

Political affairs

JANUARY 1955 • 25 CENTS

H X
1
. C 8
v. 34
no. 1

AN EDITORIAL

A. B. MAGIL

ELIZABETH GURLEY
FLYNN

ALBERT E. BLUMBERG

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

SOVIET HISTORIANS

ROBERT FRIEDMAN

- [1] Lenin and Peaceful Co-Existence
- [4] On the Struggle for Peace in the United States
- [17] Joint Declaration of Moscow Conference of European Countries for Safeguarding Peace and Security
- [27] Comrade Israel Amter: In Memoriam
- [33] Labor, Congress, and the '56 Elections
- [44] *History of the Three Internationals* (Table of Contents)
- [52] On the Study of the Modern History of Capitalist Countries
- [63] *Fire in the Ashes* (Book Review)

IN MEMORIAM



ISRAEL AMTER

March 26, 1881 — November 24, 1954

VOL. X

A

An E

This
annive
Lenin,
Party,
Social
buildi
Union
in the
world
nator
of cap
is the
the pe
idea, r
and to
fundam
of our

It w
by Le
Russia
it to
cree c

Re-ente
under t
Publish
correspo
and Ca
PRINTED

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

Lenin and Peaceful Co-Existence

An Editorial

THIS JANUARY marks the thirty-first anniversary of the death of V. I. Lenin, founder of the Bolshevik Party, leader of the Great October Socialist Revolution, organizer of the building of Socialism in the Soviet Union. Lenin, outstanding figure in the greatest social event in world history, is likewise the originator of the idea of the co-existence of capitalist and socialist states, which is the basis today for maintaining the peace of the world. This guiding idea, now vital to human progress and to human existence itself, is of fundamental concern to the people of our own country.

It was the Soviet government, led by Lenin, which, the day after the Russian laboring masses had brought it to power, issued its historic Decree of Peace. It was this Decree

which announced to the peoples of the world: "The Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic desires to live in peace with all nations and to concentrate all its efforts on domestic construction." It was the Soviet government, led by Lenin, which, in 1922, having overcome the capitalist military intervention, announced as "possible the parallel co-existence of the old and the newly-born social system" and even then spoke of this co-existence as "an imperative necessity."

Lenin's projection of the theory of peaceful co-existence is based upon the Leninist teaching of the possibility of building Socialism in one country, which must mean the existence and development of such a socialist country within a capitalist encirclement. It is based, at the same

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

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

time, upon the organic relation of peace to Socialism, upon the fact that Socialism is not exploitative at home nor predatory abroad and hence, unlike imperialism, is not driven to war-making.

Practice confirms this theoretical groundwork. The history of the Soviet Union, in international affairs, is a history of consistent struggle for peace; and where that socialist state has been involved in war, this has been brought about by aggressions from without, from the early days of imperialist intervention, to those of the assault by fascist Germany.

Indeed, the history of the Soviet Union confirms the reality of co-existence. The fact is that for over thirty years the U.S.S.R. has existed, peacefully, side by side with capitalist states, this despite their war-plots and intense provocations. Moreover, when, in 1941, war was forced upon it by aggression, a military alliance came into being, an anti-Axis alliance of states with differing social systems. This Grand Alliance endured (despite Churchillian maneuvers for perfidy) through four years of combat, and endured to victory.

Conversely, history has shown that the wars of the imperialist epoch have involved as antagonists, states having basically an identical social system, namely, capitalism. The whole record of these wars, from the Franco-Prussian War of 1870 through the First World War and including

the Second, demonstrates this truth.

The essence of this history, both in terms of socialist-capitalist international relations and in terms of inter-imperialist relations, was summed up with characteristic succinctness by Joseph Stalin. In the notable interview with Harold Stassen, in April, 1947, Stalin declared:

The systems in Germany and the United States are the same but war broke out between them. The U.S. and U.S.S.R. systems are different but we did not wage war against each other and the U.S.S.R. does not propose to. If during the war they could co-operate, why can't they in peace, given the wish to co-operate?

Lenin pronounced the possibility and the desirability and necessity of co-existence a generation ago; the passage of time has made all this more, not less, urgent. With over 900,000,000 people living in socialist countries, or countries consciously building towards Socialism, the whole meaning of co-existence assumes an overwhelming consequence. It assumes this all-decisive meaning because of its imperative desirability from the viewpoint of healthy economic relations and conditions, because of its priceless value for cultural interchange, and because of its vital necessity in this atomic era as a pre-condition for simple human existence. All these life-and-death considerations make co-existence the single most pressing question of our age.

12-30
As
tempt
perati
ground
havin
clash
will f
into t
where
that e
ist sta
howe
peace
insert
even
Yet t
gogy
popul
is a c
nition
under
mass
ple's
of go
dema
to wa
In
gle f
a dec
mand
ism,
Toda
dang
portu
for p
this
tentic
that
of the
peace
articl

As against the imperialists' attempts to build up categorical imperatives for war on the specious ground that different social systems, having different ideologies, must clash in armed combat, the peoples' will for peace is forcing co-existence into the forefront of discussion everywhere. So compelling is this will that even the leaders of the imperialist states—even Churchill and Eisenhower—have to speak in terms of peaceful co-existence, while carefully inserting reservations and conditions even in their demagogic utterances. Yet the very compulsion to demagoguery is a tribute to the power of the popular will for peace; the demagoguery is a concession to that power. Recognition of this fact should spur the understanding that only increased mass pressure can impose the people's will for peace upon the policy of government, can assure that the demagoguery does not smooth the way to war.

In concrete terms, in today's struggle for peace, our own country is a decisive arena; for here is the commanding center of world imperialism, the heart of the war danger. Today, in the United States, new dangers of war appear, as do new opportunities to press forward the battle for peace. A specific analysis of this situation, paying particular attention to the tactical differences that are appearing in the war-camp of the bourgeoisie as the struggle for peace sharpens, is provided in the article, herein published, by Comrade

A. B. Magil.

At the same time, the salient issue today, in the fight against war, is provided by Wall Street's feverish effort to re-arm a re-nazified Western Germany. The struggle, which the Soviet Union is leading, against this extremely dangerous course is at the heart of the effort to build a lasting system of peaceful co-existence. In this number of *Political Affairs* will also be found an authoritative analysis of this question in the full text of the Declaration issued by the signatory European countries at the Moscow Conference for Safeguarding Peace, held from November 29 to December 2.

On this 31st anniversary of the death of Lenin, a bequest of that genius of human progress—the possibility, desirability and necessity of the peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems—looms as never before as the most vital need of mankind. A major responsibility for assuring its realization rests with special claim upon the working class in unity with the Negro people and the entire democratic population of our country. We Communists should labor with redoubled vigor to bring all of our peace-loving compatriots the most urgent message of our day: sincere and realistic striving for peace must express itself in devotion to the achievement of lasting peaceful co-existence and friendship between the United States and the Soviet Union.

On the Struggle for Peace in the United States

By A. B. Magil

Lenin taught that the working class could achieve victory only "by necessarily, thoroughly, carefully, attentively and skilfully taking advantage of every, even the smallest, 'rift' among the enemies, of every antagonism of interest among the bourgeoisie of the various countries and among the various groups or types of bourgeoisie within the various countries, by taking advantage of every, even the smallest, opportunity of gaining a mass ally even though this ally be temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable and conditional" ("Left-Wing" Communism, An Infantile Disorder).

IT IS A LITTLE more than three years since *Collier's* magazine devoted the entire issue of October 27, 1951, to a preview of World War III entitled "Russia's Defeat and Occupation, 1952-1960." This issue, whose "overall conception," according to the editors, "was confirmed in study and consultation with top political, military and economic thinkers—including high-level Washington officials and foreign-affairs experts, both here and abroad," was a Wall Street *Mein Kampf*, an orgy of war incitement and world conquest bluster.

Collier's special issue, appearing in the midst of the Korean war, shocked world public opinion. It proved embarrassing to the State Department since it revealed too nakedly and crudely the intimate dreams of the

"American Century" monopolists and their bi-partisan political and military general staffs.

How badly the neo-barbarians miscalculated may be judged by the fact that the *Collier's* timetable called for the atomic holocaust to start on May 10, 1952 and end in January, 1955. Thus we are now at the point at which the military occupation of the Soviet Union and the people's democracies was to begin, together with the introduction of such superior products of the "American way of life" as "Woolworth Villages," the Sears-Roebuck catalogue, and the Broadway musical on the theme of an underworld crap game, *Guys and Dolls*.

But it was not only the timing that went wrong. World realities also re-

fused to behave according to plan. *Collier's* crystal-ball gazers saw World War III starting on May 10, 1952 with a military invasion of Yugoslavia after an unsuccessful Soviet plot to kill Tito. As it turned out, the real plot consummated about that date was the deal on Trieste which the United States and British governments made with Italy, a deal which Yugoslavia denounced. Moreover, the American people proved so "intractable," so reluctant to follow the Wall Street-*Collier's* blueprint, that in 1952 the five-star general who was backed by the most reactionary, most aggressively pro-war forces in American life concluded that the only way he could capture the Presidency was by promising to end the war in Korea.

And today the war-now hucksters are haunted by the fear that their dream of three years ago may be fast turning into a nightmare. Instead of a mass circulation magazine blazoning this vision of imminent world carnage and conquest before millions of readers, a publication read chiefly by business executives is now constrained to present a somewhat different kind of preview. It is offered in an article, "1964: After Ten Years of Coexistence," in the December 10, 1954 issue of *U.S. News and World Report*, edited by that unreconstructed war-now advocate, David Lawrence. The author of the article, Dr. Gerhart Niemeyer, a former State Department official who is now professor of International Relations at Yale University, paints a

grim picture: ten years of no war! In bleak, oracular accents, marshaling his words like legions marching to their doom, the professor depicts the desolate future: the admission of China to the United Nations in 1955; the Soviet Union refusing to invade Western Europe even when a manufactured "uprising" takes place in Poland in July, 1961; a hesitant American President failing to order three U.S. divisions in Western Europe into battle positions and thus missing the last opportunity to precipitate World War III; the collapse of NATO and its replacement by a "semi-alliance" between the USSR and the countries of continental Europe, including a unified Germany; the isolation of the United States—that is, of the imperialist war-instigators—because "we did not risk the use of force to assert our will vis-à-vis Russia."

Both *Collier's* issue of three years ago and the recent article in *U.S. News and World Report* express in different forms and under different circumstances the thinking of the most aggressive, adventurist circles of monopoly capital. But the contrast between them reflects the significant changes in world relationships that have taken place during this period. This contrast is negative testimony to the ascendant strength of the world peace camp headed by the Soviet Union and to the growing assertiveness of the American people's will for peace. And the conversion of the maniacal dreams of 1951 into the desperate

fears of 1954-55 underlines the new features and the new possibilities in the fight for peace today.

THE EISENHOWER-KNOWLAND CONFLICT

In recent weeks there has been much speculation about sharpened differences between President Eisenhower and the Republican Senate leader, Senator Knowland, over certain questions of foreign policy. Let us be clear about the nature of these differences. This is not a conflict between those who stand for war and those who stand for peace, but between two sectors of the war camp. Between the two groups there is no decisive cleavage; they are united on the ultimate strategic objective of world domination by Wall Street and on the use of armed force to achieve that aim. They differ only in a tactical sense—over how and when.

Senator Knowland, as he indicated in his speech in the Senate on November 16, believes that time is running out for those who would fulfill the dreams so vividly described in *Collier's* special issue. Unless every opportunity is seized to provoke conflict even at the risk of losing all allies, the Knowland-McCarthy-Radford clique believe that it will be too late in the sense that the forces of peace, democracy and Socialism will have become so strong as to make it impossible for Wall Street to achieve world mastery. That is why Senator Knowland, behind whom stand pow-

erful Big Business interests, has called for the rupture of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, has urged that if People's China is admitted into the United Nations, the United States leave that body, has demanded a blockade against China, and in general has advocated a "get-tough" and "go it alone" line in international affairs.

Eisenhower, on the other hand, speaks for the dominant Wall Street groups that are more conscious of world realities. Driving full steam ahead to bring all mankind under their predatory rule, these monopolist groups at the same time believe it necessary to avoid global war, or conflicts which might lead to it, until greater military power is achieved and relations with the allies cemented so as to guarantee the U.S. imperialists against the danger of waging the war in isolation. In this view a rearmed and remilitarized Germany, a rearmed and remilitarized Japan and the implementation of the Southeast Asian alliance are indispensable prerequisites for all-out war.

In practice there is a certain overlapping between the two approaches. And simultaneous with the main trend toward widening the rift there grow tendencies toward rapprochement on specific issues. It should be noted that the war-now crowd hold important positions within the Administration itself. Vice-President Nixon, though a political rival of Knowland, shares his outlook, as do three of the four members of the Joint

Chiefs of Staff, all of whom were appointed and are retained in their posts by Eisenhower. Secretary of State Dulles, a Hitler appeaser in the pre-war period and more recently chief architect of the bankrupt "liberation" and "massive retaliation" policy, commutes between the two groups and his speeches often combine both views. Thus, it can be expected that the Eisenhower Administration will be no more disposed to settle accounts with the Knowland cabal than with the McCarthyites, and no more averse to embarking on occasional international provocations than to embracing aspects of McCarthyism. Yet, as in the case of the anti-McCarthy struggle, the course of the foreign policy conflict does not depend entirely on the wishes of the Administration and the Wall Street top brass.

Behind this sharpening conflict over tactics lies the steadily deepening crisis in American foreign policy. As international tensions have relaxed with the Korean and Indo-China truces, the contradiction between the aggressive aims of Wall Street imperialism and the possibility of realizing them has become increasingly acute. As a result, differences over how best to carry out these aims have grown within war-generating monopoly capital and among its political representatives.

Conflict in the ruling class over foreign policy, which at bottom is economic, is not new; in varying forms it manifested itself before, during and since World War II. In the

period of the cold war it first sharply emerged in 1950-51 when it became evident that Wall Street and its Truman Administration had seriously miscalculated the nature and duration of the "police action" in Korea. Washington was compelled to back-track and to dump the chief advocate of extending the Korean war, General MacArthur.

These differences were, however, patched up around the candidacy of Eisenhower. The resolution of the National Committee of the Communist Party after the 1952 election stated:

The Eisenhower-Dulles "liberation" policy is a continuation and dangerous intensification of the aggressive Truman-Acheson war policy. It is harmful to obscure the fact that the G.O.P. victory in the 1952 elections does in fact strengthen the hand of the most reactionary pro-fascist, pro-war elements of monopoly capital.

The Eisenhower Administration confirmed this estimate by its inflammatory "liberation" and "massive retaliation" slogans, its aggressive attempts to incite civil war in the socialist countries, its last-minute effort in April to send U.S. troops into the Indo-China war, its attempt to scuttle the Geneva Conference, its opposition to the Indo-China truce, its organization of the violent overthrow of the democratic government of Guatemala.

In commenting on the Eisenhower-Knowland rift, James Reston pointed out (*New York Times*, November 17):

It was not Mr. Knowland but the President and the Secretary of State who proclaimed that the "policy of containment" was not good enough and had to be replaced by the bolder "policy of liberation." The Senator approved this bolder policy, of course, but his view now is that, while he still supports it, the Administration seems to have departed from it.

