

Political affairs

AUGUST 1954 • 25 CENTS

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

- [1] The Question of the Peaceful
Co-existence of the U.S.A. and
U.S.S.R.

CHARLES P. MANN

- [16] Comrade Eugene Dennis: An
Appreciation and an Amnesty
Appeal

MARK LOGAN

- [20] The Working Class and the Nation

A. B. MACIL

- [37] The Rape of Guatemala



- [50] Population Changes and
Negro-White Unity

MERRICK C. HASTINGS

- [65] A Reply to Some Harmful and
Incorrect Views

BETH GURLEY FLYNN

- [74] *Education of an American Liberal*
(Book Review)

NEW INTERNATIONAL BOOKS

THE INCOME "REVOLUTION" by Victor Perlo

Analyzes the class nature of income distribution in the U.S.A. and explodes the myth that "the poor are getting richer and the rich are getting poorer." \$3.55

BILLIONAIRE CORPORATIONS, prepared by Labor Research Association

A study of the most powerful monopolies and financial groups in the U.S.A. and their link with government. \$3.55

WAR ECONOMY AND CRISIS by Hyman Lumer

A full-length Marxist study of U.S. economy since the end of World War II, focusing on the relation between the developing economic crisis and the heavy war preparations.

Paper \$1.75; Cloth \$2.75

SELECTED WORKS OF MAO TSE-TUNG, VOLUME 1

The first in a 5-volume edition of the major works of Mao Tse-tung, this volume covers the period of the first two revolutionary wars and the turn to the national united front against Japanese aggression. \$2.50

THE MIKE GOLD READER

A sparkling collection of the best stories, poems, articles, columns, essays, reviews and literary reportage of the Dean of proletarian writers during the past forty years. Paper: \$1.50; Cloth \$2.50

HISTORICAL MATERIALISM by Maurice Cornforth

A valuable contribution to the systematic study of Marxism, including general principles, how society develops, and the future of Socialism and Communism. Paper \$1.50; Cloth \$2.50

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway • New York 3, N. Y.

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

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

The Question of the Peaceful Co-Existence of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.

By William Z. Foster

THE MOST URGENT political question in the world today is that of the realization of peaceful co-existence between the countries of Socialism and people's democracy and those of capitalism, of which the most decisive expression today is peace between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. This is because peaceful co-existence is the concrete realization of world peace. The question is now occupying the attention of countless millions of people throughout the world who are ardently fighting for international peace. Peaceful co-existence was the central theme in the June conference of prime ministers Chou En-lai of People's China and Nehru of India—a meeting of world historic importance. So much has this general matter become the issue that, at their Washington conference in June, even the imperialists, Prime Minister Churchill and President Eisenhower, long-time bitter enemies of Socialism, found themselves com-

pelled to talk in terms of peaceful co-existence, however distorted and demagogically they did so. The present article undertakes to treat this most vitally important question in its historic setting, as well as in its present-day significance.

THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT AND PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

From the time of the Russian Revolution in November 1917 until now, the question of the socialist and capitalist countries of the world living together amicably and without war has been a grave and growing consideration. The successive leaders of the Soviet people during the intervening 37 years—Lenin, Stalin, and Malenkov—have repeatedly stressed the desirability, possibility, and imperative need for peaceful co-existence of the U.S.S.R. and the capitalist countries. This position has been not only that of the great Russian

Communist Party, but it always has been actively seconded and supported by every Marxist-Leninist leader and Party everywhere. It has also strongly expressed the will of the peace-loving masses of the world. The need for peaceful co-existence is imperative, because the alternative to it would be a whole series of the most devastating wars in world history. Peaceful co-existence is the only thinkable perspective for humanity, especially since the advent of the A- and H-bomb.

The Marxist-Leninist conception of the peaceful co-existence of capitalist and socialist countries is in full harmony with the fundamental Communist position that historically Socialism must replace capitalism and that the present period of decaying imperialism and of the general crisis of world capitalism is also the era of great imperialist wars and proletarian revolutions. There is no theoretical conflict in the Marxist-Leninist outlook on the question, because in this period the democratic forces are powerful enough to hold the imperialist world-war makers in check while the inevitable revolutionary transformation from capitalism to Socialism takes place in the respective countries. Underlying this general consideration and forming the foundation of the whole concept of peaceful co-existence, is the fundamental fact that the economic and political interests of the great democratic masses of the peoples of all countries—capitalist and democratic—are in full harmony, and for their

realization must have peaceful co-existence. There is no incompatibility between the advance of Socialism and the maintenance of world peace. The establishment of Socialism in no sense requires international war. From the outset of the socialist movement the Marxists have always been the firmest fighters for peace.

The imperialists of the world, however—and in first line those of the United States—are fundamental and inveterate enemies of the whole concept of the peaceful co-existence of the socialist and capitalist worlds. They are the deadly foes of Socialism—which they fully realize would put a final end to the exploitation system by which they strip the workers of scores of billions of dollars every year. They are harassed by a sense of the inevitability of Socialism on a world basis unless they can somehow find the means to stamp it out violently. Therefore, on a national scale, the fundamental attitude of the big capitalists is to seek to crush the rising socialist movements of the working class and its allies by ruthless counter-revolution, and on an international scale, their line is to try to overthrow by a gigantic military war such socialist countries as may nevertheless come into existence. This has been the policy of the great imperialist powers ever since the foundation of the U.S.S.R. and it remains their basic policy today. Chief of all the political things that the international imperialists do not want is peaceful co-existence between the capitalist and socialist worlds.

At the present time the question of peaceful co-existence is taking on an ever-increasing political importance and urgency. This is because objective conditions are ripening so that the concrete development of such co-existence is becoming more and more a practical possibility, particularly because of the failure of the capitalists' anti-Soviet cold war. For the past eight years the big capitalists of the world, led by the monopolists of Wall Street, have been waging this "cold war." The heart of this peacetime "war" has been, on the one hand, a desperate effort on the part of the United States and its allies to develop an all-out capitalist military offensive to overthrow the U.S.S.R., People's China, and the European People's Democracies, and on the other hand, a resolute struggle of these countries and the other peace forces of the world to prevent such a reactionary world war.

By and large, the cold war has gone very badly for Wall Street and its allies. Although the warmongers have suffered elementary defeats on many fronts, they are, however, not yet finally defeated. They are still able to keep hanging over the world the murderous threat of an atomic-hydrogen war. Nevertheless, with victories of the peace forces mounting constantly, the question of peaceful co-existence is forcing its way onto the world political agenda as a decisive question. The time is therefore past for mere slogans on our part about peaceful co-existence between the capitalist and socialist worlds;

now it is necessary to become more concrete about the whole matter.

EARLY PHASES OF IMPERIALIST ATTEMPTS TO DESTROY THE U.S.S.R.

Immediately upon the success of the Russian Revolution in 1917 the big capitalists of the world launched a relentless war against the first Workers' Republic. The Right-Social Democracy generally took a stand against the Soviet Union on the false pretense that it was not a socialist regime, but the capitalists never had any doubt on this matter. From the outset they recognized its socialist character. Consequently they organized and financed the Russian counter-revolution and, beginning in 1918, they sent their own troops into Soviet Russia, for the purpose of destroying the new workers' government. Nearly all the leading capitalist powers—Great Britain, France, Germany, Japan, etc.—took part in this armed intervention. The United States was one of the most active participants in the dirty business; the "progressive" Democratic President Wilson, without even asking Congressional sanction, sent thousands of American soldiers into the Vladivostok and Murmansk areas of Siberia and Northern Russia.

This first phase of the permanent war of the world imperialists against Soviet Russia failed dismally. The heroic Red Guard, which in the struggle grew into the great Red Army, smashed all its armed foes, domestic and foreign. By the end of

1920 the Russian counter-revolutionary armies were destroyed, and the big capitalist powers had all been compelled to withdraw their troops from Soviet Russia. The reasons for this socialist military triumph were the tremendous fighting power developed by the revolutionary Soviet people and the spirit of solidarity of the European working class, which prevented an all-out capitalist attack against Soviet Russia. A major factor, too, was the unreliability of the capitalist troops themselves—with even American soldiers rebelling, an event which caused the whole United States intervention expedition to be hastily withdrawn. All this amounted to a tremendous and decisive victory for the young socialist republic.

Although defeated in their first counter-revolutionary assault upon the Soviet regime, from 1921 to the outbreak of World War II in 1939, the imperialist powers continued to display in varying forms their inveterate and basic hostility to the Soviet Union. For years, they ineffectively boycotted and diplomatically isolated that country, trying to starve it into submission. Great Britain and France were the counter-revolutionary leaders during most of this time, but the United States was not far behind—in fact it was not until 1933 that the United States, the last of the great powers to do so, formally accorded the Soviet Union diplomatic recognition.

In the early 1930's Germany, Japan, and Italy, with their notorious "Anti-Comintern" Pact, took the lead

in the next great stage in the permanent world imperialist offensive against the U.S.S.R. In this drive the fascist powers were helped by the appeasement policies of Great Britain, France, and the United States—which were the handiwork of the pro-fascist monopolists in these capitalist countries, whose dearest hope was to turn Hitler's bayonets against the U.S.S.R. All this was the very antipode of a policy of peaceful co-existence.

During this increasingly critical period of world history—from 1933 to 1939—as the dangerous fascist offensive for world domination was developing, the Soviet Union came forward with its famous policy of "collective security." That is, it proposed that the capitalist democracies, uniting with the U.S.S.R., should hold the fascist powers in check and thus maintain world peace. This, in substance, was a proposition for peaceful co-existence of socialist and capitalist countries, with the Soviet government giving the world the political lead on this elementary question.

The pro-fascist rulers of Great Britain, France, and the United States, however, would have no part of the Soviet's peaceful co-existence policy, for they hated and feared the Soviet Union far more than they did their imperialist rivals of the fascist Axis. Not until the very last, until Hitler, following out his joint fascist program of world conquest, had sent his *Wehrmacht* storming against them, did the Western capitalist pow-

ers e
futile
turn
Unio
On
armie
Norw
their
kirk,
atten
the h
talist
will-o
ism, t
viet
crush
woul
Germ
dictat
June
the gr
Wit
whipp
(with
war s
found
agreer
again
Italy.
a half
it wa
hatred
for th
tion
count
innate
refusa
Unite
to ope
ern E
discrin
States

ers even temporarily abandon their futile attempts to have the *Fuehrer* turn his guns against the Soviet Union.

Only after Hitler had defeated the armies of France, England, Belgium, Norway and Holland, and driven their remnants into the sea at Dunkirk, did fascist Germany turn its attention to its central, decisive job, the heart's desire of every great capitalist in the world and the historic will-o-the-wisp of monopoly capitalism, the armed overthrow of the Soviet Union. With the U.S.S.R. crushed, Hitler figured, the way would be open for world control by Germany and Japan. So the fascist dictator made the fatal mistake, on June 22, 1941, of militarily attacking the great socialist country.

With their armies decisively whipped, Great Britain and France (with the United States joining the war six months later) at long last found it imperative to come to an agreement with the U.S.S.R. to fight against fascist Germany, Japan, and Italy. But, at best, theirs was only a half-hearted alliance—at all times it was hamstrung by the ingrained hatred of the big Western capitalists for the U.S.S.R. and their determination ultimately to overthrow that country's socialist government. This innate hostility explains the deliberate refusal of Great Britain and the United States, for 18 months at least, to open up the vitally needed Western European war front, the gross discrimination shown by the United States against the Soviet Union in

the matter of wartime lend-lease, the shifting of the main war attack of the United States from Germany to Japan, the refusal to share military secrets—notably radar and the atomic bomb—with the U.S.S.R., and various other steps that were taken to sabotage the war struggle of the Soviet Union. And it is a matter of common knowledge that many prominent American reactionaries, Truman, Hoover, *et al.*—openly and shamelessly proposed the systematic weakening of the U.S.S.R. as much as possible during the war. Despite such treacheries, however, the U.S.S.R. took the main part in defeating Hitler-Germany, and thus, in winning the war in general.

THE POST-WORLD WAR II IMPERIALIST ATTACK AGAINST THE U.S.S.R.

Up to the present time, ever since the Russian Revolution of November 1917, one of the central features of current history has been the bitter, unrelenting and murderous hatred shown by the imperialist powers for the Soviet Union. Not even the co-partnership-in-arms of the bourgeois democracies and the U.S.S.R. during World War II could break down this inveterate capitalist hostility and lead to the adoption of a policy of peaceful co-existence. Nothing could eradicate the determination of the imperialists to destroy the U.S.S.R. upon the first favorable opportunity. This anti-Soviet spirit ran all through World War II, resulting, as we have seen, in systematic

betrayal of the U.S.S.R.'s fight by the Western capitalist powers.

After the historic battle of Stalin-grad, in January 1943, which broke the backbone of Hitler's army and gave the anti-fascist countries their first real perspective of ultimate victory over Hitlerism, the inevitable anti-Soviet drive began to take shape again on the part of the Western imperialists. This time it was the United States monopolists who moved ahead to take the anti-Soviet lead. Their ruthless hostility was, however, largely veiled in the various joint documents put out from time to time by the United Nations.

Thus, at the famous Teheran (Iran) conference of December 1943, which set the date for the opening of the second European war front, the allied powers issued a statement which pledged the three big signers—the United States, Great Britain and the U.S.S.R.—“to work together in the war and in the peace that will follow.” On the face of it, this document presumably opened up a perspective of the peaceful co-existence of the Soviet Union and the Western capitalist powers. The United Nations, ultimately, was supposed to express this new cooperation in the post-war peace.

Stalin, for the Soviet Government, endorsed the Teheran joint statement as being in line with the historic co-existence policy of the U.S.S.R. The hard-boiled British imperialist, Churchill, however, undoubtedly signed the declaration tongue-in-cheek, with no intention whatever

of carrying out its peaceful implications. As for Roosevelt, who was a liberal, he probably contemplated some sort of a cooperative attitude towards the U.S.S.R. in the post-war period, but this was in no sense the perspective of Wall Street. This fact was dramatically made manifest immediately after the death of Roosevelt on April 12, 1945, when his successor, the Soviet-hater, Harry S. Truman, began at once to put into effect the violently anti-Soviet line of American monopoly capital. The basic mistake at this time of Earl Browder, who became a renegade, was that, taking the Teheran agreement at its face value, he hopped to the absurd conclusion that Wall Street monopoly would perform the miracle of abandoning its inveterate anti-Soviet spirit and that henceforth it intended to live in peaceful relations with the U.S.S.R. This anti-Leninist conception took him right into the camp of imperialist reaction.

In its grandiose policies of post-war world domination, Wall Street considered the Soviet Union to be the greatest of all stumbling blocks in its path of imperialist conquest, one that had to be destroyed by a great world war. Its general imperialist strategy to accomplish world domination was much akin to that of Hitler in his ill-fated bid, along with his fascist allies, for world power. Both German and American imperialism worked on the same general lines: first, to subdue the other capitalist powers (with their present and potential antagonisms)

and to absorb their economic and military strength; and then, to deliver an all-out capitalist blow against the U.S.S.R.

Following out this strategy, Hitler had taken over control of capitalist Europe by smashing the armies and governments of the various capitalist countries; whereupon he launched into his fatal attack upon the U.S.S.R. But Wall Street, with shiny new hypocritical slogans of peace and democracy, to replace Hitler's naked and rough militarist-fascist world-conquest slogans, undertook the subordination of the capitalist world by somewhat different means—by a gigantic system of loans and gifts, by economic penetration, and by political intimidation. To accomplish the second part of this program, the military attack upon the U.S.S.R., Wall Street has worked out a most elaborate strategy.

In his time Hitler had vastly underestimated the tremendous strength of the U.S.S.R., to his own undoing, a mistake that Wall Street has sedulously tried to avoid. Although Hitler had behind him not only the powerful German army and economic system (plus those of Italy, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, etc.) and also the organized productive strength of France, Belgium, Holland, Poland, Scandinavia, etc., he could not overcome the Russians. Instead of the Soviet Union being defeated in six weeks, as Hitler had boasted, it was Nazi Germany itself that was already beginning to get into the trouble that was soon to be

disastrous to it.

Wall Street, learning from these historic lessons, has striven to bring an even greater power to bear against the Soviet Union, especially as that country is obviously now vastly more powerful than it was during the great Second World War. To accomplish this, Wall Street promptly outlined a tremendous campaign in preparation for an eventual all-capitalist attack against the U.S.S.R. As the war campaign has gone on over the years, there have developed three general prongs to this scheme of war: a) to arm the American and other capitalist peoples to the teeth, especially with A- and H-bombs, and to transform their economies into a monster munitions-producing machine; b) to build a great anti-Soviet war alliance of all the important capitalist governments in the world; and c) to cultivate an anti-Soviet, pro-war hysteria among the masses of the peoples of the world aimed at making them sanction the boundless slaughter of a great atomic world war. Wall Street seeks to use the whole capitalist world to crush the U.S.S.R.

All United States post-war policy, foreign and domestic, has been directed to accomplish these general ends. This has been the purpose of the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, NATO and EDC, American domination of the United Nations, the get-tough-with Russia policy, atomic diplomacy, the Japanese treaty, American participation in the Korean and Indo-China wars, the

enormous militarization of the United States, and all the rest of it. The heart of post-World War II political history is, on one hand, the story of the attempt of the United States to carry through its monstrous anti-Soviet world war program, and on the other, that of the efforts of the U.S.S.R. and the democratic masses of the world to make this Wall Street world war program impossible of realization.

THE GROWING FAILURE OF THE WALL STREET ANTI- SOVIET WAR POLICY

The sum-up of the vast anti-Soviet campaign of the United States during the post-World War II years, in which it has squandered, all told, no less than 250 billion dollars of the American taxpayers' money here and overseas, is the growing failure of this campaign. So far has this failure progressed by now that it amounts to practical bankruptcy, a bankruptcy which extends to all three prongs of Wall Street's general war program:

a) Although the United States has succeeded in building a tremendous war machine in this and other capitalist countries, one with a vast army, navy, and air force, with air bases all over the world and with a growing production of A-and H-bombs, nevertheless, this monstrous war machine is essentially futile, because the Soviet Union has broken the atomic and hydrogen bomb "monopoly" upon which the whole monopolist war plan rested, and it and

its friends have also built up a tremendous military force equal at least to that of the capitalist world. In fact, it is now a practical certainty that if the capitalist world should attack the socialist world it would march to overwhelming political and military disaster.

b) Although the United States, after a prodigious expenditure of effort and money, has also hammered together in some fashion the major capitalist powers of the world into an anti-Soviet alliance, in the NATO and in the United Nations, this projected war alliance is also stricken with futility. It is crippled with sharpening internal capitalist contradictions and blocked by the peace pressure of the masses. This potential war alliance is actually much weaker today than it was two years ago. Not only the working class and its allies, but also important sections of the bourgeoisie in many countries are being forced to the opinion that they "must do business with the Russians and Chinese"; which helps to explain why, in their latest conferences, Churchill and Eden were talking, however trickily, about policies of peaceful co-existence with the Soviets. Great Britain and France, expressing their opposing imperialist interests, are now quarrelling violently with Washington over international policy; while many other countries, not so long ago ruthlessly dominated by arrogant American imperialism, are now showing much more independence and less and less desire to go along with the United

States upon
America
is now
to fly
deklar
America
Nation
so mu
and o
threat
withd
its pu
flout
seatin
can ar
Japan
is very
these
50 bi
States
count
to buy
Soviet
States
fascist
has p
drain.
c) ' States
of the
for a
has a
lusory
of pec
especi
been
Lie" o
Soviet
to ov
that
defen

States in an all-out military attack upon the U.S.S.R. The planned American all-capitalist war alliance is now tottering about, threatening to fly to pieces, as our Party long ago declared that it might well do. American domination of the United Nations has also visibly weakened; so much so that Senator Knowland and other warmongers are loudly threatening to try to destroy it by withdrawing the United States and its puppets, should the U.N. dare to flout Washington's imperial will by seating People's China. The American arming of Western Germany and Japan, even should it succeed, which is very dubious, cannot possibly offset these basic losses in support. The 50 billion dollars that the United States has poured out to the capitalist countries during the post-war period to buy and coerce them into an anti-Soviet war alliance with the United States—on the pattern of the ill-fated fascist Axis of World War II days—has pretty much gone down the drain.

c) The propaganda of the United States, seeking to ready the peoples of the capitalist world ideologically for a great atomic world slaughter, has also not been without some illusory successes. Tens of millions of people all over the capitalist world, especially in the United States, have been deceived by the two-sided "Big Lie" of Wall Street, to the effect that Soviet "Red Imperialism" is about to overrun the world militarily and that the United States is the great defender of world democracy and

peace. However, despite the enormous world-wide propaganda effort of Wall Street to spread these monstrous lies, the peoples of the world, by the hundreds of millions, are rapidly learning that the danger of fascism and another great war is coming, not from the peace-loving Soviet Union but from arrogant American imperialism. They are also alarmed at the sinister growth of McCarthy fascism in the United States. This popular awakening is taking place especially because of the ultra-aggressive policies of the Eisenhower Administration, with its threatening military moves and its repeated atomic bomb ultimatums to the U.S.S.R. and to People's China. The growing realization that a third world war would be a two-sided war of annihilation by atomic and other wholesale slaughter weapons, has vastly stimulated the world demand for peace. The Communist parties of the world and other progressive bodies have been a vital factor in making the peoples of the world understand whence originate the fascist and war danger now menacing the world. So far has this enlightenment gone that today the United States has become, by general admission, the most hated and feared country in the world. Instead of preparing the people of the world to accept a great atomic world war, the general effect of the propaganda and practical policies of the United States has been to strengthen enormously the peace forces of the world. If the world war policies of the United

States imperialists are daily more bankrupt, it is because they are being shattered upon the peace-will of the world's peoples.

Illustrating the reverse side of the failure of American imperialism, all the militarism and atomic threats from the United States and its more belligerent allies have not succeeded in intimidating or checking the growth of Socialism in the world. On the contrary, the great proletarian and colonial revolutions are rolling right on, regardless of Wall Street's attempts to halt and destroy them. Since the end of the war the U.S.S.R. has increased its industrial strength three times over, as compared with what it was in 1940. In Eastern Europe, a whole series of countries, with about 100 million people, have also started on the way to Socialism through their People's Democracies. In China 600 million people (the latest official population estimate) have overthrown imperialism in their country and are on the road to laying the foundations of Socialism, a tremendous event which has shaken world capitalism to its foundations. And all over the world, in the post-war period, there has been a vast spread of colonial-liberation movements and a gigantic growth of Communist parties, trade unions, youth, women, and peace movements.

