S. government lost on a number of issues which it might, in previous Assemblies, have won." And it adds that, at a meeting of the Economic and Financial Committee, in a vote on a proposal, submitted by Uruguay and Bolivia, asserting the right of underdeveloped countries to nationalize their resources, the United States, in voting against this important proposition, found itself in a minority of one.

The rising spirit of national liberation in Latin America has been dramatically illustrated by the stirring events in Guatemala and Bolivia. In Guatemala, right in the pri-

vate Central American preserve of Yankee imperialism, the people, in a broad progressive coalition movement which included the Workers (Communist) Party, won a sweeping election victory in January, 1953, against a combination of big landlords and Yankee industrialists. This increased the coalition strength to 50 votes against 8 for the reactionaries in the national legislature. And now the government is going ahead with the radical agrarian reform launched in June, 1952, with other progressive legislation—to the dismay of Wall Street and to the inspiration of anti-imperialist forces everywhere throughout Latin America. In Bolivia, in April, 1952, the people delivered another smashing blow to reaction through an uprising that placed in power the progressive Paz Estenssoro government, which had been elected the previous year but prevented from taking office by a Right-wing coup. Then the government, in response to the demands of the masses, proceeded to nationalize the great tin mines, owned mostly by United States capital—all of which gave Wall Street something of a heart attack.

In Brazil a militant national movement, in which the Communists are a vital factor, has prevented the imperialists from grabbing the rich oil deposits in that country. Stated Luis Carlos Prestes, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Brazil, in a report to a recent meeting of the party's National Committee: "During the national campaign for a Pact of Peace more than

5,000,000 signatures were collected—the campaign rallied the millions of Brazilians longing for peace. So far we have succeeded in preventing the Vargas government from sending Brazilian troops to Korea, as demanded by its American masters.”

Further South, too, the semi-fascist Peron of Argentina, sensing the way the anti-Yankee wind is blowing, is working diligently (with covert British help) to weaken the United States influence in the lower half of South America.

The United States ultimatum to the Latin-American countries to send troops to be butchered in Korea has been almost completely ignored. This, too, is a sign of growing resistance to Wall Street. Save for Puerto Rico, where, as a colony, the United States simply drafted soldiers, only the fascist government of Colombia in the whole broad expanse of Latin America sent a token contingent of 1,000. One of the surest ways for a politician in Latin America to court political oblivion is to advocate the sending of troops to Korea to serve as blood sacrifices on the altar of warlike Yankee imperialism.

One of the major policies of the United States, in its drive for world mastery through a world war is to develop an economic boycott against the U.S.S.R., People's China, and the European People's Democracies. To enforce this blockade, the State Department has not hesitated to bring the sharpest pressure against its own allies, especially Great Britain. Latin America has not escaped such coer-

cion. But that Latin Americans resent this dictation and are inclined to rebel against it is indicated by their tendencies to increase their trade with the banned countries. Here Argentina has boldly taken the lead, conferring with the U.S.S.R., and sending a trade delegation to People's China. Its exports to the bloc of supposed-to-be boycotted countries have gone up from \$22,448,000 in 1947 to \$47,948,000 in 1950. Brazil has also made trade pacts with Poland and Czechoslovakia; Uruguay is trading with Hungary and Czechoslovakia; and Chile signed a trade pact with People's China in October, 1952. The total Latin-American imports from the Socialist world went up from \$29,589,000 in 1947 to \$57,240,000 in 1951, with exports running at about double this figure. All of which trade developments sit very ill indeed with the militant Yankee imperialists who are insolently attempting to tell the Latin-American nations, as they are other peoples, just whom they shall and shall not trade with.

The most significant of the many indications of the rising anti-imperialist spirit now developing in Latin America, however, is the greatly increased activities of the workers' and the trade-union movements in the various countries. This is tied in with the struggle against the big agrarians who, along with United States imperialism, dominate most of the countries. The past two years have witnessed a number of important strikes in Brazil, Cuba, Uruguay, Chile, and elsewhere. The

trade-union
pecially
after se
sion. I
and g
strengt
the cou
of the
tion of
Chile,
the up
movem
ica. Pr
servers
12 coun
livia, C
Mexico
Venezu
ican Fa
ate eff
with t
tators
leaders
have fa

THE C
INTI
COO

There
much
the d
movem
labor a
the U
to cont
for th
South
signifi
its alli
are th
few ye
econor

trade-union movement in Chile is especially exhibiting renewed vitality, after several years of drastic repression. It has acquired a new unity and generally has increased its strength and its political position in the country. The Fourth Congress of the Latin-American Confederation of Labor (C.T.A.L.), held in Chile, in March, 1953, strengthened the upswing of the trade-union movement generally in Latin America. Present were delegates and observers representing 225 unions in 12 countries—Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Cuba, Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico, Peru, Paraguay, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Chile. (*Latin American Facts*, May 1953.) The desperate efforts of the United States, with the help of the national dictators and the A. F. of L.-C.I.O. leadership to destroy the C.T.A.L., have failed dramatically.

THE QUESTION OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

There is an obvious need for a much closer collaboration between the developing national-liberation movement in Latin America and the labor and progressive movement in the United States. Each has much to contribute to the other. Victories for the workers and their allies South of the Rio Grande are vastly significant to the working class and its allies North of that line, and so are their defeats. During the last few years hemispheric cooperation—economic, political, cultural—has

fallen very much into abeyance, and its re-development is a task of major importance.

One of the first necessities in this general respect is for the Left and progressive movement in the United States to get better acquainted with what is taking place in the Latin-American countries, and then to make this information known far and wide among the masses. Here the Marxist press has the definite duty to act as the vanguard; to set an example for the labor and progressive forces as a whole. As Lenin stressed, it is the political responsibility of the labor movements in the imperialist countries to give the most active cooperation to the colonial and semi-colonial peoples under the oppression and domination of their national bourgeoisie; but this is an obligation that the Communist Party of the United States has but little fulfilled relative to the peoples of Latin America, especially that of Puerto Rico.

The time was, a dozen or more years ago, when there was hardly an issue of *The Communist*, without its containing one or more important articles on Latin America, written either by Latin-American leaders or by United States Communists; but now articles of this type are far between in our press. Organizational contacts through congresses, delegations, etc., have been similarly neglected. These weaknesses can and must be overcome. Latin America is full of developments vital to the progressive forces of this country and it is our bounden task to make them

widely known among the masses here. This also implies a much closer collaboration with the Latin-American Communist parties than now exists. The McCarrans and their like appreciate the enormous importance of such Communist international cooperation; hence their persistent attempts to isolate these parties from each other by drastic passport restrictions.

There is a great need, too, for closer cooperation of the trade unions on a hemisphere basis. In the years when the C.I.O. had a progressive leadership, up to the beginning of the "cold war," it maintained close relations with the C.T.A.L. and with the struggles of the Latin-American labor movement. This collaboration was of great benefit to the workers in all parts of the hemisphere. But now the C.I.O. leaders, under instruction of the State Department, have not only severed these healthful connections, but they actually have tried to destroy the C.T.A.L. by launching a dual organization. Despite this treachery, however, the rank-and-file workers in the United States have a strong common interest with those in Latin America, and they will respond to this interest, if given leadership in the matter. To bring about fraternal cooperation between the A. F. of L., C.I.O., and independent unions in this country, and the C.T.A.L. and other groups in Latin America is a task that is decisive for the progress of organized labor as a whole in the western hemisphere.

There is a general need also for a far closer cooperation between the organized peace forces of Latin America and those of the United States. This collaboration we also have greatly neglected. The peoples of Latin America, in the main, are fundamentally dedicated to the preservation of world peace. On the basis of their long and bitter experience with ruthless Yankee imperialism, they are little fooled by the false assertions of Wall Street that it is creating a great international war machine and covering the world with its air bases, all for the purpose of conserving world peace and democracy. Closer cooperation of the peace forces on a hemisphere scale would mean a great strengthening of the peace movement everywhere else.

The perspective is definitely for a further stepping up of the national liberation and peace movements of Latin America. This is already taking place in political unison with the intensification of the great mass movements in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and among the toiling masses of Europe. It will be further speeded, too, by the weakening of the U.S.-led anti-Soviet war alliance, as indicated by the more independent position being taken by Great Britain, India, Canada, and other countries in the United Nations. Our Party must realize what is happening in Latin America and fall into step with the vital mass movement which is there taking shape.

By A

DURING
the U
Staff,
the A
Vande
where
with
leader
for fu
Time.
negoti
clude
more
war n

It
that t
to ma
servic
Mexic
tions
sary o
the re
tembe
titanic
from
their
signs
politic
ly lost
north

It v
a year

Mexico: Gathering Storm

By A. B. Magil

DURING TWO SUCCESSIVE weeks in May the United States Army Chief of Staff, Gen. J. Lawton Collins, and the Air Force Chief, Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, made trips to Mexico where they "had long friendly talks with Mexican defense and political leaders that served to pave the way for future negotiations." (*New York Times*, May 13, 1953.) These "future negotiations" were designed to conclude a military pact to gear Mexico more tightly into the Wall Street war machine.

It was perhaps only coincidence that these two chiefs of the crusade to make the world safe for and subservient to Wall Street arrived in Mexico in the midst of the celebrations of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Miguel Hidalgo, the revolutionary priest who on September 16, 1810, launched Mexico's titanic struggle for independence from Spain. Certainly the irony of their visit, with its "friendly" designs on what remains of Mexico's political independence, was completely lost on the two sleek pilgrims from north of the Rio Grande.

It will be recalled that more than a year earlier, the Mexican govern-

ment, then headed by President Miguel Aleman, suspended negotiations for precisely such a pact as the Pentagon has been seeking from the new regime of President Adolfo Ruiz Cortines. "The talks broke down," wrote the *Times* of February 24, 1952, "when the Mexicans felt unable to subscribe to . . . the possibility of their having to send troops outside their national territory." And the *Times* added the significant observation that applause for the rupture of negotiations came from "all sections of Mexican public opinion, from the far Left to the far Right."

As recently as July 6, 1953, Defense Minister Matias Ramos Santos chose the occasion of the semi-annual meeting of the Mexican United States Joint Defense Commission to announce that "not a single man will leave Mexican territory to fight abroad." And once more Mexican public opinion, from Left to Right, voiced unanimous approval.

The Defense Minister's statement was another nail in the coffin of the proposed military pact. While the already existing military and political collaboration with the U.S. government remain unchanged, the re-

fusal to undertake new military commitments reflects the resistance to Washington encroachments that is mounting not only in Mexico, but throughout Latin America.

Because of its economic, political and strategic importance in the Pentagon's blueprint for World War III, and because of its traditional role of leadership among Latin American nations, Mexico is of special significance in the fight for liberation beginning to unfold in Latin America.

MEXICO'S ECONOMY

Mexico has been experiencing an industrial boom that is all glitter and gilt outside, but shoddy and crumbling within. Directly and indirectly it has been stimulated by the U. S. armaments boom; but its foundation is even more shaky than that of its northern sire. The expansion has been chiefly in strategic metals destined for the United States; the construction industry (steel, cement, etc.) due to the Aleman government's overextended public works program and the erection of luxurious homes, new factories and commercial buildings; and the consumers' durable goods industry geared to a limited upper-class and middle-class market.

However, boom and bust have developed simultaneously, locked in open conflict. The country's leading industry, textiles, operated at only 47% of capacity in 1951 and suffered further decline in 1952. Shoe production in 1951 was only 52% of what

it had been in 1939 even though the population had increased about 37%. The output of men's and women's haberdashery was in 1951 only 68.6% of the 1939 volume. And the annual report of the government-controlled central bank, the Bank of Mexico, states that manufacturing production as a whole in 1952 declined 3%. This is the first drop since 1947 and the sharpest descent in one year since the pre-war period. Official figures also show a decrease of about 6% in the volume of commercial sales in 1952.

The cause of this situation is no mystery. Though Aleman, while President, told a group of capitalists who came to pin a medal on him and give him a diploma, that "thirty million inhabitants are eating well and already living better" (*Excelsior*, Mexico City, December 17, 1951), government statistics—not to mention the most casual glance at the Mexican people themselves—tell a different story.

LIVING CONDITIONS

Only a couple of weeks before the Aleman statement, Gilberto Loyo, then head of the government Bureau of Statistics (now Minister of Economy in the new government of Ruiz Cortines), told a round table that 40.6% of the economically active population have incomes which, translated into dollars on an annual basis, amount to under \$139 a year; 45.3% have incomes between \$139 and \$416 a year; 14% receive

annual
14% of
the go
two-ha
\$1,389.
In r
capita,
econom
\$135. I
ita ince
\$1,436-
Loyo c
commu
ita ann
\$34.16,
The
gard to
come.
dex, w
true sit
penses
ico Cit
four a
with a
rean v
these f
manuf
below
data c
omy.
ing cl
For ex
of agri
51 dec
level.
as litt
month,
cuts in
timate
receive
from 6
to the

annual incomes above \$416. Only 14% of the working force—in which the government includes capitalists too—have annual incomes of over \$1,389.

In 1950 the annual income per capita, as distinguished from the economically active population, was \$135. In the same year the per capita income in the United States was \$1,436—nearly eleven times as much. Loyo cited various Mexican Indian communities in which the per capita annual income is \$9.42, \$23.94, \$34.16, \$46.90; in one it is \$2.75!

The situation is even worse in regard to real, rather than money income. The official cost of living index, which greatly understates the true situation, shows that living expenses of a worker's family in Mexico City have increased more than four and a half times since 1939, with a one-third rise since the Korean war. Even on the basis of these faulty figures, real wages in manufacturing in 1951 were 15.8% below the 1939 level, according to the data of the Ministry of Economy. Other sections of the working class have fared even worse. For example, real minimum wages of agricultural workers had by 1950-51 declined to 55.4% of the 1939 level. Teachers, some of whom earn as little as 206 pesos (\$23.79) a month, have suffered such drastic cuts in real salaries that it was estimated they would have had to receive increases in 1951 ranging from 61 to 182% to bring them up to the 1939 level of real income.

How well the Mexican people are eating may be judged by the fact that, according to a study of the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America, per capita consumption of the three staple items in the Mexican diet, corn, beans and wheat, was lower in 1944-48 than in 1925-29. Lest it be thought that the Mexican people have developed a taste for meat and milk, it should be said that the taste is undoubtedly there, but not the purchasing power. A study of the government-controlled National Bank of Foreign Commerce shows that per capita meat consumption was 30% less in 1949 than the average for the years 1935-39. And the largest private bank, the National Bank of Mexico, estimated that per capita milk consumption in the Federal District, which includes Mexico City, had dropped from 80 liters per year in 1940 to 60 liters in 1952. The bank adds that "it is likely that the drop has been larger in the case of the economically weak groups. . . ." (*Review of the Economic Situation of Mexico*, November 1952).

The catastrophic decline in the living standards of the vast majority of the Mexican people is only barely intimated in the latest U.N. economic study of Latin America which states that "employees, laborers and small entrepreneurs [including peasants] accounted for 62.9% of total consumption in 1939, and only 48.7% in 1952," while the share of those receiving profits, interest and rent increased correspondingly.