The Administration's "departure" from that "bolder policy" was not on its own steam. The steam came from the massive resistance of the world's peoples, including the American people, to the more provocative aspects of the Eisenhower-Dulles policy; it came from the consistent peace efforts of the Soviet Union and People's China; it came from the national-liberation struggles of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples; it came from the growing "neutralism" of such new Asian powers as India, Indonesia and Burma; it came from the increasing reluctance of the imperialist rulers of Britain and France to risk catastrophe for the greater profit and power of their Wall Street rivals.

As a result, the latent tactical differences within monopoly capital have burst into the open with an intensity unequalled since the launching of the cold war. What is new is precisely this sharpening of the conflict and the tendency toward the crystallization of positions which find it increasingly difficult to find a basis for reconciliation. What is new is that this battle is developing inside the Administration itself and within

the Republican Party (to some extent within the Democratic Party, too). What is new is the wide implications of this conflict for the 1956 elections and the fight for peace.

The primary factor that has caused the widening of the rift within monopoly capital and within its government and favorite political party has been the defeats inflicted on U.S. foreign policy in Europe and Asia by the world peace forces headed by the Soviet Union. This is the true meaning of the sentence in the recent *New Republic* editorial (December 6, 1954): "The immediate cause of the President's new approach is the collapse of the Dulles policy of 1954."

Among other factors are:

1. The sharpening of inter-imperialist antagonisms as a result of the aggressive "liberation" policy.
2. The increased peace activity of the American people, the mass revulsion at the menace of a hydrogen-bomb war, and the growing pressure both here and abroad for peaceful coexistence as the only alternative to universal destruction.
3. The election results, which were a rebuff to the Eisenhower Administration and brought the defeat of some of the worst McCarthyites. These results also revealed, even if obliquely, the strength of peace sentiment by the fact that the Administration and the G.O.P. high command succeeded in limiting the Democratic victory largely through demagogic exploitation of the peace issue.

4. The new advances of the anti-McCarthy movement, which placed McCarthy on the defensive and forced the overwhelming adoption of the Senate censure resolution and finally an open break between McCarthy and Eisenhower. At the same time, there has developed a growing tendency toward fusion of the McCarthyites and the Knowland forces and toward an interweaving of the anti-McCarthy struggle with the fight against the war-now advocates.

5. The economic decline, which inevitably accentuates conflicts within the ruling class, and the fear that, despite all optimistic soothsayers, the worst may not be over.

Though the differences between the two groups are not basic in relation to ultimate objective, neither are they minor or superficial in relation to the immediate issue. It would be a serious mistake to minimize their importance. For these differences provide an opportunity to strengthen that which *is* basic: the struggle for peace.

What is the significance of Eisenhower's recent emphasis on peace, moderation and what he calls a "modus vivendi" with the socialist world? First, it must be said that the words are in sharp conflict with deeds—with the Administration's war program. At the very time that the President was talking peace, he was taking new major steps toward eventual war: the Southeast Asian, London and Paris agreements and the "mutual assistance" pact with Chiang Kai-shek. The rearming of West-

ern Germany especially is a move of the gravest import which, if not halted, must vastly increase the war danger and render immensely more difficult the peaceful settlement of international differences.

The Eisenhower peace talk is therefore predominantly demagogic. In fact, one of its purposes is to mask the real meaning of these new war treaties in order to facilitate their ratification here and abroad. Sabre-rattling at this time would consolidate and strengthen the opposition to the Paris agreements in France, Western Germany and Italy and possibly lead to their defeat. The soft words are also demagogic in the sense that they are designed to create illusions, to induce the people to rely on Eisenhower as a true champion of peace and thus erode opposition to the government's war measures.

However, since the Eisenhower peace talk also expresses a real tactical conflict in a context of increasing obstacles to the aims of U.S. imperialism, it has another aspect which is new. This aspect has important implications in the fight for peace. To the extent that Eisenhower's statements represent a course not directed toward immediate war, they can be utilized by the people in the struggle to prevent the war-now crowd from gaining the upper hand and to advance the whole fight for peaceful coexistence as against the Administration's war program. Eisenhower's statements also have the unintended effect of strengthening anti-war sentiment and popularizing

the idea of peaceful coexistence.

The question may be asked: is it possible for the Eisenhower position, which is basically that of imperialist expansionism and preparing a reactionary war for world domination, to evolve into a position favoring genuine peaceful coexistence? Can a tiger become a kitten? Such a fundamental change in foreign policy would require either that the dominant Wall Street groups break with their war program or that Eisenhower break with the monopolists. Either idea is fantastic.

The question needs to be rephrased more realistically: *can the people compel the Eisenhower Administration to move a few steps away from war and toward coexistence?* Essentially this is tantamount to asking whether under a reactionary government the people can influence foreign policy. That question must be answered in the affirmative.

To the extent that the Administration is now compelled to pursue a course different from that advocated by the Knowland-McCarthy-Radford cabal, its policy has already been influenced by the resistance of the American and other peoples. The widening of the rift with the war-now group at present affords an opportunity to wrest new concessions. It is only through such *independent* struggle and the creation of a broad people's political alliance under labor's leadership that it will be possible to curb the architects of war and fascism and fulfill the perspective envisaged in the Communist Party

program for the 1956 election: "a new political majority so strong that it not only changes Administrations, but imposes on a new Congress and a new Administration a new course in domestic and foreign affairs."

It is such broadly based independent activity which can also stimulate those minority elements in the ranks of capital that from time to time speak up in favor of East-West trade, admission of China to the U.N., negotiations with the Soviet Union or other aspects of peaceful coexistence.

THE INNER-PARTY BATTLE

Involved in the Eisenhower-Knowland conflict is also a battle for control of the Republican Party. In this respect, too, the differences over foreign policy are interwoven with the anti-McCarthy struggle. Despite McCarthy's defeat in the Senate and the general condemnation of his attack on Eisenhower as "soft" on Communism this number one fascist with powerful Big Business backing remains a serious menace. The alliance of the McCarthyites and the Knowland forces means that the G.O.P.'s pro-fascist, war-now wing is in a position to make a determined bid for power. Let us remember that the Republican Senators divided almost evenly on censuring McCarthy. One of those who voted "No" was the Republican Senate leader, Knowland, who has great influence among his Senate colleagues and in top G.O.P. circles generally. At

stake in this inner-party struggle is not only immediate policy, but the 1956 presidential nomination. And Eisenhower's peace statements may be the opening guns in his own campaign for renomination and re-election.

What is the role of the Democratic Party in this struggle? A few prominent Democrats, like Senator Douglas of Illinois, are warmongers hardly less truculent than Knowland; a few, like Senator Kefauver of Tennessee, at times grope in the direction of solving problems by agreement with the U.S.S.R. However, the dominant Democratic leadership supports the Eisenhower policy (witness the explicit statement to that effect by ex-President Truman on December 13, 1954), at times even criticizing some aspects (especially the size of the war budget), from the Right. Moreover, in their conference with Eisenhower on December 14, the Democratic Congressional leaders made what amounts to a bi-partisan agreement on foreign policy and "defense"—that is, the arms program.

Toward the Eisenhower-Knowland conflict the Democratic chieftains are pursuing the same shoddy tactic they at first adopted toward the McCarthy issue: that this is an inner-party feud which is no concern of the Democrats except as an opportunity for partisan politics. Stevenson, titular leader of the party, in his speech at the Democratic National Committee meeting in New Orleans, went so far as to urge Eisenhower to conclude "a non-aggression pact

with Senator Knowland" and to "find some means of peaceful co-existence with a large segment of his party."

All this is in keeping with the fundamental character of the Democratic Party as the alternative party of Wall Street. By leaving the initiative to Eisenhower and permitting him to play the role of peace fighter, and by occasionally sniping at him for not spending more on arms, the Democrats are inviting the Republicans to do in 1956 what they partially succeeded in doing in 1954: pin the label of war party on the Democratic Party. Should Eisenhower again be the G.O.P. candidate, this tactic means inviting defeat. All this has serious implications for the labor movement, which for the most part is closely linked politically with the Democratic Party. This question vitally affects the whole perspective of developing independent political initiative by labor in an effort to influence the choice of Democratic candidates and the character of their programs.

LABOR'S CENTRAL ROLE

What are the conclusions for labor and the people that flow from the conflict between the Eisenhower and Knowland-McCarthy groups? The first conclusion is that the trade-union movement and the masses generally must not remain on the sidelines. A "plague-on-both-your-houses" attitude can only increase the dan-

ger that the plague of war will be visited on our own house. The people must intervene actively in this battle, by utilizing the differences between the two groups to advance the *independent* fight for peace.

This principle of utilizing the differences besetting the enemy, of "skillfully taking advantage of every, even the smallest, 'rift,'" as Lenin taught, is applicable to every aspect of the working-class struggle.

In order to take advantage of this particular "rift" and develop positive, effective intervention by labor and its allies in the Eisenhower-Knowland conflict it is necessary to avoid distortions of both the Right and "Left" varieties. The Right distortion is to direct the fire exclusively at Knowland and to embrace Eisenhower, ignoring the basic pro-war character of his policy. The "Left" danger is represented by the tendency to gloss over this conflict as unimportant or merely demagogic. Both these errors produce the same result: they leave all initiative to the enemy and negate *independent* intervention to further the struggle for peace and coexistence.

A correct tactical approach should follow these lines:

1. Direct heavy fire against the most immediate threat to peace: the Knowland-McCarthy-Radford clique. This means joining with millions, including those who have illusions about Eisenhower, to combat every war proposal and provocation, emanating from the Knowland group.

2. Organize maximum pressure on

Eisenhower to implement his peace talk on specific issues: West German rearmament, China, Universal Military Training, the A- and H-bombs, East-West trade, the arms budget, etc. Use the President's peace talk to combat his Administration's war acts. Oppose all tendencies to appease the Knowland forces and demand the ousting of all war-now advocates from appointive posts.

3. Develop independent mass activity by the labor movement on all these issues, as well as by the working farmers, the Negro people and urban middle-class elements.

Labor's role is crucial. The organized workers have the responsibility of acting to save our country and mankind from the horrors of a hydrogen-bomb war. It is labor's initiative that can rally and unite all other peace-loving sections of the population. It is labor's initiative that can bring about a differentiation in the Democratic Party, influencing programs and candidates so that they become more responsive to the people's deep desire for peace, to the rising national mood for coexistence.

In the ranks of labor's principal allies, the Negro people and the working farmers, the fomenters of another World War are meeting some of their strongest opposition. Among the Negro people the effect of the Soviet record in banishing all national oppression within its borders has in recent years been augmented by the emergence of People's China, with its multi-national 600,000,000 colored people, as a great

democratic, peace-seeking power. Nehru's role in championing peaceful co-existence and in opposing many aspects of Wall Street's foreign policy is also evoking an increasingly warm response among the Negro people. Symptomatic of this trend is the article by a leading Negro journalist, William Worthy, in the October issue of *Crisis*, organ of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. This article sharply attacks U.S. foreign policy, especially in Asia and Africa, and approves some of the criticisms of the Left.

Among the farming masses, historic anti-war sentiment is assuming a more assertive form as the gigantic arms program has brought them, instead of the promised prosperity, lower prices and the abandonment by the Administration of effective price supports. The recent conventions of the National Grange and the American Farm Bureau Federation reaffirmed their opposition to Universal Military Training; this is also the position of the National Farmers Union.

Mass action for peace should of course be part of a larger political and legislative program to embrace protective measures against economic crisis and mass unemployment, parity prices and other assistance to the farmers, defense of civil liberties and struggle against McCarthyism, equal rights for the Negro people, etc. The fight to unite labor and the broad masses of the people around this kind of program, regardless of differences on other questions, and the

building of a labor-led coalition for peace, jobs, democracy and equal rights are indispensable for victory in 1956 and for the eventual emergence, when conditions ripen, of a mass labor-farmer party.

The labor reformists and Social-Democrats have served as the main obstacle to the effective expression of the peace sentiment of the overwhelming majority of the American workers. In the past two years, however, some differentiation has taken place as the workers' will to peace has increasingly asserted itself. To earlier expressions by labor leaders and union conventions two recent notable statements should be added. In an editorial in the November 1954 issue of *The Butcher Workman*, Earl W. Jimerson and Patrick E. Gorman, president and secretary-treasurer respectively of the A. F. of L. Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, take issue with A. F. of L. President George Meany, who in his consuming hatred of the Soviet Union, often advocates a more aggressive war line than the Eisenhower Administration. Jimerson and Gorman state that if the people accept Meany's view that coexistence with the U.S.S.R. is impossible, "another world war is inevitable." They declare that "the only logical answer" to the diabolical power of the hydrogen bomb "must be coexistence or no-existence."

In the November 1954 issue of *The Packinghouse Worker*, President Ralph Helstein of the C.I.O. United

Packinghouse Workers, sounds a note of warning to the Democrats:

They had better find a way to make it abundantly clear to the American people that they are not "the war party." There is no way of measuring, in terms of actual votes, the effect of President Eisenhower's emphasis on his record as the "peace-maker." I am, however, quite certain that it was the Republican Party's greatest single political asset.

It is not enough for the Democrats to cry "foul" and to point to notorious warmongers in high Republican circles like Senator Knowland. They must find, instead, a positive approach to world peace as an alternative to the shifting Republican policy.

On the other hand, the C.I.O. convention last month failed to reflect the more positive approach of a number of unions and leaders. The resolutions adopted express basic adherence to the Wall Street war program, with vicious slanders of the Soviet Union and People's China, attacks on coexistence, and support of West German re-armament. The peace pressure of the rank and file did force inclusion of criticism of U.M.T. and of Administration policy in Guatemala.

The convention also adopted a resolution assailing Knowland for urging "actions that would lead directly to offensive war" against China. While supporting Eisenhower, the document adds: "If the Administration should compromise with the Knowlands, it shall meet our instant and forthright opposition."

THE MAIN PEACE ISSUES

In the fight to defeat the Knowland-McCarthy-Radford provocations and force changes in the government's own dangerous war-inciting policy, three issues take top priority today: West German rearmament, policy toward People's China, especially as it relates to Formosa, and U.M.T. To say this, is not to overlook other questions which, on the contrary, must be linked with these three. The first two of these issues are decisive in preventing a new world slaughter, while the third is a question which perhaps above all others at this time is one around which large masses can be mobilized.

Especially should there be no underestimation of the tremendous significance of West German rearmament. If one remembers the role of German reaction in launching two world wars, it becomes clear that West German rearmament will greatly increase the danger of a third. The broadest campaign needs to be organized against Senate ratification of the Paris agreements on Germany as well as the Southeast Asian treaty. Occasional expressions by trade-union leaders of opposition to West German rearmament needs to be taken full advantage of in order to make this a real issue in the trade unions. The same is true of statements by other groups and by such capitalist opponents of rearmament as Senator Flanders of Vermont and James P. Warburg. Organizations should ask to testify at the Sen-

ate hearings and Senators should be flooded with demands that they reject rearmament.

Disarmament needs to be emphasized as the alternative to rearmament, and the demand should be raised that our government sharply reduce arms expenditures and give more than verbal support to the disarmament resolution in the UN which it jointly sponsored with the Soviet Union, Britain, France and Canada. In this campaign special attention should be given to the Jewish community, where opposition to German rearmament is widespread, as well as to other national groups such as the German and Polish.