This growing defeat of Wall Street's aggressive foreign policy, which, as it has developed, has caused repeated changes in bankrupted American military strategy,

can have the most profound consequences, not only for the preservation of peace, but also for the whole cause of world democracy and Socialism. It is creating a new international situation, highly favorable for the forces of human progress. But to go further into this general perspective would take us beyond the proper scope of this article.

WHAT KIND OF PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE ARE THE PEOPLES FIGHTING FOR?

The growing failure of American foreign policy has become so pronounced during the past two years that it is now obvious to all who are not politically blind. Month by month the chances have grown less and less for the United States to launch the all-out capitalist war that its monopolist rulers have been so assiduously trying to organize since the end of World War II. At the present time, in the Indo-China situation, the failure of aggressive American imperialist policy has become so accentuated as to amount virtually to a debacle.* The very existence of the capitalist anti-Soviet alliance is being threatened in this situation.

Does all this mean that, with American imperialism increasingly checkmated in its policy of warlike aggrandizement, the danger of war has been liquidated? Does it signify that Wall Street will voluntarily reorient itself and begin to develop a program based upon co-

* The conclusion, on July 20, of the truce in the Indo-Chinese War, serves further to confirm this analysis.—*Editor.*

existence, even in the shape of an armed truce, with the U.S.S.R., People's China and the European Democracies? Does it imply that such an armed stalemate is the best that the peoples may look forward to for an indefinite future?

These three questions must be answered in the negative. As for the war danger, that will continue to exist in a dangerous form so long as the imperialist monopolists remain in control of this country and its present gigantic war machine—and so long as it is increasingly dominated by atom-maniacs, neo-McCarthyites, and military adventurers. United States foreign policy, in the face of growing failures, is becoming more irrational and insane. It is composed largely of fear, hysteria, desperation, wishful thinking, fascist arrogance, and imperialist aggression. A few examples of such political irrationality and aberrations are the Oppenheimer and Army-McCarthy idiocies on the domestic field, and, in foreign affairs, the mad attempt to spread the Indo-China war, the nonsensical efforts to undo and reverse the Chinese Revolution, and the crazy Dulles "liberation" policy. Such dangerous irrationality is inevitably generated among the capitalists in this period of general capitalist crisis and decay. The most serious danger of war in the present situation is that the pro-war elements in Washington, full of desperation at their loss of allies and the defeat of their policies, may themselves attempt to launch a great war.

Indeed, during the past two years we have seen them make precisely such attempts on at least three different occasions: 1) their desperate attempt to spread the Korean conflict into an atomic war against People's China, an outrage that was balked by the great world protest which it evoked; 2) the organized putsch in East Germany on June 17, 1953, an American-planned uprising which, had it not been swiftly defeated, might have plunged Germany into a great civil war, with the gravest danger of this provoking a world war, and, 3) the present desperate attempt of the United States to drag on Britain, France, and a whole row of puppet and satellite states into expanding the war in Indo-China into a broad and hopeless Asian atomic war. Such reckless, irrational, and irresponsible war adventures we must count upon so long as American monopolists, now being defeated on all world fronts, are able to control and arbitrarily to direct a great military power with a huge potential for war-making.

As for the United States, while it remains dominated by imperialists, the possibility of its voluntarily recognizing the futility of its war program and of working out a policy of peaceful co-existence with the U.S.S.R., even upon the basis of an armed truce, is practically negligible. If history since the Russian Revolution of 1917 has taught us anything, it is that the great monopoly capitalists of the world, of which American imperialism is the most power-

ful expression, are the inveterate, undying enemies of the Soviet Union and of all other socialist lands. So long as these monopolists possess great military power, as in the United States, they will plot and scheme against the lands of Socialism, waiting only for a favorable opportunity, or what in their increasingly insane policies they consider to be such, to launch a military attack against these socialist countries. The most desperate elements among these warmongers are the American "go it alone" fanatics. The only time the big capitalists of the world (*i.e.*, American imperialism and its allies) will abide by a perspective of peaceful co-existence with the U.S.S.R., People's China, and the People's Democracies is when they have been curbed both abroad and at home by the democratic peace forces and are therefore no longer able to threaten the world militarily. To believe otherwise, would be to fall once more into the trap of Browder, with his theory of "intelligent," "progressive," and "beneficent" American monopolists.

As for the world going into a prolonged period of armed stalemate between the capitalist and socialist countries—a co-existence at the point of the gun, so to speak—this is most unlikely, if not outright impossible. The peoples of the world do not act according to the Trotsky slogan of "neither peace nor war," (Brest-Litovsk) but the Stalin slogan of "peaceful co-existence." They will never rest content to waste half of their incomes on useless military expendi-

tures and to live under the constant threat of a murderous atomic world war. The same world peace forces which are now so successfully defeating the world-conquest policies of American imperialism on many fronts will drive through for the establishment of a real peaceful co-existence among the capitalist and socialist countries, one that is worthy of civilized humanity. Already the outlines of what they are heading for are visible in the policies they are fighting for today. These are: universal disarmament, abolition of atomic, chemical, bacteriological, and similar mass destruction weapons; establishment of full trade relations among all countries, cultivating an all-round cultural exchange among the peoples; the realization, without imperialist interference, of full independence of all countries, including especially their right to establish, by revolution or otherwise, such types of social regimes as they may see fit; the seating of People's China and other democratic nations in the United Nations; liquidation of the present imperialist war alliances, such as NATO and EDC, and development of the United Nations into a genuine peace organization instead of an instrument of the warlike policy of American imperialism. The June Pandit Nehru-Chou En-lai meeting, along this general line, stressed policies of mutual respect for their respective countries, territorial integrity, non-aggression and non-interference in each other's internal affairs, and full development

of mu
course
Such
fough
would
war
peacef
a situ
the p
world
non, I
plete
gram
Wall
THE
THI
CO-
The
masses
workin
section
middle
ments
a vital
ized,
analyz
of aggr
in the
in this
ple to
the so
lnum
given
masses
as the
militar
auge
their
the K
tempts
Eisenh

of mutual trade and cultural intercourse.

Such measures, already being fought for by the world's peoples, would abolish completely the cold war and substantially establish peaceful co-existence; would create a situation altogether different from the present position of two armed world camps. To realize this situation, however, necessitates the complete defeat of the entire war program of the monopolist moguls of Wall Street.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AND THE FIGHT FOR PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

The great democratic, peace-loving masses of the American people—the working class, the Negro people, large sections of the farmers and city middle classes (and even some elements of the bourgeoisie)—have been a vital factor, far more than is realized, in the developing defeat, as analyzed above, of the world policies of aggressive American imperialism, in the fight for world peace, which in this period is basically the struggle for the peaceful co-existence of the socialist and capitalist countries. Innumerable examples might be given of the peace pressure of the masses upon the government, such as their long resistance to universal military training, their opposition to huge military expenditures, and their practically open opposition to the Korean war. In the gross attempts of both the Truman and Eisenhower Administration to drop

A-bombs on Chinese cities and to spread the Korean war, the opposition of the American people (as well as the world outcry against such a monstrous outrage) was a decisive factor in staying the hand of the atom-maniacs. If Eisenhower and Dulles are now hesitating to send American foot soldiers into Indo-China, a vital force contributing thereto is the active opposition of the American people to such a course. By the same token, if President Eisenhower now speaks, however demagogically, of peaceful co-existence with the Soviet Union, he knows quite well that peaceful co-existence is precisely what the great American masses want.

The opposition of the American democratic masses to the war program of Wall Street is all the more significant because it is being exerted in the face of the treachery of their political and trade-union leaders. Thus, New Deal remnants such as Mrs. Roosevelt, Senators Douglas, Humphrey, Lehman, *et al.*, as well as such labor misleaders as Meany, Reuther, Harrison, and others, are even outdoing the Eisenhower Administration in clamoring for larger military appropriations and for a more positive (*i.e.*, aggressive) foreign policy by the United States.

The achievement of peaceful co-existence between the capitalist and socialist worlds (or concretely, between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.) cannot be fully realized simply by the defeat of the foreign policies of American imperialism, important

though this task is. Wall Street must also be politically defeated on its home grounds, in the United States. So long as the big monopolists dominate the United States, with their control over the immense industries and war machine, and with their political support, not only from the Republican and Democratic parties, but also from almost the entire top trade-union bureaucracy, just so long will they continue to be a malignant threat to world peace and therewith to the peaceful co-existence of capitalist and socialist states. Stalin, among his last statements, re-emphasized Lenin's position that so long as imperialism lasts there will be danger of war—a warning which is doubly pertinent with regard to American imperialism.

The power of American imperialism must be curbed in the United States. This is the immediate great task of the American people. And they will accomplish the job much sooner than even the most optimistic Communist now realizes. As things now stand, American imperialism seems to be a most powerful and fearsome political power. But it is nevertheless rotten at the heart, like capitalism everywhere. Mao Tse-tung made a fundamental estimate of its real strength when he called it "a paper tiger."

The *Draft Program* of the Communist Party, which has been widely discussed during the past few months, gives a clear line of how the struggle against warmaking American imperialism must be conducted.

This calls for a relentless fight against every phase of the cold war, and for the easing of international tension, with concrete proposals for fighting McCarthyism, the devastation of economic crisis, and the danger of war. The first stage in the general political struggle is the mobilization of all the democratic forces, including, "labor, the working farmers, the Negro people, small and middle-sized business groups opposed to the McCarthy program of fascism and war" into a popular coalition movement.

"The immediate objective in 1954," states the *Draft Program*, "must be to prevent the Eisenhower Administration and Congress from taking the country further down the road of McCarthyism. Defeating McCarthyism requires the turning of the present Administration out of political power, first by changing the composition of Congress in 1954 and then by electing a new Administration in 1956. This requires a new political majority so strong that it not only changes the Administration but imposes on a new Congress and a new Administration a new course in domestic and foreign affairs." As the great mass of the workers and other progressive strata are now supporting the two big bourgeois parties, principally the Democratic Party, this necessitates organizing them for action where they now are.

The election of such a government, as proposed, would be a defeat of the war program of American imperialism and would go far to guar-

antee w
and the
with th
Program
"As t
electing
blocking
ism an
gle will
the pers
a new
labor g
in our
ment, I
will rep
the grea
ment in
a leadi
the con
arbing
Alrea
foreign
Carthy
nomic
domest
The d
than
alarme
of Du
McCar
econor
which
are eve
signific
of the
becomi
policies
ration
that w
import
The w
other
gradua

guarantee world peace. But the workers and their allies would not stop short with this partial victory. The *Draft Program* further states:

"As the American people succeed in electing a new Administration and blocking the immediate menace of fascism and war, a new stage of the struggle will begin to unfold. It is then that the perspective of subsequently electing a new type of government, a farmer-labor government, will begin to arise in our country. Such a people's government, based on a farmer-labor party, will represent the militant advance of the great majority. It will be a government in which the working class plays a leading role, serving the interests of the common people, and directed to curbing the power of the trusts."

Already the decay of American foreign policy, the growth of McCarthyism, and the developing economic crisis are having profound domestic effects in the United States. The democratic masses, far more than is realized, are becoming alarmed at the crazy war policies of Dulles and his like, the rise of McCarthyite fascism, the menacing economic crisis, and the hostility which American imperialist policies are evoking all over the world. Significantly, too, considerable sections of the American bourgeoisie are also becoming alarmed at the warlike policies of the Eisenhower Administration—a split in capitalist ranks that will grow wider and will have important political consequences. The workers, the Negro people, and other democratic strata, are already gradually beginning the political

march which in the long run will break the power of American imperialism and which will provide the final guarantee for world peace.

All over the world the decisive leadership in the fight against war and for the peaceful co-existence of capitalist and socialist states devolves upon the Communist parties. It is their historic task, as the authentic spokesmen for the working class and all humanity in this decisive period of the going over from capitalism to Socialism, to lead in shaping policy, in educating and organizing the masses, and in general in giving the progressive united front lead to all mankind in this greatest political crisis it has ever faced. The Communist Party of the United States, despite its small size and its present difficult situation under the heavy attack from the most powerful and ruthless of all capitalist governments, also shares in this worldwide constructive Communist responsibility. Stalin said long ago that our Party is one of the few Communist parties of the world destined eventually to play a decisive role in the world struggle for Socialism. Let us, therefore, work in the spirit of this inspiring forecast. The world situation, with American imperialism and its allies going to one defeat after another, and with the forces of peace, democracy, and Socialism irresistibly on the march, should make our Party rise above its present many difficulties and attack its great tasks with a new spirit of optimism and resolution.

Comrade Eugene Dennis: An Appreciation and An Amnesty Appeal

By Charles P. Mann

WRITING, IN 1920, on an anniversary occasion in the life of the great Lenin, Comrade Stalin made the following observation in respect to the question of Party leaders: "History knows of proletarian leaders who were leaders in times of storm, practical leaders, self-sacrificing and courageous, but who were weak in theory. The names of such leaders are not soon forgotten by the masses. But the movement as a whole cannot live on reminiscences alone: it must have a clear goal (a program), and a firm line (tactics)."

Then again: "There is another type of leader—peacetime leaders, who are strong in theory, but weak in matters of organization and practical work. Such leaders are popular only among an upper layer of the proletariat, and then only up to a certain time . . . when practical slogans are demanded of the leaders, the theoreticians quit the stage and give way to new men." (J. Stalin, *Works*: Vol. 4, p. 324.)

Notwithstanding the undisputed merit of the above profiled respective leadership types, neither the one nor the other type is fully adequate to the demands of leadership in turbulent and complicated phases of the

struggle. The durable and fully adequate leader must combine ample shares of the qualities of each of the above types. As Comrade Stalin stated it, "To retain the post of leader of the proletarian revolution and of the proletarian party, one must combine strength in theory with experiences in the practical organization of the proletarian movement." (*Ibid.*)

Under the tutelage of the inspiring example of Comrade William Z. Foster, who above all others in our Party measured up to the exacting standards of a leader of the Leninist type, there emerges a collective of leaders at the top of our Party of genuine merit. In the forefront of this collective is the General Secretary of our Party, Comrade Eugene Dennis. The leadership which Comrade Dennis has given and continues to give our Party marks him out as precisely that type of leader who "happily combines the experience of a good practical worker with a theoretical education and a broad political outlook" which, Stalin has taught, must distinguish the leader of those parties with great and historic tasks to perform.

It is not fortuitous that the enemy

seized upon Comrade Dennis over four years ago as the lead-off victim in their continuing drive to crush the resistance forces of the working people, to reduce the Bill of Rights to a scrap of paper, and to pave the way for the ascendancy of counter-revolutionary McCarthyite-fascism and the extension of their military adventures into a worldwide nuclear-bomb conflagration. They recognized in the sterling leadership qualities of Comrade Dennis a product and testament of the ever-growing maturity of the Communist Party and of the great potential for its influence to penetrate into the very pores of the working class, the toiling farmers, the Negro people and all the plundered and repressed who are victimized by the bloodlust of the monopolist ruling circles.

Our comrades in the South have a special regard and affection for Comrade Dennis. The fact that Comrades Eugene Dennis, John Gates, and Bob Thompson are incarcerated in a Federal Prison in the Deep South—in the home town of Comrade Ben Davis, Atlanta, Georgia, establishes in the thoughts of our Southern comrades a special bond of identification with them. Their persecution and imprisonment in a Southern jail is symbolically associated with the oppressed and disfranchised status of the Negro nation and the miserable conditions of life of the poor masses of white workers and farmers.

During one period of the already

four-year-long imprisonment which Comrade Dennis has served, some five hundred cards and letters were sent to him from all parts of the Southern states. The messages of affection, solidarity and fighting resolve to raise higher the banner of amnesty for Comrade Dennis and all the imprisoned Communist leaders (those who were the first victims of McCarthyism's assault upon the Constitutional liberties of all Americans) express the high esteem in which this leader of our Party is held by his comrades. They also offer an insight into the little known but very significant contributions which Comrade Dennis has made through the years to the building of the Party in the South, to the trade-union organization of the workers of town and country, to the unfolding of the Negro people's struggle for equal rights and national liberation, to the development of the broad democratic front of labor and all the popular forces, Negro and white, in unfolding the common struggle for greater economic opportunity, democracy and genuinely representative government and world peace.

Some of the letters recalled that Comrade Dennis' appearance before the fascist-like Committee on Un-American Activities was featured by his bold and dramatic challenging of the competence of that Committee on the grounds that it had among its members such a creature as John Rankin, who maintained his seat in Congress illegally, by virtue of the

disfranchisement of the Negro citizens who constituted the majority of people making up his constituency. This challenge to the right of the whole Dixiecrat bloc in Congress to hold their seats, this indictment of these arch-reactionaries and violators of the human rights and citizenship status of the Negro people, enraged the political misanthropes. At the same time, it endeared him to the hearts of many thousands of Negro and white people of the South and the whole country who have become conscious of the great service his deed rendered to the cause of Negro freedom and political democracy in our country.

Other letters recalled particular occasions when Comrade Dennis displayed his keen insight into, and concern for, the problems of the working people of the South, and the sagacity of his advice. By way of illustration, one comrade writes of a conversation he had with Comrade Dennis some six years past. The conversation had centered on the Negro freedom struggle in the South. It seems that our letter writer had been detailing at great length a host of social afflictions suffered by the Negro people in the South at the hands of their tormentors of the ruling oligarchy. All the while, Comrade Dennis had been quietly and patiently compiling a catalog of these numerous abuses and grievances, according to our writer, when at length he interrupted, with a shy apology for breaking into his chain of thought, and he put the

following question:

"Tell me, comrade, since our forces are so few there, what would you say are the *two problems*, above all others, for which the Negro people are already fighting, or are prepared to fight for the solution of—notwithstanding all odds. The two issues for which all strata of the Negro people are ready to fight, and for which they could win the largest amount of support from among the white working people—taking into consideration all prevailing backward ideas and prejudices which are still rife among the white masses?"

After an extended discussion of several issues, it was finally agreed that the two single issues upon which the Southern Negro masses were bent on fighting through to the end, at that time, were the questions of (1) the full freedom of the franchise, *i.e.*, the *Right to Vote*, and (2) the abolition of all barriers to being admitted to the tax-supported schools, *i.e.*, the right to *Education for their children without segregation or discrimination*.

"Let our comrades assist in every way the unfolding of the struggle for these two vital demands which the Negro people *themselves* have put to the fore as primary for them at this *present level* of the movement. By so doing, our comrades will *strengthen their ties with these masses in motion* and not only will they be able to make a significant contribution to the success of these particular movements, but, they will be in a position

to insure that the struggle will be programmatically broadened and developed to higher levels of organization and militancy."

In the light of the subsequent great movement that the Negro people raised up against school segregation and discrimination which has resulted in the recent historic Supreme Court ruling against segregation in education, one can see how prophetic, how circumspect and practical was the tactical advice of Comrade Dennis to our Southern comrades given six years ago.

Comrade Dennis, also, constantly urged upon our Southern Party leaders to devote a major portion of their time to the indispensable, painstaking work of *personally training promising individual local cadres*. Further, he counseled our comrades to be scrupulous in the use of time and resources needed to perfect a secure system for insuring the maximum possible and timely distribution of our Party's press as well as Party and progressive literature. He taught us to work constantly at perfecting our Party's organization and for our members to increase their ties with organized masses—the workers in the trade unions, in the first instance; to be ever vigilant against the police intrigues of the enemy; resolutely to combat sectarian impatience as well

as defeatist indolence and opportunist accommodation to difficulties, to work creatively and determinedly to execute the program of our Party in conformity with its tactical line.

These and countless other "*Ideas They Cannot Jail*" of Eugene Dennis, continue to guide the development of our Party. Their influence is clearly reflected in the powerful new program of our Party, a program which arms the American working class and popular forces with a mighty weapon of struggle along *The American Way: to Jobs, Peace, Negro Equality, and Democracy*.

Certainly, it is to be anticipated that the Communists in the South, along with hundreds and possibly thousands of working people of the mills and plantations, will not be sparing in exerting real organizational efforts to assure their fullest contribution to the present phase of the struggle to *Free Gene Dennis and All Political Prisoners*.

Amnesty, freedom for Gene Dennis and his colleagues, is a primary task in the struggle to secure the full constitutional rights of all Americans from the outstretched, yawning jaws of McCarthyite-fascism.

Greet Comrade Dennis on his 50th birthday this August *by making news in the fight for freedom!*

The Working Class and the Nation

By Mark Logan

The labor movement must change its course if it is to save itself and help save the nation. . . . Labor must come forward with its own clear cut progressive program for the nation. . . . It must become the propelling force of a popular coalition. . . .

Draft Program, CP—USA

IN THE PASSAGES QUOTED above, and at the very heart of the Draft Program, the Communist Party, USA, calls upon the working class to play its rightful and historic role as defender of our nation, its people, its peace, and its well-being. Basing itself squarely on scientific Marxist-Leninist analysis, the vanguard party of the American working class, born and bred in the crucible of the most important working class struggles of the past hundred years, calls on its class to take leadership in the great struggles immediately ahead—for jobs, peace and democracy. This is the road to save our nation; this is also the highroad to Socialism.

To the forefront, among the urgent tasks of the hour, is building a front "to block the present imminent threat of McCarthyism, thereby upholding the Constitution and the Bill of Rights."

The immediate line-of-march projected in the Draft Program not only meets the prompt, urgent and popular best interests of our nation but also facilitates "the forward march of the majority toward a strengthening of democracy and the election of a new type of government, a farmer-labor, anti-monopoly government," which could then "open up the possibility for a peaceful advance of the American people to Socialism."

Undoubtedly, the die-hard monopolist groupings, who have thrown down the banner of bourgeois-democratic freedoms, will resist bitterly to the end and resort to every means to thwart the democratic aspirations of the people. They will have to be fought at every stage. However, the defense of the best interests of the nation, waged by a popular majority and given "a firm and clear lead" by a united working class, can doom to defeat the monopolist enemies of peace, democracy and security—now, and in the future.

This discussion article wishes to treat—somewhat generally—with certain aspects of this profoundly important and central thesis of the Draft Program.

In capitalist countries throughout the world the working class has become the main champion and defender of democratic freedoms and the main force around which all democratic sectors of the population are rallying. This is well known and is particularly and dramatically evident in countries like France and Italy. Efforts to push these countries further down the road to reaction and war are failing despite all efforts of American imperialism and the desperate maneuvers of powerful, monopolist sectors of the domestic bourgeoisie.

The struggle in each capitalist country is, of course, different, and being waged with varying successes and experiences, depending on specific history, peculiar national traditions, the given class relationships, and other distinguishing characteristics. Nevertheless, it is almost universally true that in the various capitalist countries, bourgeois democratic freedoms are under attack, and the ruling class has been attempting to annul fundamental democratic rights and constitutional and electoral practices, in many places seeking to make it virtually impossible for the people to exercise their popular mandate.