(Economic Commission for Latin America, *Economic Survey for Latin America, 1951-52*, p. 118.) This almost exactly parallels the shift in the distribution of national income reported in the same study.

The most eloquent commentary on the situation of the Mexican people, thanks to Wall Street domination and the short-circuiting of agrarian reform, is the annual seasonal mass emigration of agricultural workers and peasants, estimated at 1,500,000 in 1952 and expected to be much higher this year. Most of them cross the border illegally in search of work in the United States. Besides the loss of agricultural manpower that this involves for a country that is compelled to import food, the tragic exodus means that these people find the peonage wages paid them in the States and conditions which the *New York Times* (March 25, 1951) compared to those of Negro slavery a hundred years ago, more attractive than what faces them in their own country. And for American employers these Mexicans constitute a cheap abundant labor supply that is used to beat down the general level of farm wages.

The cold fact is that behind the glittering tourist facade of Mexico City and Acapulco, an entire nation—except for a handful of the conspicuously rich and a thin middle-class layer—lives in abysmal poverty and wretchedness, 70% lacking uncontaminated drinking water, the vast majority without plumbing,

electric lights, medical care, or other elementary decencies.

As in other colonial and semi-colonial countries, sub-human living standards and economic backwardness are products of the feudal heritage and of the crimes of foreign imperialist exploiters. In Mexico's case the Spanish conquest was followed by the United States conquest. The aggressive predatory war of 1846-48, by which the slaveholders' Washington government seized more than half of our southern neighbor's territory—loot which later was coined into billions for the North American capitalists—left Mexico a mutilated torso in an economic sense. In the last quarter of the nineteenth and first decade of the twentieth centuries the reactionary Porfirio Diaz dictatorship opened Mexico to a second large-scale invasion, this time by U.S. and British capital, which further plundered the country while helping to keep it locked in the vise of semi-feudal economic relations.

The Mexican Revolution, which opened in 1910, was agrarian, anti-feudal, anti-imperialist. As William Z. Foster has pointed out, it was "the highest expression" of the struggles of the Latin-American masses and "the most successful assault yet delivered against the allied big landowners, reactionary capitalists and foreign imperialists." (*Outline Political History of the Americas*, p. 303.) The revolution reached its peak under President Lazaro Cardenas (1934-

who, in response to great mass struggles of the workers and peasants and to the world anti-fascist conflict, distributed more than twice as much land to the peasants as all his predecessors combined and nearly twice as much as his two successors combined. Cardenas struck major blows at foreign imperialism by expropriating and nationalizing the U.S. and British-owned oil industry and ousting alien capital from most of the railroads and from important positions in agriculture.

Nevertheless, because the Mexican Revolution was led by the bourgeoisie and not the working class, both its agrarian and anti-imperialist aspects fell far short of their bourgeois-democratic goals. And under pressure from Wall Street and Washington, Cardenas' successors, Avila Camacho (1940-46) and Aleman (1946-52), especially the latter, emasculated some of the revolution's major achievements and gave to the whole course of social development a reactionary capitalist stamp.

From an annual average of 129,000 peasants who received land under Cardenas, the figure dropped to 6,446 under Aleman (up to September 30, 1952). At the same time the reverse process, concentration of land ownership in the hands of a few and landlessness for the many, steadily advanced. Today 2,000,000 peasants—about 40 percent of the economically active agricultural population—either have no land, or have less than one hectare (approximately two and a half acres) of arable soil,

or have no means to work the land they have. On the other hand, the real beneficiaries of the Aleman land policy have included such "Mexican peasants" as William Randolph Hearst and his heirs; William Lewis Stevens, and William Adams, Jr.

The retreat from agrarian reform has been closely linked to the surrender to Yankee imperialism. This has been manifested not only in the pro-Washington—which means pro-war—foreign policy, but in the domestic policy of facilitating the three-pronged advance of U.S. capital into the Mexican economy: through investments, loans, and increased control of foreign trade.

Mexico is today an economically occupied country. Wall Street monopolies are deforming the entire course of its development and intensifying its economic dependence on the United States. Figures cited by the U.S. Department of Commerce *Survey of Current Business* show that despite the sharp increase in foreign—preponderantly U.S.—private investments in Mexico in the post-war period, American capitalists have actually been taking more money out of Mexico in the form of profits and interest than they have been putting in. In fact, in the one year of 1951 profits and interest of \$42,000,000 were \$5,000,000 more than the total new U.S. net investment for the three-year period 1949-51. (*Economic Survey for Latin America* 1951-52, pp. 154, 160.)

A significant change has occurred in the pattern of new foreign direct

investment: a shift from the traditional imperialist favorites—the extractive industries, electric power, transport and communications—to manufacturing and distribution. To some extent this shift has also occurred in several other Latin-American countries, notably Brazil. Manufacturing, which in 1940 represented only 6.7% of the total foreign direct investment in Mexico, had by 1950 risen to 26.1% and had become the number one area of foreign capital penetration in Mexico. Commerce showed a parallel increase. Though the total United States investment in manufacturing is less than the Mexican, U.S. Big Business, by associating with it a sector of Mexican capital as junior partner, *has now acquired the dominant position in Mexican industry as a whole.*

Does this new emphasis on manufacturing mean that imperialism is changing its spots, and instead of exploiting the colonies and semi-colonies as sources of raw materials and keeping them undeveloped, is now promoting the industrialization of Mexico and possibly other Latin-American countries? By no means. Wall Street capital has been introducing into Mexico assembly-plant *ersatz* industrialization. One can buy—that is, a small sector of the Mexican public can buy—cars, refrigerators, radios, tractors and other products “made” in Mexico. But these are mere assembly jobs, put together from parts imported from the United States. In addition, U.S. capital is concentrating on certain light

consumers' goods industries catering chiefly to that small minority who have profited from the war and postwar boom. In this way U.S. goods receive a Mexican label and circumvent Mexican tariff walls. And besides siphoning generous profits out of the country, American capitalists are using customary gangster methods to force out independent Mexican manufacturers already established in various light industries.

This has nothing in common with balanced industrial development which furthers economic independence and higher living standards for the masses of the people. Is U.S. capital creating a heavy industry in Mexico? Is it creating a machinery industry? The answer is no. Without heavy industry, especially machine-building, there can be no economic independence under capitalist conditions. As for living standards, we have already seen what blessings Wall Street-sponsored “industrialization” has brought the overwhelming majority of the Mexican people.

Washington's loans use different means to accomplish the same ends. In this case the objective is twofold: to bind Mexico more tightly to the U.S. market irrespective of lower prices elsewhere, and to prevent the Mexicans from using any significant portion of these credits granted under conditions determined by the United States government for industrial projects. Of the total of \$382,500,000 received by the Mexican government from 1941 till the

end of
Export
domina
Recons
only 10
facturin
stunted
chunk
and co
the bu
desired
outs to
eign to
the Me
Teleph
The
trade.
United
two-thi
import
and po
has ris
ports t
of any
to this
to 1941
able co
then, c
unfavo
In re
signific
years.
state r
ernmer
tration
rights
signed
additic
for the
15 to
years.
has be

end of 1951, chiefly from the U.S. Export-Import Bank and the U.S.-dominated International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, only 10.5% was assigned for manufacturing (a mere 2.4% for the stunted steel industry). The biggest chunk was allocated for transport and communications, which includes the building of strategic highways desired by the Pentagon, and hand-outs to the incredibly inefficient foreign telephone trust, controlled by the Morgan-dominated International Telephone and Telegraph Co.

The situation is similar in foreign trade. In the 1935-39 period the United States accounted for almost two-thirds of the value of Mexico's imports and exports. But in the war and post-war periods the percentage has risen to more than 80—in imports this is the highest percentage of any country in the world. Thanks to this situation, Mexico, which up to 1941 enjoyed a consistently favorable commercial balance, has since then, except for two years, had an unfavorable balance.

In regard to oil too there has been significant retreat in the last few years. Though the oil industry is a state monopoly, the Aleman government encouraged foreign penetration via drilling and exploitation rights to U.S. firms. Contracts signed with these firms provide, in addition to complete reimbursement for their investment, a guarantee of 15 to 18% profit for twenty-five years. This backdoor penetration has become so extensive that in June,

1952 a leading deputy of the government party, Natalio Vazquez Palares, chairman of the oil commission of the Chamber of Deputies, in an exceptional act of defiance of the party bosses, publicly charged that the contracts with U.S. corporations were violating the Mexican Constitution and in effect nullifying the expropriation decree of former President Cardenas.

RESISTANCE TO U.S. IMPERIALISM

What resistance has developed to the economic and political encroachments of American imperialism and their domestic concomitant of hunger for the millions? An outstanding expression of that resistance was the defeat of Washington's attempt to impose a new military pact on Mexico. The struggle against the pact was spearheaded by the five democratic opposition parties. These were at that time supporting among them three different candidates for the Presidency, but on the issue of the pact they united. This and the activity of the Mexican peace movement, represented by the National Council of Peace Partisans, were important factors in crystallizing public sentiment and frustrating Washington's plans. At the same time it must be recognized that the Mexican government's refusal to sign on the Pentagon's dotted line was not the consequence of any large-scale mass campaign. Moreover, both the organized peace

movement and the only two parties that actively fought the pact, the Popular and Communist Parties, are relatively weak. And the labor movement was largely immobilized by its reactionary leadership.

Nevertheless, if despite these weaknesses, the pact was defeated, this was because the organized campaign operated on the basis of the overwhelming sentiment of the Mexican people and in addition, ran parallel with the interests of the developing national bourgeoisie.

Anti-U.S. sentiment is imbibed by Mexicans with their mothers' milk: this is perhaps more true of them than of any other Latin-American people. The war of 1846-48 and the U.S. invasion of Veracruz in 1914 are recalled by Mexicans as if they happened only a couple of years ago. The spoliation of Mexico's natural resources—its oil, metallic minerals and hydroelectric power—by U.S. trusts; the invasion of industry and commerce by Wall Street capital; the slave conditions to which Mexican agricultural workers in the United States are subjected; the chauvinist barbarities against Mexican-Americans; and the cultural corruption brought into Mexico by Hollywood films and other made-in-U.S.A. products—all these have left, not scars, but open wounds. In the minds of the overwhelming majority of Mexicans the United States is traditionally enemy number one. And if, despite the democratic sympathies of the people, there was considerable resistance to Mexican

participation in the just, liberating war against the fascist Axis, how much greater today is opposition to serving as a Wall Street mercenary in its reactionary adventures in Korea or anywhere else!

Add to this two other elements: the deep-rooted peace sentiment, sharpened by the fact that more than any people of the western hemisphere—with the possible exception of the people of Paraguay—the Mexicans have experienced war on their own flesh; and the failure of the Washington-inspired anti-Communist campaign. To say that this campaign has failed ideologically and politically, that mass anti-Communism is non-existent in Mexico, is, of course, not to say that repressions against the Communist Party and other democratic forces—repressions also largely inspired by Washington—do not exist or cannot become much worse.

As for the Mexican bourgeoisie, it too was less than enthusiastic about a military pact with the United States. Many Mexican capitalists are finding that the Wall Street bear-hug is making it increasingly difficult for them to breathe. There has emerged a considerable sector of the capitalist class—chiefly small and medium capitalists—that are actively antagonistic to U.S. capital, whose competition they feel not only in the form of imported goods, but more directly in the output of American-controlled companies on their own home grounds. In size, forcefulness and anti-imperialist po-

tential
outsta
Besid
pact, fo
the rec
the sam
ico as e
winds
master
river
These
1. TH
cratic
challen
that ha
become
2. Pa
the ele
sentim
3. TH
the cit
March
4. TH
ple fro
Ruiz C
NEW
The
ties du
paign e
cal rea
progres
Miguel
candid
forces,
The R
govern
pressed
nant c
cribed
the Ri

entialities this group of capitalists is outstanding in Latin America.

Besides the defeat of the military pact, four other major phenomena in the recent period demonstrate that the same winds are blowing in Mexico as elsewhere in Latin America—winds that bode no good for the master in the big house across the river and his Mexican servitors. These four phenomena are:

1. The launching of new democratic bourgeois opposition parties, challenging the one-party monopoly that had so long held sway and had become reactionary.

2. Partial united front successes in the electoral campaign and the real sentiment registered in the balloting.

3. The struggle of the people of the city and state of Oaxaca in March-April 1952.

4. The concessions won by the people from the new government of Ruiz Cortines.

NEW OPPOSITION PARTIES

The rise of new opposition parties during the 1952 election campaign expressed the social and political realignment that had been in progress in Mexico since 1946, when Miguel Aleman was elected as the candidate of the united revolutionary forces, including the Communists. The Rightward shift of the Aleman government after the election expressed the betrayal by the dominant capitalist groups, prodded and bribed by the imperialists north of the Rio Grande, of the agrarian re-

form and anti-imperialism that were the heart of the Mexican Revolution. It also reflected the larger regrouping on a world scale of the victorious imperialist powers following the defeat of their Axis rivals, as well as the increased Mexican dependence on the most aggressive and reactionary of those powers, U.S. imperialism. The move to the Right was bound to alienate large sections of the population and precipitate a crisis in the one-party governmental system. The new opposition parties, four in number, all developed as dissident offshoots of the ruling group, the Revolutionary Institutional Party (P.R.I.), though they also attracted other elements.

These new parties marked a break with traditional Mexican political relationships. In the past, elections tended to assume the pattern of a struggle between a united progressive front, however beset with inner contradictions and inconsistencies, supporting a single candidate—that of the government—in defense of the achievements and further progress of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, and a reactionary grouping, usually backed by Washington, seeking to annul those achievements and prevent new advance. In the 1952 election for the first time in more than thirty years the major opposition to the government came not from the Right, but from the Left—from the more progressive sectors of the country's political forces.

At the national electoral confer-

ence of the Communist Party of Mexico in December, 1951, Dionisio Encina, General Secretary, pointed out that the formation of the new parties indicated that discontent with, and opposition to, the government's policies "are not confined to the working class, peasants and important elements of the popular masses, but have extended to significant sectors of the national bourgeoisie that in one form or another condemn and combat the pro-imperialist and reactionary policy of the Aleman government."

In fact, it required the organization of fraud on a truly colossal scale—in the Federal District alone one-half the ballot boxes were stolen—to prevent the government candidate from being defeated.

The weakness of the democratic opposition in the election lay not in numbers, but in its state of division and disunity. The Communist Party, Mexico's oldest political party and the first to raise the banner of opposition to the Aleman government when it moved to the Right, labored tirelessly to unite the independent parties as part of a broad democratic and anti-imperialist coalition to function during and after the election campaign. This bore fruit, not only in the unity achieved on the issue of the military pact, but in the partial successes in the electoral struggle as a whole. A united-front agreement between the Communist Party and the Left bourgeois Popular Party, headed by Vicente Lombardo Toldano, president of the Confederation

of Latin American Workers (C.T.A.L.), based on a common platform, a common candidate for the Presidency (Lombardo Toldano), and a joint Congressional slate, was an important pillar in the unity structure the Communists sought to erect.