It would be a mistake to conclude that should the Paris treaties be ratified by all the signatory governments, the struggle against West German rearmament and for the unification and neutralization of Germany will automatically end. The fight to nullify, whether formally or in fact, Wall Street's effort to forge this decisive missing link in its chain of war, will go on in Europe, and it must continue here.

U.M.T., which was sidetracked in 1952 because of popular opposition, also requires an urgent, broad, vigorous campaign if it is to be defeated in the new camouflaged form in which the Administration is presenting it to Congress.

As for Formosa, so long as Washington, in violation of international agreements, retains its grip on this Chinese territory, and so long as the U.S. Seventh Fleet, officers and

money are used against People's China, so long will Formosa be a gun pointed not only at the Chinese but at the people of the United States. While President Eisenhower rejects Knowland's demand for a blockade of China and speaks words of moderation, as *The Nation* points out (December 11, 1954):

It is in the nature of our Asian policy that it cannot long be pursued with moderation, for it is in itself an extreme policy. Forty-eight hours after re-buffing Senator Knowland's demand for a China boycott, Mr. Dulles announces the signing of the defense agreement with Chiang Kai-shek. We have put our seal upon a document giving away an island which doesn't belong to us to a man who has no right to it.

A change in this outrageous policy and recognition by the U.S. and admission into the UN of the government of China are essential for our national security and the protection of world peace.

Besides these three urgent issues, there is a fourth of an overall, long-term character which requires far more effective propaganda and organizational expression than has been the case till now: peaceful coexistence between the capitalist U.S.A. and the socialist U.S.S.R. It is closely related to all other peace issues and must be made a central part of the battle against both the Knowland war-now forces and the Eisenhower-Dulles war program. An independent position on foreign policy can be based only on coexistence. The

unfolding of an effective fight for peace and the realization of the 1956 objectives require that this be raised as the banner of the entire struggle.

As in the anti-McCarthy movement, there are various levels of the peace struggle, ranging from those, including Big Business elements, who do not go beyond the indicated position in Eisenhower's demagoguery, to the Left-progressive forces who reject the Big Lie of Soviet "aggression" and call for acceptance of genuine coexistence based on peaceful competition between two systems. By and large the masses are at the first level, even though their aspirations go beyond it.

It is the task of the advanced peace forces to work at all levels of the peace struggle, but with main emphasis on where the masses are ideologically and organizationally. Advanced peace activity does not consist of a few people going off in a corner and talking to themselves. Nor does it consist of being among the people, but completely invisible and

inaudible, and limiting oneself to what the majority think and are ready to do. Advanced peace activity should take as its starting-point what the people think and are ready to do, but seek constantly to raise this disposition to higher levels.

Organizationally the main emphasis must be on work among the masses in trade unions, in farm, Negro and other people's organizations under conservative leadership. In addition, advanced peace work can through independent forms of expression help achieve maximum results both in numbers influenced and in the quality of their activity.

As the forces of war and fascism grow more desperate in their efforts to reverse the tide of history, new dangers face the American people. But that surging tide also brings with it new opportunities to combat and defeat these dangers. To unite the people, to arouse the organized workers to assume leadership in this titanic struggle is the task of the hour.

Joint Declaration of Moscow Conference Of European Countries for Safeguarding Peace and Security

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Polish People's Republic, the Czechoslovak Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Rumanian People's Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the People's Republic of Albania, together with an observer from the People's Republic of China, have assembled at a conference in Moscow in order to examine the situation existing in Europe in connection with the decisions of the London and Paris conferences of certain western states.

The governments of the states taking part in this conference expressed regret at the fact that not all the European countries considered it possible to take part in discussing the existing situation. The conference was also held production of atomic and hydrogen without the initiators of the London and Paris agreements: the United States of America, France and Britain. Their reply of November 29 is an indication of their intention to carry through the ratification of the Paris agreements at all costs.

On October 23, agreements relating to Western Germany were signed at the conference in Paris, which was preceded by a conference in London of nine countries: the United States of America, Britain, France, Western Ger-

many, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxemburg and Canada. These agreements provide for the remilitarization of Western Germany and its integration in military groupings—in the North Atlantic bloc and in the new so-called West European Alliance which is being knocked together.

Attempts were made very recently to restore German militarism by remilitarizing Western Germany under the flag of the notorious "European Defense Community." These attempts failed, having met with natural resistance from the European peoples, and above all from the French people. The restoration of German militarism is now being attempted under another flag, and with this end in view everything is being done to speed up ratification of the Paris agreements.

In face of this situation, the governments of the states taking part in this conference consider it necessary to direct the attention of all European states to the fact that implementation of the Paris agreements would seriously worsen the international situation in Europe. Implementation of these agreements would not only raise new and still greater obstacles to the settlement of the German problem, to the restoration of the unity of Germany as a peace-loving and democratic state, but would set one part of Germany against

the other part, converting Western Germany into a dangerous hotbed of a new war in Europe. Instead of contributing towards a peaceful settlement of the German problem, these agreements give a free hand to the militarists and revenge-seekers in Western Germany, creating a greater threat to the security of the peoples of Europe.

The Paris agreements are directly at variance with the possibilities for a further easing of international tension which have recently come to light. Thanks to the efforts of the peace-loving states, the war in Korea was ended in the middle of last year. The Geneva Conference, which met this year, helped to end the eight years' war in Indo-China and to bring about a certain normalization of the situation in that region. Nor can it be overlooked that certain progress has been made in the United Nations Organization in the talks on the question of a general reduction of armaments and the banning of atomic weapons. All this was achieved in spite of the attitude of the aggressive circles of certain states which are trying to worsen the international situation.

And yet at the very time when a more favorable situation has arisen for the settlement of urgent international problems, the ruling circles of a number of states—signatories of the London and Paris agreements—have adopted the dangerous course of restoring German militarism, heedless of the consequences of this move.

The Paris agreements provide for the formation of a German army half a million strong. The strength of these West German armed forces would be five times the strength of the army permitted for the whole of Germany

under the Versailles Peace Treaty, although it is well known that the German Reichswehr with 100,000 men, formed at that time, provided the basis for the formation of Hitler's army, which was many millions strong.

Now already, the German militarists are making no secret of their plans for increasing the strength of the West German army and raising the number of its divisions from 12 to 30, and later to 60. The formation of an army of Western Germany will mean in practice its predominance over the armies of the other partners of the "West European Alliance," with the inevitable result that armed forces in the hands of the militarists of Western Germany would occupy a dominant position in Western Europe.

The danger arising out of the formation of a West German army is evident, if only from the fact that it is being placed under the command of generals of the former Hitler army who, only recently, were organizers and accomplices of fascist aggression against the peoples of both Eastern and Western Europe.

Contrary to the international agreements on liquidation of the German war potential, the war industry is being openly restored in Western Germany. The heavy industry of the Ruhr is being increasingly converted to the production of armaments. It should not be forgotten that it is a question of the same Ruhr which has served repeatedly as the main arsenal where arms have been forged for the aggressive wars of the German militarists.

Furthermore, the Paris agreements open the way for atomic research which would provide the opportunity for the production of atomic and hydrogen

weap
other
many
agri
giver
atom
Th
woul
who,
bloo
ing
with
ples.
death
zens
ians,
Czec
and
Th
woul
even
veng
plem
shar
of d
grav
pecia
of E
Ca
remi
Wes
mak
of C
limi
the
kind
met
secu
the
mili
inve
the
obvi
Eur
very

weapons in Western Germany, and for other states supplying Western Germany with atomic weapons. Under these agreements the West German army is given the opportunity of possessing atomic weapons among its armaments.

This means that atomic weapons would be placed in the hands of those who, only very recently, imposing the bloody Hitler "New Order," were sowing death and destruction in Europe with the object of destroying entire peoples. In fact, they destroyed in the death camps millions of peaceful citizens—Poles, Russians, Jews, Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Frenchmen, Serbs, Czechs, Slovaks, Belgians, Norwegians and others.

This means that atomic weapons would be in the hands of people who, even today, are speaking of their revenge-seeking plans in Europe. Implementation of these agreements would sharpen to a great extent the threat of devastating atomic war, with its grave consequences for the peoples, especially in the most populated regions of Europe.

Calculations that the inclusion of a remilitarized Western Germany in the West European military alliance would make it possible to keep the growth of German militarism within certain limits arouse justifiable distrust among the peoples of Europe. Attempts of this kind have been made before. But they met with defeat. It is impossible to secure peace in Europe by opening the road for the revival of German militarism and lulling oneself by the invention of some guarantees against it, the inefficacy of which is completely obvious. In order to secure peace in Europe it is necessary to make the very revival of German militarism im-

possible. The remilitarization of Western Germany means that the role and influence of the militarist and revenge-seeking forces in it would become constantly greater. The inevitable consequence of this situation would be the further restriction of democratic liberties in Western Germany and the conversion of Western Germany into a militarist state. Characteristically enough, no place has been found in the Paris agreements for provisions to guarantee democratic rights for the population of Western Germany, but the agreements contain obligations on the part of the West German authorities to adopt laws on an "emergency situation," which is obviously directed against the democratic rights and liberties of the population.

By restoring German militarism and investing the militarists with actual authority and extraordinary rights, the Paris agreements pave the way for a military dictatorship in Western Germany. Not only are these agreements alien to the interests of the German people, but they are also directly aimed against the German working class and are designed to suppress the democratic forces in Western Germany. The conditions envisaged for Western Germany by the Paris agreements are reminiscent in many respects of the situation in Germany shortly before Hitler came to power. It is well known that the rights of Hindenburg, the President of Germany at that time, to decree a "state of emergency" were used by the German militarists for eradicating democratic rights and liberties, for terror against working-class organizations, for the establishment of the fascist dictatorship in Germany.

The Paris agreements speak of "the ending of the occupation regime" and of so-called "sovereignty" for Western Germany. In reality, however, the "sovereignty" of Western Germany referred to in the Paris agreements boils down to investing the West German militarists and revenge-seekers with the right to form an army which the initiators of the Paris agreements hope to use as cannon fodder for their own ends. At the same time the Paris agreements force upon Western Germany the continued occupation of its territory by troops of the United States, and of Britain and France as well, until 1998, and thus provide for the conversion of Western Germany into the main military base for the aggressive aims of the United States in Europe. Under these circumstances, it is not difficult to see the real worth of the statements about the so-called "sovereignty" of Western Germany, especially if it is borne in mind that the Paris agreements leave in force all the principal provisions of the enslaving Bonn Treaty.

Contrary to the statements made by some statesmen of the western countries, the Paris agreements cannot be appraised as other than an actual refusal to settle the German problem, a refusal to restore Germany's unity on peace-loving democratic principles for a long time to come. The plans for the remilitarization of Western Germany and for its integration in military groupings today constitute the main obstacle to the national reunification of Germany. This means that the removal of such an obstacle would afford the possibility for agreement between the four powers on the restoration of Germany's unity and sovereignty and on holding for this purpose free all-

German elections, duly taking into account the interests of the German people.

According to the estimates of the Bonn politicians, the formation of a West German army, half a million strong, would require approximately 100,000 million marks, which would press with all its weight on the shoulders of the working people of Western Germany, and primarily on the shoulders of the working class, which cannot but lead to a drastic decline in their living standards. The remilitarization of Western Germany holds out advantages only for the big West German monopolies and for the biggest monopolies of the United States, Britain, and France which are closely connected with them and which, already at the present time, are looking forward to high profits from deliveries of arms for the newly formed West German army. These munitions traders have already more than once made capital out of war, which has brought nothing but incalculable sacrifices and privations to the peoples of Europe.

The present practices are the same as before the Second World War, when German concerns were forging weapons for Hitler aggression with the support and the direct co-operation of foreign, and especially the American monopolies. The influence of the capitalist monopolies which helped to prepare and unleash the Second World War in those days, is becoming increasingly felt in the organs of state power in the United States.

The Paris agreements indicate that today, too, the ruling circles of some powers, and of the United States in the first place, are banking on the revival of German militarism and trying

to re
ern t
their
men
gress
Brita
tarist
the
of th
who,
sulte
prep

An
serve
in E
whol
in m
worl

Th
bloc
Sovie
assist
Sovie
and
which
joint
the S

aggre
possib
intern
taking
as of
the p
of E
Germ
group
the in
the r
sume
ica a
Fran
This
by th
ain u

to rely on the remilitarization of Western Germany in the implementation of their imperialist plans. These agreements create a military bloc of the aggressive circles of the United States, Britain and France with German militarism. They are a deal made behind the backs of the German people and of the peoples of other European states, who, as is well known, were not consulted by anyone at the time of the preparation of these agreements.

An aggressive bloc like this cannot serve the interests of peace and security in Europe. Its formation worsens the whole situation in Europe and increases in many respects the threat of another world war.

The formation of the new military bloc is inconsistent with the Franco-Soviet Treaty of alliance and mutual assistance of 1944 and with the Anglo-Soviet Treaty of 1942, on co-operation and mutual assistance after the war, which provide for the adoption of joint measures by France, Britain and the Soviet Union, so as to make new aggression by German militarism impossible. It is also at variance with the international agreements of the states taking part in this conference, as well as of other states, aimed at safeguarding the peace and security of all the states of Europe. Remilitarization of Western Germany and its integration in military groupings are also incompatible with the international obligations to prevent the revival of German militarism assumed by the United States of America and Britain, and later also by France, under the Potsdam Agreement. This breach of the obligations assumed by the United States, France and Britain under these treaties and agreements

undermines confidence in the relations between states and is in irreconcilable contradiction with the interests of the security of the peoples of Europe.

The formation of this new military grouping is being explained by the alleged necessity of its existence for the security of member states of the bloc, although in reality no one threatens these states. Attempts are being made to justify the remilitarization of Western Germany and its integration in military groupings of certain western states by claiming that relations with the Soviet Union and the people's democracies should be established from "positions of strength." Moreover, matters are presented as if this policy would contribute towards the creation of more favorable conditions for negotiations and for the settlement of outstanding international problems. The supporters of this policy, which has already sufficiently discredited itself, make no secret of their desire to force upon other states decisions advantageous to the imperialist circles of some western powers. It is in fact an expression of the ambitions of these circles for world supremacy. It should, however, not be forgotten how attempts of this kind by pretenders to world supremacy have ended in the past.

It is well known that military groupings of certain European states directed against other states of Europe have also existed in the past. On the eve of the Second World War an aggressive military grouping was formed, consisting of Hitler Germany and fascist Italy, and subsequently joined by militarist Japan. The organizers of that grouping, known as the "Anti-Comintern Pact," tried to justify its formation by "ideological" motives. In

reality, however, it proved to be a screen behind which they tried to conceal the real aggressive nature of that military bloc, which set itself the aim of achieving world supremacy. It is well known that the organizers of that military grouping bear the main responsibility for unleashing the Second World War.

Something of this nature is being repeated today, when the organizers of the new military groupings try to justify the formation of those groupings by references to differences in the social systems of states. But there is as much truth in their statements as there was in the statements of the founders of the "Anti-Comintern Pact," who used that pact for preparing and unleashing the last world war.

All this indicates that, whatever the motives cited to justify their creation, military groupings of some western states, with the participation of a remilitarized Western Germany, are not only incapable of serving the cause of peace and security in Europe but, on the contrary, seriously complicate the situation in Europe and must inevitably step up the arms drive, with all its dangerous consequences for all the European, and not only the European, states.