This whole development was brought sharply to the fore in Stalin's last speech delivered to the 19th Congress of the CPSU when he declared:

Formerly the bourgeoisie permitted itself to be liberal, championed bourgeois-democratic freedoms, and in doing

so created for itself popularity among the people. Gone is the so-called 'freedom of the individual,'—the rights of the individual now are recognized only in the case of those who have capital, while all other citizens are regarded as human raw material fit only for exploitation. The principle of equality of peoples and nations has been trampled underfoot; it has been replaced by the principle of full rights for the exploiting minority and no rights for the exploited majority of citizens. *The banner of bourgeois-democratic freedoms has been thrown overboard.*

If the question of bourgeois-democratic liberties has become of great concern to the peoples of other capitalist countries, in the United States it is particularly true. In our country encroachments on basic democratic freedoms have assumed ominous proportions. The whole structure of constitutional liberties is being dismantled and their defense has become an urgent and primary question for every democratic force, and for the American working class in the first place.

Though there are features in the assaults on democratic freedoms, and their defense, common to all capitalistic lands, yet there are important dissimilarities as well. The unique, the particular, the specific situation in which our own constitutional and democratic freedoms are being placed in jeopardy requires special examination and will finally help determine the particular pattern of the course of action undertaken by the American people.

Of course, we must avoid the fun-

damental and dangerous error of *exaggerating* the specific features of American imperialism. Our Party, some 25 years ago, began to realize the harm that theories of "American exceptionalism" can do to our political line and mass work. The international movement, and particularly Joseph Stalin, helped our Party understand that our main line must be based on the general features of capitalism which are the same for all countries, and that to base the fundamental policies of our Party on specific and unique traits leads to gross opportunist errors.

However, Stalin, and all other great teachers of Marxism-Leninism also stressed that it would be wrong to ignore and to fail to take into account special characteristics. On the contrary, it is here where we must continue to make sound and creative application of Marxist-Leninist theory, developing tactics and approaches that, while *basin* themselves on the basic features that American capitalism has in common with all other capitalist countries, at the same time recognize and cope with the unique and special features of American development.

Lenin, the great genius of Marxism, again and again castigated those who contented themselves with the mechanical translation of the experiences of one country to another. Repeatedly he urged that side by side with an analysis of universal experience there be the most profound study of the concrete and specific problems and experiences of each given country. Thus, in commenting

on Britain and America, almost fifty years ago, in his Preface to the Russian edition of *Letters to Sorge*, Lenin observed:

But what is more interesting, of course, is to dwell not so much on these American-Russian parallels . . . as on the *fundamental* characteristics of the British and American labor movement (his emphasis)*

Lenin had profound insight into the special characteristics of the American working class and its Marxist movement. He made very apt and profound observations in his writings that have considerable significance for the discussion on our Draft Program, and if fully grasped can give us a richer perception of the democratic tasks before the American working class. Discussing the American political scene and the maturity of the working class, he called attention in the stated Preface to certain unique features which he thought deserved special study, including:

. . . the absence of any big, nationwide, *democratic* problems whatever facing the proletariat; the complete subjection of the proletariat to bourgeois politics; the sectarian isolation of groups, handfuls of Socialists from the proletariat; not the slightest success of the Socialists in the elections among the working masses, etc. (Lenin's emphasis.)

In concluding on this point, Lenin warned:

Whoever forgets these fundamental conditions and sets out to draw broad

* The text of Lenin's Preface is contained in our November 1953 issue.—Ed.

conclusions from 'American-Russian parallels' displays extreme superficiality.

The general cautioning against "extreme superficiality" that results from abstract and sweeping generalizations, and which comes from failing to study the specific time, place and circumstance, is not outmoded advice. It is part of the continuing Marxist struggle to combine at all times theory with practice, to avoid succumbing to a method of political work in which theory is a lifeless and static dogma. In this sense Lenin's warning is always pertinent and in order.

What is more, the *special* characteristics of the American political scene, pointed to by Lenin almost 50 years ago, have not been lost on our Party, though perhaps at times the awareness of their importance has not been as great as the facts warranted.

For example, for many years, both before the revisionist mistakes made under Browder, and certainly since the reconstitution of the CP USA, our Party has attempted to break down "the sectarian isolation of Socialists from the proletariat." Foster's *History of the Communist Party, USA*, treats with many of the chief steps taken in the past thirty-five years to base our Party more firmly on the shops, mines and docks and among the basic sections of the proletariat. These measures included the decisions at the 1925 convention reorganizing our Party from "language federations" to organizations based on shop and street branches. The

Party conventions in 1925, 1927 and in the early '30s "put growing emphasis upon concentration work, that is, the strengthening of the Party's work among the miners, steel workers, railroaders, maritime workers, chemical workers and others employed in the basic and trustified industries," and thus, among other great contributions to the labor movement, "trained thousands of fighters who later formed the very foundations of the C.I.O."

As our Party approaches its 35th anniversary, the trade-union movement is stronger and more workers are organized in the chief basic industries of the country than was true when Lenin made the above quoted comments in his Preface to the Russian edition of *Letters to Sorge*. As the Draft Program states, "The Communist Party considers the emergence of a powerful trade union movement during these past two decades as the important and positive development in our national life. We are proud to have helped build it and to be a part of it. As a working class political party we strive to influence the policies of the labor movement and deem it our right and duty to speak out against policies which we believe are harmful to labor and the nation."

However, there is still much validity in Lenin's observation in this regard. The task of breaking down the barriers that still separate the American Communists from large sections of the trade union movement and from many basic segments of the proletariat still remains as the

main task before the American Communist Party.

As for his comment that there has not been "the slightest success of the Socialists in the elections among the working masses," here too there have been many significant developments, but the fundamental validity of this fact still holds. For purposes of brevity we would only call attention to the rich and instructive articles by Foster in the POLITICAL AFFAIRS issue of November 1953 and by John Swift in the July issue of 1954, and also chapter 37 of Foster's *History of the CP, USA*, "The American Working Class and Socialism." The fact remains that smashing the fascist menace, defeating the warmongers, and curbing the trusts hinges not only on "the ability of labor to come forward as a distinct political force even within the framework of the present two party system" in the crucial 1954 and 1956 elections, but will finally rest on whether labor "sets its sights in the direction of a great party of its own."

The greatest success that present-day Marxists can have in elections among working masses is to help develop the perspective of a mass third party, organized and led by labor, and free from the influences of "Wall Street financiers, corrupt underworld racketeers, or Southern Dixiecrats—in short, a true united front party of labor and the common man," as called for in the Draft Program. For the working masses, a great party of their own will not only defend the nation from the immediate menace of fascism and war, un-

fold a new stage of struggle and represent a militant advance of the majority, but it will also inevitably deepen the class consciousness of millions of workers, and speed the day when the majority will seek the ultimate solution of socialism for the problems of the working class and the nation.

This brings us to the third of Lenin's observations, and the one which we wish to discuss at greater length—the fact that in the United States there had been the "absence of any big, nationwide, democratic problems whatever facing the proletariat." A fundamental study of American history readily corroborates Lenin's view, *even as examination of present-day America reveals the emergence of great national democratic tasks for the proletariat.*

From the very inception, America, born in one of the "great, really liberating, really revolutionary wars" arose as a purely bourgeois state with no important feudal survivals, except of course for the South. Marx and Engels in speaking of pre-imperialist America, often commented on the "purely bourgeois institutions un-leavened by feudal remnants of monarchical traditions and without a permanent and hereditary proletariat."

However, this did not mean that the revolution of 1776 brought forth a fully developed bourgeois democracy. Nor did the absence of a permanent and hereditary proletariat mean that in the post-revolutionary years and during the 19th century the working class played no role in fight-

ing for *extension* of democratic freedoms.

Foster, in his *History of the C.P. U.S.*, writes:

Great as were the accomplishments of the Revolution, it nevertheless left unsolved many bourgeois-democratic tasks. These unfinished tasks constituted a serious hindrance to the nation's fullest development. The struggle to solve these questions in a progressive direction made up the main content of United States history for the next three-quarters of a century. Among the more basic of these tasks were the abolition of slavery, the opening up of the broad western lands to settlement, and the deepening and extension of the democratic rights of the people.

In the first flush of struggle for power and liberation from England the American bourgeoisie defended the right to revolution and produced the great liberating document of its time—the Declaration of Independence. Even in its earliest days, however, the bourgeoisie was far from a consistent fighter for democracy. Formally proclaiming the right of "freedom and equality for all," it sought in practice freedom for the bourgeoisie alone. From its earliest days it was haunted by fear that the workers and all the oppressed of the land might some day demand full payment on the promissory notes that had been given. Thus, from the very outset, the extension of even limited bourgeois-democratic freedoms was won only as a consequence of constant prodding and struggles of the workers, Negro people and the small

farmers. The history of these struggles is well known.

Quite early in its history, the American bourgeoisie showed how quickly and ruthlessly it would discard all pretenses of concern for democratic rights when it felt that its power or profit was being challenged. Thus, but a few short years after the Revolution the bourgeoisie, frightened by democratic measures already passed or being propagated, quickly dropped its democratic mask and embarked upon a reign of terror against the people.

The democratic press was to be silenced, free speech denied, the right of petition proscribed; and the democratic 'heresy' was to be crushed if need be by armed force. Livingston was denounced as a traitor for proposing that Gerry should renew negotiations in Paris; The *Aurora* was 'seditious' for telling the Irish what the Alien Law meant for them. . . . The purpose was to terrorize the people into silence. (Claude Bowers, *Atlantic Monthly*, Jan. '53.)

However, as long as capitalism was young and virile, as long as the capitalist system was in the ascendancy, it found it possible, necessary and desirable to adhere in the main to the bourgeois forms of limited democratic rights.

Following the civil war, the notorious betrayal of Reconstruction, and the brutal terror against the Negro people and their most elementary rights, undertaken by joint agreement between the Northern capitalists and the Southern bourbon land owners, glaringly revealed the developing anti-democratic character

of the bourgeoisie. And not only in the South, but throughout the land, countless episodes of brutal and tyrannical acts of oppression and violence came to the fore as part of a long anti-labor and anti-Negro history.

Capitalist democracy, at best, meant that "rich and poor alike were free to sleep on the park bench." However, it was only when American capitalism entered its imperialist stage that its true nature came into full view.

Vernon Louis Parrington, the great liberal and bourgeois-democratic critic, while not fully clear as to the social and economic forces at work, described the growing awareness in the country of "the ceaseless struggle between man and the dollar, between democracy and property." Parrington wrote:

America was not in fact the equalitarian democracy it professed to be. . . . The democratic principle had been bound with withes like Samson. . . . From the beginning—the scholars discovered—democracy and property had been at bitter odds. . . .

In every other major country the working class came into being side by side with the bourgeoisie in struggle against feudalism. They also played an independent political role, even breaking with capitalism—though not completely—embracing socialist views and accepting Marxist leadership in the millions. In America, though there were major militant struggles of epic proportions, workers saw their struggles as mainly for greater economic concessions.

As Lenin wrote in the cited Preface:

"... Marx and Engels taught the Socialists *at all costs* to rid themselves of narrow sectarianism and *join* the labor movement so as to rouse the proletariat *politically*; for in the last third of the 19th century the proletariat displayed *almost no* political independence either in England or America. In these countries—where bourgeois-democratic historical tasks were almost entirely absent—the political arena was *wholly* filled by the triumphant and self-complacent bourgeoisie, which has no equal anywhere in the world in the art of deceiving, corrupting, and bribing the workers." (Lenin's emphasis)

But throughout this period the class struggle grew in intensity. Increasingly the working class came to the fore in economic struggles of great magnitude in which it collided with the mailed fist of the emerging monopoly corporations directly and via class dominated courts, police and legislative bodies. In 1886, Engels wrote:

"... the last Bourgeois Paradise on earth is fast changing into a Purgatorio . . . the newly fledged proletariat of America . . . appear all of a sudden in such organized masses as to strike terror into the whole capitalist class."

The rise of monopoly capitalism and the emergence of a stable and large proletariat struggling to organize itself economically, and whose advanced ranks were beginning to grope for a greater measure of political independence (mainly under the leadership of existing Marxist groups) brought about ever sharper contradictions between the rule of monopoly capitalism and the bourgeois-democratic freedoms that had

existed heretofore.

Lenin described this development when he wrote in *State and Revolution*:

"Imperialism in particular—the era of banking capital, the era of gigantic capitalistic monopolies, the era of the transformation of monopoly capitalism into state monopoly capitalism—shows an unprecedented strengthening of the 'state machinery' and unprecedented growth of its bureaucratic and military apparatus, side by side with the increase of repressive measures against the proletariat. . . ."

Following the First World War, with the development of the general crisis of world capitalism, and the rise of fascism in Italy and Germany, the bourgeoisie in one country after another began to throw down, or draw back from, the banner of bourgeois-democratic freedoms. From a revolutionary class that led the struggle against feudalism, to fearful and inconsistent toleration of democratic rights, they now began to desert the banner of bourgeois-democratic freedoms and turn increasingly to the naked dictatorship of monopoly. The most chauvinistic, most reactionary sections of finance capital found that bourgeois-democratic freedoms had become a barrier, a threat to their dreams of world empire and maximum profits. Under the slogan of a crusade against Communism at home and abroad they seek the systematic dismantlement of the whole structure of bourgeois-democratic freedoms. No one can fail to see that American imperialism, the Wall Street monopolist oligarchs, are doing precisely this, that this is their

portrait and that only the working class can pick up the banner of bourgeois-democratic freedoms and lead the defense of the traditional and constitutional rights of our people. As Foster wrote in the *History of the C.P.U.S.*:

"... now the workers and their democratic allies, here as in all other capitalist lands, have become the sole protectors of democracy. Without the workers' democratic fight, the fascist-minded monopoly capitalists would soon destroy every democratic institution in this country."

Today, the American working class has great democratic problems and historic democratic tasks.

* * *

In our own country, the fascist menace has twice been a real threat. The first time coincided with the explosion of the economic crisis and the forward surge of great sections of the working class, farmers and the Negro people in defense of their rights to work and social security. Important circles of American monopoly began moving in a pro-fascist direction, in the early thirties, with organizations like the Liberty League providing the general staff, and demagogues like Father Coughlin attempting to recruit the mass base.

In response to the shattering impact of the crisis of '29, a new political majority began to take shape in America. It moved slowly, clumsily and with sharp zig-zags towards its objectives. It was dominated by certain sectors of Big Business, and included the working class in its

great majority, small farmers, the Negro people and small business folk. From the very outset it was an extremely unstable alliance, with the various sectors often clashing and never achieving a completely common direction. Yet with all of its weaknesses it was a new, powerful and vitalizing force in American life. Though labor was never the leader of the coalition nor ever made a real bid for leadership yet it was an extremely important factor. However, had it sought to play a more independent role it would have led to even more profound and major social and economic advances. The important leap it made in terms of organization, of unionizing the most basic sections of the working class, made it a far more important and weighty element in the life of the nation. The elementary forms of political action undertaken by the trade union movement further strengthened its role. For the first time American workers began to develop a movement in which the struggle for economic rights and the struggle for democratic rights began to merge. But the independent political action for the most part remained extremely primitive in its forms and content, and the social-democratic and reformist labor bureaucracy were content to have labor completely subordinated and giving unqualified support to the Big Business elements heading the coalition.

Today the fascist threat in our country is far more grave and has made much deeper inroads into the whole structure and foundation of

bourgeois-democratic freedoms. The tragic feature of the post-war years was that the popular majority of the New Deal and the war against Hitlerism, dominated as it was by the bourgeoisie (and the bulk of the labor movement by its reformist leadership), succumbed to the "cold war" drive of the monopolists and therefore in great measure paralyzed itself as an effective political force in the life of the nation and began to disintegrate. Organized labor, 15 million strong, by now a mighty and stable force, which could have, by more independent initiative and direction, done much to hold and build a new popular majority and to give it a new type of leadership, was unfortunately itself caught tightly in the vise of the cold war schemes of American imperialism.

Yet, it is evident that despite the passivity and the acquiescence of the bulk of reformist labor leaders, the specter of this popular majority still haunts the bourgeoisie. So much so, that it undertakes every measure to destroy the possibilities of its re-creation.

The Truman Administration, which initiated the cold war, was the first to undertake the task. It moved cautiously, but moved nevertheless determinedly, both to attach the various component elements of the "New Deal" coalition to itself through demagoguery about the "Fair Deal" and through "selling" it the cold war, while simultaneously laying the groundwork for its destruction through such measures as Taft-Hartley, the loyalty oaths, the McCarran

Act, Smith Act prosecutions, etc. These legislative measures and executive edicts were enabling acts for future fascist rule.

With the advent of the Eisenhower regime the attack against the basic, popular interests of the nation and against a *potential* new popular democratic majority was unleashed with greater fury. The main blows were carefully selected for the labor movement and the vanguard political party of the working class. However, no component part of any progressive popular majority is safe, past or future, from the Cadillac cabinet and the McCarthyite Congress and courts.

Every effort is being undertaken to destroy the gathering unity of the people, to paralyze its ability to function as a political force in the life of the nation. It seeks to discredit and to achieve the complete ostracism of the New Deal traditions and achievements. The Eisenhower regime has stopped at nothing in order to achieve this, including the linking of the former President with supposed espionage. Thus, in spite of hypocritical disclaimers, it is hand in hand with McCarthy's charge of "twenty years treason," and the Dewey-McCarthy efforts to conjure up the whole New Deal era as an age of treason and national betrayal.

Among the primary and characteristically unique American aspects of the overall struggle to defend and extend bourgeois-democratic freedoms is the struggle for full equality for the Negro people throughout the

U.S.A., and for freedom of the Negro nation in the deep South.

As William Z. Foster wrote in the Preface to his book, *The Negro People in American History*:

During the three-and-a-half centuries since the first English colonies were planted along the Atlantic Coast, the landowner and industrialist rulers of this country . . . have committed many monstrous crimes against the growing American people . . .

But the worst of all the crimes of expanding capitalism in this country has been the centuries-long outrage it has perpetrated, and continues to perpetrate, against the Negro people. To satisfy the greed of an arrogant landed aristocracy, the Negroes were stolen from their African homeland and compelled to submit, generation after generation, to a chattel slavery which was a measureless tragedy to them and a shame to our nation. And after the Negroes were emancipated, in the course of the great revolution of 1861-1865, they were forced into a semi-slavery which still persists. During three generations of "freedom," the Negroes have been lynched, pillaged, Jim Crowed, and generally mistreated as being less than human, in order to fatten the profits of insatiable capitalist exploiters. The most shameful pages of American history are those dealing with the exploitation and oppression of the Negro masses.

The long and heroic struggle of the Negro people against the outrages to which they have been subjected is the greatest epic in our nation's history. . . . During the course of their long, bitter uphill struggle the American Negro people have welded themselves literally into a nation.

Today the relationship between the

fight for Negro equality and liberation and the fight in defense of overall bourgeois-democratic freedoms points up the crisis of American bourgeois democracy in a particular way and is of crucial and urgent importance to the struggle to build a democratic coalition against fascism under the leadership of the working class. This whole area of questions requires extended treatment which the author of this article does not undertake in the confines of this piece. The profoundly rich report of Ben Davis to the 1951 convention of our Party and many subsequent articles that have appeared in *Political Affairs* have shed considerable light on this question, and above all Foster's volume in chapters dealing with the Jim Crow system today, *The Road Ahead*, and *Negro National Liberation*.

Questions that are directly germane to the subject matter of this article include: The fight for Negro equality and the struggle for bourgeois-democratic freedom; the role of the working class of the USA in the fight for Negro equality and Negro liberation; the role of the Negro working class in the struggle for Negro liberation, and in unity with the white workers in defense of bourgeois-democratic freedoms in the U.S.A. today; and finally the struggle for freedom for the Negro nation as related to defense of the national interests of the U.S.A. as a whole, and the various stages of this struggle as they relate to one another.

The recent decision of the Supreme Court on segregation in edu-

cation, historic in its significance as a victory for the Negro people in particular, bears directly upon and highlights special features of the crisis of American bourgeois democracy and the many pathways of struggle before the American working class and their allies. The Supreme Court decision was wrested from the bourgeoisie by intensive, prolonged and heroic struggles on the part of the Negro people, aided by the American working class as a whole (in spite of the white supremacist, divisionist and opportunist impediments of the reformist and social-democratic misleaders of labor). Furthermore, the Eisenhower Administration, acutely aware of its tottering prestige among the Asian, African and Latin American peoples, was influenced by the liberation struggles throughout the colonial world, and the proletarian international solidarity of the socialist lands and the New People's Democracies, demonstrated in countless ways, in the U.N. and out.

Insofar as the ruling monopoly circles, the Southern bourbons, the Eisenhower Administration and the Dixiecrats are concerned, the Supreme Court decision will remain, at best, so much papier-mache facade, a phony "democratic" fig-leaf as part of the "free world" fraud, to cover the drive for world domination and behind which segregation and discrimination will continue in multitudinous forms—UNLESS there is united action between labor and the Negro people. The working class, white and Negro, has a special responsibility in this struggle.

All
a point
democ
a new
eviden
bourge
If th
the fou
proced
the co
consci
stroy i
ration
tures a
of the
dom,"
tern f
cause
million
tors an
and fas
have a
metho
geois-d
factors
topolis
fascist
ense"
world.
The
Lerner
crisis"
and car
time to
ers, w
iced on
betwe
depart
ber th
of han
each o
Ther
The b

All of these factors have led us to a point where *the struggle to defend democratic liberties has entered into a new phase. Each new assault gives evidence of the growing crisis of bourgeois democracy in our country.*

If the monopolists still maintain the formal semblance of democratic procedure and speak in the name of the constitution even as they move consciously and continuously to destroy it, if the Eisenhower Administration still engages in formal gestures and even speaks in the name of the "Bill of Rights" and "freedom," it is not because of any concern for these rights. It is only because we live in a world in which millions have gone through the horrors and the experience of world war and fascism: only because Americans have a long history of parliamentary methods of rule and strong bourgeois-democratic traditions. These factors, among others, force the monopolists to seek to achieve their fascist aims behind a facade of "defense" of democracy and of the "free world."

The Walter Lippmanns and Max Lerner speak of a "constitutional crisis" but mean thereby the anarchy and cannibalism that breaks out from time to time among the witch hunters, when the McCarthys begin to feed on the Stevens, when the rivalry between the Executive and Legislative department as to who can dismember the constitution better gets out of hand and they begin to step on each other's toes in the competition.