This policy bore further fruit with the adoption by all the democratic opposition parties of a platform based on the original Communist-Popular Party platform. The new document, on which the parties which in fact represented a majority of the Mexican electorate waged their campaign during the closing weeks, called for a five-power peace pact and the outlawing of weapons of mass destruction, the active defense of Mexican national sovereignty, a halt to the policy of enslaving loans, renewal of agrarian reform, restoration of labor's rights, and other measures to promote the national welfare. Unfortunately the logical extension of this unity was not achieved, and Mexico witnessed the paradox of two progressive Presidential nominees and two sets of progressive Congressional candidates, all running on the same platform. For this situation, which facilitated the election steal, obstructions created by the non-Communist parties were responsible.

EVENTS IN OAXACA

Of great significance in understanding developments that are harbingers of new gigantic people's

struggle
Amer
the sp
there
ing li
strugg
in Fr
bare t
ciety.
economi
stricke
co. W
a rela
rary
state's
summer
workes
sans a
panded
verged
and th
paraly
virtual
spite th
ened t
repeal
masses
mande
In the
govern
impose
despate
ment,
cent sp

* Part
of Tehua
have been
direction
shipped
being bu
sail of M
in May,
Walter T
house and
of the Pa

struggles in Mexico and Latin America are the events in Oaxaca in the spring of 1952. What happened there was one of those sudden searing lightning flashes that, like the struggle around the Stavisky scandals in France in the early thirties, lays bare the rottenness of an entire society. Oaxaca* is one of the most economically backward, poverty-stricken states in impoverished Mexico. What began as a conflict over a relatively minor issue—the arbitrary enactment by order of the state's corrupt governor of consumers' goods taxes that affected workers, peasants, merchants, artisans and manufacturers—quickly expanded into a stormy struggle that verged on civil war. First the city and then the state of Oaxaca were paralyzed by a general strike of virtually the entire population. Despite the fact that the governor hastened to have his dummy legislature repeal the reactionary taxes, the masses pressed forward and demanded his resignation or removal. In the face of armed assault by the governor's gunmen and martial law imposed by a motorized brigade despatched by the federal government, the people displayed magnificent spirit and held firm for nearly

two weeks. The governor later found it expedient to resign.

The Oaxaca struggle was not directly related to the issues of peace and foreign imperialist domination. Nevertheless, it struck, despite inevitable confusions, at the policy of a government whose increasingly reactionary internal course paralleled its alignment with the forces of war and imperialist oppression north of the Rio Grande.

Oaxaca is symptomatic of all of Mexico, and in a basic sense of all of Latin America. Behind the Oaxaca struggle, behind the rejection of the military pact with the United States, behind the repudiation, in fact if not in official statistics, of the Aleman government at the polls, lies the social-economic situation of the Mexican people. This situation, however great the many national differences, is typical of that vast semi-colonial hinterland, that cauldron of anti-imperialist and class struggle that is Latin America.

ADMINISTRATION OF RUIZ CORTINES

To avert new and bigger Oaxacas, President Ruiz Cortines, who during the election campaign pledged to continue the Aleman program, has found it necessary to depart from it to some extent. Measures have been adopted to check the rise in living costs, to curb monopolies and government corruption, and some victims of the Aleman political repression have been released from jail.

* Part of the state is on the strategic isthmus of Tehuantepec. Uranium mines on the isthmus have been reported as being exploited under the direction of American engineers, the uranium being shipped to the United States. A new highway being built across the isthmus to connect the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific Ocean was described in May, 1950, by the then U. S. ambassador, Walter Thurston, as of enormous strategic importance and, when completed, a powerful auxiliary of the Panama Canal.

These steps caused Lombardo Tolodano and the Popular Party to declare that the new government had adopted the program of the democratic opposition and that the task was to help it carry out that program. The Communist Party, on the other hand, at a meeting of its Central Committee in February, 1953, rejected this position, while likewise criticizing as "mechanical and sectarian" its own original completely negative attitude toward the Ruiz Cortines government.

The Communists declared that the government's positive measures "reflected the new correlation of forces created in the country as a result of the Presidential election campaign." But the changes were still only partial and indecisive. The Communist Party proposed "to mobilize the working class, the peasants, the popular masses to demand of the new government the application of a democratic policy which benefits the interests of the nation; . . . to prevent the continuation of the reactionary anti-working class policy, the policy of national treason of the government headed by Aleman." The key factor for achieving a fundamental change is "the mobilization, unity and militant action of the masses and the united front of the masses." The Communists urged the democratic opposition parties and all other anti-imperialist forces to unite in a broad National Democratic and Anti-Imperialist Front.

How was it possible for the forces of reaction to have gained so much ground in reversing the course of

the Mexican Revolution? Foster points out:

The greatest weakness of the Mexican Revolution, from the very start, was the fact that the working class did not assume the leading role. As late as 1917, seven years after the revolution began, there were only 30,000 trade unionists in the country. The basic leadership of the revolution always rested in the hands of liberal capitalist-landlord and middle class elements, although the working class and peasantry furnished the main fighting forces for the struggle. The non-working class leadership slowed the revolution on all fronts, prevented it from realizing its limited program, and also diverted the revolution from its potentially anti-capitalist trends, especially as the working class lacked a powerful party of its own. A stronger Communist Party could have led the Mexican people to shatter imperialism and the latifundia system; it could also have laid the basis for an eventual solid advance along the road toward socialism. (*Cited Work*, p. 317.)

Lenin and Stalin have shown, and the revolutionary experience of the twentieth century has proved, that in the epoch of imperialism, bourgeois-democratic revolutions (such as the Mexican) cannot be successfully led by the bourgeoisie. *They must be led by the working class.* The bourgeoisie, feeling the hot breath of the proletariat at its back, and bound by innumerable links to the landlords and the foreign imperialists, constantly tends to compromise with them at the people's expense, to dissipate the revolution and its gains.

In
Amer
fight
fight
the fi
the fi
foldin
of the
Revol
worki

TRAD

The
a nati
ing-cla
geois-c
was at
Party
that co
worke
class p
and its
syndica
the lab
an app
measu
progre
Marxis
tion to
of the
in the
postwa
pressur
man
and fr
unions
deliver
its own
In ac
of U.S
harmfu
as well

In Mexico, as throughout Latin America, the problems converge: the fight for the people's welfare, the fight against feudalism and fascism, the fight for national liberation, and the fight for peace are one. The unfolding of this struggle is the task of the next stage of the Mexican Revolution, the stage in which the working class will learn to lead.

TRADE-UNION MOVEMENT

The trade-union movement was on a national scale a product of working-class participation in the bourgeois-democratic revolution. This was at a time when no Communist Party or even Socialist Party existed that could have helped the organized workers establish an independent class position *vis-a-vis* the bourgeoisie and its government. Under anarcho-syndicalist and reformist leadership the labor movement became in fact an appendage of the state. In large measure this persisted even when progressive elements, influenced by Marxism, came to the fore, a situation to which the opportunist errors of the Communist Party leadership in the thirties contributed. In the postwar period, partly as a result of pressure from U.S. trusts, the Aleman Administration used force and fraud to purge most of the unions of progressive leadership and delivered them into the hands of its own racketeering stooges.

In addition, the "labor lieutenants" of U.S. imperialism have played a harmful role on the Mexican scene as well as in other Latin American

countries. The old Pan-American Federation of Labor, organized in 1918 by the A. F. of L. and the chief Mexican labor center at that time, the Mexican Regional Confederation of Labor (C.R.O.M.), was used by the reactionary Gompers leadership for intervention not only in the Mexican trade union movement but in the political life of the country as well.

With the rise of the C.I.O., its leaders began to collaborate with the progressive forces in the Mexican labor movement and established fraternal relations with the Confederation of Latin American Workers (C.T.A.L.). However, after the war and especially after the Marshallization of the C.I.O. leadership and the expulsion of the progressive-led unions, the C.I.O. chieftains broke with the C.T.A.L. and swung their influence behind the Aleman Administration's reactionary labor henchmen.

In January, 1951, the top leadership of the A. F. of L., C.I.O. and the United Mine Workers joined hands—or, rather, the State Department did the joining for them—to launch at a conference in Mexico City the Inter-American Regional Organization of Workers (O.R.I.T.), affiliated to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (I.C.F.T.U.). Because of a family squabble and resentment at too obvious U.S. dictation, most of the Mexican Right-wing leaders, who had helped organize the conference, refused to affiliate to the new body. In 1952, however, the U.S. labor

chiefs made a deal with the leaders of the largest Mexican labor center, the Confederation of Workers of Mexico (C.T.M.), and O.R.I.T. headquarters were shifted from Havana to Mexico City. This reintroduced the direct influence of the U.S. labor bureaucrats into the Mexican trade-union movement.

It is a movement that, thanks to the government's reactionary policy—there is as yet no sign of a change under Ruiz Cortines—has been greatly weakened and divided into more than a dozen different centers. By and large the Left and progressive forces are outside looking in, with only one small labor center as a base. However, the perspective is by no means entirely bleak. Dissatisfaction at the virtual freezing of wages and the no-strike policy of the labor leadership is widespread. A number of recent strikes and internal union struggles show a growing disposition on the part of the workers to break the stranglehold of the Right-wing racketeers. The independent political trend that emerged in the election and remains a continuing force has also had its effect among the workers.

Much will depend on how quickly and effectively the Left and progressive forces apply broad united-front policies. In his report to the meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party in August, 1952, Dionisio Encina emphasized the importance of intensifying trade-union work, of establishing unity of action around the most urgent demands between the workers in

the progressive-led unions and those under Right-wing control. The fourth congress of the C.T.A.L., held in Santiago, Chile, last March, also pointed to united action in the factories and fields, regardless of union affiliation, as the way to change the situation in the labor movement. The workers of the United States have a direct stake in helping their Mexican brothers bring about such a change since it is part of the fight against the rapacious U.S. Big Business corporations that operate on both sides of the border.

* * *

Nowhere as in the colonies and semi-colonies is so clearly laid bare the full bankruptcy of imperialist capitalism, its repulsive, inhuman character, its incapacity to provide even a patchwork solution for the problems of mankind. Fortunately the solution of these problems is not entirely in the hands of the degenerates who fancy themselves lords of the American Century. For the Wall Street conquistadores, Latin America is a reservoir from which they draw the sinews of war, and superprofits on six billion dollars of investments. For the people of the United States, Latin America is people—160,000,000 strategic allies in the fight for peace, decent living standards and liberation. The large and brutally mistreated Mexican and Puerto Rican national minorities in the United States can become bridges, helping to link together all the peoples above and below the Rio Grande in the common struggle against the common enemy.

The

of Bo
publi
Bolivi
news
It is
in Bo
—the

In t
nist
people
to poi
the
saved
threat

WHA
FOI

In c
of go
curre
tary a
upris
class,
army,
Rosca

* Ni
ing the

What Must Be Done in Bolivia

The Secretariat, Central Committee, C.P. of Bolivia

The Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Bolivia issued the statement published below on December 27, 1952. It was published on December 31, 1952 in the newspaper La Nación, organ of the Bolivian government, and republished, January 15-18, 1953, in the Chilean newspaper, El Siglo, from which the translation that follows was made. It is brought to our readers as an historic document illuminating conditions in Bolivia, and shedding light upon the whole situation in Latin America—the Editor.

In this historic hour the Communist Party addresses the Bolivian people to make known its views and to point out the only ways by which the National Revolution can be saved from the serious dangers threatening it.

WHAT THE PEOPLE FOUGHT FOR ON APRIL 9, 1952

In contrast to all previous changes of government, the one which occurred on April 9 was no mere military *coup*. It was a genuine people's uprising led by our heroic working class, which routed the reactionary army, smashed the ruling of the *Rosca*,* and brought into power the

present government leaders. *The people fought and gave their lives to impose a new state of affairs.*

The people took up arms on April 9 to impose a democratic way of life, with full guarantees for the free functioning of the trade unions and the popular parties; to achieve the nationalization of the mines; to break up the landed estates and give land to the peasants; to stimulate the country's progress by building up a national industry that would assure work and better living conditions for all Bolivians; to put an end to our country's status as a semi-colony and to enable it to live in freedom and respect; to stop Bolivia from being a tool of the Yankee warmongers and to place it firmly and with dignity in the

* Name popularly given to the group dominating the tin industry.—Ed.

camp of democracy and peace.

For that alone—for its revolutionary and patriotic content—the April 9 uprising deserves the name of National Revolution.

WHAT HAS BEEN WON SINCE APRIL 9

More than eight months have passed since the heroic days of April. A survey of events that have occurred during this period reveals the following gains, which are of undeniable historic significance: 1) the taking up of arms by the people and their victory over the armed forces of the pro-imperialist *Rosca*; 2) the organization of a Workers' Center; 3) the existence, in great measure, of democratic guarantees, thanks to which the popular parties and mass organizations have organized and are functioning; 4) the nationalization of the mines; and 5) the right of universal suffrage.

WHAT MUST STILL BE DONE

But the gains made since April 9 are only a small part of the task that has to be accomplished. In the first place, we must firmly consolidate our gains up to now. In the second place, we must advance boldly to achieve broader aims.

The people in arms made possible the new state of affairs. Only the armed people will be able to defend the Revolution and assure its final success. For that reason, the Govern-

ment must clearly understand that we Bolivians *need no other armed force but the one which arose out of the April 9th uprising*. Consequently, instead of continuing to maintain or trying to reorganize other armed forces outside the control of the working class, the Government—in accordance with promises made on numerous occasions by President Paz Estenssoro—must recognize the urgent need of giving more arms to the workers and peasants. The growing alliance between workers and peasants will be greatly strengthened by the organization of a people's militia controlled and led by the workers' and peasants' trade unions. That is the bulwark of our revolution and the sole guarantee of an effective peace within the country.

The heroic sacrifices of the working class gave our people victory on April 9. In the road that lies ahead the working class will continue to occupy its vanguard position. That it why it is in the vital interest of all Bolivian patriots to strengthen the organization and unity of our heroic working class. The unity of Bolivian workers is on the point of being achieved through the Bolivian Workers' Center (C.O.B.). But this unity, which our people ardently desire, is now menaced by repeated attempts to undermine the class independence of the Bolivian proletariat and to introduce anti-democratic practices into the trade unions. Consequently, our revolution demands that the Workers' Center fight energetically

for the
effecti
tena
line, s
ing c
trade-
d) g
pation
politic
As re
ing-cl
must
sent
gover
repres
same
ly un
tween
gover
new
as we
ment
must
ing cl
can n
achiev
the v
defen
long
from
anti-i
As
mine
point
Octol
dated
of th
Rosca
ment
coun
of th

for the following aims: a) broad and effective trade-union unity; b) maintenance of an independent political line, serving the interests of the working class; c) permanent practice of trade-union democracy at all levels; d) greater and permanent participation of the working class in the political leadership of the country. As regards this final point, the working-class ministers in the cabinet must always realize that they represent the Workers' Center in the government and are not government representatives in the C.O.B. At the same time, however, it must be clearly understood that the relations between the working class and the government are now relations of a new type in our country, inasmuch as we now have in Bolivia a government of a new type. These relations must be those of two allies: the working class and the present government can march united in the struggle to achieve our country's liberation; and the working class will support and defend the government's work so long as this work does not depart from the aims of the agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution.