If the armies, air forces and other armed services are increased on the side of the said military groupings in Europe and matters are carried to the point of restoring aggressive German militarism, the other states of Europe will inevitably be forced to adopt effective measures for self-defense, for preventing attack. It follows from this that all the states interested in safeguarding peace and security in Europe should strive to prevent the restora-

tion of German militarism, to avert the possibility of an intensified arms drive, and assist in combining the efforts of all European states for safeguarding security in Europe.

Recognizing that the settlement of the German problem is the main task in strengthening peace in Europe, the governments of the U.S.S.R., the Polish People's Republic, the Czechoslovak Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Rumanian People's Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the People's Republic of Albania consider essential for the settlement of the German problem first of all:

Rejection of the plans for the remilitarization of Western Germany and its integration in military groupings, which would remove the main obstacle to the reunification of Germany in accordance with peace-loving and democratic principles;

Achievement of agreement on the holding of free all-German elections in 1955 and the formation on this basis of an all-German government of a united democratic peace-loving Germany.

It would then become possible at last to conclude a peace treaty with Germany, which is necessary for consolidating peace in Europe.

It should be recognized that the withdrawal of the occupation troops from the territory of Eastern and Western Germany, as was proposed by the Soviet Union, would contribute in many respects towards the *rapprochement* of the two parts of Germany and towards the solution of the problem of restoring Germany's unity.

In order to safeguard security in

Europe
be rea
on the
tion,
of all
and t
The
States
toward
ern G
milita
bility
does t
Europ
in the
the ex
the m
Rea
ensur
closed
Europ
Europ
tem o
Such
based
pean
and st
of all
the in
Europ
pation
solvin
must
States
states
settler
which
safeg
also t
lectiv
A
tive
the s
oblig
arise

Europe it is necessary that agreement be reached by the interested powers on the question of Germany's unification, in accordance with the interests of all peace-loving peoples of Europe and the German people themselves. The course adopted by the United States of America, France and Britain towards the remilitarization of Western Germany and its integration in military groupings excludes the possibility of such an agreement. Not only does this course not tend to safeguard European security, but it represents in the eyes of all peace-loving peoples the expression of a policy that menaces the maintenance of peace in Europe.

Real security in Europe can only be ensured if, in place of the creation of closed military groupings of certain European states directed against other European states, there is created a system of collective security in Europe. Such a system of collective security, based on the participation of all European states, regardless of their social and state order, would enable the efforts of all European states to be united in the interests of safeguarding peace in Europe. Naturally, the equal participation of the German people in the solving of this general European task must be ensured in this. The United States of America, together with other states bearing responsibility for the settlement of the German question, which is of decisive importance for safeguarding peace in Europe, could also take part in such a system of collective security.

A general European system of collective security must make provision for the states taking part in it to assume obligations that all disputes which may arise between them shall be settled

in accordance with the requirements of the United Nations Charter, in such a way that peace and security in Europe are not endangered. This system must provide for consultation whenever, in the opinion of any of the states taking part, a danger arises of armed attack in Europe, for the purpose of effective measures being taken to remove such danger.

In order to be effective, this system should provide that an attack on one or several states in Europe shall be regarded as an attack on all parties to the corresponding general European treaty, and each party shall render assistance to the attacked state with all the means at its disposal, including armed force, in order to restore and uphold peace and security in Europe.

The organization of this general European system of collective security would entirely conform with the requirements for promoting international co-operation in accordance with the principles of respect for the independence and sovereignty of large and small states and of non-interference in their internal affairs. The establishment of such a system of collective security would also facilitate in many respects the possibility of settling the German problem, inasmuch as it would preclude the conversion of Western Germany into a militarist state and would create favorable conditions for the restoration of Germany's unity.

The organization of collective security in Europe on democratic principles is the course that will ensure the development of Germany as one of the great powers. Unlike the militarist course, along which Germany's development was directed in the past and which repeatedly had the gravest con-

sequences for the German nation, the reunification of Germany, in the conditions in which collective security in Europe is established, will open up wide possibilities for the progress of Germany's peaceful economy, industry and agriculture, for the development of extensive economic relations between Germany and other countries, and especially with the countries of Eastern Europe and with the countries of Asia, with their immense population and inexhaustible resources. Germany's development in conditions of peace, and with extensive economic relations between her and other states, would open up big markets for her industry, ensure the employment of her population and assist in raising her living standards.

The destiny of Germany as a great power is thus directly dependent on whether she will follow the course of peaceful development and co-operation with all other European states, or whether she will follow the course of preparations for another war. The course of peaceful development and international co-operation pursued by the German Democratic Republic leads to the regeneration of Germany and Germany's progress. The other course, along which the German militarists are trying to direct Western Germany, leads to another war and consequently to Germany's conversion into a zone of fire and destruction.

All this indicates that the real national interests of the German people are inseparable from the interests of peace and from the organization of an effective system of collective security in Europe.

• • •

The states taking part in this con-

ference fully accede to the principles formulated in the draft General European Treaty of Collective Security in Europe, submitted by the government of the U.S.S.R., and urge all European states jointly to consider these proposals, which accord with the requirements for ensuring lasting peace in Europe. They also declare their readiness to consider any other proposals on this question, with the aim of preparing a draft treaty of European collective security which would be acceptable to all interested states.

The states taking part in this conference are deeply convinced that security in Europe, based on these principles and fortified by friendly relations among European states, would make it possible to put an end to a situation in which Europe is periodically subjected to devastating wars, with incalculable sacrifices for the European nations.

In the very near future the parliaments of some western states are expected to consider the question of ratifying the Paris agreements. Official circles in some states are bringing increasing pressure to bear on parliaments and on public opinion in order to secure ratification of these agreements.

In view of this, the governments of the U.S.S.R., the Polish People's Republic, the Czechoslovak Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Rumanian People's Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the People's Republic of Albania consider it their duty to direct the attention of all European states, and especially of the states that are signatories of the Paris agreements, to the fact that ratification of

these
recte
and
other
woul
the
woul
outst
above
Rat
these
dang
natio
states
neigh
The
fact t
of th
on a
econo
peace
have
a mil
ism, t
to ren
to th
existe
part
armed
natio
now
head
circu
sition
suppo
tarism
many
of an
The
the ag
efforts
confer
guard
loving

these agreements would be an act directed against the maintenance of peace and towards the preparation of another war in Europe. This ratification would complicate to a greater degree the entire situation in Europe and would wreck the possibility for settling outstanding European problems, and above all the German problem.

Ratification and implementation of these agreements, by increasing the danger of war, would be a threat to the national security of the peace-loving states of Europe, and of Germany's neighbors in particular.

This threat arises as a result of the fact that the states that are signatories of the Paris agreements are pursuing on a growing scale their military and economic undertakings against the peace-loving states of Europe. They have now gone so far as to enter into a military bloc with German militarism, to undertake with their own hands to remilitarize Western Germany, and to threaten still further the peaceful existence of states which do not take part in their military groupings. The armed forces of the states that are signatories of the Paris agreements will now include a West German army headed by Hitler generals. Under these circumstances, continuation of the "positions of strength" policy will rely for support directly upon German militarism being revived, which would in many respects bring nearer the threat of another war in Europe.

• • •

The situation thus created places on the agenda the task of combining the efforts of the states represented at this conference, for the purpose of safeguarding their security. The peace-loving states are obliged to adopt,

without any delay, measures to counter the aggressive forces of this military bloc of the western powers with the combined might of the peace-loving states in the interests of safeguarding their security.

The states taking part in this conference declare their resolve to carry through in the event of ratification of the Paris agreements, joint undertakings with respect to the organization of armed forces and their command, and also other measures necessary for strengthening their defense capacity, in order to protect the peaceful labor of their peoples, to guarantee the inviolability of their frontiers and territories, and to ensure defense against possible aggression.

All these undertakings are consistent with the inalienable right of states to self-defense, with the Charter of the United Nations Organization, and with the earlier treaties and agreements directed against the revival of German militarism and designed to prevent new aggression in Europe.

The states taking part in this conference have agreed to examine the situation again, in the event of the Paris agreements being ratified, in order to adopt proper measures for safeguarding their security and in the interests of the maintenance of peace in Europe.

The states taking part in this conference are firmly determined to insist, in the future as well, on the establishment of a system of collective security in Europe, in the conviction that only the combined efforts of the European states can create a basis for firm and lasting peace in Europe. With this end in view, they are prepared to co-operate, in the future as well, with other European states which declare

their desire to follow this course.

The governments of the states taking part in the Moscow Conference of European Countries for Safeguarding Peace and Security in Europe are deeply convinced that their policy, aimed at strengthening peace and general security, and also the measures outlined by this conference, are in accord with the interests of our peoples, as well as the interests of all other peace-loving peoples. The peoples of the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania and of the German Democratic Republic are engaged in peaceful constructive labor. Their efforts are concentrated on the further advancement of the economy and culture, on steady improvements in the living standards of the working people, and at the same time on the provision of reliable safeguards for their great socialist achievements. There is no force in the world capable of turning back the wheel of history and of interfering with the building of Socialism in our countries.

The peoples of our states are aware

that the Paris agreements have greatly increased the threat of another war. But they will not allow developments to take them by surprise.

Our peoples are confident in their strength, in their inexhaustible resources. The forces of peace and Socialism are stronger and more solidly united than ever before. Any attempts to attack, to unleash war and to disturb the peaceful life of our peoples will receive a crushing rebuff. And our peoples, backed by the sympathy and support of other peoples, will then do everything to destroy the forces of aggression and to secure the triumph of our righteous and just cause.

Our peoples want to live in peace and to maintain friendly relations with all other nations. And for this very reason, continuing to uphold by all means the interests of peace and general security, they will do everything necessary to ensure the continuation of the peaceful course of their development and the proper security of their states.

By El

It is w
munis
death
ter m
fighter
the rig
cialism
the ag
after
which
work
active
until j
He res
with
abreas
develo
gree.
wrote
cal eff
for D
lished
Party

This
and te
ingly
It is
Court
educat
a unar
does n
that t

Comrade Israel Amter: In Memoriam

By Elizabeth Gurley Flynn

It is with deep sorrow that the Communist Party, U.S.A. mourns the death of our veteran comrade, charter member of the Party, militant fighter for peace, for security, for the rights of all peoples, and for Socialism—Israel Amter. He died at the age of 73, on November 24, 1954, after a long and painful illness, which incapacitated him for public work in his latter years. But his active mind remained clear and alert until just a few days before his death. He read constantly, discussed eagerly with visitors and family, and kept abreast of the times on all political developments to a remarkable degree. Shortly before his death he wrote by hand, with incredible physical effort, an article on "The Fight for Desegregation," which is published in the November issue of *Party Voice*.

This document is like a last will and testament to us, and is in amazingly vigorous and practical terms. It is on the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision against segregated education. He pointed out that even a unanimous opinion of this tribunal does not guarantee law enforcement, that there will be organized resist-

ance to it (as there has been), and that it will require united action of all American working-class, nationality and trade-union organizations, taking the lead under the slogan: "Jimcrow must go!" He spoke of the necessity of educating teachers, reaching mothers, and involving students in this struggle. His handwriting was almost illegible, due to his illness, and his efforts to convey his clear thoughts on this important historical struggle, were truly heroic. It was symbolic of his entire life and of the Spartan-like mold of this Communist leader.

Israel Amter was born in Denver, Colorado, of Jewish-Austrian stock. He grew up on a Western ranch, and graduated from high school there. He had great musical talent and spent the ten years immediately preceding World War I in Europe, principally in Germany and Austria, where he earned a living by teaching English, while he studied music. His wife, Sadie Van Veen, who also came from Colorado, and whom he married in 1903, was an artist and studied in her field while there. They returned to the United States after World War I broke out. They were both Socialists and became immedi-

ately active here in the Left-wing movement of the Socialist Party, which in 1919 brought them into the Communist Party, as charter members.

One of the regrettable sectarian weaknesses of our movement in those days caused Israel Amter to give up his profession as a pianist and composer, as Bob Minor similarly abandoned his profession as an artist, indeed, as the greatest cartoonist of the day. They both strove to dedicate themselves as "professional revolutionists," to the service of the people. Their art and their politics were not incompatible and they could have served the cause abundantly in both capacities. But unfortunately this was not fully appreciated in the '20's, and no attempt was made to persuade them otherwise.

I was introduced to Comrades Amter and Van Veen by Mother Bloor. As I recall, it was during the early days following World War I when blows were falling thick and fast upon our movement. There were the Lusk Committee raids in New York State; the Department of Justice Palmer raids on a national scale under the direction of the young Red-hunting eager-beaver, J. Edgar Hoover, and the resultant deportation cases and state prosecutions and imprisonments. Comrade Amter at that time was the organizer of the newly-formed Friends of Soviet Russia, which did tremendous relief service during the terrible famine years there, and valuable agitational work

for recognition in this country.

He was then a member of the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party and later of the Workers Party, which succeeded it from 1921 to 1925, in the struggle for the legality of the Communist Party. Comrade Amter remained a member of the Central and later National Committee of the Party throughout all these and subsequent stages until 1948, when it was reduced to the present thirteen members. He was among those indicted at Bridgeman, Mich., when a Communist convention there was raided in 1922, but he was among a large group who were never tried.

My contact with him in the early 'twenties was in relation to my work as organizer of the Workers' Defense Union, when many members of the Communist Party were harassed, persecuted and prosecuted. He came to see me on protest meetings, leaflets, bail, defense funds, etc. His tall, thin, rather gaunt but wiry figure which moved so swiftly that he seemed to be flying or running, rather than walking, is unforgettable, and makes his last years of immobility all the more tragic. His hair was raven-black, his eyes a piercing black, but his stern features were relieved by a kindly gentle smile—if he approved of you and your work. If not, he could be very severe and uncompromising. But he was never personal in his criticisms.

Their family consisted of two chil-

dren,
and I
The
I reca
crayon
down
land,
dren,
treasu
my so
he wa
a rigo
sisting
not o
live f
but I
matte
to the
ing to
accust
auster
it was
and v
persua
and co
apartr
vator,
In
Amte
gate t
on th
of his
neerin
jects
cialist
neglec
muni
estly
proble
the N
as I v

dren, Nell, then about ten years old and Donald, seven years younger. They were always very poor: in fact, I recall one summer Sadie took her crayons and drawing tablet and went down to the boardwalk at Coney Island, to draw colored sketches of children, to earn a little money. I still treasure a beautiful crayon head of my son Fred, which she drew when he was about ten years old. They had a rigorous mode of existence, subsisting on a vegetarian diet. It was not only a necessity in those days to live frugally, as funds were scarce, but Israel and Sadie believed, as a matter of principle, in living close to the workers, knowing them, listening to them, sharing their lives. So accustomed did he become to this austere and simple way of life, that it was hard, even after he was very ill and walked with great difficulty, to persuade him to move into a small and comparatively inexpensive heated apartment in a building with an elevator, near the Party office.

In the early 'twenties Comrade Amter was sent as an American delegate to represent the American Party on the C.I. in 1923 and 1924. Some of his early writings were of a pioneering character, dealing with subjects which the earlier American Socialist and Left-wing movements had neglected and with which the Communists were just beginning earnestly to grapple, such as the agrarian problem in the United States and the Negro question. He also stressed as I well recall, activity in the trade-

union movement and was a member of the Bookkeepers, Stenographers and Accountants Union No. 124646, but was expelled as a Communist in the early factional fighting led by anti-Communist Social-Democrats.