There is a *real* constitutional crisis. The bourgeoisie does not yet for-

mally outlaw and illegalize the Bill of Rights and the Constitution. It continues to operate behind the smokescreen of "due process." It still attempts to give "legal" sanction to all of its illegal encroachments. But even as it does so, the facade becomes more shabby and threadbare. Though it continues to develop new forms of demagoguery, it finds increasing numbers of people developing immunity to its hypocrisies, especially in the ranks of the working class. As a result it turns more and more to open terror. The present economic recession and the swiftly maturing economic crisis finds the Eisenhower Administration stepping up the construction of the fascist gallows for American democracy.

Today, the fascist direction being taken by the most powerful circles of monopoly capitalism places upon the working class a great historic task, a great national democratic task, to help create and aspire to the leadership of a new popular majority which can defeat the fascist menace and keep open the road to ever greater freedom.

The struggle to defend democracy today requires the unity of all democratic strata of the population in united action with the working class. But in the first place it requires the unity of the working class. While labor unity cannot be viewed as developing schematically or in stages, nor will it have to develop into full-blown organic unity before the democratic *unity in action* of the bulk of the population can deliver powerful blows against the fascist menace,

the fact remains that working class unity is paramount and decisive to its own fighting ability and to make possible its leadership of the democratic front.

Slowly and belatedly, and even at this stage, with great hesitation and unevenness, organized labor has begun to sense its stake, if not its role, in the struggle against the fascist developments in our country. The Eisenhower Administration and its McCarthyite policies have helped jar awake certain new sections of the trade union movement. Draft legislation like the Goldwater-Rhodes and Butler Bills have bluntly served notice on even the most conservative labor unions that the monopoly corporations want the power of life and death over each and every labor organization. And every labor spokesman has indicated that he understands this.

The developing economic crisis has given all these developments additional meaning and the labor movement, in its various sectors, has begun to realize—though not always to the same degree—what is in store for it unless it unites and begins to fight back. A growing number of trade unions have begun once again to see the tie-up between the economic and democratic struggles and the perspective is for an ever greater merger of these battles.

There have been two main barriers to the organized labor movement passing over to a more vigorous counter-offensive and playing its full historic role in this period.

First, the fact that for the most part

the top labor bureaucracy has been committed and tied to the "cold war" and the imperialist policies of world domination of the big corporations. The long standing devotion to policies of peaceful co-existence between nations, advocated by some of the more progressively-led independent unions and some few influential leaders in AFL and CIO unions, is now being reinforced to an extent. The reinforcement, for the moment, is chiefly from labor union groupings who have begun to suspect only recently that the foreign policy of General Motors statesmen can't be much better for the nation than the domestic policies of General Motors employers and cabinet members. Considerable soul searching is taking place, and certainly the war-mongering of *some* of the labor leaders is more restrained as the deep-going peace sentiment of their membership continues to grow. The upsurge of the mood for peace among the great mass of union members can only be ignored on the pain of growing isolation. However, there are still the Meanys who feel they can compete with the most bloodthirsty of the Eisenhower war-mongers. The labor movement's resistance to fascist encroachments on its rights will continue to be weak and hardly effective until this state of affairs improves sharply.

The second obstacle has been the inability of the greater part of the labor movement effectively to fight McCarthyism as long as they practiced McCarthyite loyalty oaths, heresy trials, Red-baiting, witch-hunts

and
Here
noted
still
fine
ter-of
front
ception
ciation
senate
in V
AFL
hand
the
"Joe-
welco
grow
howe
erties
the d
ism.
of no
labor
McCa
witch
mitted
strugg
Bot
fact t
reform
subscr
that t
aggre
and th
Onc
down,
toric
leader
in cor
percei
—by s
the U
course

and purges in their own unions. Here, more of a change can be noted than on the issue of peace, but still not enough to translate the many fine resolutions into a fighting counter-offensive, waged by a common front. All unions, with very few exceptions, are strong in their denunciation of McCarthy, the junior senator from Wisconsin. However, in Wisconsin, both the CIO and AFL shamefully failed to lend a hand (not to talk about leading) to the powerful and near-successful "Joe-Must-Go" recall movement. A welcome development has been the growing recognition that the Eisenhower-Brownell assaults on civil liberties and labor's rights are part of the danger of fascism, of McCarthyism. But, in spite of condemnation of not only the most obvious anti-labor bills, but also of the Smith and McCarran acts, and of the various witch-hunting Congressional committees, here too, aggressive united struggle is still lacking.

Both these obstacles stem from the fact that large sections of the top reformist trade-union bureaucracy subscribe to and peddle the Big Lie: that the Soviet Union is organizing aggression against the United States and the rest of the capitalist world.

Once these two barriers are broken down, then labor's unity and its historic role, as defender and finally leader, of the nation will not be long in coming. Already, some of this is perceived—if somewhat dimly, as yet—by some sections of the CIO, AFL, the United Mine Workers, and of course by the various progressively-

led independent unions. The N.Y. CIO council recently called on labor to take *the front line* in the fight against McCarthyism; the three top leaders of the Ford Local No. 600, in the May 1st issue of *Ford Facts*, declared, "*Labor must unite and be in the vanguard of the rest of the nation in the fight against McCarthyism and its spokesmen.*" The CIO Packinghouse Union has on several occasions, and most recently at its convention, expressed the same thought, even more clearly and sharply.

The Communists have a heavy responsibility in the task of achieving greater labor unity in the struggle for peace, democracy and jobs.

Lenin once put the question very forcefully:

Nothing is easier than to write the word 'unity' in letters a yard high, to promise unity, to 'proclaim' oneself an adherent of unity. But in reality, unity can only be advanced by work. This is not easy. It requires work, persistence, the rallying together of all class-conscious workers. But without such work there is no use in talking of the unity of the workers. . . . Unity must be won. . . .

* * *

In attempting to assimilate international experience we find that bound up with the task of defending democracy today in the various capitalist nations of the world is the task of defending the nation itself.

In France and Italy, for example, the working class and the Communist parties at its head, in alliance with the broadest sections of the

population, have stood guard over their nations' democratic institutions and constitutional rights and prevented their decimation by the most reactionary sections of their native bourgeoisie, who work hand in glove with American imperialist interventionists.

These countries are faced with the reality that, together with their democratic freedoms, the most basic interests of their nation are threatened not only by their own bourgeoisie, but by the fact that the most reactionary sections of their ruling class are betraying their nation to American imperialism. The very sovereignty and independence of these countries is at stake; they have in one degree or another become subjugated economically, politically and even culturally by Wall Street and Washington. In these capitalist lands, the defense of the nation includes the struggle for independence and sovereignty, as well as struggle for democratic liberties; and though each of these problems calls forth a different response from different sectors of the nation, in the main it can be said that they merge into one larger problem—the defense of the nation.

In our country, the situation is somewhat different. There is a very real crisis of bourgeois democracy. The attack upon democratic liberties has proceeded at a far greater pace than in any other major capitalist country. But there is no threat to our sovereignty, to our independence. No one, despite all of the hysteria that has been whipped up, threatens our shores. No foreign

power or interventionists threaten us with oppression, or subjugation, or would deprive us of our independence.

Yet, in a very real sense, the future and well-being of our nation is in grave jeopardy and the defense of our nation has become an urgent question for every democratic force to ponder and to act upon. While our sovereignty, independence or national borders are not in danger, our national interests, our national heritage, and our relations as a nation in a community of nations are all deeply involved in the struggle to defend our democratic freedoms, and to safeguard world peace. In this important and real sense, the struggle for the Bill of Rights and against fascism and war is a struggle for the defense of all our most important national interests and the wellbeing of our nationals—the American people.

We have arrived at the stage where the bourgeoisie which learned its nationalism in the market place and which for a time stood at the head of the nation has now in its obsession for world conquest and maximum profits forsaken every slightest concern for the interests of the nation. The nation must serve the interests of General Motors and that alone shall be its existence. For the sake of the corporate interests all that is best in our nation is on the auction block. The monopolists plunder the national wealth, destroy our national resources. They sack our artificial rubber plants, they steal our tidelands' oil, and now plot to

seize
well a
Al
ward-
is being
of fin
monop
munic
violenc
and so
the pr
tratic
A r
and fr
stead,
Dulles
presen
capital
and p
ervoir
which
having
liance
against
been s
if not
By
in fore
ate in
monstr
our na
to self
defend
to the
jority
The
son" at
own b
and th
taken
terests.
The
ganda

seize atomic power production, as well as the TVA.

All that is decent, healthy and forward-looking in our national culture is being wiped out. Instead, the lords of finance, operating through their monopoly grip on the media of communications have spread the cult of violence and racism among our youth and seek to discredit and disgrace the progressive aspects of our democratic traditions.

A nation must have the respect and friendship of other nations. Instead, systematically, the John Foster Dulleses and the Allan Dulleses representing the most powerful finance capitalist groupings, are dissipating and poisoning the tremendous reservoir of international good will which Wendell Willkie spoke of having existed during the Great Alliance with the Socialist world against fascism. Never has America been so alone, unpopular and feared, if not hated, as it is today.

By pursuit of atomic blackmail in foreign affairs, refusing to negotiate in good faith, and brandishing monstrous weapons of destruction, our nation has been put on the road to self-destruction, unless the best defenders of the nation come rapidly to the fore in a mighty popular majority for democracy and peace.

The lords of monopoly cry "treason" at the Communists to hide their own betrayal of bourgeois democracy and the suicidal course they have taken in terms of our national interests.

The monopolist lords of propaganda have their scribblers write that

this talk by Communists of defense of bourgeois-democratic freedoms and defense of the nation is dishonest, nothing but Communist maneuvers inspired by sinister "peace" plots hatched in the Kremlin. They say that Communists are not defenders of the nation, that they are agents of a foreign power. The George Sokolskys and Gus Tylers never seem to tire of this stale fiction.

If by this they mean that Communists are not chauvinists nor jingoists, they are correct. If they mean that Communists are not white supremacists or war-mongers, then, of course, they are right. It is true that Communists are not *bourgeois nationalists*, nor do we have anything in common with theories or practices of bourgeois nationalism. As the Draft Program says:

"We proclaim our fraternity with all peoples who have pioneered the new frontiers of human history toward Socialism, with all peoples struggling to achieve their independence and national development."

We are proud of our firm, unwavering proletarian internationalism. But this does not mean that we are advocates of national nihilism. On the contrary, the Communist Party USA, as the party of the working class, is the best defender of our nation and its well-being. And it is, as Peter Wieden wrote back in 1938, "not a new 'tactic' which we see reflected in the relations of the working class to the nation but a *historical development*."

This calumny that the Communist fight for democratic freedoms cannot be trusted and is in contradiction to

the Communist basic philosophy had been invented and used even before the Gus Tylers began to peddle this line. In 1935 Georgi Dimitroff explained very clearly that:

We Communists are a class party, a proletarian party . . . we Communists have other ultimate aims than (other) classes and parties, but in struggling for our aims we are ready to fight jointly for any immediate tasks which when realized will weaken the position of fascism and strengthen the position of the proletariat. We Communists employ methods of struggle which differ from those of the other parties; but, while using our own methods in combating fascism, we Communists will also support the methods of struggle used by other parties, however inadequate they may seem, if these methods are really directed against fascism.

We are ready to do all this because, in countries of bourgeois democracy, we want to block the way of reaction and the offensive of capital and fascism, prevent the abolition of bourgeois democratic liberties, forestall fascism's terrorist vengeance upon the proletariat and the revolutionary section of the peasantry and intellectuals and save the young generation from physical and spiritual degeneracy. . . . We are ready to do all this *because we want to save the world from fascist barbarity and the horrors of imperialist war.*

We believe there is much that is sound in this statement for today, and for the Communists in the USA.

There are some would-be Marxists

who wonder not about the honesty but the *wisdom*, the correctness, of defending bougeois-democratic freedoms, and placing the question as urgently as does the Draft Program. Some of these views have even been expressed by certain comrades in the discussion on the Draft Program, views which implied that perhaps all this concern for the struggle against fascism means deserting the struggle for socialism. These good comrades and friends could not be more mistaken.

The struggle for democracy is part of the struggle for socialism. It is not a maneuver nor a detour. Lenin wrote many years ago:

It would be a fundamental mistake to suppose that the struggle for democracy can divert the proletariat from socialist revolution, or obscure, or overshadow it, etc. On the contrary, just as socialism cannot be victorious unless it introduces complete democracy, so the proletariat will be unable to prepare for victory over the bourgeoisie unless it wages a many-sided, consistent and revolutionary struggle for democracy.

Thus, our Draft Program, soundly based on scientific Marxism-Leninism and on the needs and aspirations of the American workers, small farmers, Negro people and the popular masses (once it has been amended and finally adopted), will be a most powerful weapon in the hands of the working class as it fight for jobs, peace, democracy and for the best interests of the nation.

By A

THE
lence
of Gu
brazer
rialist
Amer
invad
twent
of H
screen
nism"
Fruit
of the
Admi
aggre
colum
compl
intern
imper
gover
fascist
orders
bassa
In
Street
shod
not o
but o
people
mistal
Guate
armed
spher
planet
shack
risked

The Rape of Guatemala

By A. B. Magil

THE OVERTHROW BY FORCE and violence of the democratic government of Guatemala is the most brutal and brazen act of United States imperialist aggression against a Latin-American nation since U.S. marines invaded Nicaragua in the nineteen twenties. With a cynicism worthy of Hitler—and behind the smoke-screen of Hitler-like “anti-Communism”—a giant trust, the United Fruit Company, and the government of the trusts, the Eisenhower-Dulles Administration, combined armed aggression from without with fifth-column betrayal from within to accomplish their ends. By this act of international gangsterism the dollar imperialists ousted a legally elected government and replaced it with a fascist-militarist dictatorship taking orders from the United States Ambassador.

In carrying through this *coup* Wall Street and Washington rode roughshod over the wishes and interests not only of the Guatemalan people but of all the other Latin-American peoples, who had demonstrated unmistakably their solidarity with Guatemala. Recklessly bringing armed conflict to the Western hemisphere, the would-be rulers of the planet defied world public opinion, shackled the United Nations, and risked creating another Korea or

Indo-China at our very doorstep. Their action has brought shame and dishonor on our country and struck a blow at the real interests of the American nation.

Today the people of Guatemala are living under a savage reign of terror, with people's leaders being murdered by execution squads, with thousands of trade unionists, peasants, students, intellectuals, Communists, members of democratic capitalist parties in prisons and concentration camps, with civil liberties abolished, the free trade union and peasants' movements outlawed, agrarian reform suspended, and the majority of the people deprived of the right to vote even in the rigged elections scheduled to be held. For the Guatemalan people one phase of their heroic liberation struggle has come to a tragic end; a new and even more difficult phase begins. But in that struggle they will learn the lessons of past mistakes and build a stronger unity against the oppressor. And they will find many new allies in Latin America, in the United States, in other countries of the world. Those who won this dirty but temporary victory over a gallant small nation are already reaping a whirlwind of hatred and indignation. Goliath licks his chops, but David's day of vengeance will come, and the

Davids are legion.

II

The struggle of the Guatemalan people was part of the national-liberation movement of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples of the world whose main axis is today in Asia. These struggles, characteristic of the epoch of imperialism, have reached new heights since World War II. Their most important achievement is the tremendous victory which established the Chinese People's Republic in 1949, thus lifting the imperialist yoke from six hundred million people. This upsurge of colonial and semi-colonial liberation movements is one of the most important manifestations of the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism in the post-war period.

The special significance of the Guatemalan struggle is, in the first place, that it developed in that area, Latin America, in which Wall Street domination is most direct and complete, from which the U.S. war machine draws a large part of its raw materials, and which plays a major strategic role in the Pentagon war plans. Second, the Guatemalan struggle was the first bourgeois-democratic and anti-imperialist revolution in Latin America since the Mexican revolution, which began in 1910, ebbed and flowed throughout many years, and reached its crest in the Administration of General Lazaro Cardenas (1934-1940). Third, the Guatemalan revolution was the first in the Western hemisphere in which the working class played a relatively

independent role and became in fact the driving force of the struggle. Finally, the Guatemalan revolution served to inspire and stimulate anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggles among other Latin-American peoples and to raise the general level of resistance to the Wall Street robber barons.

III

The Guatemalan revolution began in 1944 with the overthrow of the reactionary dictatorship that had ruled the country, with only brief interludes, since 1898. The revolution occurred during the world struggle against fascism and in part was a product of that struggle. It was a highly limited revolution, involving workers, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois elements, but not the peasant masses, who constituted some 80 percent of the population. The leaders of the revolution were university students, merchants, professionals and young army officers, among whom one of the most prominent was the man who later became President, Jacobo Arbenz.

The program of the revolution in this phase was also limited. Civil liberties were established, the franchise was widened, political parties and other organizations were allowed to function, workers were given the right to organize and strike (under the dictatorship trade unionism had been outlawed), a labor code and a social security system were enacted, public education was extended. But the conditions of four-fifths of the population were left untouched and

the economy of the country continued under imperialist-feudal control. This greatly impeded and distorted capitalist development.

Despite this limited program, Guatemala's first democratic government, headed by Dr. Juan José Arévalo, a liberal with certain Social-Democratic tendencies, soon found itself in sharp conflict with the United Fruit Company and the State Department. This conflict became especially acute when the workers of United Fruit organized a union and struck for higher wages and better conditions. In the U.S. press and in our Congress the cry of "Communism" was raised against President Arévalo long before a Communist Party even existed in Guatemala.

United Fruit, accustomed for so many years to running the Guatemalan government, began, with the help of the State Department, to organize conspiracies to re-establish by force and violence the kind of government it wished. No less than thirty such conspiracies were organized during the Arévalo Administration. All were crushed by the army and the people, with the organized workers playing an increasingly important role in guarding the achievements of the revolution.

The anti-imperialist position of the Arévalo government was largely defensive, a response to the attacks of the United Fruit Company and the State Department. This position was not without serious vacillations induced by pressure of the imperialists and of landowner and bourgeois

compradore elements. In the United Nations and in foreign affairs generally the Guatemalan government in this period supported Washington virtually 100 percent.

The Arbenz government, which took office in March 1951, was a continuation of the Arévalo Administration in the sense that it was based on capitalism, on bourgeois democracy and on defense of what had been won by the 1944 revolution. At the same time, it represented a qualitative change. Responding to pressure from the democratic masses, especially the working class, the Arbenz government set itself the task of launching anti-feudal land reform, of stimulating capitalist development and of making a start toward breaking the shackles of foreign domination. The Guatemalan revolution thus entered its bourgeois-democratic and national-liberation phase.

In addition, the Arbenz Administration sought more consistently than its predecessor to build support among the popular masses, especially the workers and peasants. At the same time, it also won greater support among the weakly developed but growing industrial bourgeoisie, whom the Arévalo government had tended to alienate because its failure to tackle basic economic and social problems gave no future to independent industry and made its present very difficult.

Besides agrarian reform the Arbenz program included three other major projects: a government-owned hydroelectric plant that would provide

power at lower rates and curtail the monopoly of Empresa Electrica, subsidiary of the Morgan-dominated American and Foreign Power Company, which generates over 90 percent of the country's electric power; a road to the Atlantic to expand transportation facilities and provide competition for International Railways of Central America, United Fruit subsidiary, which owns virtually the whole of Guatemala's railroad system; and a government-owned port on the Atlantic to reduce dependence on the United Fruit Company, which owns all the nation's seaports.

All four measures of the Arbenz program were of a limited capitalist type. The agrarian reform law, which affected only large extensions of uncultivated land or land not cultivated directly by or for the owners, was described by the *New York Times* (May 21, 1952) as "not a drastic measure"; in certain respects it was in fact less radical than Mexico's earlier law. And the other measures directed at foreign economic domination were certainly far less drastic than the Cardenas expropriation of the American and British oil companies and of the British-owned railroad system in Mexico.

At the same time, since the United Fruit Company was the biggest landowner in Guatemala and most of its land had been left uncultivated for years, agrarian reform took on a direct anti-imperialist character. And the entire Arbenz program developed in a political context which gave it

far-reaching democratic and anti-imperialist implications.

It should be noted that the Guatemalan revolution was predominantly peaceful. Except for isolated acts of violence against trade union and peasant leaders by big landowners and the abortive conspiratorial revolts instigated by the United Fruit Company and the State Department, the struggle against feudal survivals and against foreign imperialism developed peacefully. It was the concocters of Smith Act frameups against American Communists on the false charge of conspiring to teach and advocate the violent overthrow of the United States government, who organized massive force and violence to crush Guatemala's peaceful revolution, overthrow its constitutional government and extinguish democracy and national sovereignty.

Though agrarian reform was in operation less than two years and encountered many objective difficulties as well as sabotage by certain government officials, it produced significant positive results. It increased the income of peasants and agricultural workers; expanded the production of corn, rice, cotton and other agricultural products; stimulated trade and industry by broadening their market; and reduced the dominant position of the United Fruit Company.

Not the least of the positive effects of agrarian reform was political. It initiated the process of the political awakening of the peasant masses,

rallying them around the government and weakening the reactionary influence of the big landowners, the Catholic Church hierarchy and the United Fruit Company.

Together with the political awakening of the peasants there took place, under the stimulus of the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist struggle, a great upsurge of democratic and patriotic activity and organization. This was manifested in the rapid growth of the trade unions and the peasants' federation, of the peace movement, the women's, youth and cultural movements, in the mounting struggles of workers, peasants, tenants and small property owners to improve their economic conditions, in the thousands of expressions of patriotic support of the government that came from all parts of the country.

IV

Behind the Arbenz government and its program stood a coalition of classes and parties. The multi-class coalition comprised workers, peasants, industrialists, small merchants, artisans, intellectuals and professionals. The political expression of this coalition was a formal alliance of the three democratic capitalist parties and the Workers (Communist) Party. The alliance was subsequently broadened to include the united labor center, the General Confederation of Workers of Guatemala (CGTG), and the National Confederation of Peasants of Guatemala (CNCG).

This political alliance existed largely, though not exclusively, at

the top. The Communists regarded this as one of the key weaknesses of the Arbenz coalition. At an enlarged plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Workers Party on October 16, 1953, José Manuel Fortuny, its general secretary, raised the slogan of forging a mass united front through the creation of united front committees in factories, on farms, in neighborhoods, in democratic organizations, etc. The Communists projected the emergence of a National Democratic Front as the nationwide instrument of this mass united front. There would then arise the possibility of reshaping the Arbenz Administration into a government of the National Democratic Front.

Though the Communist proposal was warmly received among the other sectors of the coalition and among the masses generally, and some progress was made in creating united front committees, this work had not advanced very far at the time the imperialist invasion was launched.

What was the class nature of the political leadership of the bourgeois-democratic and anti-imperialist revolution? Does the prominent part played by the trade-union movement, many of whose top leaders were Communists, and the active, positive role of the Workers Party in the Arbenz coalition mean that the revolution was led by the working class?