As far as nationalization of the mines is concerned, it is necessary to point out that the great step of October 31 has not yet been consolidated in all its aspects. The transfer of the mines from the hands of the *Rosca* clique to those of the government does not yet mean that our country has ceased to be a satellite of the war economy of the United

States. The government, after nationalizing the mines, has confined itself to declaring that it will sell our minerals to whoever wants to buy them; but, instead of deciding to sell them to those countries which need them in order to build a world of peace and well-being, it has promised to limit these sales to the needs of the U.S. market. In other words, it will sell to those who have always protected the *Rosca* clique and do not want the existence of an independent Bolivia. This attitude not only infringes on our national sovereignty and keeps Bolivia in the war camp, it directly affects the economic situation of our people; for without active international trade and without a native industry of our own, scarcity of commodities and inflation enormously increase the cost of living. Even more: the promise to keep our country chained to the North American market furnishes the enemies of our country with the most effective weapon for stifling the revolution by means of hunger and for preparing a counter-revolutionary *coup d'état*.

Nationalization of the mines must, therefore, be accompanied by the immediate establishment of diplomatic and trade relations with the countries in the camp of peace and by the sale of our minerals on the free market. This will constitute the first practical step designed to ward off economic crisis and to consolidate our national sovereignty.

AGRARIAN REFORM CANNOT BE POSTPONED

Bolivia's future does not, however, depend exclusively on the sale of our minerals. There is no reason why we should resign ourselves to being eternally a single-commodity country. Our soil can furnish us with all the articles of construction necessary for our subsistence. If this has not hitherto been the case, it is because the imperialists and our own landlords have distorted our economy so as to serve their own exclusive interests. Nationalization of the mines and the sale of our minerals on the free market are not enough. The National Revolution—if it is to be one in fact as well as name—must therefore proceed with *agrarian reform*. That means: *confiscation of the landed estates and the free distribution of land to the working peasants—farm laborers, tenant farmers, poor and middle farmers—for them to work individually or collectively, as they choose*. This task can no longer be postponed. There are three basic reasons why it must be carried through at once: 1) to end the semi-feudal form of exploitation based on absolute rent (which is profit made by absentee landlords without any capital investment and simply by virtue of holding title to the land; 2) to save the people from hunger and crisis; 3) to disarm the reactionary conspiracy of the *Rosca*, the big landlords, the Falangists, and

the Trotskyites, who have spread the slogan not to sow the land, with the deliberate aim of sabotaging the revolution. In this way, too, the economic power of the enemies of the people will be liquidated once and for all.

The Government must clearly recognize that so long as the country remains in a semi-feudal state, there will be no way of laying the foundations of our economic independence or of assuring our people's advance along the road to effective material and cultural progress.

Agrarian reform, liquidating once and for all the backward forms of life and exploitation in the countryside, is the most important step that remains to be taken in the struggle for our national liberation. It concerns not only the peasants but the nation as a whole: the manufacturers will benefit, because with the increase in purchasing power of more than two million peasants, they will be able to enjoy a rapid increase in the sale of their manufactured goods; the merchants and professionals will also benefit for the same reason. Within a short time the whole country will enjoy the advantages of this great step, because if the economic conditions of the majority of the Bolivian people are improved, tax receipts and domestic business will increase. Thus it will be possible to carry out a real program of improvement in the entire economic life of the nation.

THE
MU

Agr
basic
power
conspi
with
Rosca
menac
Falan
an So
tionar
trated
Move
aided
and t
seek t
moral
able
plans,
ment
for th
April
they
Gover
junta.
either
Bolivi
ists ar
velop
by m
Henc
effect
waver
length
ual"
liquid
or "r
must
subst

THE IMPERIALIST CONSPIRACY MUST BE CRUSHED!

Agrarian reform is, moreover, the basic solution in the face of the powerful menace presented by the conspiracy of Yankee imperialism with our own big landlords and *Rosca* clique. The spearhead of that menace at the present time is the *Falange Socialista Boliviano* (Bolivian Socialist Phalanx) and the reactionary elements which have infiltrated the National Revolutionary Movement (M.N.R.). These are aided by the Trotskyites (*poristas*) and their provocations. All of them seek to bring about hunger and demoralization so as to create a favorable situation for their putschist plans, hoping thus to undo in a moment everything that has been done for the people and the country since April 9. They want things to be as they were under the Urriolagoitia Government and that of the military junta. The choice, therefore, is clear: either this anti-popular and anti-Bolivian conspiracy of the imperialists and the *Rosca* is allowed to develop, or it is nipped in the bud by means of the agrarian reform. Hence, this reform must be put into effect immediately, without fear or wavering. To all those who advise lengthy preliminary studies or "gradual" methods of agrarian reform by liquidating "non-productive" estates or "mechanizing" untilled lands, we must reply as follows: any delay or substitute method is merely a way

of protecting the reactionary conspiracy, of giving the agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution a stab in the back.

LAY THE FOUNDATION FOR THE COUNTRY'S INDUSTRIALIZATION

The sale of our minerals on the free market and a consistent program of agrarian reform must be followed by the immediate industrialization of the country. This step will enable us to provide the main articles of consumption and create new items for export. Consequently, it is imperative that the government lose no time in setting up a Planning Commission charged with making a thorough study of the industrialization of the country.

History knows only one course of development — only one road — by which mankind can march forward. We all know that this road is not free of obstacles and difficulties. But the experience of all periods and all peoples, as well as our own experience, shows us that the only way to overcome these obstacles is by resolutely coping with them. Every attempt to look for short cuts, to halt midway, to make compromises with the enemy or to delay solutions will ultimately prove futile and harmful, for the enemies of progress do not rest or remain quiet. Bolivar and Sucre, when they won national independence for us, had to reject flatly any compromise idea of giving us a

mere protectorate instead of a republic. The great uprising of Tupac Amaru and Tupac Katari lost time and momentum in the vain effort to make the King of Spain and his representatives listen to reason.

Since April 9, Bolivia has traveled a considerable way along the road of true independence. What is more, it has only begun the journey. Without having yet completed its first stage, the National Revolution has entered a period of marking time. The facts enumerated above indicate that it is not simply a question of a breathing-spell but of a partial truce which benefits the enemy. This indecision must therefore end. The forward march must be resumed: the great task begun by the working class and the people on April 9 must be completed.

But the waverings and weaknesses impeding the advance of the revolution are not exclusively the result of personal shortcomings in some of the government representatives. A people's revolution cannot be the exclusive work of a group of men or of a single party. A people's revolution is the work of the people themselves—of all progressive and militant elements of the people. It can only be the result of common efforts on the part of all the popular parties, of all the progressive forces, and especially of the organized working class in close alliance with the peasantry. That is why the victorious uprising of April 9 was not carried through by one party alone: the en-

tire Bolivian people fought side by side with the working class and the active members of the M.N.R. The Communist Party, vanguard of the working class, also took an active and outstanding part in it; so too did non-party workers and peasants, men and women, young and old—all united in a supreme effort to free Bolivia forever from the domination of the *Rosca* and imperialism. Similarly, the immense majority of Bolivians irrespective of party, class, opinion, or religious beliefs were and are in complete accord concerning the nationalization of the mines.

Furthermore, this move is supported by all the peoples of South America, particularly the working class and the peasantry, who see in the April 9 uprising an example for them to follow in their anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle. The revolution begun on April 9 is, therefore, a revolution which belongs not only to the Bolivian people but to all the oppressed peoples of our Continent; and it is part of the great front of world struggle for the national liberation of all colonial peoples subjugated by aggressive Anglo-American imperialism. If in the past Bolivia was the first in point of time to rebel against the hateful Spanish yoke, today it has placed itself at the head of the peoples of America, raising the banner of economic and social independence against the shameful yoke of North American imperialism. This means that if the Bolivian Revolution ful-

fills the
liberty
copy
the C
revolu
cies. I
can b
resolu
peace
The
ter of
its int
theref
unite
All th
sive e
the a
revolu
victori
zation
dersta
throug
for a
ment
tion d
be we
organ
tion i
and p
necess
ized a
otic F
The v
to no
isolati
lution
and co
contra
ing fo
and u
uprisi

fills the people's aspirations for peace, liberty, and well-being, it will occupy an honorable place alongside the Chinese Revolution and the revolutions in the People's Democracies. It means, moreover, that Bolivia can become the most consistent and resolute standard-bearer of world peace against war in the Americas.

The popular and national character of the Bolivian Revolution and its international significance demand, therefore, that our entire people unite to bring it to full realization. All the people, especially the progressive elements, must understand that the agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution has not ended with the victorious uprising or the nationalization of the mines. They must understand that it will not be carried through to completion by waiting for a single party or for the government alone to achieve it. The revolution does not come by itself; it must be won. But to win it, we must organize it. If the National Revolution is the concern of all patriotic and progressive elements, it is also necessary that all of these be organized and united in a powerful *Patriotic Front of National Liberation*. The vacillations we have observed up to now arise above all from the isolation and dispersion of the revolutionary forces. Unswerving aims and consistent deeds require, on the contrary, the unity of all the fighting forces, backed by an organized and united people. If the April 9 uprising was the work of the united

people who took to arms, the Revolution of National Liberation, an agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution, must therefore be the work of a *National Front of Liberation*—a broad united front of the people against imperialism and the *Rosca*.

That is why the Communist Party, which from its formation at the beginning of 1950, has oriented the struggle of our people toward national liberation, today issues this fervent appeal to all the progressive elements to set up without delay this great *Patriotic Front of National Liberation*. We appeal to the National Revolutionary Movement (M.N.R.), to the anti-imperialist elements in the other parties, to the Bolivian Workers' Center, to the peasantry, to the revolutionary students, to the progressive intellectuals, to all non-party men and women who are anti-imperialist and patriotic, to all those who long for a free and prosperous country and a better life, to all those who love peace, happiness, and the well-being of our children. We appeal to you all to form a powerful *Patriotic Front of National Liberation*, on whose banner of struggle will be inscribed the following tasks arising from the historic moment in which we are living:

- 1) Sale of our minerals on the free market.

- 2) Agrarian reform, expropriating the landed estates by means of confiscation and giving free land to the farm laborers, tenant farmers,

poor and middle farmers, and the communes.

3) State monopoly of foreign trade.

4) Effective workers' control in the nationalized mines.

5) Greater participation of the working class in the government.

6) Strengthening of the people's militia, on the basis of a democratic and unified structure; and furnishing more arms to the workers' and peasants' trade unions.

7) Guarantees for the full development of trade-union unity and independence. Broad democratic liberties for the people; vigorous measures of revolutionary vigilance against the conspiratorial forces of imperialism and the *Rosca*.

8) Denunciation and abrogation of the shameful and illegal Keenleyside colonization plan and of the war treaties imposed by North American imperialism at the Conferences of Bogotá, Rio de Janeiro, and Washington. Expulsion of the United States military mission, whose presence is an insult to our national sovereignty.

9) Establishment of diplomatic

and trade relations with the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, and the People's Democracies, as the only way of assuring the purchase of our minerals on favorable terms and the independent development of our national economy.

10) A foreign policy directed unswervingly at taking Bolivia out of the war camp and into the camp of peace, as a means of insuring the further development of our National Revolution.

* * *

This is the program we must fight for, united and without faltering, in order to safeguard the future of Bolivia, crush the conspiracy of imperialism and the *Rosca*, and consolidate the historic National Revolution begun on April 9.

This is the program that will give the Bolivian people peace, land, culture, and a better life.

Let us not forget that our National Anthem teaches us the road to follow: "Let us preserve the lofty name of our country in glorious splendor and at its altars let us again swear to die rather than to live as slaves."

The Left-Led Unions and Labor Unity, II

By John Swift

If the present independent progressive and Left-led unions are to play an important and special role in the struggle for labor unity, two things are necessary:

1. They must survive all current attempts to destroy them.

2. They must operate on more than "their own union" perspective. Their outlook must encompass the labor movement as a whole and their particular relationship to it.

Each of these two conditions is dependent on the other. A broader perspective is impossible without survival. Survival is impossible without a broader perspective. Given *both* conditions, however, the independent progressive unions can play an increasingly important and advanced role in the struggle for the unity of action of the nation's labor movement.

Let us briefly examine these two inter-dependent propositions. **First**, the question of survival. This is not only necessary because these unions represent important and advanced sections of the labor movement. It is necessary also in order to influence the outcome of the struggle for unity

within the Right-led unions. The existence of relatively strong bases of Left influence and leadership in a number of industries can become a factor of great importance in teaching workers in Right-led unions the need for unity with the Left, particularly in the same and allied industries.

As a practical example take the farm equipment industry. The workers are split into two major unions and a number of smaller ones. This is an extremely negative factor and has already cost these workers dearly. But when the Red-baiting, splitting leadership of the United Auto Workers took advantage of the lost Harvester strikes of a few months ago in order to raid the plants of the independent progressive United Electrical-Farm Equipment Union, it was in the interests of unity to defeat the raiders. This is exactly what the Harvester workers did.

If one were to see merely the outer shell of unity while remaining indifferent to its inner substance, one might conclude that the UE-FE victory over UAW was bad, for it perpetuated the organizational division of the Harvester workers. If one

understands, however, that *real* labor unity can never be achieved by a policy aimed at the extermination of the Left current, then the conclusion would be quite different. This would be especially true, if the UE-FE victory were seen not as a means to freeze the present situation, but precisely to unfreeze it. This victory helped bring home to all Harvester and farm implement workers that raiding and counter raiding must cease, that *all* the unions in the company chain and industry must begin to pull together. Then something really positive could emerge from the present negative situation. The workers in this industry could then begin to find their way forward, first to united action and then to organic unity.

From this it follows that there can be no basis for real labor unity, that is, for unity cutting across ideological and political differences, without defeating the present Right-wing attempt to exterminate the Left-wing and specifically the policy of raiding. So long as the Right-wing splitters look upon the independent progressive-led unions as prey to be devoured, so long will a policy of raiding prevail as against a policy of unity. This is true even where the rank and file of a given Right-led union are opposed to raiding. The latent opposition may never become articulate so long as the official policy of raiding appears to be "successful."

Raiding, if it is to cease completely, therefore must first cease to "pay",

even in the narrow, distorted Right-wing sense. There is evidence that it is ceasing to "pay." The UE-FE record of beating back raiding is matched by that of the splendid record of the Mine Mill Union, while the Fur and Leather Union and the West Coast Longshoremens have maintained their strength intact. The uproar which took place at the last IUE convention over the huge sums squandered on raiding and the action of the General Electric workers at Lynn in calling for unity with the UE indicate that raiding is losing its support even in the IUE, the union whose very origin is due to splitting and raiding.

* * *

We are now entering into a period of sharper class battles. This will confront the independent progressive-led unions with both the opportunity and necessity to pursue a more vigorous, militant and affirmative struggle for labor unity. Their own future and role will be determined by the extent and effectiveness of this struggle.