On his return from Soviet Russia, he became the Communist Party's state organizer in Ohio, where I met him and Sadie several times, when I spoke at Sacco-Vanzetti meetings there and in 1926 when I was on a tour for the International Labor Defense. He was then 45 years old and an astounding dynamo of energy—neither eating nor sleeping regularly, always on the go, writing and mimeographing leaflets, distributing them himself at factory gates, as an example to others. When unemployment grew and the depression hit the industrial areas of Ohio, he organized and led delegations and finally hunger marches to the state capitol at Columbus. When I returned to speaking in Ohio, after my long illness, it was nearly ten years since Comrades Amter and Van Veen had spoken and organized there. Yet steel workers in Youngstown and Steubenville, coal miners in Bellaire and all along the Ohio Valley would eagerly inquire about them and tell me stirring stories and dramatic details of their devoted work in the unemployment movement of 1929 and 1930.

Israel Amter returned to New York City in 1930 to become the district organizer of the Communist Party here. Robert Minor was then

editor of the *Daily Worker* and William Z. Foster was organizer of the Trade-Union Unity League, which gave leadership to the Unemployed Councils. These three great giants of the working-class movement plunged into the nationwide struggles of the unemployed, and were in the forefront of the demonstration at Union Square where 110,000 workers gathered on March 6, 1930. Similar demonstrations were held simultaneously in Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit, Los Angeles, Milwaukee, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, and many smaller cities. "Work or Wages!" "Don't Starve—Fight!" were their slogans. It was estimated by the International Labor Defense that over 250 were arrested in these demonstrations, which were brutally attacked by the police everywhere.

In New York City the police army was directed by dapper Commissioner Grover Whalen. When the great crowd at Union Square elected Foster, Amter, Minor and Harry Raymond (then a young seaman, now ace reporter on the *Daily Worker*) to go as a committee to City Hall to present their demands, the police broke up the line of march, smashed heads and cruelly manhandled men, women and children. Mounted police rode people down. The committee managed to reach City Hall but were arrested as soon as they appeared. Charged first with unlawful assemblage, they were later charged with felonious assault because a policeman claimed he was hit with a

brick. After five days they were released on bail totalling \$62,500. They were sentenced to an indeterminate sentence of three years on the unlawful assemblage charge and served about six months in an indescribably horrible hell-hole of that day—Welfare Island.

William Z. Foster, in his *History of the Communist Party*, describes the impact of this movement as follows: "The gigantic March 6th demonstration startled the entire country. Under the leadership of the Communists the unemployed had stepped forth as a major political force. The great demonstration at once made the question of unemployed relief and insurance a living political issue in the United States." The National Unemployed Council came into existence that fall, demanding unemployment insurance, cash and work relief, public works at union wages, food for children, etc. An A. F. of L. Committee for Unemployment Insurance and Relief, headed by Louis Weinstock of the Painters' Council, won general support of the unions for the Unemployment Insurance Bill, which was finally passed.

During the early 'thirties Israel Amter was struck by an automobile and seriously injured, which crippled him quite badly and eventually caused the disease from which he never recovered. It was a great shock to me to see him bent and lame in 1936, after my return from the West where I had spent a number of years.

But
disab
acute
stop
came
runn
for M
dent
Sena
Gove
sup
ousl
thes
nece
the
gres
000
ceiv
offic
whe
rece
Cha
Part
dail
full
1944
The
the
ter
mar
ates
H
retir
prev
incl
the
seve
Jun
in t
and
F.B

But he did not permit his physical disability, which became increasingly acute and painful as time passed, to stop his political activities. He became a candidate for public office, running on the Communist ticket for Mayor of New York City, president of the Board of Aldermen, U.S. Senator, Lieutenant Governor and Governor of New York State. With superhuman effort he spoke continuously, vigorously and eloquently in these campaigns, traveling when necessary the length and breadth of the state. In 1938, running for Congressman at Large, he received 105,000 votes, the largest number received by a Communist for public office. His last campaign was in 1942, when he was candidate for Governor, receiving 45,220 votes. He remained Chairman of the New York State Party as long as he was able to go daily to his office, but finally, regretfully, he was compelled to retire in 1944. He was succeeded by Robert Thompson as chairman in 1945, but the advice and counsel of Israel Amter were sought until the last by many of his comrades and associates.

His long illness and involuntary retirement from all activity did not prevent the U.S. Government from including him, at the age of 70, in the second Smith Act indictment of seventeen Party leaders arrested on June 20, 1951. He was resting out in the country and was arrested there and taken back to New York by the F.B.I. His appearance as he tottered

down the middle aisle of the courtroom, leaning on Sadie's arm and a cane, created an outbreak of indignation among the shocked spectators, and caused the Judge to release him at once on a nominal bail. On the motion of the Government attorneys, who realized they had pulled a boner in arresting this feeble, sick old man, his case was severed and he was released permanently on \$500 bail; but the indictment was not dismissed. He was compelled to remain within the Southern New York federal district for the past three and a half years. Only death freed him from this vindictive persecution and harassment. Another situation which caused Israel Amter great indignation and unhappiness in his last years, was the enforced separation from his daughter Nell, her husband Anthony Cattonar and their two children. Tony was deported in 1951, and the family went with him. They are now living in Trieste.

It is a matter of deep regret to me and to many of those who knew Israel Amter in his prime, that so many of our younger comrades knew him only as an invalid, tied to a wheel chair or confined to his home, and even in the last years of his active work they recall him as one making a painful superhuman effort to stand on his feet and make himself heard, while the audience suffered in sympathy with him. A whole generation has grown up who did not know Israel Amter as a stirring agitator, an energetic organizer, an unswerv-

ing Communist and a truly great American, with a profound political knowledge, giving bold leadership to masses of people. It would not be easy to emulate one so completely self-sacrificing in all personal habits. He was indeed of a special mold. But he is an example to inspire all of us to greater effort, to give more of ourselves within our limits, of our time, energies, thought and devotion to the greatest cause of which the human race is capable—its own complete emancipation from exploitation, war and all forms of tyranny.

The ways in which we give of ourselves today are not necessarily identical with what was unavoidable in the early pioneer days. "New occa-

sions teach new duties." But the class struggle will never be easy and the road to Socialism will not be without road blocks and detours, and even sharp and violent resistance on the part of the owning and exploiting minority class. To believe otherwise is to deny history and our own experiences. Our departed Comrade Amter was a hard worker, a brave fighter, a devoted builder of the Communist Party. Nothing daunted him. All his days were illuminated by his steady and ardent faith in Socialism. Let us keep his memory alive by striving in a like manner, and with the same faith and confidence in the singing tomorrows, to bring them to fruition.

La
By
S
Pol.
day
stor
and
ber
vel
Mc
imp
sur
the
"pe
refl
offs
tha
peo
Eis
Car
7
gro
the
off
ber
U.S.
to
tio
wa
Me
org
of
Ar
lio
tic

Labor, Congress, and the '56 Elections

By Albert E. Blumberg

SINCE NOVEMBER 2

POLITICS TOOK no post-election holiday in 1954. Foreshadowing the stormy period that lies ahead in '55 and '56, the weeks following November 2 were crowded with major developments in the struggle against McCarthyism and war. Particularly important were the McCarthy censure fight and the emergence of the "new" Eisenhower bi-partisan "peace" line. These developments reflected the Big Business drive to offset the significant election defeats that labor and its allies, the Negro people and the farmers, had dealt Eisenhower, the G.O.P. and the McCarthyites.

The open pro-fascist elements, grouped around the McCarthys and the Knowlands, attempted an all-out offensive with the opening November 2 of the Special Session of the U.S. Senate. The aim was not only to cancel out the anti-McCarthy election mandate. It was (1) to put forward an outright program of fascist McCarthyism and War-Now; (2) to organize a mass movement in support of this program (McCormick's "For America" and McCarthy's "Ten Million Americans Mobilizing for Justice"); and (3) to commit the '56

G.O.P. platform and ticket to this program under threat of a third party of the extreme Right, while strengthening McCarthyite influence in a number of big city Democratic machines.

Meanwhile, the dominant Wall Street forces, who speak through the Eisenhower Republicans and the Dixiecrats (as well as the Stevenson-Truman-Lyndon Johnson and other "bi-partisan" Democrats) took a different and subtler tack. Eisenhower's peace demagoguery, which had enabled the Administration to avert more serious losses in '54, took on new dimensions in the post-election period. A "peace" smokescreen was laid down to conceal Wall Street's own program for meeting the crisis in U.S. foreign policy. And the Wall Street press undertook to rehabilitate their preferred candidate for '56, Eisenhower, in the eyes of the anti-Administration masses who desire peace above all else.

Spelled out in more detail, the Wall Street-Eisenhower bi-partisan "peace" line was designed (1) to "reassure" the Western "allies," while seeking to impose atom-armed Nazi divisions upon a bitterly resisting Europe; (2) to "reassure" the American people, while preparing for Con-

gress a "peace" program of Nazi (and Japanese militarist) rearmament, a 5-billion boost in the war budget, U.M.T., and "aid" to colonial countries; (3) to forestall rank-and-file resentment at bi-partisan support of this program by the Democratic leadership; (4) to counterpose a "peace-loving" Eisenhower to the war-monger Knowland (and a "freedom-loving" Ike to the fascist McCarthy) thus boxing in the G.O.P. opposition and ensuring the renomination of Eisenhower in '56; (5) to extend "bi-partisanship" from foreign to domestic matters—under the slogan of "defense and security"—thus decapitating the Democratic-led anti-Administration camp of labor and the people and ensuring the re-election of Eisenhower in '56.

Taking advantage also of a temporary upturn in the economy, Wall Street poured it on. Eisenhower was the world "peacemaker," initiator of a new era of "bi-partisan coalition," originator of a political philosophy of "moderation" and "progressive conservatism," architect of a return to "normalcy." Walter Lippmann (*Herald-Tribune*, Dec. 16) concluded, "It is a remarkable fact that in the few weeks since the election the prestige and power of President Eisenhower have risen steeply."

As 1954 draws to a close, how do matters stand?

The McCarthyite offensive for the moment has been turned back by the power and breadth of the anti-McCarthy sentiment. On December 2 the Senate voted 67 to 22 to condemn

the Wisconsin fuhrer—a people's victory which few would have believed possible a year ago. The McCarthy mass movement, in Westbrook Pegler's tearful phrase, for the time being "laid an egg." A basic factor was labor's firm anti-McCarthy stand, illustrated by the pro-censure telegrams which the C.I.O. National Board sent on the eve of the censure vote.

Further, the merging of the Knowland-War-Now conspirators with the McCarthyites revealed more clearly the essential unity of the menaces of war and fascism. This opened up new avenues of peace expression, especially in the labor movement.

Thus new opportunities were created not only to press the fight against McCarthy and McCarthyism but to develop a *labor-based movement against War-Now and for peaceful co-existence.*

With all its "cold war" outlook, even the foreign policy resolution of the C.I.O. Convention, Los Angeles, December 6-11, sharply condemned Knowland and his group for their "inflammatory and reckless proposals" and "hysterical sabre-ratting." The inevitable result of his policies, it said, would be "the outbreak of immoral, so-called preventive war and the ultimate destruction of civilization." (*C.I.O. News*, Dec. 11.)

Again, indicative of rising labor concern for peace were the statements favoring co-existence issued in November by the two top officers of the A.F.L. Meat-Cutters Union (with 200,000 members) and the editorial

upholding the same viewpoint in the December issue of the organ of the Hotel and Restaurant Employes Union, A.F.L. (with 400,000 members).

Thus new opportunities were created, not only to press the fight against McCarthy and McCarthyism, but to develop a *labor-based movement against War-Now and for peaceful co-existence.*

However, McCarthy, while being checked, is not routed. He retains strong support in some of the big industrial cities and his challenge to Eisenhower cannot be dismissed simply as an act of desperation. The fight must be pressed. Labor should demand that the New Congress end witchhunts and take steps to expel McCarthy. It should support the "Joe-must-go" recall movement in Wisconsin. The Minneapolis A. F. of L. set an example when it recently established a special committee "to devise ways and means of putting the weight of this Central Labor Union behind a campaign to retire Senator McCarthy to private life." (*Daily Worker*, Dec. 20.)

Furthermore, while McCarthy for the moment is checked, McCarthyism is not. This is mainly because the Eisenhower-Big Business Administration—which seeks to exploit the anti-McCarthy sentiment—itsself embraces McCarthyism and pursues a line of McCarthyism without McCarthy. Eisenhower has a Watkins to "restrain" McCarthy and a Brownell and a Nixon to advance McCarthyism in the legislative and electoral fields. With the censure vote won,

labor should reject leave-it-to-Eisenhower illusions and extend the battle against McCarthy all along the line against McCarthyism, Brownellism and "McNixonism." It should call for repeal of the Butler-Brownell-Humphrey so-called Communist Control Act of 1954 and should urge amnesty for Communist and other political prisoners and an end to the Smith Act prosecutions.

It should also be observed that while anti-McCarthy sentiment forced the censure vote, the anti-McCarthy camp was generally slow in intervening and remains largely unorganized. This dangerous situation can be remedied only if the unions take the lead in placing the anti-McCarthy movement on a solid footing.

The Eisenhower-Wall Street "peace" drive thus far has not encountered the same rebuff as the offensive of the open McCarthy-Knowland wing of Big Business. The reason in the last analysis is the position of labor.

As the December C.I.O. National Convention, labor's first major post-election gathering, shows, the unions stand united against McCarthy and are beginning to speak up sharply against Knowland. But while they reaffirm their opposition to the domestic policies of Eisenhower, they do not yet oppose the foreign policies of the very same Administration. In fact, labor's dominant reformist and Social-Democratic leadership fully endorses the Eisenhower "peace" line.

As a result, the Stevenson-Truman Democratic leadership, who depend on labor and the Negro people for support, perform their "bi-partisan" function with little or no fear of incurring the displeasure of labor. Thus, they organize a post-election National Committee meeting (New Orleans, Dec. 4, 5) on the theme—"How we won in '54 and How to Win in '56." And they come away with a Stevenson keynote speech which demands bi-partisan support for the Administration foreign policy (and even throws in for good measure a plea for a non-aggression pact with Knowland).

It is clear, therefore, that while the main developments since November 2 open up important new avenues of struggle, they likewise create grave new dangers for the labor and people's anti-Administration struggle in '55 and '56. These developments lend fresh emphasis to the chief lessons previously drawn from the November elections—that victory in '56 requires: (1) that the independent political action of labor and its allies reach a new level in which *a positive program for peace is in the center of the anti-Administration struggle*; (2) that labor and its allies mount effective mass campaigns for their demands on every front of struggle in '55, especially in the 84th Congress opening January 5; (3) that the Communist and other Left forces radically increase their ability, not only to estimate and analyze the mass developments leading to '56, but to *intervene* in them and to in-

fluence their outcome.

STRENGTHENING THE INDEPENDENT POLITICAL ACTION OF LABOR AND ITS ALLIES FOR '56

Barring the road to McCarthyism and war requires that labor and its allies undertake to oust the Eisenhower Administration in '56. This, in turn, as the Communist Party Program states—

. . . requires a new political majority so strong that it not only changes Administrations but imposes on a new Congress and a new Administration a new course in domestic and foreign affairs. . . . The answer to our present national plight is not a switch-back to another Truman-type Administration. . . . What is needed is a new Administration which starts to build where the New Deal left off.