By no means. In the cabinet of the government directing the revolution there was not a single Communist or trade-union representative. In Con-

gress there were only four Communists among a membership of 56. The workers elected Communists to leading posts in the trade-union movement because they saw in them the most effective defenders of their *economic* interests. But *politically* the majority of the workers, like the majority of the peasant masses, supported the bourgeois parties. Though the Workers Party grew more than five-fold from its second congress in December 1952 to March 1954, and would undoubtedly have increased its representation in the Congressional elections that were scheduled to be held this November, it was still a small party.

Undoubtedly the working class exerted great influence on its class allies and on the course of the revolution. Without the initiative and pressure of the workers there would have been no agrarian reform and Guatemala would long ago have succumbed to imperialism. The working class was thus the motor of the revolution, but the steering wheel remained in the hands of the petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie, classes which by their nature vacillated and could not be counted on to lead a consistent struggle till the end. And of course among these bourgeois and petty-bourgeois elements there were encrusted in the government and other public institutions, in the army, in the capitalist parties not a few reactionaries and fifth columnists. Guatemala in fact confirms the lesson of Spain: toleration of reactionaries in the gov-

ernment and army tightened the noose around bourgeois democracy.

V

The Inter-American Conference in Caracas, Venezuela, last March marked a momentous crossroads in the relations between Guatemala and the United States. The State Department's objective at that conference was to organize a collective assault on Guatemala up to and including armed aggression. The opposition of other Latin-American governments, prodded by the solidarity movements with Guatemala that had developed in their countries, forced Washington to retreat. The State Department had to content itself with an "anti-Communist" resolution which did not mention Guatemala by name nor propose immediate specific action. Even this was backed by most of the Latin-American delegates reluctantly under pressure, with Mexico and Argentina abstaining and Guatemala casting a negative vote.

There can be no doubt that at Caracas U.S. imperialism suffered on this and other issues the most serious setbacks it has had at any inter-American conferences in the past twenty-five years. And the courageous stand of the Guatemalan delegation against "the internationalization of McCarthyism" strengthened the fight of the Guatemalan people and won them increased support in Latin-American and other countries.*

However, those who failed to see the limited character of the State

* See A. B. Magil, "The Caracas Conference," *Political Affairs*, May, 1954.

Department defeat and the fact that the "anti-Communist" resolution provided a new political weapon for the interventionists greatly underestimated the determination of Wall Street imperialism and its government to stop at nothing in order to destroy the "focus of infection" that Guatemala constituted for all the Latin-American liberation struggles. Both the Workers Party of Guatemala and the Communist Party of the United States warned that the Caracas resolution increased the danger of more aggressive intervention.

Less than two months after the Caracas Conference the State Department proved the correctness of these warnings when it concocted the provocation in regard to a shipment of arms to the Guatemalan government. This was followed by the invasion of the Castillo Armas mercenaries, financed and equipped by the United Fruit Company and the State Department. Having failed to achieve collective aggression, Washington had to do the job itself and, so to speak, in broad daylight, using as springboards the satellite dictatorships of Honduras and Nicaragua.

This brutal armed assault on a nation of 3,000,000 touched off tremendous protests, especially in the Latin-American countries, but not limited to them. The movement in Latin America was of great breadth, embracing even conservative anti-Communist elements. The solidarity movement in Latin America and elsewhere was still in the ascendant when the Arbenz government was

ousted and the Guatemalan struggle betrayed.

The exact course of events in Guatemala from the launching of the invasion to the resignation of President Arbenz remains veiled in obscurity. Further information will be required before complete judgments can be made. It appears clear, however, that the government failed to mobilize the people for the defense of the country and did not permit the trade union and peasants movements, the Communists and other democratic forces to mobilize them. Whether this ban was imposed at the orders of the Army high command, as seems likely, is not known. The paralysis inside Guatemala was all the more striking in view of the fact that up to the moment of the invasion the country had been seething with all kinds of patriotic activity. And on the military plane the resistance was half-hearted.

It is evident that the paralysis of mass action and the perfunctory character of military action was the course dictated by frightened bourgeois and petty-bourgeois elements, lacking faith in the people, in order to pave the way for surrender to imperialism. Thus, the Guatemalan people were not defeated in battle; they were stabbed in the back.

VI

Was the defeat of the Guatemalan people inevitable?

To answer this, let us examine the principal favorable and unfavorable factors involved in the nearly ten-

year course of the Guatemalan people's struggle.

The favorable factors may be listed as follows:

Inside Guatemala: 1) A progressive government with a program that enlisted ever widening popular support; 2) A relatively high measure of political unity among the democratic and anti-imperialist forces; 3) The relative weakness of divisive anti-Communism within the democratic camp and among the masses generally; 4) The outstanding political role of the trade unions; 5) The positive contribution and growing influence of the Workers Party; 6) The dwindling of popular support for the reactionary opposition so that at the time of the invasion it lacked a real base; 7) A difficult terrain which favored prolonged military resistance.

Outside Guatemala: 1) The growing change in the world balance of forces in favor of the camp of peace, democracy and national liberation; 2) Steadily rising support from other Latin-American peoples; 3) The reluctance of most Latin-American governments to support action against Guatemala and occasional indirect assistance for Guatemala from two or three of them; 4) Indirect aid from the peace policy of the Soviet Union, People's China and the European People's Democracies and from the activities of the world peace movement—all of which has been curbing to some extent the aggressions of Guatemala's chief enemy, Wall Street imperialism; 5) Indirect

support from the liberation struggles of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples of Asia, Africa and the Middle East; 6) The beginnings of a protest movement in the United States not limited to the Left, as signalized by the June 9 speech of Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO United Automobile Workers, denouncing U.S. intervention in Guatemala and Indo-China and the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy as a whole, and by the statement on the invasion issued by the CIO Executive Board; 7) The force of public opinion in the United States, Latin America and throughout the world which prevented Washington from invading Guatemala with U.S. troops as it did in the case of several Latin-American countries in the first three decades of the century.

The chief unfavorable factors were:

1) The smallness of the country and its economic weakness and backwardness; 2) Guatemala had to fight aggression by the greatest imperialist power in the world; 3) Great economic dependence on the United States—76.6 percent of Guatemala's exports and 64.5 percent of her imports were in 1953 accounted for by the U.S.—and the fact that the country is situated in an area, Latin America, of similar great economic dependence; 4) Guatemala's immediate neighbors in Central America are reactionary Washington puppet regimes; 5) The government of the northern neighbor, Mexico, in contrast to the Mexican people, gave Guatemala little positive support and

afte
gov
surv
6)
tion
whi
port
stru
Geo
cent
peac
anti
of I
the
mal
bour
tion
mal
the
comp
press
This
lead
reform
its ap
polit
mass
peas
the s
still
the
the
13) F
of th
peopl
toward
colon
ton's
No
factor
relati
negat

after the Caracas Conference that government, under Washington pressure, turned its back on Guatemala; 6) Geographic and economic isolation from the socialist countries, which are the only consistent supporters of the national liberation struggles of oppressed peoples; 7) Geographic isolation from the main centers of the colonial-liberation and peace movements; 8) Lagging of the anti-imperialist struggle in the rest of Latin America in comparison to the level it had attained in Guatemala; 9) the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois leadership of the revolution, which meant that as Guatemala's crisis grew, there also grew the tendency of these elements to compromise with the imperialist oppressor and betray the struggle; 10) This bourgeois and petty-bourgeois leadership greatly delayed agrarian reform and to some extent sabotaged its application; 11) This impeded the political awakening of the peasant masses and weakened the worker-peasant alliance indispensable for the success of the struggle; 12) The still inadequate political maturity of the Guatemalan working class and the relative weakness of its party; 13) Failure of all but a small section of the American working class and people to assume their responsibility toward the people of a U.S. semi-colony by acting to curb Washington's aggressive interventionist policy.

Not all these positive and negative factors were of equal weight and the relationship between positive and negative was fluid and changing.

Among the negative factors the most decisive proved to be the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois leadership of the Guatemalan struggle, which resulted in rapid surrender once the invasion began, and the weakness within our own country of opposition to the reactionary Wall Street-Washington policy.

This weakness must be considered within the framework of the relations between oppressing and oppressed nations and in the light of the basic Marxist-Leninist teachings on the national and colonial question. When Marx wrote that "no nation can be free if it oppresses other nations," he was establishing the inseparable link between the struggles of the working class of the advanced countries and the national-liberation movement of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples. Marx showed that the workers of the oppressing countries must *in their own interest* champion the emancipation of the oppressed nations.

Lenin and Stalin further elaborated the Marxist theory of the national and colonial question for the epoch of imperialism. Thus Stalin in *Foundations of Leninism* pointed out the necessity of joining the working-class movement in the developed countries and the national-liberation movement in the colonies in "a common front against the common enemy, against imperialism." And he placed the main responsibility for the creation of such a front on "the proletariat of the oppressor nations"

which must render "direct and determined support to the liberation movement of the oppressed peoples against the imperialism of its 'own country'. . . ."

If we apply these criteria concretely to the Guatemalan liberation struggle, it must be said that the U.S. working class has not discharged its historic responsibility and has not forged that "common front against the common enemy" so essential to the success of its own struggles. How account for this situation?

First, the general political and ideological influence of the bourgeoisie—that is, of the most reactionary and aggressive imperialists in the world—continues to be strong in the ranks of the working class and its allies.

Second, there has been a decline of anti-imperialist consciousness among U. S. workers, farmers and middle-class people, similar to the decline in socialist consciousness in the working class which William Z. Foster discussed in his article, "Marxism and the American Working Class" (*Political Affairs*, November, 1953). Foster cited as the principal objective reason "the consequences to the workers of the rise of American imperialism as a world power, especially since the period of World War I." He specifically referred to the improved living standards won by the struggles of the workers since World War I.

Though anti-imperialist consciousness and socialist consciousness are not identical since the former does

not necessarily require acceptance of the abolition of capitalism, the principal objective factor mentioned by Foster also has served to blunt opposition to the imperialist role of the U.S. ruling class and its government, especially in relation to Latin America. This factor has likewise weakened anti-imperialist sentiment among the farming masses and the middle classes.

An exception should, however, be noted in the case of the Negro people. Both because they benefited less than the white masses from the rise in living standards, and because of the character of the Negro people as an oppressed nation in the South, anti-imperialist consciousness, though developing unevenly, has on the whole tended to grow rather than decline among this one-tenth of our population. The Negro people have been especially responsive to Mussolini's invasion of Ethiopia in the thirties and to the more recent national liberation struggles of the peoples of Africa, Asia and the Caribbean area.

Other factors that have not only diluted anti-imperialist consciousness but tended to develop pro-imperialist attitudes have been the Roosevelt New Deal reforms, especially the "good neighbor" policy, which eliminated or moderated the cruder, more aggressive forms of U.S. intervention in Latin America; chauvinist nationalism and white chauvinism in relation to the Latin-American peoples, and the anti-colonial demagoguery with which the U.S. imperialists have

masked the oppression of their own colonies and semi-colonies as well as their efforts to seize those of their imperialist rivals.

The most pernicious ideological influence of all has been that of the Big Lie of "Communist intervention" and "aggression." In the case of Guatemala this has been a double lie, since not only has it completely misrepresented the nature of Communism and the Soviet Union, but it has pinned the false labels of "Communist" and "Communist-infiltrated" on a democratic capitalist government.

A major factor in weakening anti-imperialist sentiment and imbuing the workers and other sections of the population with a pro-imperialist outlook have been the labor bureaucracy and the Social-Democrats inside and outside the trade-union movement. In the case of Guatemala several AFL and CIO leaders were on a sponsoring committee of the Big Business-dominated National Planning Association which last December issued a report virtually inciting to the violent overthrow of the Arbenz government. In February, the AFL Executive Council sent a letter to President Arbenz demanding he purge all "Communists." The *CIO News* of March 22, likewise published a virulent attack on "Communism" in Guatemala. One of the vilest journalistic assaults on the struggle of the Guatemalan people was contributed on the eve of the imperialist invasion by a Social-Democratic liberal, Max Lerner, in the columns of the liberal-

Social-Democratic New York *Post*.

Finally, serious shortcomings in the work of the Communist Party contributed to the general weakness of the U. S. people's opposition to the United Fruit-State Department outrage against Guatemala. For years bourgeois influences represented by the Browder leadership caused the Party virtually to abandon all activity on Latin-American issues. Only in the last three or four years has a change begun. The most active and consistent champions of Guatemala's cause—which is bound up with the cause of our own people—have been the Communists and other advanced forces.

However, in saying this one ought not to gloss over the fact that in regard to the peoples oppressed by Wall Street imperialism outside our borders—as distinguished from the Negro people within our borders—the Communist Party is not yet fulfilling the vanguard role demanded by the Marxist-Leninist approach to the national and colonial question. Wider distribution and more effective utilization of William Z. Foster's *Outline Political History of the Americas* can be of major assistance in achieving that objective.

However, the failure of the American working class and people to oppose in a significant way the aggression against Guatemala and the other imperialist crimes in Latin America is not a static phenomenon. What is new in the situation is that despite the reactionary propaganda of the government, press, radio, etc., despite

the Big Lie of "Communist aggression," despite the long years of ignorance of and indifference to Latin-American questions, the beginnings of a breakthrough both in the labor movement and among the people generally emerged in connection with the Guatemalan struggle.

The Mazey speech, a statement of great importance, was the first such sign among the Right-wing top leadership of the trade unions. Of prime significance too was the statement of the CIO Executive Board. Though there is no dearth of phrases about "Communist imperialism" and "Communist aggression" in this statement, its main emphasis is on criticism of the United Fruit Company and the State Department.

Of outstanding significance were also the spontaneous expressions that appeared in the letter columns of newspapers in various parts of the country. These letters, some of which revealed anti-Communist prejudices, criticized the aggression against Guatemala and the State Department's role and ran counter to the editorial position of the newspapers in which they appeared.

The specific contribution of the Left-progressive forces also reached a higher level in the Guatemalan crisis. An overflow mass protest meeting in New York in March; a hard-hitting column by Harry Bridges in the March 19 issue of the *Dispatcher*, organ of the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union; a splendid demonstration of nearly 1,000 outside the United Na-

tions organized by the New York Peace Council; meetings and forums in Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, Philadelphia and other places; the publication of the pamphlet, *The Truth About Guatemala*, are a few of the expressions of this heightened Left-progressive activity. And in the midst of the yelping Big Business press, publications like the *Daily Worker*, *The Worker*, the San Francisco *Daily People's World*, the *National Guardian*, progressive foreign-language papers, and the liberal *Nation* brought the truth about Guatemala to thousands of Americans.

Despite continued great weakness in the anti-imperialist work of the Left-progressive forces, they responded more actively to the Guatemalan struggle than to any Latin-American issue for years and helped directly and indirectly to stimulate expressions among broader sections of the American public.

Had Guatemalan resistance continued, the response of labor and the people would undoubtedly have grown. In time it could have achieved such scope that, together with the rising protest movements in other countries, it could have checked Wall Street-Washington aggression against Guatemala, just as the protests of the American and other peoples checked the plans to send U.S. troops to Indo-China.

In view of all this, one must conclude that the defeat of the Guatemalan people was not inevitable. Wall Street imperialism, which even by using its own military force was

unable to conquer Korea, could have been prevented from conquering Guatemala.

VII

What are the perspectives of the Guatemalan people's struggle?

The betrayal was carried through so swiftly that the working class and the people's movement generally appear to have been beheaded, with most of the leadership murdered, imprisoned or driven into exile. In view of this situation and the terrorist character of the new regime, one cannot expect that within the next few months it will be possible for the working class and its allies to regroup their forces and build a substantial challenge to Dulles' gunmen. Defensive battles there will be; in fact, the fascist junta had hardly been glued together when news came of widespread peasants' struggles to defend their land against efforts of the former expropriated owners, backed by troops and police, to recover them. Important as these resistance efforts are, it will under existing conditions take some time before they move to higher levels and develop into broad mass struggles of a political nature, led by the working class.

The course of the Guatemalan struggle will also depend on political developments in the rest of Latin America, especially in the Central American republics and Mexico. It will also be strongly affected by political developments in the United States. The growth of the American people's struggles for peace and

against McCarthyite fascism will have important repercussions inside Guatemala. The extent to which labor and its allies realize the 1954 and 1956 electoral objectives posed in the draft program of the Communist Party and elect a new Administration that follows "a new course in domestic and foreign affairs"—this too will greatly influence what happens in Guatemala in the next period. And of course the worldwide struggle for peace, democracy and national liberation will be of great assistance to the Guatemalan people.

In the immediate future the opportunities are favorable for organizing a broad U.S. protest movement to demand a halt to the barbarous persecution of trade unionists and other patriots and the restoration of full civil liberties; to demand the preservation of land reform, wage standards and other social gains; to demand an end to U.S. intervention in Guatemala and other Latin-American countries. It is necessary to appeal to every decent American man and woman, to every supporter of the Roosevelt "good neighbor" policy, to every opponent of fascist brutality and war. The workers should take the lead in this movement. Such protests, developed in the trade unions, in Negro people's organizations, in farm groups, in women's, peace and civil liberties organizations can become a powerful force not only in assisting the Guatemalan people but in advancing the American people's own struggle for jobs, peace and democracy.

Population Changes and Negro-White Unity

By John Swift

THE DRAFT PROGRAM of the Communist Party stresses the *self-interest* of the *whole* American people in the attainment of Negro freedom. It points out that "all America has a stake" in this objective and "stands to gain by it."

Why this central emphasis? Because the ruling class, through its ideology of white supremacy, seeks to conceal the identity of white-Negro interests. It strives to confuse the white people into believing that their interests are opposed to those of the Negro people. It fosters the erroneous belief that every gain, every right won by the Negro people is obtained, somehow or other, at the expense of the white masses. It is this insidiously false notion which stands as a barrier to rallying larger numbers of white workers, farmers and middle class people for joint struggles with their Negro brothers and for full equality.

One of *the main levers*, therefore, by which to combat white supremacist ideology and to forge Negro and white unity is to convince the white masses that Negro equality is not only in the interests of the Negro people but is *in their own interests* as well.

This emphasis is heightened by a number of important changes that have occurred in recent years in the class composition and geographic location of the Negro people. (1) The Negro people are now in their majority an urban people; (2) One-third of the Negro people are now in the North; (3) The shift from the land to the city has become an increasing tendency *in the South as well*.

These changes underscore anew the vast stake of the whole working class and all democratic forces in the attainment of Negro rights. They also are bound to have an important bearing on this struggle. It will be the purpose of this article to discuss these changes and to show their significance toward forging white and Negro unity on a scale and with a strength hitherto unmatched.

I. NEGRO URBANIZATION

The U.S. Census Report for 1950 shows some 60%, or over nine million, of the Negro people, residing in towns and cities with a population of 2,500 or more. How rapid the process of Negro urbanization in recent years has been can be seen by comparing it with the same process at

work in the white population. Already by 1920, a majority, some 53%, of the white population, was urban, but only one-third, some 34%, of the Negro people, was similarly located. By 1950, however, this difference in the extent of white and Negro urbanization had shrunk to about 4%. Approximately 64% of the white and 60% of the Negro population were urban dwellers.

What is the significance of this development? In the first place, it indicates that the Negro people are becoming transformed into nonfarm wage workers at a faster pace than the white population. In March, 1940, some 42% of employed Negro men and some 21% of employed white men were engaged in agriculture. In April, 1950, about 25% of Negro men and 15% of white men were so employed. But by April, 1952, it was estimated that only 19% of employed Negro men were engaged in agriculture (including forestry and fishery).*

The urban Negro population is more predominantly working class than the urban white population. "The proportion of Negroes in the labor force has been consistently higher than whites. . . . About 63% of all Negroes aged 14 years and over were in the labor force compared with 57% of all whites."* This is not the full story. The classification "labor force" includes much more than industrial or even wage workers. In 1950, only 4% of employed Negro men and 6½% of employed Negro women were listed as in "professional, technical and kindred" occupations, and

as nonfarm "managers, officials and proprietors." This compares with 19% of employed white men and 17% of white women.*

The process of Negro urbanization, therefore, has been a process of Negro proletarianization. Under today's conditions the question of forging a lasting and firm alliance between the working class and its natural ally, the Negro people, cannot be achieved without the unity of the white and Negro workers. Negro and white *class unity* is an essential prerequisite for white and Negro *people's unity*.

This can be seen by the following additional facts. The proportion of employed Negro men working in manufacturing industries rose from 15% in 1940 to an estimated 26% in 1952. (This does not include the estimated 2% engaged in mining, the 8% in construction and the 7% in transportation and communication.) The proportion of employed Negro women engaged in manufacturing industries rose from 3½% in 1940 to an estimated 7% in 1952. This does not represent stable continuous rise, for in fact employment in manufacturing for Negro men dipped from 24% in 1944 to 22% in 1950 and only climbed again because of the Korean War boom. As for Negro women, the peak in manufacturing employment was reached in 1944, in the midst of World War II, when it grew to 13%. It since has shrunk

* U.S. Senate Labor Committee Report, *Employment and Economic Status of Negroes*, published in 1952.

steadily—to 9% in 1948, 8% in 1950, and 7% in 1952.*

These fluctuations prove once again that the Negro workers are still the last to be hired and the first to be fired. As for the Negro women, they are the very last and the very first.

Unemployment among Negroes between 1947 and 1951 was "more than 50% above that for whites."* Especially in periods of economic decline, as was true immediately following World War II, and as is true at this time, Negro employment in general, and in manufacturing in particular, takes a nose-dive. This tendency exists side by side with the tendency toward a greater relative employment of Negroes in industry.

"The Negro worker is becoming a very important factor in industry," observes William Z. Foster, in his most recent and very important book on the Negro people. "Negro workers," he writes, "are estimated to comprise 11% of all industrial workers. In the coal mines Negro workers constitute about 25%, in steel and auto plants about 15%, and in meat packing plants about 30%" (Foster's, *The Negro People in American History*, pp. 531-2).

This means that the white workers cannot achieve even their most limited objectives of defending their living standards and trade-union organization, nor improving them, without the Negro workers at their side. This will be even more so as unemployment increases and a new economic crisis breaks forth. The

policy of the bosses to fire Negro workers first and to discriminate against Negroes in upgrading is not to the advantage of the white workers, even if it so appears at a superficial glance. It is aimed at splitting the working class along color lines, at pitting Negro and white class brothers against each other. Thus the shaft of discrimination aimed at the Negro worker also has as its target the white worker.