It is not enough that these unions have a perspective of "holding their own" or even of strengthening themselves, as important as that is. It is necessary that they operate with a longer range perspective in mind. This cannot be based on permanent separation from the rest of the labor movement. These unions did not leave the C.I.O. as a matter of choice. They have always been for a united

labor
dep
led
shou
neces
ly de
shou
of c
devo
of la
proc
tions
the i
the
To
unity
unio
sive-
ly ar
these
obje
for i
tang
is n
tend
The
itself
abili
unio
of th
pora
is by
but
esser
surre
cies
only
whic
unio
the
men

labor movement. They became independent because they were expelled by the Right-wing. A virtue should not be made now out of this necessity. Sometimes this is mistakenly done. The desire of these unions should be to return to the main body of organized labor, not as lambs devoured by the rapacious wolves of labor disunity, but as part of a process of uniting all wings and sections of the labor movement around the immediate interests of labor and the nation.

Toward this goal of real labor unity, militant trade unionists in all unions and the independent progressive-led unions must work consciously and patiently. Every member of these unions should be won for this objective and taught how to work for it. In order, however, to make tangible headway in this direction it is necessary to combat two wrong tendencies in the Left-led unions. The first wrong tendency expresses itself in a lack of confidence in the ability of the independent progressive unions to survive the concerted blows of the Right-wing raiders, the corporations and the government. This is by no means a prevalent opinion, but it does exist in a few places. In essence it advocates the complete surrender of the positions and policies of the Left. It sees this as "the only way out," and as the means by which the independent Left-led unions can "merge" once again with the mainstream of the labor movement.

When the exponents of this position use the word "merge" they do not mean "unite," "join together," "coalesce." What they really mean is "dissolve." To merge two different qualities, whether chemical or political, is to create a new quality, in this instance, a new and different situation in the labor movement. This was what happened when Right-Left unity helped form the C.I.O. in 1935. But a self-imposed dissolution of Left bases, no matter how it is dressed up in "unity" garb, is still dissolution. It therefore could not bring about a new and more favorable situation in the labor movement. If anything, it could only worsen and prolong the present divisive state of affairs.

Let us take a concrete situation. The division in the ranks of the farm equipment workers must find its complete resolution someday in the unification of these workers within one union. This could take many different forms. But, is organic unity a practical consideration at this time? How can it be, when the UAW leadership continues to conduct a war of extermination against the Left?

A single united union certainly will come for these workers, but only *after* the policy of raiding, splitting and hysterical Red-baiting has come to an end. It will come only after the Left wins the *democratic right* to exist within the labor movement and to advocate its own advanced policies. Any other concept of Right-Left organic unity represents capitulation.

lation and the betrayal of working-class principle.

To raise the question of organic unity prematurely and carelessly is to detract from the more immediate and practical steps toward unity. These point in the direction of achieving *unity of action* as the most important and most solid foot-hold from which to move forward to more advanced forms of unity. The tendency to jump stages, to see organic unity as the starting point instead of the end result of a whole period and process of struggle, is to defeat the very objective of labor unity. This is particularly true where Left-led unions are involved. But it is also true more generally.

The struggle for C.I.O.-A. F. of L. organic unity would be much further advanced, for example, if more concrete steps were taken to pave the way to it by *united action today*. It is just such united action that the labor reformists fear. They are afraid of the *movement of workers* for unity, wanting unity to be only a product of their own slick maneuvers on top. But without the active participation of the workers on a shop, local union and industry-wide basis, real labor unity cannot be attained.

Unless the tendency to put the cart of organic unity before the horse of united front action is defeated, it will be impossible to cope with the other equally false and even more prevalent tendency in the independent progressive unions. This tendency takes the opposite tack. It

views the situation in the labor movement as fixed and frozen. It sees the large Right-led unions and the smaller Left-led ones and believes that "never the twain shall meet". It sees no sense in talking about unity or in fighting for unity. It looks upon all this as a utopian dream. It believes that the job of each of the independent progressive unions is to "hoe its own row" and to keep clear of "entanglements,"—meaning by this, all close ties with other sections of the labor movement including the other Left-led unions. Thus, it believes in "going it alone" with a vengeance and letting "life decide the future."

This perspectiveless perspective, this strange trade-union version of "rugged individualism," is defended from the lofty perch of so-called "principle" as well as from the terra firma of so-called "practicality." But as we shall show, this position is neither practical nor principled.

The Leftist rejection of the struggle for labor unity conceals a basically opportunist estimate of things, particularly of the situation in the present Right-led unions. It sees these unions as all the same with no gradations and differences between them. It sees only the Right-wing leadership of these unions and not the rank and file. Or, it sees them as one and the same. Hence it betrays a lack of confidence in the workers. It lacks confidence in the ability of the progressives to win these workers from below for a policy of unity. It lacks

confidence in the ability of the workers to impose their will for unity upon their leadership, or to change this leadership where it refuses to bow to this will.

Essentially, the Right-opportunist position of capitulation and the "Left"-sectarian position of "go it alone," have the same common source. Both exaggerate the strength of the Right-wing officialdom because they exaggerate the strength of American imperialism. Both underestimate the developing new situation in the country and the world and the growing new possibilities for winning the workers in the Right-led unions for progressive policies and real labor unity.

The Right-opportunist position of capitulation feeds the Leftist "go it alone" position. So also the other way around. The negative approach to labor unity results in a failure to speak to the rank and file of the Right-led unions. Or where such appeals are made, to have them issued in a purely perfunctory, bureaucratic and formal fashion, without feeling or conviction. It also affects the progressive-led unions themselves. It undermines their inner unity and morale. For two reasons: First, it places in jeopardy the policy of unity across ideological lines which has been carefully fostered in these unions—sometimes even to the extreme of having Left-wing militants cease fighting more vigorously for one or another progressive measure. Second, it leads some workers to the false conclusion

that it is the Left-wing which stands as an obstacle to unity.

Those independent progressive unions which made clear from the outset their position on labor unity, beat off the raiding attacks more successfully than those that did not. When the UE delegates "jumped the gun" and left the C.I.O. convention in 1948 *before* the act of their expulsion, even though the expulsion was a foregone conclusion, they made it easier for the Red-baiters to split their union. They raised a doubt in the minds of some workers as to who was responsible for the split. Thus, even from the narrower viewpoint of so-called practicality and expediency the fight for unity represents the very best policy.

* * *

This is most important to remember in the period ahead. The need for unity on the part of the independent progressive-led unions is going to arise in most urgent form. Any failure on the part of these unions to audaciously and skillfully lead the struggle for unity can have only the most dire consequence for their own survival and for the labor movement as a whole. The workers in the independent progressive unions need unity in just as vital a way as do those in the Right-led unions. Only those unions who *take the lead* in fighting for unity in every way, honestly and sincerely, and not as some "maneuver" will win the lasting respect and allegiance of the

workers. For the division in the ranks of the workers has cost them much. We are not now speaking of the big question, of the qualitatively new political role which labor could play in the nation, given a united movement. Here we are discussing the more limited question of putting up a common economic fight against the new arrogance of the corporations.

In a period of industrial boom, when the increased demand for labor power operates in the labor market to the temporary advantage of the worker, labor unity does not appear to have such supreme urgency in the eyes of the workers. In such a period the bosses are compelled to make more concessions. During the recent boom the government intervened and imposed wage controls as a means of artificially counteracting the economic factors favoring higher wages. If these controls have since been removed in the holy name of "free enterprise," the real reason is that the monopoly enterprises see the boom as swiftly coming to an end and want to restore to themselves a free hand with which to tear down past labor gains.

Already in a number of industries over-production has become a problem. This is not yet a general phenomenon. But in a number of consumer industries, in industries closely tied in with agriculture and in a number of non-ferrous metal extraction industries, this is becoming an increasing problem.

An example of what is in store for labor as the economic situation worsens can be seen by a study of the International Harvester strikes of last year. The IHC always has been one of the toughest, most vicious anti-labor corporations in the country. Whatever the Harvester workers have won in union rights and improved conditions over the years were wrested from the company in bitter battles.

A year ago this giant corporation saw its chance to strike a blow against its workers. The reason 1952 was chosen is simple. The first six months of 1952 had shown a five percent drop in the sale of farm implements as compared with the previous year. As the publication *Implement and Tractor* noted this January, "The experience of the industry during 1952 indicates the complete return of the industry to a buyer's market . . . without a single exception for any type of farm equipment." Thus, the growing symptoms of crisis in agriculture and the loss of former export markets, plus the division in the ranks of the workers, gave the Harvester Corporation its "opportunity" to take on the unions one at a time and to defeat them separately.

This is exactly what happened. Over the issue of the right to downgrade day work and retime piece-work jobs, the corporation first took on and defeated the A. F. of L. local in its Milwaukee plant, in a bitter nine week strike. Then it forced a strike on the UAW local in the Mel-

rose
mid
UE-F
same
also
temp
work
UAW
leader
and f
on t
week
and s
pelle
terms
Th
for t
the
A. F.
and t
sive
ing.
sough
feats
rallie
union
milit
cause
union
had
their
a de
They
leader
indu
It
the U
the
Othe
more
unity

rose Park, Illinois, plant. In the midst of this strike, the independent UE-FE locals, confronted with the same intransigence of the company, also "hit the bricks." Despite the attempts of the UE-FE leadership to work out a united front with the UAW during the strike, the UAW leadership broke the common front and forced the UE-FE locals to carry on the battle alone. After twelve weeks of terror, a murder frameup and starvation, the UE-FE was compelled to bow to company-dictated terms.

Thus labor disunity had "paid off" for the company in a big way, and the workers in the Right-led A. F. of L. and UAW-C.I.O. locals and those in the independent progressive UE-FE locals are doing the paying. But when the UAW splitters sought to take advantage of the defeats to raid the UE-FE, the workers rallied behind their independent union in a remarkable display of militant solidarity. They did so because they recognized that of all unions in the industry, the UE-FE had fought the hardest to preserve their gains and had tried to achieve a degree of unity during the strike. They did not blame their own union leadership for the disunity in the industry and for the defeat.

It cannot be said, however, that the UE-FE leaders saw early enough the *crucial* significance of unity. Otherwise they would have fought more vigorously and persistently for unity over a longer period of time.

They would have gone all-out in support of the Milwaukee strike. The fact is that even the progressive militant leaders of the UE-FE miscalculated in their estimate of the relationship of forces. They failed to realize that what was enough to bring victory during the war and immediate postwar boom years no longer sufficed in 1952. Unity of action plus a *new level of rank and file mass mobilization* in struggle had become burning imperatives. We shall have something further to say later about this latter necessity.

Referring to the lessons of the Harvester strike in the February issue of *March of Labor*, a leader of the UE-FE points out that "a genuine approach to unity with the UAW-C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. *long before the crisis of a strike* could have made victory possible." (Emphasis as in the original—J. S.)

The lost strikes do not represent the end of company attacks. The beast has tasted blood. It has already arrogantly informed the unions that they can expect no modifications or concessions in the escalator provisions, not even the modest ones won by the General Motors and Ford workers. Whether the company can get away with this remains to be seen. Despite the fact that the UE-FE has come back strong from its defeat, the corporation will continue to exploit the division in the ranks of the workers.

This means that unity on a chain-wide basis is now the key question.

This has been called for by the UE-FE. The same is true for workers in other company chains, such as General Electric. Here, too, the UE has taken the lead in calling for unity. The time has come for workers who are employed by the same corporation, but separated by different union affiliations, to get together in joint councils for joint consultation and action. Such a development is of critical importance and *does not require any union giving up its own individual identity, affiliation or freedom of action.* In fact, the *only* way such unity can be achieved is to make it strictly clear that organic unity is *not contemplated or proposed at this time* because the conditions for it are not yet ripe. What is being proposed as a *first step* forward toward ultimate unification is chain-wide united action of the existing unions as *presently constituted.*

That such joint action can be realized between the independent progressive unions and Right-wing led unions, is to be seen in a number of recent developments. We have already referred to the action of the I.U.E. General Electric local at Lynn. During the Harvester strike a number of U.A.W. Harvester locals voted to invite representatives of the U.E.-F.E. strikers to appear before their Harvester Council. The Milwaukee A. F. of L. local raised funds and in other ways identified itself with the U.E.-F.E. strike. In New York, Local 1227 of U.E. and Local 8 of the A. F. of L. Metal Polishers set

up a joint committee to negotiate contracts with two companies.

In 1951, the independent Mine Mill Union united the copper workers, including Right-led A. F. of L. locals, and scored a great and common strike victory. The Mine Mill Union has also been working to unite the brass workers. A first step in this direction was the convening of an inter-union conference of five locals in five American Brass Company plants. In a recently adopted Policy statement, the International Executive Board of the Mine Mill Union had this to say about the prospect of labor unity.

We in Mine Mill applaud any and all moves toward labor unity. As far as we ourselves are concerned, we believe the first need is for unity among the workers in our industry. We call attention to the steps already taken toward unity among the workers in the Connecticut brass industry, as well as the steps toward unity on the legislative front in Montana and Utah. The unions in the oil and packinghouse industries, and to some extent in the brass industry, last year pioneered the way in finding unified approaches to bargaining. This kind of unity means that all, or most of the workers in an industry present a united front to the employers. To the extent that the workers remain united around such a program, they are unbeatable.

We believe new steps can be taken in our own industry this year aimed at broadening the unity among the non-ferrous metal workers to win their bargaining goals. We intend to make it

know
we i
ing u
ers, r

Th
try-w
to be
In e
gress
they
of fi
stanc
start
tool
worl
in ri
brin
worl
it is
of c
othe
long
the
Fre
van
prin
resp
thei
C
nity
unic
sive
atm
In
key
tive
Th
tim
ferr
fur

known throughout this industry that we invite and welcome such bargaining unity with any and all metal workers, regardless of affiliation.

The issue of chain-wide and industry-wide unity in bargaining is bound to become more and more important. In every industry where the progressive and Left-led unions exist, they can do much to begin the process of fighting for unity. In many instances the problem is one which starts right in a single plant, where tool room, maintenance, or office workers are frequently to be found in rival unions. Yet little is done to bring about solidarity between these workers of different unions. Thus, it is not uncommon to see workers of one union out on strike, while other union men and women belonging to other unions continue on the job. Nor is it always their fault. Frequently nothing is done in advance of the strike to establish the principle of mutual aid and mutual respect between these workers and their organizations.

Only by utilizing every opportunity for bridging the gap between unions can the independent progressive-led unions help to change the atmosphere in the labor movement. In some industries they can play a key role, for there can be no effective all-out action without them. This is true of the West Coast maritime industry. It is true of the non-ferrous metal industry and of the fur and leather industries. It is true

of the farm equipment and electrical industries.

The independent progressive unions have begun to project the slogan of labor unity and to fight for it. But they have only begun. This struggle has not yet permeated all the thinking and work of these unions. It is not yet seen as the *major* task, requiring that type of conviction, determination and energy for which the Left-wing and progressives are so renowned.

Not every opportunity for solidarity and unity is seized. Too few steps are taken by the independent progressive unions to *prove* their solidarity with the workers in the Right-led unions when these are engaged in battle with the companies. There still are tendencies to view such struggles as "phony." What seems to be forgotten is the simple truth that the struggle of the workers with the bosses is never "phony," even where the leadership may be. The I.U.E., for example, has split and raided all across the country. But when its workers go out on strike, as was recently the case in Syracuse, New York, they are workers engaged in a class battle and must be given every support. When the Left-wing in the labor movement learns to fight consistently for this kind of trade-union solidarity, it will do more in practice to teach the workers the basic difference between honest trade-union fighters and reactionary corrupt leaders than any amount of talk.