To build this majority it is necessary to recognize that the decisive sections of labor and the people generally still express themselves politically through the two-party system, mainly the Democratic Party. It follows that today the key to labor's independent political action and therefore to '56

. . . lies in the ability of labor to come forward as a *distinct force even within the framework of the present two-party system.*

Coming forward as a distinct force means that labor should (1) advance its own independent progressive program for the nation; (2) develop its own alliances with other independent electoral forces, and (3) *build its own*

political action and election machinery.

To what extent did labor do this in '54? How can its independent role be strengthened for '56?

Labor played the principal part in the G.O.P. defeats of November 2. Not only did trade-unionists vote overwhelmingly against the Administration, but labor's chief political arms reached a new level of activity and unity. Thus, in Philadelphia (*Evening Bulletin*, Nov. 19) the heads of the Labor League for Political Education (A. F. of L.) and the Political Action Committee, C.I.O., in a joint post-election statement said: "For the first time we all learned the value of political unity and an informed membership." The L.L.P.E. chairman estimated that more than 20,000 A. F. of L. members took part in the Philadelphia League meetings. Both leaders pledged to carry over this unity into the spring municipal elections. In Michigan, Illinois, Oregon, and other states the elections likewise revealed the growing unity of labor in the face of the Eisenhower-Big Business anti-labor drive.

What of labor's independent role? This was undoubtedly strengthened in the area of independent political organization. The L.L.P.E. and P.A.C. activities in registration, dollar-drives and mobilizing workers for election day were a prominent feature in the main industrial states.

Labor also registered some advances in its relations with its allies. The movement towards coalition of

labor and the anti-Administration masses of the Negro people took a new step forward in Detroit. There, the C.I.O.-P.A.C., in an unprecedented action, withheld pre-primary endorsement from an incumbent Democratic Congressman, O'Brien. This opened the way for the rank and file auto workers to support the Negro candidate, State Senator Diggs, who challenged O'Brien in the August primary. With the Negro community strongly united, this significant move towards coalition assured the election of the first new Negro Congressman since 1946.

In some states, like Michigan and Oregon, labor sought new ties with the hard-hit farmers. The P.A.C. Family Participation program also brought many women and youth into labor's political action activity. Labor's cooperation with the liberal middle-class independent voters and A.D.A. groups was an important factor in the anti-McCarthy victories in Chicago.

On the decisive question of labor's intervention on candidates and issues, '54 provided some very fruitful experiences. In the spring primaries, Cleveland trade-unionists initiated important movements for trade-union and Negro candidates in the legislature. In Michigan, the U.A.W. and the A. F. of L. exerted considerable influence on the ticket and campaigns of the Democratic Party. Labor came into sharp conflict with McCarthyite and reactionary Democrats in New York and Connecticut in the unsuccessful fight to

win gubernatorial nominations for FDR, Jr., and Bowles. Most noteworthy was labor support for Condon of California, despite rejection of his candidacy by the Democratic National Committee.

Though it increased appreciably, labor's independent intervention was still the exception. It had not yet become a *general policy*.

The A. F. of L. and C.I.O. post-election estimates ignore this key question. They are pretty much confined to hailing the anti-Administration gains. "From labor's point-of-view the '54 elections were a trial run which augurs well for greater victories in '56" (*A. F. of L. News-Letter*, Nov. 5). The Fair Deal forces, says the *C.I.O. News* (Nov. 8) are "half-way to the White House." There is little or no analysis of the quality and independence of labor's political action, little or no probing of the question—why no anti-G.O.P. landslide in '54.

Such questions, however, are very much alive among the workers. Mike Quill, fresh from the battle for FDR, Jr., against the Farleys and DeSapios, reflected more than "frustration" when he took the C.I.O. Convention floor to challenge labor's policy of tagging along behind the Democrats.

The challenge is timely. If ever such a policy invited disaster it does so today when the Democratic leadership is embarked on a course of bipartisan support of the Eisenhower-Wall Street war policy and of party "unity" with the white supremacist,

labor-hating Dixiecrats. Only labor's increased independence *vis à vis* the Democrats and rejection of this course can safeguard labor's '56 objectives.

This increased independence today must be fought for along the three lines that bring labor forward as a distinct political force—even within the context of its present relations to the two-party system.

(1) Labor must advance its independent program for the nation—on jobs, on civil rights and civil liberties, on peace. Above all, it is the issue of peace, as the November elections show, which will be decisive for '56.

Can labor's rank and file break through the "cold war" policy of the main trade-union officialdom? Can the unions adopt and press upon the labor-influenced Democrats a positive program for peace? This is the primary challenge that must engage the best energies of the Left and other progressive trade-unionists and of the peace forces generally.

Every major avenue must be explored in developing peace action in the labor movement. Of cardinal importance is the struggle for peacetime jobs—answering the Eisenhower-G.O.P. demagoguery of "peace and prosperity."

A new approach arises from the merging of the anti-McCarthy and the anti-war struggle, as found in labor's opposition to the Knowland War-Now line. This may well become a key to opening up the whole struggle on the part of the unions

for a policy of peaceful coexistence.

If this is to be the case, however, progressives will have to overcome certain confusions concerning the differences between the Knowland and the Eisenhower policies. Two wrong tendencies exist. Some conclude from Eisenhower's speeches and his present rejection of Knowland's China-blockade proposal, that the Administration has gone over to a bona fide policy of peaceful coexistence. Others dismiss the differences as pure demagogy. The first tendency undermines the struggle for peace by spreading the fantastic illusion that Eisenhower is a force for peace. The second weakens the struggle by isolating the peace forces from the mass of labor, who, while not yet understanding the war role of Eisenhower, are prepared to fight for peaceful coexistence against the clear menace of the Knowlands.

Peace forces need to recognize that there is *no* difference in aims between Eisenhower and Knowland; the Big Business forces for whom they speak are united in pursuit of the objective of world domination. There are, however, real and shifting differences on tactics—where, how, when and with whom to prosecute the drive. Such differences grow because of the many setbacks inflicted upon aggressive American imperialism by the world camp of peace—the Soviet Union, China and the other People's Democracies, and the anti-war masses of all countries including the U.S.A.

The peace forces can and should

utilize these differences. To do so today they must (a) join unhesitatingly with labor and the people in condemning the Knowlands; (b) at the same time develop maximum pressure upon the Administration for peace *deeds* and against Nazi rearmament and U.M.T.; (c) urge labor and the labor-influenced Democrats to bring forward their own independent proposals for peaceful negotiations—as against the war-mongering of the Knowlands and the new war-breeding program of Eisenhower.

(2) Labor, in preparing for '56, must embark on a new bold program to strengthen its relations with the Negro people and the farmers, the women, youth, national groups and liberal middle-class.

Most pressing is the need to fight the Democratic leadership sell-out on civil rights. Labor is confronted with the responsibility for preventing the disruption of its alliance with the Negro people. It must, therefore, independently assure full support to the main demands of the Negro people. These include first the prompt implementation of the Supreme Court decision on desegregation, a demand supported by the C.I.O. National Convention. They include a new struggle for jobs and F.E.P.C., against Jim-Crow housing, travel, and the like. They include, finally, a new and rapid general advance in Negro representation, appointive and elective. This means a coordinated drive for a major break-through in the city elections in '55 and in Con-

gress in '56. What Detroit did in '54 can be done by Philadelphia, Chicago, Brooklyn, Cleveland, Los Angeles and many other cities in '56.

Likewise, farmer-labor cooperation requires that labor get behind the fight to restore fixed parity prices and other aids to the farmers in the coming session of Congress.

(3) Labor needs to consolidate for '56 its gains in independent political organization. The P.A.C. and L.L.P.E. should be placed on a year-round basis as the P.A.C. women are already doing. At the same time a greater involvement of the membership in the shops is essential.

Apart from this, the next big step in labor political organization would be to bring P.A.C. and L.L.P.E. into the wards and communities. This would tremendously broaden labor's political influence.

Finally, while the immediate outlook is for increased independent political action within the two-party system, there is growing interest in labor party and labor-farmer party perspectives. Discussion and clarification of such perspectives can greatly strengthen labor's present political policy.

LABOR AND THE 84th CONGRESS

It will be in the mass struggle on issues that labor—together with its allies—will forge its growing political independence and influence. The arenas of struggle in the coming year will be many and no major one can be neglected.

The pace in the battle for wages and conditions will be set by the fight for a new auto contract (following the spring expiration of the 5-year escalator agreement) and by the wage reopener in steel. These battles will influence every phase of the struggle leading to 1956.

In the communities the acute problems of jobs, discrimination, housing, schools, health, youth programs, taxes and civil liberties will give added importance to labor's role in the 600 municipal elections listed for 1955. Especially in such cities as Chicago, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Cleveland, these contests will vitally affect the alignments for '56.

Some 44 state legislatures will be in session in the coming weeks. Labor's increased political influence will be put to an early test. A major struggle will shape up in New York to realize Gov. Harriman's commitments on a labor legislative program. In Pennsylvania and other states new campaigns are in preparation for state F.E.P.C.'s and the repeal of repressive legislation. The A. F. of L. is placing heavy emphasis on rallying against the Big Business Right-To-Work" (*i.e.*, scab) laws now on the books in 17 states and threatening in more.

It is, however, no underestimation of these arenas to direct special attention to the 84th Congress. The session beginning January 5th will receive and act on the new Eisenhower war-and-depression program to be unveiled in the January 6th Message on the State of the Union.

The struggle that will set in against this program and for the demands of labor and the people will go far toward defining the issues for '56. It will likewise directly affect every major problem facing labor and its allies.

Those labor leaders who in the past two years covered their distaste for mass legislative action by preaching the theory of "wait-till-'54," should be reminded that '54 is here and is gone. And labor will only be harmed by pitting state legislative action against Congressional action, as some are inclined to do.

The stress on Congress is all the more necessary because post-election estimates of the new Congress tend to self-defeating extremes. It should be obvious that while the Democrats gained control and the McCarthyites are weakened, labor will face hostile majorities in both branches. The U.A.W., basing its estimates on voting records, sets "liberal" strength in the House at 175 (the old was 147)—43 short of a majority; in the Senate the figure is 36 (the old was 33)—13 less than a majority. Furthermore, anti-labor Negro-hating Dixiecrats will chair key committees such as the House Rules (Howard Smith), House Labor (Barden), and Senate Finance (Byrd). Labor will get no easy victories.

It would be worse than folly, however, to conclude that nothing can be done. The increase in the labor-influenced Congressional contingent, the passing of some key Committee chairmanships into the hands

of pro-labor Democrats, the approach of '56—all these open up new possibilities. Negative attitudes can be just as harmful as illusions about a "liberal" Congress.

What are the main requirements for a successful labor and people's fight in the new Congress?

1) The forces of labor need above all to counter the Eisenhower-Big-Business legislative proposals with real labor and people's demands, as suggested in detail in our Party's Program. These embrace labor's program for jobs, increased purchasing power for workers and farmers, tax-cuts, a welfare as against a warfare budget; opposition to U.M.T. and arms for Nazis and a return to Roosevelt's policy of peaceful negotiations; equal rights for the Negro people, implementation of the desegregation decision, F.E.P.C.; ouster of McCarthy and repeal of McCarthyite legislation, like the so-called Communist Control Act, the Smith Act, and the McCarran and McCarran-Walter Acts.

2) The Administration is counting heavily on two things to put over its program: the bi-partisan swindle on foreign policy and the top Democratic policy of appeasing the Dixiecrats in the name of party "unity." Labor, if it is to win its demands, will have to insist that pro-labor Democrats break with these policies and put up a real fight against Eisenhower and the Dixiecrats. There will be many factors, partisan and others, operative to upset the Administration scheme. The

pressure of labor and its allies can change many Congressional minds.

3) Likewise essential is a new type of *mass* labor and people's campaign for the legislative programs set forth by the C.I.O., A. F. of L., and other organizations. Legislative action must go beyond testimony at hearings and periodic bulletins. What is needed is to put labor's whole political action machinery, the L.L.P.E. and P.A.C., into the legislative struggle—with grass-roots, united legislative conferences in the Congressional districts, Congressmen's report meetings, national conferences on legislative issues, and mass lobbies.

Finally, while these struggles will largely determine the issues, it is already in order for labor and its allies to tackle certain *electoral* preparations for '56. Specifically, there is the question of labor and Negro representation and intervention in the choosing, whether by spring primary or convention, of delegates to the '56 Presidential nominating convention. There is the matter, too, of timely preparations to influence the choice of issues and candidates for other major offices in the spring 1956 primaries.

THE POLITICAL ACTION OF THE COMMUNIST AND OTHER LEFT FORCES

The results of November 2 and the very great tasks of '56 pose urgent problems for the Communists and other Left forces in the field of political action. Of paramount importance is the speed and skill with

which the entire Left—especially the Left trade-unionists—address themselves to the question of peace and labor's independent political action as outlined above.

There can be no doubt that, as the elections showed, the Left is beginning to orient itself towards the mainstream of American political life. But progress is uneven and a major extension of the overall role of the Left (including the Communists) is indispensable for 1956. This requires concentrated attention to strengthening the role of the Left in the trade unions and people's organizations.

This also requires attention to the independent role of the advanced organizations. The advanced electoral forces represented by the A.L.P., I.P.P., and P.P. made important contributions to clarifying the issues politically, especially in the New York, California, and Pennsylvania elections. However, the low votes—and the loss of ballot status in New York and California—do raise certain questions.

The basic reason for the low votes is the fact that labor and the people generally today are fighting for their political demands within the two-party system. It is only in exceptional situations—where they see no alternatives within the two parties—that they vote in any appreciable numbers for a third candidate. This low vote, however, by no means signifies a general weakening of the influence of the Left.

In the coming period it is necessary

that advanced political bodies perfect a more conscious policy of coalition. Remnants of rigid third-party attitudes must be eliminated, and the specific forms and campaigns of advanced political bodies must be so chosen as to reinforce and not come into conflict with the labor and people's aims to defeat the main, open centers of reaction.

The advanced political organizations—A.L.P., I.P.P., P.P.—are very much needed. Through activity on legislative issues in '55, they can broaden out their coalition relations and influence, while seeking those forms and campaigns which will provide even greater assistance to the fight for an anti-McCarthy, pro-peace electoral majority in 1956.

As for the Communist Party, its outstanding contribution to the elections and to '56 so far is symbolized by the distribution of over 700,000 copies of its Program. This document has stood the test of life and continues to be an indispensable guide for the whole period ahead.

Likewise, special tribute must be paid to Comrade Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, member of our Party's National Committee, and those who participated in her campaign for Congress last fall. This campaign—in the midst of the passage of the so-called Communist Control Act—was a powerful contribution to the fight against McCarthyism and for the legal rights of the Communist Party.

The National Election Conference (August) of our Party and Comrade

Pettis Perry's major Report applied the Party Program to the specific electoral tasks of 1954.

Experience indicates that *a major weakness was the failure to move more boldly from estimates and analysis to a position of influencing the outcome of the main political struggles*. In only rare instances (as in some Chicago, New York and California Congressional Districts) was a consistent fight made to influence key campaigns at every stage of the struggle. To strengthen the Party's capacity to influence the thinking and action of labor and the people generally, it is necessary among other things:

- 1) To fight against all tendencies simply to record developments and tail behind them, especially on the issue of peace; to encourage more initiative and more boldness—with proper consideration of tactics.