This simple truth is beginning to be understood by larger numbers of white workers. It is this which has led to a greater awareness of the importance of the Negro question and to a greater degree of white and Negro trade-union unity. But it is necessary to warn emphatically that the continued growth of this unity cannot be taken for granted, as something which will come of itself. The increased proportion of Negro industrial workers creates objective conditions favorable toward greater Negro and white working-class unity. But it must be remembered constantly that these very same objective conditions, under conditions in which much of the labor officialdom gives lip-service to the principle of Negro equality, could lead to opposite results—to a retrogression and deterioration of this unity. And job discrimination has increased, as can be seen by the following shocking facts:

In 1949, the average income of urban Negro families was almost 58% of the average among white families—

* U.S. Senate Labor Committee Report.

a decl
tween
come
by ov
familie
chang
Tha
every
of suc
That
gram
enfor
dema
be for

2. NE

Du
Negro
two
main
states
listed
there
crease
North

Ho
in so
by th
popu
more
1940
popu
Calif
more
1940
with
popu
Neg
—fro
popu
Neg

• U

a decline from 66% in 1945. . . . Between 1945 and 1949 the average income of white families had increased by over \$500, while among Negro families it remained practically unchanged.*

That is why an *offensive* against every form of job discrimination is of such vast importance at this time. That is why the proposed Draft Program places the demand for a *strictly enforced federal FEPC*, as the first demand in behalf of Negro rights to be fought for today.

2. NEGROES IN THE NORTH

During the 1940-1950 decade the Negro population increased by some two million in the North, while remaining stationary in the sixteen states and the District of Columbia listed as "South" by the Census. Thus, there has been a proportionate increase in Negro population in the North.

How large has been the increase in some Northern States can be seen by the following facts. The Negro population in the State of Michigan more than doubled—from 208,000 in 1940 to 442,000 in 1950, while its white population increased by 17%. In California, the Negro population more than tripled—from 124,000 in 1940 to 462,000 in 1950, compared with a 52% increase in the white population. In New York State the Negro population increased by 60%—from 571,000 to 918,000—the white population by 8%. In Illinois, the Negro population increased by 66%

—from 387,000 to 645,000—the white population by 7%. In Ohio, the increase in Negro population was 51% and in Pennsylvania, 36%. The same trend is to be seen *in every industrial state from coast to coast.*

Negro migration to the North has been a movement to the main industrial centers. In 1950, there were 27 cities with 50,000 or more Negroes. Fourteen of these were in the North. "Only two . . . Southern cities had increases of more than 100% in their Negro population over the decade, while 43 cities, widely dispersed throughout the rest of the country, had doubled their Negro population."^{*}

New York, Detroit, Washington, Chicago, Los Angeles, Cleveland, San Francisco, Newark and Oakland were the cities in which the Negro population increased by more than 50% between 1940 and 1950. In Chicago, St. Louis, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Newark and Nashville, there was an actual decline in the number of white residents due to the shift of white middle-class people to the suburbs.

What is the effect of this absolute and relative increase of Negro population in Northern industrial areas—an increase which has continued since 1950? In the first place, as we already have noted, it has greatly strengthened the role of the Negro people in industry and forced upon the labor movement the issue of white and Negro unity as crucial to its very existence.

* U.S. Senate Labor Committee Report.

* U.S. Senate Labor Committee Report.

It also has had important political effects. The concentration of increasing numbers of Negro people in the most populous key industrial states has added to their political weight in the country as a whole. The Negro electorate has grown more rapidly than the general country-wide increase in Negro population because a majority of the Negro people in the South are still disfranchised, many of them getting their first right to vote when they come North. Furthermore, the Negro vote is now a significant force in every key state from New York to California. Lastly, the Negro vote, concentrated in densely populated communities, is both highly organized as well as distinctly conscious.

The Negro people are increasingly aware of their new nationwide strength. Their changed class composition has given them a sense of power which goes beyond their numerical increase. It also makes possible working-class leadership of the Negro people's movement. The Negro people realize that by their organization and unity they can deliver important blows against segregation and discrimination both North and South.

The dispersal of Negro population—only in the sense that one-third of it is now spread throughout the North—has not had the effect, therefore, of weakening the solidarity and feeling of "one-ness" of the whole Negro people. On the contrary, it has enhanced them. The Negro people in the South look upon those in

the North as extremely important reserves, capable of doing much to awaken the understanding of the whole American people to the significance of Negro oppression. On the other hand, the Negro people in the North maintain close ties with the South and realize that the source of their segregation and discrimination stems from the state of Negro oppression in the South. What happens in the South has swift reverberations and repercussions among Northern Negroes. Contrariwise, what happens in the North, every victory won for Negro rights, encourages and stimulates the struggle of the Negro people in the South.*

The growth of the Negro minority in the North, its increased working-class composition, and its growing unity and consciousness have helped impress larger numbers of white progressives with the need for white and Negro political unity. Even in the '30s, it was the militant *joint* struggles of Negro and white masses which helped make possible the progressive advances of that period. If such unity was needed then, how much more is it needed now, when reaction is in the saddle and when the Negro people make up such a critical balance of power? *Under present conditions no progress is possible whatsoever without growing Negro-white unity!*

It would be folly, however, to believe that this unity will grow of itself, merely because objective condi-

* See the article by Charles P. Mann, *Political Affairs*, April, 1952.

tions favor it. What is required is consciousness of its decisive importance and unremitting struggle in its behalf, because the very objective conditions which compel greater political unity also create counter currents which must be clearly seen and firmly fought.

It must be borne in mind that there are powerful economic and political forces which are determined to prevent Negro-white unity. Not only is the ruling class opposed to this unity, but many white labor and middle-class leaders are chauvinist in their outlook and do not favor white-Negro unity based upon full equality. Furthermore, the growth of the Negro population in a given area, temporarily at least, activates the chauvinism of backward white elements, previously dormant. In some Northern areas, such as Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, and California, there also has taken place an influx of prejudiced white masses from the South. These aggravate the problem. On top of this, there are many whites who, while considering themselves progressive-minded and free from racial bias, fail to consider the special *new* problems confronting the Negro community as a consequence of the growth of population. They even fail to comprehend that gains won yesterday can easily evaporate in face of the changed conditions and the vastly greater needs of today.

Let us take any one of the Northern industrial cities in which the Negro population has expanded rapidly. Have housing facilities for Negroes

expanded correspondingly?—or, is the larger mass of Negro humanity being compressed into the dangerously over-crowded ghetto? Have job, educational and cultural opportunities multiplied to the same degree as population? Have the Negro people obtained the greater representation in government—city, state and national, which their increased numbers make so imperative? Or, have the political subdivisions been gerrymandered to guarantee that the Negro people retain only the same token representation of the past?

In how many cities can these questions be answered affirmatively? Yet, we are not dealing at this point with how to win new advances in equal rights—and new advances must be won continually! We are dealing with the fact that there is no guarantee that even the extremely limited rights won yesterday will be maintained at the same proportionate level. And the Negro people will never be satisfied with anything less than their full rights! Nor should their white brothers!

Thus, where there is a failure to appreciate the new problems arising from the growth of Negro population, there is the acute danger of Negro-white hostility instead of growing unity.

The conclusion from all this is that the possibilities for growing Negro and white unity in the North have never been better, for life itself dictates to the white masses the urgent need for this. At the same time this will not happen by itself. It must

be fought for. In that lies the only guarantee.

3. URBANIZATION IN THE SOUTH

The South still remains the most backward region of the country. Yet, within this framework, industrialization is increasing.

Both sides of this picture must be seen to understand that which is new in the South today. The increase in industrialization is shown by the increased proportion of capital investments for *new* manufacturing plant and equipment going to the South. In 1939, the South (Maryland to Texas), got 21% of all such expenditures; in 1947, 23%; and in 1951, 25%. How this compares with other regions—the East (New England to Pennsylvania), the Midwest (Ohio to Kansas), and the West (Colorado to California)—can be seen by the following table:

REGIONAL COMPARISON OF EXPENDITURES FOR
NEW PLANT AND EQUIPMENT — FOR 1939, 1947, 1951*

	1939	1947	1951
United States	100%	100%	100%
East	33%	29%	28%
Midwest	38%	37%	36%
West	8%	11%	11%
South	21%	23%	25%

Thus, the Eastern portion has declined. The Midwestern has also declined somewhat, although this region received more than one-third of the total. The two regions which showed an increase in their share

* *Statistical Abstract*, Department of Commerce.

were the South and the West.

While the *rate* of Southern industrialization has increased, its *extent* is nowhere near that of the North. This is shown by a comparison of population size with that of workers engaged in manufacturing production** and with new manufacturing investments. The following table compares these for the four regions.

These figures indicate two things: (1) The backwardness of the South as compared with the rest of the country on a per capita basis. With 31% of the country's population, it has only 20% of its production workers.*** (2) Even *at the present* higher rate of industrialization, the South can *never* catch up with the North. To catch up, its proportion of new manufacturing expenditures would have to be considerably above its per capita proportion. But it is still 6% below this ratio!

It should be noted that the num-

ber of production workers increased from 1939 to 1951 by some 60% nationally and by 61% in the South.

** Manufacturing does not include construction, communications, transportation, or mining (whether coal, metal or petroleum).

*** All references to production workers pertain to those in manufacturing only.

REGIONAL COMPARISON OF POPULATION, PRODUCTION
WORKERS AND EXPENDITURES FOR NEW MANUFACTURING
PLANT — FOR 1951

	Percent of population	Percent of prod. workers	Percent of invest. for new mfgt.
United States	100%	100%	100%
East	26%	36%	28%
Midwest	29%	35%	36%
West	13%	8%	11%
South	31%	20%	25%

The largest increase was in the West—120%, and the second largest in the Midwest—72%. The smallest increase was in the East—41%.

The 61% increase in Southern production workers represents a substantial increase. To this should be added—that from 1940 to 1950 there also was a 21% increase in mining employees in the South, an 85% increase in construction workers, and a 50% increase of those employed in transportation, communication and other public utilities. All together, these indicate a significant growth in the Southern industrial working class.

Before going over to an examination of some of the effects of this development, it is necessary to make clear that the rate of industrialization has by no means been uniform for the entire South. It has been extremely uneven. Thus, the *general* rate of increase for the South as a whole may be at great variance with the *particular* rate in any given state or area.

Let us compare a few of the most striking disparities. From 1939 to 1951, the number of production

workers in the State of Texas increased by 132%—twice the national and Southern average! At the other end of the see-saw, North Carolina increased its production workers by only 38%. Kentucky was a second high with 97% increase, while South Carolina was a second low with 48% increase.

The dissimilarity in the rate of Southern industrial development is a factor of considerable importance for two reasons. In the first place, it makes possible a break-up in what has been known as the "solid South." The border states, with one foot in the rural, semi-feudal South and with the other in the industrial North, have been traditionally pulled in two directions at the same time. This pull has now become accelerated and is being exerted in deeper areas of the South as well. It is bringing about a process of sharp differentiation and bitter struggle.

But this great unevenness of development also has a negative side. It means that contrary to the wishful thinking of some people, the present industrialization is not putting an end to the root cause of Negro op-

pression. The Black Belt area of the South, where the Negro people are an oppressed majority, is precisely the section with the *least* industrialization. These states continue to lag behind even in relation to the remainder of the South. In these states of the plantation belt, as shown by Victor Perlo in his recent work, *The Negro in Southern Agriculture*, the semi-feudal agrarian economy is still dominant and the exploitation on the land is as severe, and in some respects more severe, than ever. The very mechanization of Southwestern cotton agriculture has not lessened the burden on the sharecroppers and tenant farmers of the Southeast. It has only compelled them to pit their sweat and toil, and that of their children, in inhuman competition with the motor driven tractor and cotton-picker.

Thus the disproportionate industrial development which makes possible a break-up of the "solid South," must lead to only greater attention to the root of Southern backwardness—the semi-feudal agrarian economy which is at the bottom of the oppression of the Negro nation in the Black Belt.

Most important of all developments in the South, in the sense that it opens the door to progressive change, has been the process of urbanization which has accompanied the increased industrialization. This has greatly enlarged the size of the Southern working class and with it those sections of the urban middle class which are most directly dependent

upon the income of the working class (professionals, merchants, small business people, etc.).

Southern cities experienced a much larger relative growth in the period from 1940 to 1950 than those in the North, although, again, this has not been uniform. However, while the increase in Southern urban population has been the result of a much larger influx of both Negroes and whites, the proportional increase of Negro people exceeded that of whites in only three Southern cities. Thus, despite a very considerable growth in the absolute number of Negroes in most Southern metropolitan areas, there was in these areas a relative decline in the Negro proportion of the population. This is explained by the greater migration of Negroes to the North. This, in turn, is explained by still another fact—the intense Jim Crow discrimination which bars most Negroes from industrial employment in Southern cities.

There can be no doubt that the white masses in the South have gained more from industrialization than have the Southern Negro people. "The white labor force in the Southeast," for example, "is distributed between high income and low income occupations much more favorably than is the nonwhite labor force. Whereas one-fourth of the white labor force is in the five low-income occupations, two-thirds of the nonwhites are so located. Conversely, two-fifths of the white labor force is in high income occupations, but among nonwhites the proportion

is c
7
Sou
the
too
No
syst
is t
sibl
the
sion
whi
livin
Thi
com

Th
is a
neck
no f
the
Sl
than
tary
into
the
taki
tinu
very
ning

* U
**
exact
the am
miscalc
of top
great i
North

is only one-tenth.**

This relative better position of the Southern white worker does not alter the fact that his standard of living too is dwarfed as compared with the Northern worker. The pernicious system of Southern white-supremacy is the reason for this. It makes possible the lower wage differential in the South. Thus the special oppression of the Negro people is the lever which forces down the standard of living of the white masses as well. This is graphically illustrated by income comparisons.

REGIONAL COMPARISON OF MEDIAN** INCOME — 1949*

	<i>white persons</i>	<i>nonwhite persons</i>
United States	\$2,053	\$ 961
East	2,246	1,622
Midwest	2,143	1,652
West	2,114	1,445
South	1,647	739

The Jim Crow system, therefore, is a monstrous millstone around the neck of the Negro people. It is also no featherweight burden on that of the Southern white people.

Slowly, and yet more perceptibly than in the past, this simple elementary truth is beginning to percolate into the consciousness of a section of the Southern white people. This is taking place side-by-side with continued prejudice expressed by the very same people who are first beginning to see that the Jim Crow system

also hurts them. On the part of the workers, in particular, elementary class interests are beginning to collide more openly with what have been considered as hereditary white caste interests. Gradually, a tie-up is being made between low wages, vicious state anti-labor laws, lack of trade-union organization, poor educational facilities, backward social legislation, and the Jim Crow system.

This certainly is the significance of the resolution adopted two years ago by the Texas CIO, as quoted recently by John Pittman in *The*

Worker. The resolution reads:

Be it resolved that the 16th Annual Convention of the Texas CIO goes on record as supporting the immediate elimination of all forms of racial segregation in the public school system of Texas . . . and that the Texas CIO continue to work with and extend its assistance and cooperation to the NAACP in the State of Texas until all citizens are assured of equal justice under the law.

Likewise, the tremendously important movement of the twenty-seven oil and chemical unions to form a united union in the industry has been made possible because a glimmer of new light is being cast also on the Negro question. The oil

* U.S. Senate Labor Committee Report.

** Median income is that which is at the exact middle—with one-half receiving less than this amount and one-half above it. It is somewhat misleading because it includes all incomes—that of top income brackets as well. It still proves how great is the gap between Negro and white and North and South incomes.

workers of the land have been afflicted for many years with heart-breaking disunity and lack of organization. One of the important reasons for this has been the past refusal of the Southern white oil workers to join together with their Negro brothers.

Those white urban middle-class groups whose prosperity depends upon the achievement of a higher standard of living for the Southern masses also cannot avoid facing up to the heart of this problem—the special oppression of the Negro people. Even when they attempt to bring about minor reforms by breaking through the hardened crust of Dixiecratism at the ballot box, they meet up with the same obstacle in the form of the disfranchisement of the Negro people. For without winning the vote for the Negro people of the South, Dixiecratism and McCarthyism cannot be beaten in that region.

Hence, while there still is no recognition of the Negro people as an oppressed nation in the Black Belt region of the South, and while there is still too little understanding that the root of Negro oppression lies in the semi-feudal plantation system, nonetheless, there is a growing recognition among progressive-minded white Southerners that conditions in the South *must change* and that the Negro people must get at least economic and political equality.

In many ways, even more important than these visible signs of change among Southern whites has been the recent militant and heroic struggles

of the Southern Negro people. Nor can one separate these two closely intertwined developments. The militancy of the Negro people helps make progressive white masses realize that the status quo cannot be maintained. In turn, the first rudiments of change among progressive whites encourages the Negro people of the South, for it shows them the existence of a potential ally in the fight for a progressive South.

The Negro people in their struggle for freedom have been inspired by the great victories of the colonial peoples of the world against imperialism. They feel themselves a part of this world movement. They realize that the Negro question in the United States has become a world question—something which has been pointed out many times by our Party, particularly by Ben Davis, Henry Winston and Pettis Perry. The many glib speeches of Washington officials about “democracy” and the “free world” do not go unnoticed by the Negro people. They insist on payment on these promissory notes—and they want the whole world to know the truth about Negro oppression in this country.

The determination of the Negro people of the South to win their rights has expressed itself with particular vigor in the struggle for the right to vote and representation in government. From one end of the South to the other, Negroes are fighting for their ballot rights and are increasingly filing Negro candidates for school board, city council and

legis-
in f
elect
supp
ago
City
a tow
white
alty
were
Dem
Mobi
stanc
But t
one v
are r
City
North
ginia,
cite t
indica
to pla
harsh
tinues
South

The
have
the N
ers in
becaus
and is
tion.
trend,
be, is
for tr
bastill
progre
the fo
was en
mon P
our Pa

legislative positions. For the first time in fifty years, Negroes are being elected here and there with the support of white votes. Some weeks ago two Negroes were elected to the City Council of Crowley, Louisiana, a town of 15,000, with the support of whites and the winning white mayor-ality candidate. Two Negroes also were elected for the first time to the Democratic County Committee in Mobile County, Alabama. These instances are still few and far between. But they do represent a *new* trend, one which has been *growing*. There are reported to be fourteen Negro City Councilmen in the states of North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, and Louisiana. To cite this pitifully small figure as one indicating progress, as we do, is only to place added stress on how heavy, harsh and horrible has been and continues to be the oppression of the Southern Negro people!

* * *

These developments in the South have great meaning, not alone for the Negro people, or, for Southerners in general, but for *all Americans*, because the Jim Crow South has been and is today a major bulwark of reaction. The significance of the new trend, weak and feeble as it still may be, is that it opens up the possibility for transforming the South from a bastille of reaction into a bastion of progress. *The South does contain the forces for such a change!* This was emphasized in the special *Common Program for the South* issued by our Party a year ago. In fact, it is the

heart and soul of that Program. This is also the estimate contained in the extremely important articles on the South written by Comrade James Jackson a few years ago. It was also dealt with in the excellent report by Comrade Hugh Bradley* at the National Conference of our Party, and in articles by C. P. Mann.

What a changed South would mean for the whole country was well understood by Karl Marx. Writing to two American friends (Siegfried Meyer and August Vogt), in 1870, Marx compared the treatment of Negroes in the South with that of the Irish in England. He wrote:

Every industrial and commercial center in England now possesses a working-class population *divided* into two *hostile* camps, English proletarians and Irish proletarians. The ordinary English worker hates the Irish worker as a competitor who lowers his standard of life. In relation to the Irish workers he feels himself a member of the *ruling* nation and so turns himself into a tool of the aristocrats and capitalists *against Ireland*, thus strengthening their domination *over himself*. He cherishes religious, social, and national prejudices against the Irish worker.

Marx then notes that the attitude of the English worker toward the Irish "is much the same" as that of the poor white in the South to the Negro. Marx also shows who is responsible for this and what are its consequences:

This antagonism is artificially kept

* *Next Steps in Negro Liberation*, by Hugh Bradley.

alive and intensified by the press, the pulpit, the comic papers, in short by all the means at the disposal of the ruling classes. *This antagonism is the secret of the impotence of the English working class*, despite their organization. It is the secret by which the capitalist class maintains its power. The latter is well aware of this.

(*Letters to Americans*, p. 78—All emphasis as in original).

Marx wrote the above after the Civil War but before the great betrayal of Reconstruction in 1876. He wrote, therefore, before the present Jim Crow system had been imposed upon the backs of the "free" Negroes. He also wrote before the vast Negro migration to the North. Furthermore, he wrote before the imperialist epoch and the general crisis of world capitalism, therefore, before the general trend of American capitalism became that of reaction and fascism. How much greater significance has the Negro question for the America of today!

That the impotence of the Southern working class is caused by the artificially contrived antagonism between the white and Negro masses is clear to anyone who crosses the Mason-Dixon Line and looks about him with eyes not blinded by prejudice. It is also an important factor in the impotence of the whole American working class. The Draft Program is correct when it states:

If there were no oppression of the Negro people in our land, there would be no wage differentials between the North and South. Thus, Southern white

workers, together with their Negro brothers, would receive higher wages, while Northern labor could put an end to run-away shops and Southern cheap labor competition. In this way wage levels could be raised for the whole country.

If there were no oppression of the Negro people there would be no poll-tax Congressmen. Without poll-tax Congressmen it would have been far more difficult for the reactionaries to pass the Taft-Hartley, the Smith and the McCarran Acts.

If there were no poll-tax Dixiecrat Congressmen in Washington there also would be a better chance to get improved social security legislation, price and rent controls, more federal aid to education, a federal housing program, greater aid for the unemployed and the aged, and far more equitable tax laws.

The great significance of the South for the whole democratic struggle in the country can best be understood when one considers what is required to arrest the present offensive of reaction and then to defeat it. Can anyone, for example, conceive of a farmer-labor government in this country, such as outlined by the Draft Program, without first achieving a major change in the South? Without such a change a farmer-labor government is impossible!

As we have already pointed out, the possibilities for change in the South have greatly improved. Not only the valiant struggle of the Negro people but also the vital self-interest of the white masses increasingly compels this. But, once again, as in respect to the other developments we have discussed, such change

is not assured in and by itself. For with the new possibilities there are also new dangers. The *old* never gives way to the *new* without bitter struggle. The Talmadge-Byrnes-Shivers Dixiecrat forces of die-hard white supremacy will try to move heaven and earth to prevent non-segregation and equality for the Negro people.

It also is necessary to see that the process of increased industrialization of the past decade-and-a-half was the consequence of war and preparations for war. As the general economic trend is one of decreased production levels, and as a major economic crisis is approaching, new industrialization will taper off greatly. Millions of new Southern workers will find themselves unemployed. At the same time the crisis in cotton agriculture, aggravated by the mechanization of the Southwest cotton fields, will throw even more masses of Negro and white share-croppers and tenant farmers on to the labor market. This can become an objective factor leading to an upsurge of white and Negro unity on the land. But the most reactionary forces will endeavor to utilize these same conditions to stir up animosity and antagonism between white and Negro, trying to get the white masses to translate their general dissatisfaction into anti-Negro hatred.