Especially toward unions that were raiding them, the progressive and Left leaders frequently have found it difficult to maintain an objective point of view. This certainly has been and continues to be difficult. But a policy based on subjective resentment will only make it easier for the reactionary labor leaders to keep labor divided. Name calling, re-raiding, and other forms of "answering in kind," only give some workers the feeling that they are being used as pawns in an unprincipled factional fight for power by *both sides*. Among the workers in the Right-led unions it frequently results in a subjective reaction, a feeling that "their union" is under attack and that they must rise blindly to its defense.

Many opportunities exist for united labor action and many more must be created by the continuous efforts of the progressive forces. Some of these are: The fight for an anti-depression program based upon raising the purchasing power of the workers and the mass of the people. The fight to organize the unorganized, particularly in the South. The fight against McCarthyism. The fight to defeat and repeal all anti-labor and all reactionary legislation and to adopt progressive social legislation. The beginning of coordinated independent political action on the part of all labor unions and their progressive allies, particularly in the approaching municipal

and congressional election campaigns.

All these fields offer opportunities for parallel and joint labor action. Nor should progressive labor leaders wait for engraved invitations to participate in these movements. The class struggle is not some ritzy social affair, not some diplomatic ball, where everyone stands on ceremony and where all the formal amenities are lived up to. The reactionary labor bureaucrats do not want the presence or the participation of the independent progressive unions or of the Left generally. They do not want labor unity. But progressives should not make it easier for these anti-unity elements. It is their duty to show the workers who it is that is splitting and dividing labor's ranks and who it is that is striving to unite them. If the independent Left-led unions are determined to make their modest contribution to unity, it will become increasingly difficult for the Right-wing labor leaders to prevent this. They will only run into more frequent collision with their own rank and file.

The previously quoted policy declaration of the Mine Mill Union correctly states:

We know that the full flower of unity among the people and within the labor movement will not be won without a fight for it. But we in Mine Mill believe such unity can and must be achieved. We intend to fight for it; we intend to be a part of it.

This is the approach and the spirit needed to win.

* * *

We have already made clear that the unity of the trade-union movement does not require ideological unity. What it does require is a recognition of the right of conflicting ideological and political tendencies to exist and to be fought out in one and the same labor movement.

This is essentially what Joseph Stalin told an American trade-union delegation in 1927, when it asked him how labor unity could be attained. He replied: "I think there is only one way out; leave room for conflict of opinion and of tendencies within the American trade unions, and give the working class of America an opportunity of making a free choice of these tendencies. . . ."

Stalin did not advocate the giving up of conflicting opinions. He knew that this was impossible and, were it possible, wrong and harmful. For, said Stalin to this delegation composed in large part of Right-wing labor leaders, "if the labor movement in America desires to live on and develop, it cannot avoid a conflict of opinion and tendencies within the trade unions." And elsewhere: "The working class of America stands in absolute need of such conflict of opinion and of such criticism in order that it may be able to choose between the various tendencies and finally to take its stand as an independent or-

ganized force within American society." (Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. I, pp. 383-4.)

From this it follows that the pursuance of broader policies and the searching out of all possible avenues towards labor solidarity and unity does not require that the Left current give up its identity or soft pedal its criticisms of reactionary policies. To pursue broader policies, to influence the course of events in the whole labor movement, the Left must be more, and not less, of a Left current. That is, it must base itself more squarely on class-struggle policies. It must help propel labor ever forward, politically and ideologically.

This means that if the progressive and Left-led unions are to play a greater role in advancing labor unity and the interests of the nation, the Left current within these unions must also be strengthened, by being both widened and deepened.

Sometimes when the Left-wing loses ground to the Right-wing, it is said that the Left "was too far ahead of the masses." Where true, the question still arises: Could it have been prevented and without giving up the advanced ideology of the Left? The answer is: Yes! Many workers who were first organized by the Left-led trade unions were later lost to the Right-led unions because these workers were not given even an elementary education in the difference between progressive and reactionary trade union policies. Is it not also true, that as some of the

Left-led unions grew in size, organizing new, previously inexperienced sections of workers who knew nothing of the history of the union and of the Left-wing in the labor movement, that the political and ideological problems within the union also grew?

It is further true that frequently Communists and Left-wingers have taken a narrow, oversimplified "bread and butter" approach to political and ideological questions. They have thought that all that was required to win the minds of the workers was to put forward correct immediate economic demands and to fight for these. But the failure to struggle *consciously* for the minds of the workers has not meant that these minds remained blank. It only meant that the reactionary ideology of the ruling class and of its "me-too" labor lieutenants was permitted to poison the minds of the workers.

Sometimes the very economic gains won by Left leadership, as when a group's economic status was greatly raised, led not to greater class consciousness and militancy, but to greater illusions in capitalism, to a loss of militancy and to petty bourgeois thinking. Only where economic gains were used to teach the workers to rely on their own militant and united strength, only where the workers were taught how temporary and illusory was their "security" under capitalism, only where they were strengthened constantly in a basic class outlook while fighting to ex-

tend their gains, were these workers maintained as a militant, clear-sighted and advanced force.

There is much which still needs to be done to make the progressive and Left-led unions better fighters for the workers, and progressive unions in every sense of the word. This is not to deny the many fine qualities of which these unions can justly be proud. They alone in the labor movement refused to surrender to the war hysteria and war drive. No small matter. They are by far the most democratic unions in the country, the most militant, and the most advanced on the question of Negro-white unity.

But having said this, it is also necessary to point out that the Left-led unions have not been completely immune from the weaknesses that apply to the American labor movement generally. American unions are notorious for their bureaucratic methods. Aping the bourgeoisie, the reactionary labor officialdom considers the trade union movement not as a *movement of workers*, but as a new and lucrative kind of "business" over which they are big shot "Executives." Everything is done from the top. Large full time staffs, all controlled by one central authority, "service" the union and run its affairs. Attendance at meetings is not considered important, for the pay-roll check-off *guarantees* full dues payments.

To some extent this approach also finds its reflection in progressive-led

union
vious
most
run in
The
about
their
is as
survive
is a l
the F
the m
U.E.-
amon
But i
know
article
quote
neith
organ
an or
was o
The
drawn
in th
taken
of the
began
in, th
Lea
did n
ion is
defeat
closed
devel
tinued
was a
situat
The
proble
the ri

unions, even though as we have previously pointed out, they are the most democratic and rank and file run in the country.

That all unions will have to bring about a much fuller participation of their membership than heretofore, is as certain as the fact that their survival will depend upon this. This is a lesson also to be learned from the Harvester strike. It is true that the main cause for the defeat of the U.E.-F.E. was the lack of unity among the workers in the chain. But it is also true, and this is acknowledged by an F.E. leader in the article in *March of Labor* previously quoted, that the rank and file was neither prepared fully enough, nor organized well enough to withstand an ordeal of this kind. Too much was done exclusively *from the top*. The mass of the workers were not drawn in fully and actively enough in the struggle. They were not taken sufficiently into the confidence of the leadership. The result: ranks began to break, demoralization set in, the strike was lost.

Learning this lesson, the U.E.-F.E. did mobilize the ranks of this union in a new way after the strike defeat. The result: the workers closed ranks, a new fighting spirit developed, the struggle was continued inside the plants, and what was at one point a highly dangerous situation was soon altered.

The Left-led unions also face the problem of fighting in a new way for the rights of the Negro people. The

pioneering role played by Communists on this question more than two decades ago has brought important gains. Today, the overwhelming bulk of organized labor has been compelled to do something on the issue of Negro rights.

This means that the Left-led unions have a broad basis for unity with the rest of the labor movement on various aspects of this issue, particularly on F.E.P.C. It also means that the Left-led unions cannot rest on laurels won yesterday, but must set *new goals* in the struggle for the *complete equality* of Negro workers on the job and in union leadership, and for the *complete freedom* of the Negro people. Of special importance at this time is the struggle for federal and state F.E.P.C.s, for the inclusion of F.E.P.C. clauses in all contracts, for the right to vote in the South, and for the organization of the Negro and white workers in the South.

The progressive unions also have a special task in projecting the struggle for peace as a major issue in the entire labor movement. At a time when some sections of the Right-led unions are beginning to raise this question, even though timidly and confused as yet, it is the duty of the independent progressive unions to bring increasing clarity and activity to this struggle. This has not been the case to date. They still are on the defensive on this issue even though recent developments have more than confirmed the correctness of their opposition to the

Korean war and to the whole war drive.

The Left-led unions also have a special duty to keep aloft the banner of international and hemispheric labor solidarity and to express its spirit in every way possible. At a time when the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. leadership is actively engaged in splitting activity abroad, it is incumbent upon the Left-wing labor leaders to uphold the honor of the American labor movement.

The independent progressive unions should also imbue their ranks with a clear cut political perspective for the labor movement. This should be the objective of establishing labor as a *thoroughly independent political force*, with a political machinery of its own, with a progressive program of its own for the nation, and with its own ties and alliances with other democratic

forces. Such a development would be the most decisive prerequisite for the formation of a new majority coalition of all progressive Americans. It would constitute the new conditions for a popular progressive coalition in which labor would no longer be the tail-end to the bourgeois political parties, but an independent political force, which even if not at first at the head of a party of its own, yet definitely moving in that direction.

If the independent progressive unions can be strengthened along these lines, they will stand out as progressive examples to the rest of the labor movement and can influence it to progressive policies and class unity. It is the task of Communists and all conscious Left-minded workers who are members of these unions to help bring this about.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The September issue of *Political Affairs* will include a special supplement containing a detailed reader's guide to William Z. Foster's *History of the Communist Party of the United States*.—the Editor.

The
stallin
fairs
ing q
of th
ions i
1.
and
bor u
Can
work
is th
union
2.
curre
What
reform
Can
exclu
ing-cl
path
3-
'30's
Left
vance
class?
ibility
lowed
labor
on th
ened
4-
labor
What
if the
impor
labor
raisin
from

Reader's Guide to Further Study

The foregoing article (its first installment appeared in *Political Affairs* in July) deals with the following questions on the role and tasks of the independent progressive unions in the struggle for labor unity.

1. Why is it essential to influence and advance the movement for labor unity and united labor action? Can this be done without systematic work in the Right-led unions? What is the special role of the Left-led unions?

2. What are the two ideological currents in the labor movement? What is the Communist, what is the reformist, conception of labor unity? Can labor unity be realized by the exclusion of the Left? Why is working-class unity vital to block the path of fascism and war?

3. What conditions existed in the '30's resulting in unity with the Left and how did such unity advance the interests of the working class? On whom does the responsibility rest for the split which followed? Can the Left current in the labor movement be destroyed? Why, on the contrary, must it be strengthened?

4. What is the relation of united labor action to organic unity today? What tendencies must be combatted if the Left-led unions are to play an important role in the struggle for labor unity? Why is the premature raising of organic unity a diversion from the immediate task of united

labor action? Why is the "go it alone," Leftist, rejection of labor unity harmful to the interests of the workers?

5. Why should the Left-led unions take the lead in fighting for labor unity? How? What are some forms of united labor action that must and can be advanced? Does united labor action require the giving up of the individual identity or the freedom of action of any union?

6. Around what kind of issues can unity of action, or parallel action, be developed today? What are some of the special tasks of the Left-led unions in the fight for peace, for Negro rights, for independent political action, for international working-class solidarity?

SUGGESTED SUPPLEMENTARY READING

John Swift: "Some Problems of Work in Right-led Unions," *Political Affairs*, April and May, 1952

—"Reuther's Seizure of the Ford Local," *Political Affairs*, July, 1952

A. H. Kendrick: "The Party and the Trade Unions in the Post-War Period," *Political Affairs*, December, 1952

John Williamson: "The Main Direction of the Party's Trade-Union Work," *Political Affairs*, February, 1951

Recent Events and the Party's Immediate Tasks*

Central Committee, Socialist Unity Party of Germany

The Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany at its meeting held on June 21 discussed the situation in the German Democratic Republic and adopted the following decision:

The events in the German Democratic Republic are directly linked with the development of the international and national situation. The decisive distinguishing feature of the international situation is the powerful growth of the forces of the world camp of peace during the past few months. An armistice agreement is pending in Korea. In Italy the people have won a big victory over reaction. Resistance to participation in the American policy of war is growing in Britain and France. In Western Germany the patriotic movement for the re-unification of Germany is growing. Based on the initiative of the world camp of peace a world-wide movement of the peoples for the solution of controversial questions by means of peaceful negotiations is unfolding. In every country the influence of the peace policy of the Soviet Union, China, the German Democratic Republic and

other parts of the world camp of peace is spreading more and more, for this policy coincides with the interests of the peoples.

As a result the American and German warmongers find themselves in a difficult situation. They see the crash of their plans. The Third World War, which they would like to unleash as quickly as possible, is being put off for a long time.

In their anxiety they resort to adventurist measures. One of these measures was the fixing of June 17, 1953, as "X-day," when they planned to deliver, from Berlin, a heavy blow at the German Democratic Republic.

This was an attempt, utilizing the Western Berlin bridgehead, to switch to Germany the flames of war which the people are putting out in Korea. This attempt will suffer fiasco.

Why did the warmongers choose this particular moment for their fascist provocation against the German Democratic Republic? On June 11 the Government of the German Democratic Republic decided on measures which will lead to the further strengthening of the German Democratic Republic and contribute in a big way to the struggle for a

* Reprinted from *For A Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*, June 26, 1953.

united Germany, for agreement between Germans. With a view to ensuring a decisive improvement in the conditions of the working people, and of the workers in the German Democratic Republic in the first place, it took a number of measures including those designed for developing private initiative in handicraft industry and in small and medium industry by widely granting credits and the necessary raw materials and other materials. It put an end to the excesses in financial policy in relation to transport fares and social insurance. People who fled from the Republic, including wealthy peasants, were granted permission to return with all confiscated property restored to them; thousands who had been arrested were released. Pupils expelled from the middle schools and school teachers who had been dismissed were reinstated. The zonal borders and the sector borders in Berlin were thrown wide open.

The effect throughout Germany of the decisions of the Political Bureau and the Government made the position of the warmongers still more difficult and prompted them to provoke, as quickly as possible, the long-prepared "X-day."

The Party and the Government began to correct the political line hitherto pursued in the German Democratic Republic since this line had not led to a rapid rise in the standard of living of the population of the German Democratic Republic and did not conform to the all-German struggle for unity and peace.

The Political Bureau stated that the general situation called for reconsideration in a new light of the course hitherto regarded as correct. Being the leadership of a Marxist-Leninist Party the Political Bureau publicly announced its conclusions, pointed to the mistakes made last year and recommended to the Government the first steps for correcting the mistakes. It had already begun to elaborate a general plan for improving the conditions of the working people which would be submitted to the Central Committee for approval. At this moment the Western agencies resolved on "X-day" in order to frustrate realization of the turn towards improving conditions in the German Democratic Republic.