- 2) To bring the whole Party, and not only individual leading forces, into the political action struggles of '55 and '56.

- 3) To strengthen the Party organization and the Marxist press, principally among trade-unionists in the main industries, as a key factor for '56.

- 4) To intensify the fight for the defense of the legal existence of the Party and the freedom of its leaders—in particular to defeat the new drive of the Eisenhower Administration to re-imprison Eugene Dennis, Ben Davis, and the other National Committee members under the membership provisions of the Smith Act.

History of the Three Internationals

By William Z. Foster

(TABLE OF CONTENTS)

In February of this year, on the occasion of Comrade Foster's 74th birthday, International Publishers will publish a new volume from his pen—*History of the Three Internationals*. Thus will Comrade Foster, National Chairman of our Party, make still another monumental contribution to an historical materialist understanding of the present era. His latest work—nothing less than an examination of the history of world Communism for the past century—joins his other basic contributions to a definitive Marxist historical library, *Outline Political History of the Americas* (1951), *History of the Communist Party of the United States* (1952) and *The Negro People in American History* (1953).

Next to the work itself, nothing speaks so clearly of the wide scope of this book and of its pioneering quality as does its detailed table of contents, which we are happy to bring to our readers in the following pages. Comrade Foster's *History of the Three Internationals* will prove indispensable to anyone seeking a comprehension of the history of the past one hundred years and of the movement which in that period has been transformed from a "spectre" to a glowing reality for almost one billion peoples, and which is destined to be chosen by remaining humanity as the leader in their struggle for peace, prosperity, equality, and freedom.—*The Editor*.

PART I

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL (1864-1876)

Chapter

1—THE GENERAL ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL BACKGROUND:

The Industrial Revolution—The Political Consolidation of Capitalism—The Industrial Revolution and the Workers—Early Trade Unionism—Anti-Capitalist Tendencies.

2—MARXIAN SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM:

The Communist League and the *Communist Manifesto*—The Major Principles of Marxian Socialism—Philosophical Material-

ism—Dialectics—The Materialist Conception of History—The Class Struggle—The Revolutionary Role of the Working Class—Surplus Value—The Role of the State—Class Struggle Strategy and Tactics of the Working Class.

3—THE REVOLUTION OF 1848:

The Revolution in France—The German Revolution—Betrayal by the Capitalist Class—Years of Political Reaction.

4—THE FOUNDING OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL (1864):

Precursors of the First International—Establishment of the International Workingmen's Association—The I.W.A. Program and Constitution.

5—TRADE UNIONISM, BLANQUISM, PROUDHONISM, LASSALLEISM, BAKUNINISM:

Marx' Fight against the Sects—Pure and Simple Trade Unionism—Blanquism—Proudhonism—Lasalleism—Bakuninism.

6—CONSOLIDATION: THE GENEVA CONGRESS (1866):

Labor's First World Congress—Political Activities of the I.W.A.—The Work of the Congress.

7—GROWTH: THE LAUSANNE AND BRUSSELS

CONGRESSES (1867-1868):

I.W.A. Trade Unions and Strikes—The International in the Political Struggle—The Congress of Lausanne—The Congress of Brussels—Increasing Capitalist Attacks—Growth of the International.

8—BAKUNINISM: THE BASLE CONGRESS (1869):

The Make-Up of the Congress—The Eisenachers—Bakunin Enters the I.W.A.—Marxists and Bakuninists at Basle—The Irish Question—Outbreak of the Franco-German War.

9—THE PARIS COMMUNE (1871):

The Course of the War—The French Republic Established—Birth of the Commune—The International and the Commune—The Work of the Commune—The Commune Overthrown—Historical Role of the Commune.

10—THE SPLIT AT THE HAGUE CONGRESS (1872):

External Pressure—The Internal Crisis—The London Conference—The Congress at the Hague—The Powers of the General Council—The Question of Political Action—The International Removes to New York—The Expulsion of the Bakuninists—The Aftermath of the Split.

- 11—THE ANARCHIST INTERNATIONAL (1872-1877):
The Saint-Imier Congress—The Downward Course of the Anarchist International—Kropotkin Succeeds Bakunin—Why the Anarchist Movement Shrank—The Disintegration of Anarchism.
- 12—THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL IN THE UNITED STATES (1872-1876):
The American Situation—The I.W.A. in the American Class Struggle—The Struggle Against the Sects—The Marxists and the Lassalleans—Internal Crisis and Political Progress—The Dissolution of the First International.
- 13—THE HISTORICAL ROLE OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL (1864-1876):
The Achievements of the International—Ideological Destruction of the Sects—The Causes for the Dissolution of the I.W.A.—New Times and New Tasks.

PART II

THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL (1889-1914)

Chapter

- 14—THE PERIOD BETWEEN THE INTERNATIONALS (1876-1889):
The Expansion of Capitalism—The Development of the Labor Movement—The Gotha Compromise—Continuing International Tendencies—The Death of Karl Marx.
- 15—THE FOUNDING OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL—PARIS (1889):
The Work of the Congress—The Marxist Orientation of the Congress—The Right Danger—Origins of Right Opportunism.
- 16—Brussels, Zurich, London (1891-1896):
Growing Right Opportunism—The Struggle Against the War Danger—Reform versus Revolution—The Fight of the Left—The Death of Frederick Engels.
- 17—INTERNATIONAL TRADE UNIONISM:
Pure and Simple Trade Unionism—Marxist Trade Unionism—Anarcho-Syndicalism—Toward a Trade-Union International.
- 18—IMPERIALISM AND MILLERANDISM—PARIS (1900):
The Millerand Case—The Left Defeated at the Paris Congress—The Struggle Against Militarism and War—The International Socialist Bureau.
- 19—BERNSTEIN REVISIONISM—AMSTERDAM (1904):

The Bernstein Program—The Fight in the German Party—The International Struggle Against Revisionism—The Left Carries the Amsterdam Congress—The Dresden-Amsterdam Resolution.

20—LENIN: THE PARTY OF A NEW TYPE:

Lenin and His Work—The Building of a Revolutionary Program—Early Development of the Party in Russia—The Birth of Bolshevism: London, 1903—The International Intervenes.

21—THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION OF 1905:

The Russo-Japanese War—The Rising Revolutionary Wave—Two Tactics: Menshevik and Bolshevik—The High Tide of the Revolution—Reaction—The International and the Revolution—Question of the Mass Political Strike.

22—COLONIALISM AND WAR—STUTT GART (1907):

The Colonial Question—Anti-Militarism and Anti-War—The Stuttgart Resolution—American National Chauvinism.

23—THE CONGRESS IN COPENHAGEN (1910):

The Anti-War Resolution—Nationalist Trade Unionism—Opportunistic Conceptions of the Cooperatives—Kautsky and Legien.

24—THICKENING WAR CLOUDS—BASLE (1912):

Growing Imperialist Tensions—The Basle Manifesto—Words versus Deeds—The Forces of the Second International—The Left Wing Prior to World War I.

25—THE GREAT BETRAYAL—WORLD WAR I:

The Outbreak of the War—The Great Betrayal—How the Betrayal Occurred—The Defense of the Fatherland—The War as an Imperialist War—The Vicious Circle of the Second International.

26—THE HISTORICAL ROLE OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL:

Early Constructive Work of the International—The Price of Opportunism.

PART III

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL (1915-1943)

Chapter

27—THE ZIMMERWALD MOVEMENT (1915-1917):

The Beginnings of the Third International—Socialist Anti-War Gatherings—The First Zimmerwald Conference—The Kienthal Conference—Lenin's Great Theoretical Struggle.

- 28—THE RUSSIAN BOURGEOIS REVOLUTION (March 1917):
 The Course of the Revolution—Why the Revolution Took Place
 —The Reactionary Provisional Government—The Revolutionary
 Program of the Party—A Peaceful Road to the Revolution—
 The Stockholm (Zimmerwald) Conference.
- 29—THE GREAT RUSSIAN PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION
 (November 1917):
 The Eve of the Revolution—The Conquest of Power—The Soviet
 Government in Action—The Defense of the Revolution.
- 30—THE SOVIET SYSTEM:
 The Character of the Revolution—The Political Structure—The
 Economic Foundation—The Trade Unions in the Soviet Regime.
- 31—THE GERMAN AND HUNGARIAN REVOLUTIONS (1918-1919):
 Lenin and the Broad Post-War Upheaval—Soviets in Germany
 —The Revolution Betrayed—The Bourgeoisie Resumes Full
 Charge—The Hungarian Revolution.
- 32—THE FORMATION OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL (1919):
 The Versailles Treaty and the League of Nations—The Resur-
 rection of the Second International—The Call For the Third
 International—The Moscow Congress—The Program of the Con-
 gress—The Formation of the Third International.
- 33—REVOLUTIONARY PERSPECTIVE: SECOND COMINTERN
 CONGRESS (1920):
 A Revolutionary Situation—Formation of the Young Communist
 International—The Program of the Second Congress—"Left-
 Wing" Communism—The "21 Points."
- 34—THE COMINTERN AND THE COLONIAL WORLD:
 The Colonial Question—Karl Marx and the Oppressed Peoples—
 Social-Democratic Imperialism—Communist Anti-Imperialism.
- 35—REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLES: THIRD COMINTERN
 CONGRESS (1921):
 The Post-War Employers' Offensive—The Birth of Italian Fas-
 cism—Formation of the Two-and-a-Half International—Program
 of the Third C.I. World Congress—Some Organizational Ques-
 tions—Work Among Women.
- 36—THE RED INTERNATIONAL OF LABOR UNIONS (1921):
 The I.F.T.U. in War and Peace—Foundation of the R.I.L.U.—
 The Program of the R.I.L.U.—Shaping the Program—The New
 Revolutionary Unionism

37—THE UNITED FRONT: FOURTH COMINTERN CONGRESS (1922):

Lenin and Labor Unity—The Berlin Conference of the Three Internationals—The Fourth World Comintern Congress—The Policy of the United Front—Regarding the Versailles Peace Treaty.

38—PARTIAL CAPITALIST STABILIZATION: FIFTH COMINTERN CONGRESS (1924):

The Death of Lenin—The Amalgamation of the Two Social-Democratic Internationals—The October Defeat in Germany—The Congress and Partial Capitalist Stabilization—The Question of the United Front—The Bolshevization of the Communist Parties.

39—CLASS COLLABORATION AND CLASS STRUGGLE (1924-1928):

The Rationalization of Industry—The British General Strike—Revolutionary Struggles in China—The Fight Against the Trotsky-Zinoviev-Bukharin Opposition.

40—C.I. PROGRAM: SIXTH COMINTERN CONGRESS (1928):

The Comintern Program—The Comintern's Political Perspective—Imperialist War and Colonial Revolution—Some Organizational Matters.

41—THE GREAT ECONOMIC CRISIS (1929-1933):

The Ravages of the World Crisis—The Crisis-Stricken United States—The First Soviet Five-Year Plan—Class Struggle, Fascism, War Preparations.

42—HITLER'S FASCISM AND ROOSEVELT'S NEW DEAL:

Why No Fascism in the United States—The Advance of German Fascism—Hitler Seizes Power—German Fascism—The Roosevelt New Deal.

43—THE GROWING STRUGGLE AGAINST FASCISM AND WAR (1933-35):

The Fascist Offensive—The Revolutionary Chinese Struggle—The Fascist Defeat in France—Armed Struggle in Austria—Armed Uprising in Spain—Dimitrov at Leipzig.

44—THE PEOPLE'S FRONT: SEVENTH COMINTERN CONGRESS (1935):

What Fascism Is—The International Peace Front—The People's Anti-Fascist United Front—The Unification of Labor's Forces—The New Tactical Orientation.

45—THE PEOPLE'S FRONT IN ACTION (1935-1939):

The National Anti-Imperialist Front in China—The French

- People's Front Government—The People's Front in the Americas
—People's Front and Civil War in Spain.
- 46—MUNICH: THE ROAD TO WAR (1935-1939):
The Appeasement Crime—The Growth of Soviet Power—The
Betrayal at Munich—The Drive to War.
- 47—WORLD WAR II: THE COURSE OF THE WAR (1939-1945):
The Imperialist Stage of the War—The Soviet-Finnish War—
Hitler Smashes the Western Powers—The Changed Character
of the War—Unfaithful Capitalist Allies—The Russians Smash
Nazi Germany.
- 48—WORLD WAR II: THE GUERRILLA FORCES (1939-1945):
The Guerrilla System—The Russian Partisans—The Chinese
Guerrillas—The Partisans in Eastern and Middle Europe—The
Resistance Movements in Western Europe.
- 49—THE HISTORICAL ROLE OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL
(1919-1943):
The Dissolution of the C.I.—Why the Comintern Was Dissolved
—The Historical Role of the Comintern.

PART IV

SOCIALISM VERSUS CAPITALISM

Chapter

- 50—THE AFTERMATH OF WORLD WAR II
The Deepened General Crisis of Capitalism—The Growth of
Democratic and Socialist Forces—The Drive of American Impe-
rialism for World Domination—The Basis of the Cold War—
The Second International and the Cold War.
- 51—BIRTH OF THE PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACIES (1945-1947):
A Revolutionary Europe—The Rise of the People's Democracies
—The New Type of Proletarian Dictatorship—The Coalition
Government in Italy—The Fight for Democracy in France—
The British Labor Government.
- 52—BROAD EXPANSION OF THE TRADE UNIONS AND OTHER
MASS ORGANIZATIONS (1945-47):
Formation of the World Federation of Trade Unions—The
Struggle for World Labor Unity—The World Youth Organiza-
tion—The Women's International Democratic Federation—The
European Mass Communist Parties.

- 53—THE REVOLUTION IN THE COLONIAL WORLD (1945-1950):
The Colonial Revolution—The Chinese and Indian Revolutions
—The Revolution in Other Asian Countries—National Liberation
Movements in Africa and Latin America.
- 54—EARLY STAGES OF THE COLD WAR (1947-1950):
Atomic Diplomacy—The Truman Doctrine—The Marshall Plan
—The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)—Social
Democracy and American Imperialism.
- 55—THE COMMUNIST INFORMATION BUREAU (1947):
The Cominform Rallies the Workers—The Tito Betrayal—The
Right Social-Democrats Split the World Trade-Union Move-
ment—The Ideological Decay of World Social-Democracy.
- 56—THE VICTORY OF THE CHINESE REVOLUTION (1950):
Chiang Launches the Civil War—The Victory of the People—
The Chinese People's Democracy—The Role of Mao Tse-tung.
- 57—WALL STREET WANTS WAR; THE WORLD DEMANDS
PEACE:
The Two Camps, Peace and War—The Korean War—The War
in Indo-China—The Fight for World Peace—A Third World
War Is Not Inevitable—The Death of Stalin.
- 58—THE INSOLUBLE GENERAL CRISIS OF WORLD
CAPITALISM:
Why Capitalism Decays—Capitalism Cannot Automatically Re-
cover—The Futility of Keynesism—American Hegemony No
Solution—The Insanity of Imperialist War.
- 59—THE INEVITABILITY OF WORLD SOCIALISM:
Why Socialism Is Inevitable—A Record of Unprecedented Eco-
nomic Progress—Socialism Solves the People's Problems—The
Road to Socialism.
- 60—THE HISTORICAL ADVANCE OF SOCIALISM (1848-1954):
The Rise and Decline of Capitalism—The Advance of the Work-
ing Class—The Historical Justification of Marxism—The Leading
World Role of the Communists.