Furthermore, the most reactionary forces of finance capital are exceedingly frightened at the possibility of a white-Negro alliance which makes the South a great force for progress. It is no accident that McCarthy has

so many cronies in Texas and in other parts of the South.

To realize the immense possibilities which exist in the South requires, therefore, the concentrated attention of the labor and progressive movements throughout the country. In the first place, the job of organizing the unorganized workers of the South is a task of utmost importance at this time. If this is not accomplished, the unorganized South with its wage differential will more and more compete with Northern labor, endangering wage levels and union organization. Already the tendency for run-away shops to go South is quite pronounced. With many of the newer plants in the South among the most modern in the country, the danger of Southern competition cannot be lightly viewed. It is this which on top of other factors *must* compel the trade-union movement to enter the South with both feet!

Organizing the unorganized industrial workers must also include a serious effort to begin organizing the Negro and white farm laborers, share croppers and tenant farmers. For on the land, too, the basis for Negro and white unity is growing. And while this article is limited to a discussion of the three population changes referred to at the outset, the struggle for a new South *must not be limited*. It must include as one of its most important components *a change on the countryside*, particularly in the plantation belt. In fact, the greater urbanization we have discussed, the new changes in the outlook of sec-

tions of Southern Negro and white masses, have already had their positive effects on the countryside and inevitably will produce more of them. The Southern worker has close ties with the countryside. Many of them still live on the land as worker-farmers.* Thus, organizing the unorganized workers can flow over into a movement for organization on the land as well. But one need not wait on the other.

The fight for the right to vote is also one which requires the active support of all democratic forces. It requires *federal action to prohibit the poll tax* and federal action to *enforce* the right of all citizens to the ballot. The slogans of "Proportional Representation" and "Majority Rule" are of great importance in the fight for democracy in the South.**

It is the task of our Party nationally to closely watch, influence and give leadership to the great struggle for a *New South*.

* * *

From all of the foregoing, it can be seen that the self-interest of the white masses is the main lever by which to win increasing numbers of them to support and take up the struggle for Negro rights. This is not always understood. Many labor leaders and liberals view the Negro question as a humanitarian one. They see

* See Victor Perlo's book, already cited.

** See the article by Pettis Perry in May, 1954, *Political Affairs*.

the struggle for Negro rights as something "just for the Negro." It is the task of Communists, particularly white Communists, to show the white masses their stake in the struggle for Negro equality. The immorality of Negro oppression is a monstrous crime. But this crime, like the earlier one of Negro slavery, cannot be corrected without winning important sections of the white masses, particularly the white workers, to an understanding that Negro freedom is needed not as abstract morality, but in the best interests of the white masses themselves.

It was this thought which Marx stressed to the British workers in analyzing the Irish question. In 1869 he wrote that he had "become more and more convinced—and the only question was to bring this conviction home to the English working class—that it can never do anything decisive . . . until it separates its policy with regard to Ireland in the most definite way from the policy of the ruling classes. . . . And, indeed, this must be done, not as a matter of sympathy for Ireland, but as a demand made in the interests of the English proletariat."

To paraphrase Marx: The Negro people must have their rights "not as a matter of sympathy," but as a demand made in the interests of the American working class and American democracy.

A
By F

A co
tion
ago c
He c
varia
practi
descr
ism o
ful to
tionar
and t
ism
In
the c
under
(a)
"Righ
Gus
venti
tions'
velop
Stalin
has p
in a
(b)
der c
taken
and
conce
way.
again
acteri
battle

A Reply to Some Harmful and Incorrect Views

By Frederick C. Hastings

A COMRADE HOLDING a leading position wrote a document some time ago criticizing the line of the Party. He expressed views which are at variance with both the policies and practices of the Party. They can be described at best as "Left" sectarianism of a most dangerous type, harmful to the struggle against the reactionary war policies of Wall Street and to the fight against McCarthyism.

In essence, the incorrect views of the comrade may be summarized under two main headings:

(a) That the Party has made a "Right deviation" from the line of Gus Hall's Report to the 1950 Convention and is still making "deviations" from the basic principles developed by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. He contends that the Party has placed the struggle for Socialism in a "reserve moth bag."

(b) That Socialism is "on the order of the day," but the Party has taken the path of the "lesser evil" and "gradualism" as opposed to his conception of "the revolutionary way." The reactionary offensive against democratic liberties is characterized by him as simply "sham battles."

These views on their face are false and are incompatible with the line of the Party. They must be rejected and actively combatted. They are ideas which are injurious to the struggle for peace, democracy and the economic well-being of the masses, and hence, also to the struggle for Socialism. Consequently the comrade must be answered.

Thinking is reflected in action. False thinking leads to false practice. Hence if the comrade maintains his point of view the result will be confusion instead of clarity in his mass work. It will contribute toward disunity rather than unity in the struggle to prevent a new war, to outlaw the atom and hydrogen bombs, to realize U.S.-Soviet peaceful co-existence, to defeat McCarthyism and the fascist threat, to advance the fight for the economic needs of the masses, and to win equal rights for the Negro people.

But the author defends his line and argues:

It's best to have our disagreements now so as to set our Party in fighting trim, well fit, to wage the coming battles that are ahead for our Party and the American working class and its allies, in order that our Party can play

the vanguard role in giving leadership to these struggles that have been so clearly pointed out to us in the recent 'New Opportunities' report.

This statement is not precise. The following observations are necessary:

First, the writer is correct when he points to the fact that the report to the recent National Conference was a very clear statement of Party policy. But he should have noted that the report is free from phrasemongering and all sectarian nonsense. Unfortunately, however, his views, in their totality, make it very clear that he has not understood that report.

Secondly, it should be said that discussions flowing from "disagreements now" or in the course of the struggle must result in the achievement of maximum clarity. This is possible only in the struggle for mastery of the correct Party line and testing that understanding in every day activity among the masses.

Thirdly, it is not only necessary to "set our Party in trim" for "the coming battles" but to engage actively and as a vanguard force *in the important battles of today*. This is the only way that the Party can prepare itself for the fulfillment of the vanguard tasks of tomorrow.

The author states that there is "a missing link in the chain of our work today." He poses the problem in this way:

Haven't we allowed our Party to fall into the pitfall that Comrade Hall warned us against in 1950, and that is

that we have placed the struggle for Socialism in that reserve moth bag, and we are carefully nursing and preserving it for some distant future day to come?

The "missing link" as defined by him is that the Party has placed "the struggle for Socialism" in a "reserve moth bag," until "some . . . future day to come." From this false premise he draws the equally false conclusion that this is a result of a "Right deviation" from the line of Comrade Hall's report as well as "deviations" in general which the Party is still making, he contends, from the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism. Having set up a straw man the writer boldly proceeds to knock him down.

In what way is this "Right deviation" expressed? The writer gives this example:

In my opinion neither the *Daily Worker* nor *The Worker* raise the question of Socialism sufficiently in its editorials. I have just finished reading George Morris of December 2, on why we need the N.L.C., and on the conventions of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. where Negroes were all but completely zero in attendance. I also read the very fine and forthright articles by Mary Norris that the fight to save the unions is the hub of the anti-McCarthy struggle. But, neither one of these writers, who were dealing with these two basic problems of labor and the Negro people, mentioned Socialism one time in all of their many good sounding words and suggestions on tactics and approach in the struggle, but not a word on the final solution, a revolutionary approach.

Such is the "evidence" to prove that the Party has made a "Right deviation." It should be noted that the comrade makes several points. Yet, even if one were to agree with him that the editorials in the *Daily Worker* and *The Worker* do not "raise the question of Socialism sufficiently," this still has nothing in common with his charge that "the struggle for Socialism" has been placed "in a reserve moth bag."

These are two different concepts, with different qualities. Perhaps it would please the comrade if the articles had mentioned Socialism "one time," but mentioning "Socialism one time," is not a struggle for Socialism. At the same time, the comrade displays a gross weakness in his underestimation of the crucial struggle of today against reaction, which to him becomes only "good sounding words . . . etc." He opposes to this fight his phrasemongering about the "revolutionary approach." Such a view has nothing in common with Marxism.

The allusion by the comrade to "good sounding words and suggestions on tactics and approach in the struggle," reveals that the writer suffers from an adventurist impatience with the immediate struggle of the masses. This "Leftist" tendency flows from a lack of understanding and appreciation of the significance of correct flexible Marxist-Leninist tactics and their relationship to the achievement of the strategic goal of our Party, Socialism.

Ironically enough, all this is done

in "defense" of Comrade Hall's report which placed in a new way great emphasis precisely on the question of tactics. It is indeed quite strange how the comrade, having read the main report to the 1950 Convention, could overlook the emphasis of Comrade Hall on tactics and argue that our Party has deviated from the line of the Convention.

In setting forth our tactical line Comrade Hall declared:

"The struggle for peace is the crucial question. If our Party is to do anything, it must move resolutely into this struggle, above everything else." And later, "The number one task for us Communist is to search out every possible issue, every method and form, every organization and individual that will help to broaden out, and move additional people in the struggle for peace."

In a similar vein Comrade Hall signalized the growing fascist danger in the country: the attempt to nullify the Constitution—the Smith Act cases, the deportations, the Taft-Hartley and other anti-labor laws, the increasing attacks upon the Negro people, the Truman "Emergency decrees," etc.

Comrade Hall reached his correct conclusion because he recognized, as does the Draft Program of the Communist Party, that such policies "correspond to the needs of the people under circumstances in which their liberties and living standards are in imminent danger of complete destruction and in which they are not prepared to accept Socialism as the way out." Basing himself on Marxist

science Comrade Hall was fully aware of the fact that Socialism alone could abolish forever oppression, economic crisis, fascism and war.

What, then, is the task of Communists under circumstances when the majority of the people are not ready to accept Socialism as their way out? The Draft Program asserts that it is the duty of Communists to assist the masses in every way to find the path of unity of all peace loving forces, "unity on one issue, or a score of issues—irrespective of ideological and political differences on other questions and on longer range goals."

The objective of such unity is to "delay the outbreak of an economic depression and to cushion its blows upon the people . . ." to "save America from the clear and present danger of McCarthyism . . ." to "block war and fascism, save U.S. living standards, and maintain democracy."

Such are the guiding policies and practices of the Party. This is Marxism which is consistent with the 1950 Convention report of Comrade Gus Hall. Nor can it be otherwise, because the Communists defend *the immediate and ultimate* interests of the working class.

The author takes exception to this policy. To him the struggle for the most vital immediate needs of our class and people, and seeking ways to further this struggle, is regarded as "good sounding words about suggestions and tactics in struggle," the "path of the lesser evil," or "gradual-

ism," and the denial of the "revolutionary approach." This is obviously pure and simple phrasemongering.

As opposed to the policy of the Party the author proposes as policy:

It is my opinion that we must come forward today and take a bold position unwavering in explaining to the labor, the Negro people, the poor and middle-sized farmers and the allies of labor and the farmers, that there is only one final answer to solve these problems, and that will be when the workers take power and establish Socialism.

Of course, the "final" answer, the only *real* solution, is Socialism. But can we skip over and ignore the vanguard role of the Party on such vital questions as the *immediate* struggle to combat the oncoming economic crisis, to defeat McCarthyism, to prevent war, to win greater equality for the Negro people?—and yes, to do these things even under capitalism—to the extent that it can be done.

The comrade is not defending the report of Comrade Hall. On the contrary, he does violence to that report by distorting it in a most monstrous way. It is not the Party but the comrade that is guilty of a deviation. Can the comrade not see that he, in fact, is accepting the enemy's slander against our Party which alleges that our fight for the immediate needs of the masses is mere "window dressing?" The only difference is that the comrade speaks about "lesser evil" and "gradualism."

Undoubtedly recognizing the weaknesses of his argument, the comrade

does
strug

A
unite
peace
good
our s
throu

TH
"goo
these
"wor
tion"

It
dang
coun
rapic
And
"just
journ
the

Le
dista
York
will
reach
of th
must
in th

T
of th
the
nate
cern
socia
not
they
ugly
econ
coun
role

does give a bow to the immediate struggle. He states:

A united people's fight for peace, a united people's struggle for a world peace-time trade with all countries is good and we must all work with all our strength to bring such into existence through a united people's coalition.

The comrade states that this is "good." But he hastens to warn that these vital questions of "peace," "world . . . trade" and "people's coalition" are only "whistle stops."

It is clear that he does not see the danger of war and fascism in the country. Neither is he aware of the rapidly approaching economic crisis. And this gross underestimation is "justified" by talk about "end of journey." He expresses himself in the following way:

Let us agree that Socialism is the full distance of our journey. Let us set New York as the end of this journey. There will be many beautiful cities before we reach the city of New York, but none of them will be New York. The same must be firmly stated today on Socialism in the U.S.A.

This simile is a gross vulgarization of the Marxist approach to winning the masses for Socialism. Unfortunately, the masses have to be concerned with very grave matters of a social, economic and political nature, not solely geography, and on the way they see not only beauty but the ugly dangers of fascism, war and economic crisis. *It is only in the course of carrying out a vanguard role in the mobilization of the work-*

ers around these issues that the Party can succeed in winning the overwhelming majority of labor and the people for Socialism. It would be well for the writer to ponder this fact.

What about the alleged "Right deviation" charge made against the Party? Stalin stated, "Under capitalist conditions, the Right deviation in Communism is a tendency, an inclination, not yet formulated it is true, and perhaps not yet consciously realized, but nevertheless a tendency on the part of a section of the Communists to depart from the revolutionary line of Marxism in the direction of Social-Democracy."

The "Right deviation" does not consist in the fight waged by Communists for the immediate urgent needs of the masses. On the contrary, it is the departure from such struggles, it is the betrayal of *both the immediate and ultimate interests of the working class.* It would not be amiss to point out that among other things the Right-wing Social-Democratic leaders ardently support the reactionary foreign policy of Wall Street imperialism and its drive for world domination and war, whereas our Party militantly opposes this course.

The Right-wing labor reformists, for example, oppose policies leading toward U.S.-Soviet peaceful coexistence. They are opposed to seating People's China in the U.N. They support imperialist military aggression in Korea and Indo-China. They even supported the threat of intervention against little Guatemala. Our

Party, on the other hand, consistently fights for U.S.-Soviet peaceful co-existence, for the withdrawal of all U.S. troops from foreign lands, for the national independence of all peoples and for world peace.

The Right-wing Social-Democratic labor leaders oppose the policies of our Party on domestic questions as well. They subordinate the interests of labor to those of Big Business. They stand in the way of labor unity and engage in the wildest Red-baiting. They keep labor tied to the two-party system of monopoly capitalism and oppose an independent class line on the part of organized labor. It is not for nothing that these Right-wing labor leaders are the sworn enemies of our Party. Where they take a correct position it is in the main because of the militant pressure of the rank and file, which by its struggle alone can change the course of the labor movement. It would be well for the writer to rethink his conclusions against this background.

In characterizing the reactionary offensive against democratic liberties as "sham battles," the comrade fails to see the drive to fascism and its relationship to Wall Street's preparations for war and world domination. The reason for this monopoly offensive as stated by this comrade is "we know that Communism is not on the order of the day in the U.S.A., but Socialism is on the order of the day, but we are not sufficiently exposing these liars to the workers and their allies today on this question." The above vague and confused re-

marks not only reveal a lack of understanding of the relationship between Socialism and Communism but a total lack of comprehension of the socio-economic roots of the present fascist danger, flowing from the drive of U.S. monopoly capital to war and world domination.

Wall Street imperialism is driving toward war and fascism not because "Socialism is on the order of the day," but because it seeks world domination. Every sensible person knows that Socialism can only come when the majority of the working class and the American people are prepared to make that change. Those who shout about the "danger" of Socialism and Communism are knowingly creating a smokescreen behind which they want to stampede the people toward fascism and atomic war. First, they want the people to think that Socialism is a danger threatening their liberties, when it is not either an immediate or ultimate danger, for Socialism would be the real solution to the real dangers confronting the American people. It would not be a danger but a boon! In the second place, they want the people to think that the Communist movement is some kind of conspiracy in which a minority intends through force and violence to impose its will on the majority of the people.

To say that "Socialism is on the order of the day," in the sense that we are living in the epoch of the general crisis of world capitalism, in the epoch of history in which capi-

talism is giving way to socialism, is correct. To say this, however, in the sense that the present stage of our struggle in the country is to bring about the transition to Socialism, is entirely false and incorrect. It is not only to jump stages, to ignore the real situation, but to fall right into the trap of extreme reaction. Why? Because the great masses are opposed to fascism and war. They are ready to struggle against these dangers. They see these more clearly than in the past. But the vast majority of these workers and democratic-minded people generally are still confused about what Socialism is and are still opposed to that solution for this country. To make Socialism the issue of the day, to tell them that they must choose between Socialism and fascism, is to make unity against war and fascism impossible.

We must be ready to say to the workers and the people generally, and we do:

Let us unite to preserve peace and democracy, let us raise living standards and win civil rights for the Negro people. Let us agree to do these things today. We Communists are proud to proclaim our adherence to the principles of scientific socialism, of Marxism-Leninism. We are confident that the American people will ultimately realize the need for ending capitalism and establishing a socialist America. We insist on our right to believe so and to advocate our belief. But let not differences on the future course keep us from uniting on the immediate issues—the defense of bourgeois-democratic liberties and the preservation of world

peace. Even if you are opposed to Socialism, that is not on the order of the day in this country. Those who say otherwise, those who say that the Soviet Union threatens the country or that Communists see to impose Socialism by minority rule or by 'outside intervention,' are only spreading the 'Big Lie' of Adolph Hitler, are trying to divide the country in order to impose fascist rule and take us into the terrible catastrophe of an atomic war.

The writer distorts the sense of Gus Hall's report when he says that his speech at the 1950 Convention declared Socialism as being "on the order of the day." Had he read the report and summary carefully, he would have noted the following:

We must at all times keep in our mind the epoch in which we are living and working. It can be properly called the epoch of the collapse of capitalism and the victorious rise of the working class and Socialism. That describes this epoch generally. [Further] If we give our resolutions life: if the resolutions, the reports and discussions do not remain on paper, but we take them to the Party, to the working class, to the people—if we build the peace movement—then this Convention will really help enhance this process, and bring the working class to the struggle for Socialism.

Comrade Hall speaks about an "epoch" and not "order of the day." On the other hand, he states, if life is given to the "resolutions, the reports and discussions," and "if we build the peace movement,"—this will enhance "the struggle for Socialism." The dialectical inter-rela-

tionship is quite clear. The "reserve moth bag" theory has no basis in fact.

Flowing from his incorrect "socialism . . . on the order of the day" concept, the author quotes out of context from Stalin's *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*. He refers to the section dealing with conditions favorable for the assumption of power by the proletariat as if this meant that the question of Socialism was a slogan of action in our country today. But Stalin, the great Marxist, was writing about something else. He was discussing how in countries where the working class was a minority of the population it was necessary for it to form and maintain an alliance with the majority of the small property owners, especially the farming masses. He pointed out that under conditions of such an alliance embracing the majority of the people, a socialist government headed by the working class can be established and can maintain itself in power. Thus Stalin was stressing the need to *win a majority* as the only way to bring about Socialism, and not some Leftist adventurism.

But the problem for us in the United States at this time is not that of trying to form an alliance for the establishment of Socialism. It is to forge the broadest unity to preserve democracy and peace. Of course, in the course of building such unity we must uphold, teach and advocate our socialist principles and extend class consciousness in the ranks of the

workers. But this task must not be seen as against that of forging the broadest unity for peace, democracy, economic security and Negro rights.

It is therefore clear that the comrade has failed to grasp the decisions of the 1950 Convention. The essence of the line adopted was that of *strengthening the ties of the Party with the masses*, above all with the basic workers and in this regard, improving the *Party* character of our work. The report of Comrade Hall emphasized the absolute indispensability of giving greater attention to developing correct flexible tactical approaches, at the same time, in the interest of strengthening our ties with the masses, overcoming liquidationist tendencies, building and strengthening our Party, the Marxist press, and improving the circulation of our Marxist-Leninist literature.

What is demanded at this moment even more urgently than in 1950 is creative Marxist-Leninist attention to the achievement of flexible mass tactics, which can only come about by understanding the *specific* stage of struggle in the country and the strategic objective of that stage.

The hard and ugly realities of the moment cannot be escaped by a flight into empty prattle about "Socialism . . . on the order of the day." On the contrary, the welling discontent, flowing from the unrelenting offensive of the monopolist bourgeoisie, the Eisenhower Administration and the McCarthyites against the living standards of our class and people can

be canalized into a great democratic, anti-war front capable of checking and finally defeating the drive to war and fascism. But this can only be done by coming to grips with the day-to-day problems of the workers, the farming masses, the Negro people, the middle strata, and all peace loving forces.

The crux of the problem confronting the democratic and peace forces and our Party is how to achieve the organization of the struggle of these various groups, in the first place organized labor, around their own specific issues.

It is only in the course of struggle that the masses can be shown the real countenance of monopoly capital, its bipartisan spokesmen, and conditions can be created for the exposure of those labor leaders who stand in the way of unity for peace, democ-

racy and economic security.

The discussion around the Draft Program provides the opportunity for deepening and enriching our understanding of the line of our 1950 Convention, the reports and writings of Comrades Foster, Dennis, Hall, Winston and Davis, and of the 1953 National Conference of our Party. What this discussion must lead to is an improved understanding of Marxist-Leninist ideology in our ranks, the mass character of our work, and the strengthening of the Party organization as the indispensable vanguard of the American working class. It is to be hoped that in the course of this discussion the comrade will overcome his incorrect approach and make his contribution to the "fighting trim" of our Party for the battles of today and the coming battles of tomorrow

A Liberal's Education

(Book Review)

By Elizabeth Gurley Flynn

Education of an American Liberal, by Lucile Milner, Horizon Press, New York, \$3.95.

This book is a history of the rise and decline of the American Civil Liberties Union, written by a conscientious woman who served as its Secretary from 1920 to 1945, when she resigned. "The Civil Liberties Union had lost its old meaning for me," was her terse summary. The author, Mrs. Lucile Milner, was born in St. Louis, Mo., of a wealthy Jewish family. She had a pleasant sheltered life until the sudden death of her young husband caused her to seek solace in social work. She came to New York City, in 1912, to attend the School of Social Work of Columbia University. A course given by Mary Van Kleeck brought her in contact with speakers from the Socialist and labor movement. She heard for the first time an I.W.W. speaker, the poet, Arturo Giovannitti, who had recently been tried for murder in the Lawrence textile strike. She made a special study of child labor, learned about unemployment, poverty, slums, prostitution, and became a Socialist. On her return to St. Louis she worked as a tireless lobbyist on behalf of child welfare and woman's suffrage.