The enemies of the people themselves openly spoke about "X-day." Jacob Kaiser said: "It is possible that X-day will come soon. . . . Our job is to be prepared in the best possible way for solving all the problems. The general plan, it can be said, is ready!" In Western Germany there was, and there is now, an American agency which, on instructions from Washington, is plotting war and civil war. In Western Germany and in Western Berlin, Adenauer, Ollenhauer, Kaiser and Reuter directly organized the preparations for "X-day." For instance, in the guise of a "research council," and with the active aid of the Americans, a special headquarters was set up in the Ministry headed by Jacob Kaiser for the purpose of carrying out acts of sabotage and acts of civil war; this

"research council" received millions of marks from the secret funds of the foreign and German imperialists. In Western Berlin, Kaiser and Reuter systematically trained and armed in terror organizations war criminals, militarist and criminal elements.

American gangster methods were added to the old experience of the fascist assassins: in this way fascist scum were brought together again. Adenauer, Ollenhauer, Kaiser and Reuter, jointly with the foreign warmongers, bear full responsibility for the blood shed during the smashing of the fascist gamble.

For the purpose of unleashing their provocation the enemies used the discontent which arose among certain sections of the population as a result of our policy of last year. On June 13, 1953, during a pleasure cruise for the workers of the state-owned "Industriebau Berlin" enterprise, a cruise in which enemy agents from some of the big enterprises took part, preparations were made for a strike of building workers. The date for the provocation was fixed for Tuesday, June 16. Simultaneously, the enemies infiltrated bandit columns, supplied with sulphur, phosphorus and petrol bottles and arms through the sector borders for the purpose of turning, by means of deceit and inciting slogans, the work stoppage of honest building workers into a demonstration against the Government and, by means of arson, robbery and gunfire, to impart to this demonstration the appearance of a revolt. Simultaneously, they instructed groups of

agents in other parts of the Republic to organize similar actions next day, and in yet other places a day later. The fascist degenerates, infiltrated from Western Berlin and guided from there, organized looting from food stores, attacked hostels of the working youth, clubs and shops and tried to murder Party functionaries and functionaries of the mass organizations and state apparatus who courageously defended our democratic system. On the basis of lists prepared in the agency centers in Western Berlin, fascist and other criminals were set free in a number of places, as was the case for instance, with the SS woman Erna Dorn, commandant of the Ravensbrueck concentration camp for women, sentenced by a democratic court for her savage crimes against humanity. Thus an attempt was made to establish a fascist regime in the German Democratic Republic and to block Germany's way to unity and peace.

As a result of the timely steps taken by broad sections of the population, heroically supported by the people's police, and as a result of the steps taken by the Soviet occupation authorities who imposed a curfew, the foul encroachment on the German Democratic Republic, on Germany and on world peace ignominiously failed within 24 hours. As a result, the premeditated wholesale bloodshed was averted.

PRESENT SITUATION

Calm prevails throughout the Republic. Work is proceeding normally.

A large
been
dare to
ment-
being
my is
ivity-
ing—a
Thuri
where
with a
ters. T
zig-Be
be car
undisc
ing to
With
Ollen
person
column
radio
main
lost g
At
tactics
The
enem
to ear
Simul
ing s
provo
of the
work
for w
their
ing t
rural
tage
lation
for f
work
Co
solute

A large number of provocateurs have been arrested while others do not dare to raise their heads at the moment. However, calm is far from being completely ensured. The enemy is continuing his subversive activity. Foreign aircraft are parachuting—as was the case previously over Thuringia, Saxony-Anhalt and elsewhere—groups of bandits equipped with arms and secret radio transmitters. Trucks intercepted on the Leipzig-Berlin highway were found to be carrying arms for groups as yet undiscovered. The enemy is switching to large-scale acts of sabotage. With the participation of Adenauer, Ollenhauer, Kaiser and Reuter, who personally are inspiring the bandit columns, the provocative R.I.A.S. radio station is trying might and main to breathe new life into the lost gamble.

At the same time changes in the tactics of the enemy can be observed. The undiscovered groups of the enemy agency have been told to go to earth and camouflage themselves. Simultaneously the enemy is circulating secret slogans and is trying to provoke new disturbances. In view of the fact that large masses of the workers are now aware of the aims for which the enemy sought to use their discontent, the latter is resorting to acts of provocation in the rural districts. He is calling for sabotage of supplies for the urban population in order to get a fresh pretext for fostering discontent among the workers.

Consequently, the task now is resolutely to smash the enemy, com-

pletely to liquidate the fascist gangs and, with our own forces, create a firm basis for order and ensure realization of the new course of the Party and the Government. What is needed for this?

OUR PARTY AND THE WORKING CLASS

For this it is necessary above all to clear up the confusion among those sections of the working class which allowed themselves to be deceived by the enemy, that those who, without realizing or without wishing it, succumbed to the influence of their mortal enemies—the monopoly capitalists and fascists—get rid of this influence so that the relations of confidence between the working class, the Party and the Government are restored.

What is the situation today?

The overwhelming majority of the enterprises throughout the Republic did not take part in the strikes. In many instances the workers chased the groups which came to their enterprises and urged them to strike; they demonstratively remained at work just to show that they were against the stoppage. In many cases the workers spontaneously pledged to increase output in order to prove their loyalty to our Party and our Republic and to make up for the losses. But in many of the enterprises which took part in the strikes and where work has now been resumed some of the workers are embittered. They think that the Party and the Government have

abandoned them. They still do not realize that the smashing of the fascist provocation benefits them as well, that it is the basis for their future life. They still have not grasped the interrelation of events with the result that they see only their own local, production demands and thus lose sight of the decisive factor that the fascist provocation took place because and after the Government had decided on a number of measures aimed not only at satisfying the just demands of the working people but also for the creation—and this constitutes a new course!—of an economic life and of condition in the enterprises and throughout the German Democratic Republic which will not brook repetition of failure to respond to just demands. Above all, these workers do not realize that their worst enemies—the American and the big capitalists in Western Germany who trample on their own workers, throwing millions of them onto the streets, dooming them to hunger and demoralizing them—use their demands in furtherance of their own aims, the realization of which must inevitably lead to a situation in which the security and life of the workers in the German Democratic Republic are placed in jeopardy. The overwhelming majority of the workers who were taken in by the provocateurs realized this the moment they saw the provocateurs setting fire, using petrol and phosphorus, to workers' clubs, the hostels of the working youth and the factory canteens built with the hands of the workers. "We

did not want this!" they said. "We are not doing the right thing."

The present moment calls for work and the Party will not play into the hands of the enemy: it will not dissipate its forces on talk as to how things could have reached such a pass among part of the working people. At the present moment we must act. Therefore the Central Committee, at this decisive moment, says but one thing: if the masses of workers do not understand the Party then the Party and not the workers is to blame!

From this principled standpoint all functionaries and members of our Party must draw the conclusion of the need most carefully to distinguish between honest working people upholding their interests who temporarily fell under the influence of provocateurs, and the provocateurs themselves. The honest workers, who temporarily had been led astray have not, because of this, ceased to be honest workers, and they must be respected as such. Those honest workers who have not yet realized their mistake, also have not ceased to be honest workers because of this, and must be respected as such. It is they precisely who most of all need the help and patience of the Party. It is they precisely who most of all need the Socialist Unity Party, even if this is not yet clear to them. The Central Committee expects all Party members and functionaries to prove now the maturity of their consciousness and their magnanimity by conducting wholehearted work precisely among this section

of the working class.

The Central Committee expects, at the same time, that all members and functionaries of the Party will take sharper action against the real provocateurs, expose them before the working masses and, with their help, hand them over to the security organs. Firmly resolved to defend with an iron hand the interests of the workers against fascist provocation the Central Committee is, at the same time, fully aware that along with this the Party must effect a change in its approach to the working class, beginning from today!

The need for this change is proved by the attitude displayed by many functionaries and Party members during these days. While tens of thousands of our functionaries and Party members have maintained and maintain now the closest contact with the masses, other tens of thousands sit at their desks, draft all sorts of circulars and wait. The Party must at any moment and particularly just now be with the masses! The entire Party must be rallied for the purpose of patiently convincing the masses. The Central Committee therefore expects that functionaries in all spheres, functionaries of the central apparatus, in the regions and districts will, from tomorrow on, go to the enterprises. In all enterprises Party meetings and meetings of workers must be held at which our functionaries must openly and boldly answer the questions of the workers and other working people and begin consistent struggle for the interests of the work-

ing class, for the well-being of all working people, for explaining the new line and carrying it out, for overcoming the incorrect views of the honest workers, but against the provocateurs.

The test of the success of our explanatory work will be the adoption by the worker-collectives of a decision, based on inner conviction, to support the new political course of the Party and Government, the realization by them of the need for active struggle against all provocateurs, open and secret.

IMMEDIATE MEASURES

No foul attempts at interference by the foreign and German warmongers will force the Central Committee to abandon the work of carrying out the new course. In these attempts it sees but further confirmation of the correctness of its course. It is going ahead with the new course in a planned way.

The decision of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of June 9 and the decision of the Government of the German Democratic Republic of June 11 outline the first measures of the new course, the basic aim of which is, in connection with the reduction of planned assignments in heavy industry, to improve the living standards of the workers, peasants, intelligentsia, handicraftsmen and other middle strata of the population.

The Central Committee adopts today, within the framework of the far-reaching economic changes, the

realization of which is called for by the new course, the second series of measures:

1. Wages shall be based on the norms which prevailed up to April 1, 1953.

2. Reduction of fares for workers with season tickets will, beginning with July 1, 1953, constitute for workers and office employees receiving up to 500 marks per month, 75 per cent as against the former regulation.

3. The minimum old-age pension, disability and accident pensions are increased from 65 to 75 marks per month.

The minimum widow's pension is increased from 55 to 65 marks per month.

Pensions received for partial disability are increased from 45 to 55 marks per month.

Where the wife (husband) of a pensioner in receipt of old-age pension, disability or accident pension does not get a pension and is incapacitated or has reached old age, the extra sum paid to the husband or wife shall be increased to make the pension of the two, together with the extra sum, amount to a minimum of 95 marks per month.

4. Inclusion of holidays for treatment or for recuperation of health at the expense of the annual holiday is nullified.

5. The decision of March 19, 1953, excluding voluntary insurance from social insurance is nullified.

Assurance pensions, additional insurance and life insurance which prevailed up to March 31, 1953 are

restored for all citizens in accordance with the old rates and rights.

German insurance agencies shall accept healthy policy-holders without medical examination in accordance with the rates which prevailed up to April 1, 1953.

6. The building and repair of apartments, particularly in the large cities and industrial centers, must be considerably extended. At the expense of the sums saved from curtailing investments in heavy industry and in industry of the basic means of production, to allocate in 1953 a supplementary sum, in addition to that stipulated in the plan, of 600 million marks for extending housing (new construction, extensions, repairs), and also for street repairs.

7. To allocate an additional sum of 30 million marks in 1953 for improving hygienic and sanitary installations in the publicly-owned enterprises. The trade-union leadership in the enterprises shall submit corresponding proposals to the Central Boards of their unions which shall verify these proposals and submit them with their viewpoint to the respective Ministries for their decision. Publicly-owned enterprises of local industry must forward their proposals to the regional organs.

8. In 1953 an extra 40 million marks shall be allocated for construction, extension and rehabilitation of socio-cultural premises and buildings in the system of the public health services, such as, for example, the one-day rest homes, trade-union

sanato
es.

9. F
wear

in ac
submi

Amal
Unio

10.
cuts

tion s
consu

heavy

The
power

Gover
necess

adequ
popul

month

The
the no

ing th
tial n

form
all pr

new
Alrea

tee d
that t

the C
stand

the p
realiz

peopl
system

tivity,
spread

and r
ship a

ly-ow
Centr
comes

sanatoria, kindergartens, and creches.

9. Provision of workers with footwear and overalls shall be improved in accordance with the proposals submitted by the Board of the Amalgamated Free German Trade Unions.

10. In the third quarter the daily cuts of electricity for the population shall be annulled by restricting consumption of electric power by heavy industry.

The State Secretariat for electric power is requested to submit to the Government by August 1, 1953, the necessary proposals for ensuring an adequate supply of electricity to the population during the winter months.

The Central Committee will, in the near future, meet again—following the elaboration of further essential measures—in order fully to inform the Party and the public about all problems in connection with the new political and economic tasks. Already today the Central Committee draws attention to the basic fact that the initiative of the Party and the Government for improving the standard of living of all sections of the population can be successfully realized only in case the working people, convinced of the need for a systematic increase in labor productivity, further develop emulation, spread the methods of the innovators and raise to the proper level leadership and organization in the publicly-owned industrial enterprises. The Central Committee, therefore, welcomes the decisions of the many

factory collectives which have called for making good the considerable production losses caused by the destruction and outrages.

Let every Party member, every working man and woman realize that the preservation of peace and the realization of German unity depends, in large measure, on raising the standard of living in the German Democratic Republic, on the consolidation of our democratic state power, on the creation of a really model democratic state on German soil.

Adenauer, Ollenhauer, Kaiser and Reuter have taken a course for war. Hence they direct blows against us. Hence Western Germany is being converted into a center of fascism and reaction.

Our Party and our Government stand for peace. Therefore, we follow the course of a model peace economy. Our new course is the keenest weapon in the hands of all Germans against any military provocation on German soil.

To work, comrades!

Whet your vigilance, redouble your efforts and strengthen discipline.

Long live the Socialist Unity Party of Germany—the standard bearer in the fight for peace, unity and democracy!

Long live the Government of the German Democratic Republic, the Government of peace and labor!

Long live the President of the German Democratic Republic, Wilhelm Pieck!

Book Review

THE LEADERS OF NEW CHINA

By Evelyn T. Saunders

Red Dust: Autobiographies of Chinese Communists, As told to Nym Wales. Stanford University Press, 238 pp. \$5.00.

Since the historic victory of the Chinese people in 1949 and the monumental achievements of the People's Republic of China in the three years following liberation, American imperialists are recalling with terror Napoleon's characterization of China as a "sleeping giant" who, when awake, "will shake the world."

With unmitigated arrogance they lament the "loss" of China and offer fantastic expansions as to how it all happened. In a frantic effort to assess blame, to prove who "made the mistakes in China," they credit the victory of the hundred years' struggle of the whole Chinese people against feudalism and foreign imperialism to a few government officials and writers who, in the past, however, inadequately and timorously, dared to point out some of the realities of the Chinese scene.

There are those, however, with a more "scholarly" approach. In an effort to reduce the Chinese revolution to some "gimmick" they have taken to examining the documents and lead-

ing personalities of the Communist Party of China in order to uncover some "psychological quirks" or find a revealing "blueprint of the Chinese Communist Movement." Such a book is the University of Washington's recent publication of important speeches and writings of Chinese Communist leaders called *Mao's China*. In it, the Director of the Far Eastern and Russian Institute apologizes for the book in a foreword which compares these writings to Hitler's *Mein Kampf* and warns "we ignore such material at our peril."

The book being presently reviewed, ambiguously entitled *Red Dust*, is also marred by an introduction, in this case by Robert Carver North of the Hoover Institute, in which is given a brief review of the Chinese Revolution in the totally false and cynical terms of "power politics." It ends with the promise that "among the family relationships, the early experiences, the loves and psychological quirks, the hopes and fears and hates, we can find the biases that disposed the person toward the discipline of Communist dogma."

However, the book also has a preface by Miss Wales, to whom these life stories were related in Yen-an, in 1937-

Miss
book
of the
depen
bor 1
years,
Amer
the F
dicat
of Dr
Vice-C
lic of
Wales
to th
stand
would
sugge
No
sentia
traits.
are,
(Tun
of the
the V
are to
tizatio
word.
in ge
idea
new t
them
vidua
explo
questi
forth.
Mo
of "et
was t
them
did no
behav
know
world
ness—
more
great
pated.

Miss Wales is the author of the stirring book *Song of Ariran*, an early account of the Korean people's battle for independence, and of *The Chinese Labor Movement*. She has, for many years, made major contributions to the American people's understanding of the Far East. Her present book is dedicated to Soong Ching-ling, widow of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, and one of the Vice-Chairmen of the People's Republic of China. "I should like," says Miss Wales in her preface, "for the reader to think of the autobiographies as standing quite alone." The reader would do well to follow Miss Wales' suggestion.

No distorted frame can blur the essential grandeur of these human portraits. For while these autobiographies are, with a few notable exceptions (Tung Pi-wu, Lin Piao), the stories of Communist leaders little known to the Western world, and while they are told simply and without self-dramatization, grandeur is not too large a word. Miss Wales had some difficulty in getting her subjects to talk. "The idea of autobiography seemed entirely new to these persons and it seemed to them a violation of etiquette to individualize their personal histories and exploits. . . . In time they did yield to questioning and . . . the stories came forth."

More important than considerations of "etiquette," it seems to this reviewer, was the fact, confirmed by the stories themselves, that these men and women did not seek for the motivation of their behavior in personal terms. As their knowledge of themselves and the world they lived in—their consciousness—expanded, their lives more and more merged and became one with the great events in which they participated. Their stories cover some of the

most tumultuous and decisive years in the growth and maturing of the Chinese Revolution and the Communist Party of China.

With the close of World War I, the Chinese working class first demonstrated its strength in the May Fourth Movement of 1919. This was a movement in protest against the Versailles Treaty which granted the former German concessions in the province of Shantung to Japan. The growth and strength of the movement served as a stimulus to China's students and intellectuals and influenced them to carry on revolutionary activity among the workers. In Shanghai, Tanshan and Changhsintien a political strike was called by the workers for the first time in Chinese history. It was in these years of tremendous revolutionary ferment, which especially permeated the youth of China, that the men and women whose stories are related in *Red Dust* were drawn into the revolutionary movement. Reflecting the national nature of China's struggle they came from every class. Not "psychological quirks" but their social existence and especially that aspect of it which made foreign imperialists masters in their house, shaped their lives and charted their course.

"I had seen foreigners and received a bad impression of them because their attitude was arrogant. I contrasted their wealth with the poverty and backwardness of the Chinese and felt bitter," said Wu Liang-ping, Chief of the Propaganda Department of the Communist government in Yen-an, who originally stemmed from a merchant family. General Wang Cheng, who had been a railroad worker earning seven dollars a month at the age of thirteen, had a common memory: "Our workers' movement was not only anti-

feudal but also consciously anti-imperialist. The Canton-Hankow Railway was a British capital investment though nominally the property of the Chinese government. In the head office there was a British engineer whom we called Fan Ehr-pi in Chinese. The locomotive engineers had orders never to sound the whistle when passing near his house, so as not to disturb his sleep! We all hated this foreign imperialism."

Their enemies were real—the twin monsters of foreign imperialism and feudal-landlord oppression. They were not words to them but evils which blighted their lives. "It was only after I became a Communist," said Hsiao K'e, son of a Confucian scholar who, at 23, was the youngest of the top commanders of the Chinese Communist Army, "that I learned not to be personal in my revenge and hatred but to see the general social problems of a corrupt semi-feudal society as a whole and understand that the degradation of my own family and clan was only a part of this phenomenon."

They served their people and their Party with single-minded devotion. While most of them came into the revolutionary movement during the post-World War I upsurge, they lived, endured and learned through the bitter defeat following the betrayal of Chiang Kai-shek in 1927. Of this period Hu Chiao-mu, Vice-Director of the Propaganda Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, says in his *Thirty Years of the Communist Party of China*: "From April 12th, when Chiang Kai-shek began his massacre, until after the defeat of the revolution, many brilliant leaders of the Party and many revolutionary workers, peasants and intellectuals were savagely slaughtered throughout

the country. The whole country was suddenly plunged into darkness. Not only the national bourgeoisie, but many of the upper strata of the petty bourgeoisie deserted the revolution. Large groups of intellectuals of petty-bourgeois origin, who had joined the Party but who lacked resolution, announced their withdrawal from the Party. But the heroic Communist Party and the revolutionary people of China, as Comrade Mao-Tse-tung said, 'were not frightened, not conquered, and not annihilated. They stood up again, wiped off the bloodstains, buried their fallen comrades and went on fighting.'"

All of those whose stories are told in this book lived through these terrible years. The simple matter of fact way they tell the story does not dim its heroism and glory. Kang K'e-ching, daughter of a poor fisherman who later became the wife of Chu Teh, Commander-in-Chief of the Red Army, spoke: "Some Communists were killed openly in the fields without benefit of arrest. Some were caught and beaten in order to get them to betray the hiding places of their comrades and were afterwards killed. Some were stripped naked and burned slowly at the stake. Many women and pregnant mothers were executed. The wives and children of Communists were killed with them. Many Communist Youth boys and girls were executed also. Even many revolutionary sons of landlords were executed. . . ." "Revolution," she added later, "is always hard."

It was not possible rapidly to rekindle the revolution in the cities. A large part of the revolutionary working class had been slaughtered. It was here that the terror and state power of Chiang were strongest. However, it

could
strang
area
tricts
strugg
wante
in or
it. Th
the ca
come
correc
peas
lem v
was t
ing c
revolu
the p

In
a co
Work
Army
kang
of K
estab
Borde
Gover
attack
lead t
the la
Peng
troop
ary b
the
Kiang
and f
Bases
capita
To
sent
100,0
paigh
Centr
were
Chan
was
majo

could not reach out with the same stranglehold into all the vast rural areas of China. Especially in those districts which had been influenced by the struggles of 1921-1927, the peasants wanted land and had some experience in organizing themselves to fight for it. The Communist Party, examining the causes for the defeat of 1927, had come to understand that failure to give correct and energetic leadership to the peasants in solving the agrarian problem was a major factor. The peasantry was the solid, main ally of the working class and the hope of reviving the revolutionary movement lay in leading the peasants' struggle for land.

In October 1927, Mao Tse-tung led a contingent of the newly formed Workers and Peasants Revolutionary Army in a withdrawal to the Ching-kang Mountain Area, on the borders of Kiangsi and Hunan provinces and established there the Hunan-Kiangsi Border Region Workers' and Peasants' Government. They repulsed repeated attacks by the enemy and started to lead the peasants in the distribution of the land. Troops under Chu Teh and Peng Teh-huai joined forces with the troops under Mao and the revolutionary bases gradually expanded. In 1929, the Red Army advanced to South Kiangsi and west of Fukien Province and founded the Central Revolutionary Bases with Juikin, in Kiangsi, as their capital.

Towards the end of 1930, Chiang sent seven divisions, totaling about 100,000 men, in an encirclement campaign against the Red Army in the Central Area. One and a half divisions were wiped out by the Red Army and Chang Kai-shek's field commander was captured. Thereafter three more major "extermination" campaigns were

undertaken by Chiang, but all were defeated by the Chinese Workers and Peasants Red Army. But in October 1933, Chiang, in a desperate, all-out effort, unleashed the Fifth Campaign with a force of 1,000,000 men. Reflecting disagreements in policy within the Communist Party, a mistaken defensive strategy was employed and the Red Army failed to smash the Fifth Encirclement Campaign. In October 1934, the Central Red Army withdrew from its bases in Kiangsi Province and began the famous Long March unparalleled in the annals of all history. With incomparable tenacity, overcoming innumerable military and political difficulties as well as natural obstacles, crossing almost impassable snow-clad mountains and grasslands, the Central Army reached North Shensi in October 1935.

It was in Yen-an in North Shensi, two years after the Long March that Miss Wales visited Yen-an. What did these epic struggles mean in terms of the lives of the individual Communists to whom she spoke?

"Throughout these years," says Hu Chiao-mu, "all the main cadres of the Party have lived a life of military communism. Their revolutionary discipline and spirit of self sacrifice have been of such a high order as is difficult for people living in peaceful conditions even to imagine."

As they tell their stories the difficulties are not minimized. But these twenty-four of *Red Dust* were among those of whom Mao Tse-tung said "their great skill, courage, determination and almost superhuman endurance and revolutionary ardour" made possible the victorious Long March of the Red Army and its triumphant arrival in Kansu and Shensi with its main

core still intact.

Their accounts of this period are replete with incidents demonstrating their deep roots in the people, how the people at every opportunity revealed their great creative capacity for leadership and self government, how the women of China, oppressed and disinherited, became a mighty revolutionary force filled with joy and pride at the new life opening up before them.

Hsiao Ke, the 23-year-old General of the Sixth Red Army, whose name had become known throughout China as an outstanding exponent of the war of manoeuver and mobility, recalled: "We covered ten thousand li* on our Long March. In those months the number of the enemy who chased us in the rear or attacked in the front and on the flank were, altogether, one hundred thirty regiments (130,000 men). We had only 20,000 men in our armies. But the Kuomintang could not blockade us. We defeated the enemy and left them behind everywhere." When, after recounting the titanic achievements of the Long March, Miss Wales asked him why the Red Army was victorious, he replied: "Because of the correct political line of the Communist Party of China! Because of the bravery of the Red Army! Because of the co-operation of the rank and file and the officers! Because we were supported by the masses!"

Almost without exception the autobiographies contain moving tributes to the women of China. Tsa Shu-fan, the Hanyang miner, reminisced: "In the cotton factories most of the workers were women and girl children. These women and girls were active and brave. It was fifteen li from Ch'aok'on to Hankow but they walked to meetings

with their bound feet, anyway. I found that always in the struggle and strike movements the women were more positive than the men . . . because they get lower wages and are more oppressed they became very revolutionary. Their active leadership in the revolution has been very important." Of the peasant women in the liberated areas Teng Feng related: "The women are more determined than the men that the government and the land system shall not revert to the old ways, for they have their freedom now."

A book such as this is not subject to review in the ordinary sense. In spoken narratives, interpreted and recorded, these men and women, Communist leaders in Yenan in 1937, told the stories of their lives. These stories are in substance one of the great stories of our time. Because their lives are so integrally welded with the history of their times, an introduction which embodied a consecutive and truthful account of the process of the Chinese Revolution would have enhanced the portraits. The publishers of the book obviously had other objectives. One might also wish (of course this cannot be considered a reflection on the author) that the narratives extended beyond 1937.

On October 11, 1952, the *New York Times* reported that John Foster Dulles, speaking to a Republican rally, "urged that the U.S. start quickly on a program to undo the Communist conquest of China." He asked: "Why should we assume that China is dead and done for so far as we are concerned. Why should we assume that what Soviet Communism could do in China, we cannot undo? It will, no doubt, take several years of resourceful and imaginative effort to undo the

* A li is equal to about one-third of a mile.

disaster. But the fact that it will take time is no reason for doing nothing, but a reason for getting started quickly."

The present volume is further proof that the policy advocated by the present Secretary of State is a policy of disaster for the American people. It demolishes the myth propounded by U.S. imperialists that the Chinese Revolution was a "putsch" engineered by a small clique, directed from Moscow. No one who reads these narratives can escape the conclusion that the Chinese Revolution and the Communist Party of China spring from the soil of China and have been nourished by the devotion, sacrifice and heroism of the Chinese people. In these stories of how the revolutionary people of China, led by their Communist Party, fought and defeated a powerful enemy sustained by the greatest imperialist nations of the world is a solemn warning to the American people lest they allow themselves to be deceived into a catastrophic war with New China. In an article called "Is China A Great Power?" Lt. Alexander De Conde writes: "Japan with a modern military machine, for fifteen years fought a backward, dis-united China, and was not able to conquer her. . . . If Japan could not conquer China in fifteen years, could we in less time, without endangering the national welfare by pinning down a great land army in China's limitless acres? What of the debilitating effect upon our economy already strained by world-wide anti-Communist commitments. . . . In the early days of the Korean conflict many advocates of a China blockade vowed that China would be forced to her knees when cut

off from trade with the West, that backward, non-industrial China could not get along without our manufactured goods. . . . Over two years have passed, and China seems stronger than ever."*

Lt. De Conde adds up the area, the manpower and the industrial might of New China and shakes a warning finger. He does not even mention her greatest strength—the morale of a free, united and inspired people.

Those whose heroic life stories unfold in the pages of *Red Dust* were harbingers of the future. Today hundreds of millions of Chinese, participating in the building of a new society under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, are transforming themselves as they change their world. They have discarded the ages-old, "Mei-Yo banfa" (No way out—it can't be done) of a humiliated, grievously oppressed people. Today there rings throughout China the new cry "Yo banfa" (There is a way). It was this spirit of defiance in the face of gigantic obstacles, and supreme confidence in man's ability, guided by the science of Marxism-Leninism, which sustained the men and women of *Red Dust* through the years of unparalleled hardships and struggle. Today this cry is on the lips of all China. It reflects the new hope and energy which suffuses the country. "Yo banfa!" There is a way! It is the way of peaceful construction of a new land of freedom and plenty for all, the way of cooperation and trade, the way of brotherhood and peace with all peoples who meet them in friendship, as equals.

* In U.S. Naval Institute *Proceedings*, January, 1953.

NEW INTERNATIONAL BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

- LETTERS TO AMERICANS; 1848-1895
by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels \$3.50
- BORN OF THE PEOPLE, *by Luis Taruc*
Paper \$1.75; cloth \$3.00
- BROTHER BILL McKIE, *by Philip Bonosky*
Paper \$1.50; cloth \$2.25
- LABOR FACT BOOK 11,
prepared by Labor Research Association \$2.00
- ECONOMICS OF PEACE AND WAR, *by John Eaton*
Paper \$.90; cloth \$1.50
- PLOT AGAINST PEACE, *by Ivor Montagu*
Paper \$1.00; cloth \$1.75
- BRITISH TRADE UNIONISM, *by Allen Hutt*
Paper \$1.50; cloth \$2.25
- ON CONTRADICTION, *by Mao Tse-tung* \$3.35
- MATERIALISM AND THE DIALECTICAL METHOD,
by Maurice Cornforth \$1.00
- AMERICA OVER BRITAIN, *by Philip Bolsover* \$1.00
- ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF SOCIALISM IN THE USSR
by Joseph Stalin \$.25
-

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS, 832 Broadway, New York

5

0

0

5

5

35

00

00

25

ork