She was strongly opposed to U.S. entry into the war, and found her family and friends impatient with her views. She describes the St. Louis week-long Emergency convention of the Socialist Party, held in April, 1917, to

decide the party's anti-war stand. They warned that at home "*unreason would prevail and our liberties would be sacrificed during a war.*" Many peace organizations mushroomed in this country after the outbreak of the European war in 1914.

The widespread anti-war sentiment of the American people was reflected in the vote of 51 Congressmen and 6 Senators against the declaration of war, on April 6th, 1917. Under pressure of war hysteria the American Union against Militarism folded up, leaving only its Civil Liberties Bureau. But there was a tremendous movement for peace in the country. I realize Mrs. Milner is not writing a history of the peace movement but of the fight for civil liberties. However, they were not unrelated. The fight against war, for peace and democracy and for labor's rights, produced the multitude of attacks which kept the Bureau busy.

The Civil Liberties Bureau had a gigantic task to defend the Bill of Rights. It did valiant service for conscientious objectors, the war dissenters—both religious and political, and the hundreds of Socialists, Anarchists, I.W.W.'s and others accused of opposition to the draft, and of violating the newly enacted dragnet Espionage Act, and in protesting against violence and terror. Their offices were raided, their files were confiscated, they were evicted from their offices, and Roger Baldwin was jailed in 1918 for refusing

to register for the draft. It seems as remote from the present A.C.L.U. as the ragged determined soldiers at Valley Forge are from the Homburg-hatted Sons of the American Revolution of today.

Mrs. Milner first speaks of me in reference to a letter she received from Roger Baldwin from his cell in the Essex County jail. She says, "He urged me to save myself for the 'big cause' he, Norman Thomas, Scott Nearing and Elizabeth Gurley Flynn were working on." This was the project to set up a permanent peacetime Civil Liberties organization in place of the wartime Bureau which we had considered a temporary emergency organization.

There are some details of this period with which Mrs. Milner may not be familiar. While Roger Baldwin was in jail, Albert De Silver was in charge of the work of the Bureau. It became increasingly evident that a committee of busy individuals could not handle the multiplying problems on a weekly meeting basis. It was not staffed or equipped for large fund raising for defense or to mobilize the labor movement for an amnesty campaign. I had been requested by the I.W.W. General Defense Committee to act as a liaison between it and the Bureau, with whom I met regularly. Finally Charles Ervin, editor of the *N. Y. Call*, and Scott Nearing of the Rand School, acting as a subcommittee, gave me a credential on November 8, 1918, three days before Armistice Day, authorizing me to organize a Workers' Defense Union. They advanced \$250 to pay my salary for nine weeks. By that time we were a going concern. We held a founding conference in the *Forward* Hall on December 18th, 1918, with delegates from 163 organizations. Fred Biedenkapp was

treasurer, Simon Schachter was Secretary and I was the organizer.

We lifted a load from the Civil Liberties Bureau, making it possible for it to concentrate more on free speech and amnesty. At the end of the war there were approximately 1500 political prisoners in Federal penitentiaries and army prisons, for sentences up to 35 years. Our job, in the Workers' Defense Union in addition to helping in amnesty efforts, dealt with the vicious post-war attacks—the Palmer raids, which precipitated state sedition and criminal syndicalist cases in a dozen states; against the deportation of hundreds of foreign-born; and in the seven long years of struggle to save the lives of Sacco and Vanzetti from a dastardly frame-up. I became identified with the American Civil Liberties Union at its birth.

I was one of its founding members; it was my first intimate contact with American liberals—middle-class professors, lawyers, ministers, Quakers, even priests—most of them very fine people as individuals. But after my many years with the uncompromising I.W.W. and my contact with plain speaking workers, they amazed me by their many vacillating contradictions, which stemmed from their class backgrounds. I had a solid rock foundation in the class struggle. But they did express moral indignation over vigilante violence, lack of due process, invasions of the Bill of Rights, and consistently fought against them in the period of the 20's. They did yeoman service for democracy, for the rights of labor and political minority parties, for amnesty of the wartime political prisoners and religious objectors, for countless deportees. They passed no judgment on the views of those whom they defended. Under the

leadership of Dr. Harry F. Ward, its first Chairman, the A.C.L.U. was a courageous fighting organization. It went beyond a formal definition of civil liberties, in defense of Tom Mooney and Sacco and Vanzetti, charged with murder. It defended the right of the unemployed in the 30's, to assemble and demonstrate; helped defend the Scottsboro defendants and one of its leading attorneys, Whitney North Seymour, participated in the Supreme Court Appeal of Angelo Herndon. Mrs. Milner does an excellent job in recounting the stirring history of these years, in which she so generously gave of her time and ability.

When I returned to New York City in 1936, after a long illness, I resumed my duties as an A.C.L.U. Board member. I had been granted a leave of absence and was warmly greeted on my return by the members I knew. Among them was Robert W. Dunn, staunch fighter for civil liberties and labor's rights since the '20s, who has remained so through all these years and is in the forefront today. But it soon became apparent to me that it was not the A.C.L.U. I had known. In the earlier period the Board of Directors were not fearful of the ideologies of those whom they defended. I found this group had thinned out. New faces had appeared—"liberals" who did not share the tolerance of the 20's, when the famed Voltairian attitude to civil liberties had undoubtedly been based unconsciously on the concept that there was no clear and present danger of the "Reds" succeeding.

By the late 30's several factors had caused an ever sharper division in the country and the A.C.L.U. did not live in a vacuum. One was the increasing strength of the Soviet Union, and the

world spread of Socialist ideas. There was the militant and effective leadership of the Communist Party here in labor and unemployed struggles; and the growth of the C.I.O. Mrs. Milner comments that "President Roosevelt's official family read like the roster of the A.C.L.U." This contributed to the organization's increasing respectability, as person after person left the Board to become a government official, on the Supreme Court, in the Cabinet, etc. I found my old friend and associate, Wm. Z. Foster, Communist leader, missing from their rolls. He had been a founding member, when he led the great steel strike of 1919-20. I was put off with the excuse, "He couldn't attend meetings." Then in 1939, when I was absent only on short speaking trips, I received a letter from the office suggesting I be transferred to the National Committee and my place on the Board be filled by some one "who can attend regularly." I refused. But that was after I had joined the Communist Party and was the first indication of a coming storm in which I would be the center. They knew because I told them, that I had joined the Communist Party in 1937. They had re-elected me to the Board after that.

Mrs. Milner gives the background of this cause celebre, as starting in 1937 when the issue of Henry Ford's "right of free speech" nearly split the Board asunder. The A.C.L.U. actually rebuked the National Labor Relations Board for condemning Ford's intimidation of workers (through leaflets cautioning them not to join the union and attacking the union). The N.L.R.B. branded Ford's actions as unfair labor practices, forbidden by the Labor Relations Act. She describes how the A.C.L.U. capitulated to the Dies Committee. Their

coun
field
ngto
was
came
Harr
man
uste
Chair
for P
alleg
tion.
'strug
attach
of C
from
critic
recor
yond
neces
purge
Comm
of th
tee.

In
Natio
out c
ent, t
his
orer
that
since
for a
ing c
staff,
organ
dicta
his
supp
the M
of gu
as th
Ame
Nazi
K.K.

counsel, Morris Ernst and Arthur Garfield Hays secretly visited him in Washington to assure him that the A.C.L.U. was not "a Communist agency." Then came a Pearl Harbor-like attack on Dr. Harry Ward, by Morris Ernst and Norman Thomas, who demanded he be ousted as Chairman because of his Chairmanship of the American League for Peace and Democracy, which they called a "Communist front organization." Norman Thomas carried the struggle into the *N.Y. Call*, in a further attack on Dr. Ward, calling for a purge of Communists and fellow-travellers from the A.C.L.U. Board. The Board criticized Thomas severely and went on record once more that no standards beyond loyalty to the Bill of Rights were necessary. But by a slick maneuver, a purge resolution by the Nominating Committee was sent out over the heads of the Board to the National Committee.

In Feb., 1940, at a meeting of the National Committee, where only eight out of forty-three members were present, with twenty-two voting by proxy, this resolution was adopted. It was a forerunner of all the "loyalty" oaths that have plagued our country ever since. It held it to be "inappropriate for any person to serve on the governing committees of the Union or on its staff, who is a member of any political organization which supports totalitarian dictatorship in any country, or who by his public declarations indicates his support of such a principle." Then (like the McCarran Act) it built in a verdict of guilt by defining such organizations as the Communist Party, the German American Bund and all Fascist and Nazi organizations, including the K. K. K., etc. But as Mrs. Milner points

out, "The inclusion of the Nazis, the Klan, the Christian Frontiers, fooled no one, because at no time and at no place had they ever fought for civil liberties in this country."

Dr. Ward was the first casualty. He resigned in protest against this purge resolution. I was the next. But the real casualty was the A.C.L.U. Seventeen prominent liberals, headed by Robert Morse Lovett, signed an Open Letter to the A.C.L.U. on March 18th, 1940, urging it to rescind the purge resolution. They included Theodore Dreiser, Carey McWilliams, Prof. Franz Boas, John T. Bernard, I. F. Stone, Henry Pratt Fairchild, and Prof. Robert S. Lynd. They said the purge resolution made the A.C.L.U. "seem a fellow-traveller of the Dies Committee," and "The Civil Liberties Union was formed in 1920 to fight postwar hysteria. It would be a great pity if it were now to become the victim of pre-war hysteria." Mrs. Milner lists among those members of the National Committee who emphatically voted "No" on the purge resolution—Professors Meiklejohn, Mussey and Vida Scudder, also Bishop Edward Parsons, Jeanette Rankin, Dr. John Lapp and George P. West.

Mrs. Milner gives a surprisingly frank account of my so-called "trial" before the Board of Directors. Among those who clamored for my resignation as a "traitor in our little redoubt," was John Dos Passos, who had tobogganed down—to reaction! There were others, some of them heavy contributors, including Mrs. Margaret De Silver, widow of Albert De Silver. The charges against me on the Communist Party count were brought by Dorothy Bromley, a journalist. Mrs. Milner describes it as follows: "Her selection by Roger [Baldwin] as Elizabeth's chief accuser must

have seemed incongruous even to her, but he persuaded her. 'It's a tough job,' he wrote her, 'but you are the person to do it with firmness and delicacy,' and she accepted."

"Delicacy" was probably required because my only son Fred died on March 29, 1940—in the midst of this struggle, in fact during the very week the trial was set. I was brought to trial on May 7th, less than six weeks after his death. It was not easy for me, in the throes of the deepest grief, to defend myself. But Mrs. Milner's blow by blow description, refreshes my memory and is extremely gratifying to me. Apparently she believes I acquitted myself with credit. At least I fought back. They had asked me to resign quietly.

Two other charges were based on articles I had written in the *New Masses* and in the *Daily Worker*. The section that particularly stung my accusers was the following: "The A.C.L.U. directors have become class conscious. When labor was weak they could afford to be benign, detached liberals demanding the rights of labor. But labor is strong and powerful today. It needs no wet-nurses. These pseudo-liberals take fright at the giant on the horizon which points the possible future everywhere—the Soviet Union."

I protested first against the Board trying me. They were not impartial since they had already demanded my resignation. Three of them were my accusers. Dr. John Haynes Holmes had characterized me as "a symbol of difficulties," not a valid charge even in a capitalist court. "I demand the kind of trial the Civil Lib. Union has insisted upon for the persons it has defended," I said. This was rejected. I was then put through a searching examination by one of the most skillful lawyers in America—Arthur Garfield Hayes, on

the Communist Party of the U.S.A. and its relations to the Soviet Union. I was reminded of it when I was cross-examined by the Government attorney along the same lines before the Subversive Activities Control Board, in 1952. Another line which he pursued, of which I was reminded in my famous "colloquies" with Judge Dimock in 1952 during one Smith Act trial, "Do you believe in civil liberties and democracy and the Bill of Rights as a way of life, or merely as a means to bring about a Soviet system, in this country, a Communist system?" It was Communism, not Elizabeth, that was on trial, before the A.C.L.U. and in Judge Dimock's court, twelve years later. Finally I was asked to withdraw. A vote was taken at 2:30 a.m. on the C.P. membership charge. It stood nine to nine. Dr. Holmes, as Chairman, cast the deciding vote for my expulsion *for my political beliefs*.

While this was happening, an omnibus bill called "The Alien Registration Law" was being debated in Congress. The A.C.L.U. had gone on record against it, but in the turmoil of the inner struggle, had done little. In June, 1940, this Smith Act was passed which not only forced all foreign-born non-citizens to register, be fingerprinted, carry identification cards and notify the authorities of change of residence, but carried a rider *which made a deadly sneak attack on the Bill of Rights*. Prof. Zachariah Chafee, Professor of Law at Harvard University, wrote in his book *Free Speech in the United States* (1941): "Not until months later did I for one realize that this statute contained the most drastic restrictions on free speech ever enacted in the United States during peace. It is no more limited to registration of aliens than the

Espionage Act of 1917 was limited to spying."

The thought control section of the Smith Act of 1940 lay dormant during World War II, but it set the pattern for loyalty tests, subversive lists, witch hunts, the police-state McCarran Act, Taft-Hartleys oaths, after the war was over. Even the most feeble protest by the A.C.L.U. against any of these invariably met with the devastating question, "Did you not expel a Communist from your governing board?" They had sanctioned thought control. It stultified their opposition to it in other places. The Flynn case was the skeleton in their closet which they would probably like to forget. But life has dragged it into the open on many occasions. Mrs. Milner faces it frankly.

My recollection of Mrs. Milner for twenty years was that of a quiet, self-effacing, efficient person who gave factual reports, when asked to do so, kept the minutes, ran the office, made all the wheels go round, but did not participate in discussions. Until I read her book I never knew she felt so strongly about Dr. Ward's resignation and my expulsion. Mrs. Milner had been in Europe in 1934 for the American Committee Against War and Fascist Oppression in Germany. She visited camps where thousands of refugees were gathered in France, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and the Saar. She courageously visited Berlin, against the advice of government representatives and met leaders of underground organizations. She learned the full extent of Nazi brutality, especially atrocities against Jewish people. She was profoundly anti-Nazi and antifascist. The tragic climax for Mrs. Milner came in the A.C.L.U. in 1945.

Because World War II was a just and popular war against fascism, no

civil liberties cases arose that were comparable with the period of World War I. The A.C.L.U. had little to do. No cases in World War I, she points out, "showed the slightest evidence that speeches or publications were backed by enemy money or served enemy plans." But now a new type of case confronted them, a wartime case charging twenty-eight men and two women with pro-Nazi propaganda and activity, under direction of the German Reich. They included Pelley, leader of the Silver Shirts; Kunze, leader of the German-American Bund; Joe McWilliams, a pro-fascist Jew-baiter; Elizabeth Dilling (author of the notorious *Red Network*) and George Sylvester Viereck, an avowed German agent in World War I. They were accused by Attorney General Biddle, (former member of the A.C.L.U.) of aiding the enemy in wartime. The Board of the A.C.L.U. decided this was not a civil liberties case. However, Mrs. Milner makes this direct charge: "A small minority of officers and members were unwilling to accept the Board's decision and offered aid to a number of defendants and their lawyers. Had they done so as private individuals it might have been considered their own affair. But they offered aid to these defendants by using the facilities, the stationery, the connections and the prestige of the American Civil Liberties Union." Mrs. Milner was greatly disturbed by the additional fact that after the Board had taken its action, Dr. Holmes rebuked her for intervening in the discussion. At the next meeting of the Board, at her request, they voted her the right to speak on any matter before them. But the office situation was intolerable and continued in spite of her protest. So after twenty-five years' service as Secretary she resigned.

She expresses her grave concern over the present waves of intolerance, thought control and loyalty tests. She concludes, however, on a fighting note, "But the future depends on us. Liberty is not handed down like the family silver, but must be fought for and re-won by each new generation. The measure of freedom we in America will have depends upon the efforts we make to keep our traditional rights intact. They are ours only insofar as we are willing to maintain them." Significantly, she does not refer to the American Civil Liberties Union as a leader. It has fallen too far behind in the struggle.

There are many good and sincere members in the A.C.L.U. who are devoted to the defense of the Bill of Rights. Now and again a local representative, like Mr. A. L. Wirin of Los Angeles, plunges vigorously into a free speech struggle, as he has done in three Smith Act cases. But they wage no battles in the valiant and forthright manner they did in the 20's—against repressive measures like the Smith Act, the McCarran Act, the Taft-Hartley Act and loyalty oaths, and McCarran-Walter attacks on the foreign-born. If the outrageous proposition embodied in the last Act, namely for an alien to deport himself or go to prison for ten years, had been proposed in the 20's, the A.C.L.U. would have been in the center of a two-fisted struggle against it. If a travelling circus of professional informers and F.B.I. agents, had been the star witnesses in political thought control trials of the 20's, as they are now, the A.C.L.U. would have created a tremendous protest. But today it is virtually silent. On the contrary, the degenerative process of the A.C.L.U. has led to a point where one can envisage its defense of informers and stool pigeons. Indeed, one might say there is

a perverse logic in the rushing of the multi-perjured informer Crouch, to the A.C.L.U. to be defended by it.

What is the reason that the A.C.L.U. is now inactive on all these issues? It is because the A.C.L.U. succumbs to the "Big Lie," first promulgated by Adolf Hitler. Lately another anti-Communist resolution was proposed that caused a new furor in its membership, comparable to the protest in my case, and this time brought about the resignation of Dr. Corliss Lamont. It was couched in almost the exact language of the McCarran Act, declaring the Communist Party to be a part of an international conspiracy! In December, 1953, in an advertisement in the *Nation* the organization states: "The Union fights for the civil liberties even of those anti-democratic opinions it abhors. In order to do so it bars from its governing body all totalitarians of left and right."

I have seen no defense of Communists' rights emanate from its national office. Yet, as I stated in my A.C.L.U. trial in 1940, Communists are among the best defenders of the Bill of Rights. I said, and no one denied it: "Communists have been among the most loyal and devoted defenders of civil liberties, as were our predecessors, the Left-wing groups of the old Socialist Party and the I.W.W. The records of the Civil Liberties Union abound with our names as those who were arrested, beaten, jailed, tried and sentenced for free speech, free press and free assembly. Is there any member of this Board whose record as a consistent fighter for these rights can outweigh the records of Wm. Z. Foster and myself, since the free speech fight in Spokane in 1910, which were not our first arrests? How often have Mrs. Bromley or Mr. Riis or Mr. Rice been in jail for free speech?"

Why did the A.C.L.U. sink so far from its once high and honorable position? As the working class movement in our country grew tremendously and the war against fascism created a united front of powerful progressive forces, many of its leaders reverted to type as petit-bourgeois-minded upholders of the reactionary class interests. So long as there was no danger of working-class advance here and victories on a world scale, they could indulge in their Boy Scout "good deeds." But when the "test of tests" came, to stand up and be counted, they not only failed but rushed to the defense, not of labor and the people, not democratic rights, but of the bourgeoisie. Dr. Corliss Lamont, who remained true to his liberal principles, was recently refused the right to speak on the A.C.L.U. platform in Los Angeles because, I understand, a heavy contributor, a big industrialist, objected.

We have fought in our Smith Act trials, to secure adequate counsel, against exorbitant bail, against vile stool-pigeon testimony, against abuse, slander, misrepresentation and downright lies, against outside political attacks by prosecutors and the F.B.I., and charges of contempt of court for refusing to "name names." I have seen no representative of the A.C.L.U. appear even as an observer at our trial here in N.Y.C. in 1952, to see if due process was observed, or to help us in our struggle against a stacked jury system. How can they, when they assert they believe the lies peddled in these trials? When and if the prison door closes on me and I serve a three-year sentence on a Smith Act thought-control conviction, it is the logical conclusion of my expulsion from the A.C.L.U. fourteen years ago. How could they defend me today against the very charges they themselves made

then? Their dilemma, which stymies all their attacks on repression, is that they agree with its premises, that the Communists are guilty. They are like those who say they agree with McCarthy's objectives, but not his methods. Usually their protests against his methods end in capitulation to McCarthyism, as the A.C.L.U. capitulated to Dies. I have little hope of the A.C.L.U. measuring up to the needs of the hour, so well described by Mrs. Milner in her conclusion. The magnificent role of the Soviet Union in the war against Hitler, its courage and enormous sacrifices, which won praises even from a MacArthur and admiration from the people of the whole world, did not change these stodgy liberals in their anti-Soviet attitude. But whether it can arise phoenix-like out of the ashes of its recent past and recapture its honorable traditions or not, will not stop the march of progress, "The world goes on just the same." There are new forces, such as the Lawyers' Guild, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, the Civil Rights Congress, whose valiant leader, Wm. Patterson, is at this writing in jail for refusing to be a stool-pigeon. These new forces are carrying on the defense of the Bill of Rights today. Americans by the thousands are becoming increasingly alarmed at the course of events—at the threat of war in the world and of fascism here. They will find new channels, now, as we did in the 20's, to express their protest and opposition. Mrs. Milner's excellent book is a challenge to continue the battle for our traditional freedoms, to which she so gallantly gave a quarter of a century. I am sure she will continue in that battle, with all the honest and sincere Americans who cherish peace and democracy.

Ready Soon—

THE ORIGINS OF CHRISTIANITY

By ARCHIBALD ROBERTSON

Serious and thoughtful students will hail the publication this month by International Publishers of Archibald Robertson's *The Origins of Christianity*, price \$2.50.

The author, a renowned British Marxist scholar and historian, provides in this volume a comprehensive analysis of the social roots of early Christianity, of the forces which contributed to the founding of the Christian church, and of the revolutionary and conservative tendencies within the first Christian communities. His study reveals how the early Christian writings reflect real controversies between social classes which developed in the sick and dying slave society that was making way for feudalism. His study also traces the development of messianic ideas among the Jews of the Roman Empire, discusses the "myth" theory about Jesus, maintaining that the Christ story originates in definite historical events.

In demonstrating that Christianity was the product of a long and complex historical evolution which began centuries earlier, Dr. Robertson unravels the tangled problem of Christian origins, throwing a brilliant light on this focal question, and on the revolutionary role of the Prophets and the final crystallization of a new, dogmatic and authoritarian religion.

Here is a book you will want for your permanent library.

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway • New York 3, N. Y.

th
of

ro-
of
of
en-
ow
ial
was
of
the
tes

and
ert-
g a
of
and