On the Study of the Modern History of Capitalist Countries*

THERE IS A struggle going on between two forces in contemporary international political life. The advanced progressive forces are fighting for peace, democracy and Socialism, against the forces of imperialist reaction and war. Historical science is an active participant in this struggle. Reactionary bourgeois historiography attempts to portray the capitalist system as the stronghold of freedom and democracy and the bourgeoisie of our times as the defender of the national interests and the champion of the economic and cultural progress of peoples. In the United States of America there is a business history society concerned with the writing of the history of "big business firms," endeavoring to prove that capitalist monopolies are the moving force of progress. Official historical science in the U.S.A. and in other capitalist countries serves the reactionary and predatory aims of the present rulers of these countries. To please the capitalist monopolies, it distorts true history, hushes up some events and misrepresents others, arbitrarily snatches up and falsifies separate historical facts, so as to justify imperialist oppression and slander the forces that are fighting against this oppression.

Marxist-Leninist historical science serves the great objectives of the lib-

eration struggle of the working class and of all toiling people. It sees its high and noble mission, as a weapon of science, in the furtherance of the triumph of Socialism and the deliverance of peoples from the horrors of want and war. In contrast to the reactionary bourgeois historians who array themselves in the toga of impartial scholars and hypocritically proclaim the "independence" of science from politics, Marxist historians frankly defend the position of the most advanced class in society, the proletariat, whose mission it is to pave the way to a bright future for mankind. In doing this, they do not deviate from historical truth. The profound scientific study of the history of mankind leads to a recognition of the correctness of Marxist-Leninist teaching, since every principle of this teaching finds its confirmation in history. The socialist policy of the working class is profoundly scientific and Marxist historical science is indissolubly linked up to the political struggle of the working class. . . .

Soviet historians, in their conduct of research on the history of the capitalist countries of Europe and America, tie it up closely with the general course of world history. In counterbalance to bourgeois historians who contrast "the advanced West" to "the backward East," Soviet historians consider the history of the countries of the East and of the

* Editorial article translated from *Voprosy istorii* (Problems of History) Moscow, July, 1954. Text slightly condensed.

in the process of bringing to light the peculiarities of individual countries, they discover the general laws to which their development conforms. Such an approach makes it possible to deal a shattering blow to the entire ideology of contemporary imperialism which divides people into the worthy and the unworthy, into people destined to command and people destined to obey. In exposing the bourgeois falsification of history and truthfully illuminating the course of historical events, Marxist-Leninist historical science serves as an important weapon in the struggle of the working class and of all toiling people for peace, democracy and Socialism.

As regards direction and level of scholarship, the works of Soviet historians are immeasurably superior to any of the works of bourgeois historians, even the most significant of them, since the works of Soviet historians are imbued with a materialist understanding of history, the greatest achievement of scientific thought. The sympathy with which progressive historians abroad follow the achievements of Soviet historical science and try to follow the same Marxist path, is quite understandable. We must make mention here of the great contribution made to historical science by progressive historians abroad. The works of these historians, which illuminate in a profound manner important questions of the modern and current history of capitalist countries, expose the apologetic concepts of reactionary historiography. Contemporary Chinese historians have written valuable works in which, on the basis of new material, the true story of the expansionist policy of the West as links in one historic process;

USA and other capitalist powers in the Far East, is depicted.

Bourgeois scholars who refuse to follow the orders of imperialist circles obediently and who are searching for correct answers to the questions troubling them, also have a lively interest in the works of Marxist historians.

Soviet historians have achieved wide success in the study of the modern and current history of capitalist countries as well as in other fields of historical science. Guided by Marxist-Leninist theory, they have written a number of valuable research studies on the history of economic development, the class struggle, the revolutionary movement in capitalist countries. The works of Soviet historians on the history of Germany, France, England and other capitalist countries are widely known beyond the borders of the U.S.S.R. and have become the property of world science. The heritage of Russian as well as foreign historic thought has been re-examined and the numerous distortions of the bourgeois falsifiers of history have been exposed. The most significant lines of demarcation in the formation of the basis for a scientific periodization of history have been defined in accordance with Marxist-Leninist teachings in regard to socio-economic formations. Soviet historians doing research on the history of the international relations and the colonial policy of imperialist states have published major works in this field. They have begun the writing of a many-volumed *World History*, a work which will draw general Marxist conclusions.

• • •

However, the achievements of Soviet historians in the field of the study of the modern and current history of capi-

Great October Socialist Revolution and the influence the October Revolution and socialist construction in the USSR have had on the working-class and democratic movements throughout the world, to reveal the new relationships of forces that have arisen as a result of the new breakdown of the capitalist system and the formation of people's democratic states in Europe and in Asia. It is impossible to make a study of the history of individual capitalist countries in most recent times without a profound analysis of the influence of these world-wide historic events. . . .

Soviet scholars should be devoting more attention to the treatment of the history of the development of productive forces and the relations of production, in their research studies. Soviet historians have written works on the history of the industrial revolution in the countries of Europe, but the ensuing period of socio-economic development has been little treated. In our country, major works have been published in capitalist countries, are still inadequate. There are major hiatuses and defects in the treatment of this section of historical science. There have been few studies published as yet throwing light on the basic problems of the general crisis in the capitalist system, the history of the First and Second World Wars, the economic and political development of capitalist countries, the working-class and democratic movements in the period between the two wars, the history of the Communist International. Soviet historians should center their attention on the study of all of these questions. It is especially important to point out the profound changes that have taken place in the international arena as a result of the victory of the

lished on the history of the bourgeois revolution of the 17th century in England, of the French revolution at the end of the 18th century, of the revolution of 1848-1849, the Paris Commune. Work in that direction should be continued and broadened. Such problems as the history of bourgeois-democratic revolutions and the socialist movement, the origin and development of Marxism, the work of the First International, the rise of Social-Democratic Parties, the conflict of trends in the Second International, should become subjects for research by Soviet historians to an even greater degree. It is necessary to give serious attention to the study of the history of socialist ideas; there have been practically no research studies published on these questions nor dissertations written, of late.

We must here note the insufficiently high standard of scholarship and ideological theory of the works and dissertations on the modern and current history of capitalist countries. Some of them give a simple account of events with no profound analysis of them and without drawing any general conclusions. Many works, dissertations and articles are not creative in nature, do not advance science. It is of course, useful to have one or another research worker bring to light new facts and documents for dissemination among scholars. Useful but not enough. Every work should contain some new scientific result, new conclusions enriching science.

In some works on modern and current history there is wide application, on the part of the writer, of the vicious practice of substituting numerous quotations, sometimes having no direct relationship to the subject under discus-

sion, f
his ow
marks
citation
ers wh
sics of
own.

recogn

In a

turn t

illustr

presen

from

gener

facts

dealin

mann

is at

Marx

be tr

Lenin

rate

facts

discu

or e

ably,

cion,

or se

of a

relat

their

is be

T

Mar

mod

four

tori

sion

—

1

266

2

of J

poli

sion, for a presentation of facts with his own analysis. Of late, quotation marks have been omitted from around citations in some works; there are writers who present theses out of the classics of Marxist-Leninism as their very own. This is a practice that we must recognize is impermissible.

In a number of works the authors turn to facts only for the purpose of illustrating theses they have already presented. These writers proceed not from their material or their facts to generalizations, but rather adjust their facts to a definite set of theses, often dealing with facts in a quite arbitrary manner. Such a subjective approach is at variance with the principles of Marxist-Leninist research. "For it to be truly a foundation," wrote V. I. Lenin, "it is necessary to take not separate facts, but *the whole aggregate* of facts bearing on the question under discussion, with no single exception, or else the suspicion arises unavoidably, and it is a fully legitimate suspicion, that the facts have been selected or sorted out arbitrarily, that in place of an objective relationship and inter-relationship of historic phenomena in their entirety, a 'subjective' concoction is being presented. . . ."¹

* * *

The outstanding classical works of Marxism-Leninism furnish us with a model of true research based on a profound and careful analysis of vast historical source materials. The conclusions drawn by K. Marx in *Capital* or

by V. I. Lenin in his work *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, are supported by a careful and thorough analysis of historical facts. We cannot accept the narrowness of the sources of the historical materials used as the basis for research in the area of modern and current history, a condition from which some works, dissertations and articles suffer. It must be kept in mind that the materialist analysis of a historic event is a scientific piece of work demanding profound and careful research, "for it is obvious," said Engels, "that nothing can be done here with mere phrases, that only a mass of critically sifted, completely mastered historical material can enable one to solve such a task."² . . .

It is necessary to make resolute moves against manifestations of conciliatoriness in relation to bourgeois ideology and opportunely and decisively to repulse all attempts on the part of bourgeois historians to distort historic events and facts. Soviet historians still do not devote to this work of exposure the attention due it. The numerous falsifications of the modern and current history of capitalist countries and the reactionary attacks of Western European bourgeois historians frequently remain unanswered on the part of Soviet historians. Soviet historical institutions, among them the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. and our magazine, follow but poorly the historical literature published abroad and the state of historical science in capitalist countries.

The major country of imperialism—the United States of America—is being most inadequately studied by Soviet historians. Neither the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, pp. 266-267 (in Russian).

² On K. Marx's "Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy," a Review by Engels. Gospolitizdat, 1951, p. 251 (in Russian).

U.S.S.R., nor the other research institutes and higher schools of learning, have published in recent years even one major work on U.S. modern and current history. Bourgeois falsifiers distort this history, spread false notions concerning the exceptionalism of American capitalism, concerning the essential "difference" between the colonial policy of the U.S.A. and the older imperialist powers, concerning the American way of life and American democracy. The task is to oppose these concoctions with a true history of the U.S.A., as a history of class struggle, the struggle between the progressive and the reactionary forces, as the history of the American people and not of presidents and businessmen.

It is especially important to develop a profound study of the history of the Second World War. In the U.S.A., in England, in Western Germany and in other capitalist countries, there are at present being published a vast quantity of pseudo-scientific works, as well as documents and memoirs, which falsify this history in the interests of American, English, German and other imperialists. Soviet historians are paying very little attention to the exposé of bourgeois conceptions of the Second World War. It is their duty to oppose the bourgeois distortions with a genuinely scholarly, truthful history of the Second World War. The Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. should organize and direct this work.

In speaking out resolutely against manifestations of bourgeois objectivism, Soviet historians should intensify the struggle against the various tendencies of oversimplification, vulgarization and subjectivity in historical science. The

Party called attention to the danger of these tendencies in connection with the works of Pokrovsky and his disciples who, in the process of carrying on a struggle against bourgeois historiography, fell into vulgar-materialist positions, denied the active role of the superstructure, interpreted in a distorted manner the relationship of history to politics and in fact liquidated history as a science. At that time the Party censured the attempts to justify the incorrect interpretation of historical events under the plea of imaginary political expediency. The tasks of politics and science cannot be put in contradiction to each other. Historical truth is not at variance with the political interests of the proletariat but rather reinforces and substantiates them.

In the resolution of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolshevik) "On the Organization of Party Propaganda in Connection with the Publication of 'The Short Course of the History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolshevik)'" it was stated that the Pokrovsky "school" "interpreted historical facts in a distorted manner and, contrary to historical materialism, interpreted them from the point of view of today and not from the point of view of the conditions out of which the historical events flowed, thereby distorting actual history."³ Such a "turnabout of politics to face the past," distorted the past and perverted Party policy. By characterizing the views on historical science of the Pokrovsky "school" as anti-Marxist, anti-Lenin, as a matter of fact, liquidationist and anti-scientific, the

³ *The Communist Party of the Soviet Union in Resolutions and Decisions of the Congresses, Conferences and Plenums of the Central Committee. Part II, Gospolitizdat, 1953, p. 861 (in Russian).*

Party and the Soviet government showed that overcoming these harmful views was a necessary prerequisite to the development of Marxist-Leninist historical science.⁴

• • •

However, relapses into oversimplification and anti-scientific views are still widespread. In a number of works, among them books on modern and current history, we find digression from the requirements of historical materialism, deviation from dialectics in the analysis of social phenomena, and inclination in the direction of the modernization of historical events. The presence of such errors impedes the development of historical science, hampers the struggle against bourgeois historiography. The historian who carries on the struggle against bourgeois historiography from incorrect, vulgarizing positions, cannot fulfill his task. His blows miss the mark. It is important to remember that everything depends on conditions, place and time. "The whole spirit of Marxism, its entire system requires that every situation be examined solely (a) historically, (b) only in relation to other situations, (c) only in relation to the concrete experience of history."⁵

First and foremost it is necessary to take up the question of the socio-economic history of capitalist countries from the correct, Marxist-Leninist positions. Whereas bourgeois historiography ignores and distorts questions of economic development, Marxism-Leninism considers all historical events within

the framework of a definite social formation, analyzing the deep economic processes that determine its development. The fundamental reason for the decline of contemporary bourgeois economics, politics and ideology lies in the unavoidable antagonistic contradictions between the growing productive forces and the decrepit capitalist relations of production chaining them down. It must be pointed out that the incompatibility between capitalist relations of production and the character of the productive forces inevitably leads capitalism to its downfall. This does not mean, however, that this incompatibility existed in the early stages of capitalist development. It is therefore incorrect, for example, to characterize the economic crisis of 1825 in England as "the manifestation of the rising incompatibility between the relations of production of capitalism and the development of the productive forces," as it is stated in the modern history program worked out by the modern history department of the Moscow State University. The economic crisis of 1825, of course, bears witness to the sharpening of the contradictions of capitalism; however, capitalist relations of production had not yet become a brake on the productive forces.

The role of the popular masses in history has up to now been but poorly treated in the works of Soviet historians, especially in relation to the consideration of the "peaceful" periods of development of individual countries. We know that bourgeois historians, ignoring the role of the popular masses, have not infrequently reduced the entire historical process to the deeds of kings and generals. In contradistinction to this it is necessary to point out

⁴ *On the Study of History*, Gospolitizdat, 1937, p. 21 (in Russian).

⁵ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 35, p. 200 (in Russian).

that the true creators of history are the popular masses. In this connection it is important to bring to light how, in the course of historical development, the consciousness and organization of the popular masses rose steadfastly. The spontaneous uprisings of the peasants or of the forerunners of the proletariat are one thing; the organized actions of the working class under the leadership of workers' parties are another thing. The very concepts "the masses," "the vanguard," "the party" change in the course of history. In the period of imperialism, parties of a new type are formed that are guided by scientific strategy and tactics in their actions in leading the struggle of the working class. . . .

It would be just as incorrect to fall into another extreme in bringing out the role of the popular masses and ignore the role of outstanding individuals in history or deny the significance of prominent progressive figures in the past for the sole reason that they were representatives of the ruling class. Thus, in the textbook *Modern History*, for higher schools of learning (Vol. I, 1951), the outstanding man of learning and public figure of the 18th century, Benjamin Franklin, is regarded as a troubadour of the ideas of the ruling American bourgeoisie. Such names as Robespierre, Voltaire, Lessing and others were dropped from the modern history program to which we refer above, after the appearance in the Party press of the well-known instructions on the struggle against the cult of the individual. Such an approach of oversimplification and vulgarization is at variance with actual history. Marxism does not deny the role of outstanding individuals but rather explains

scientifically the social conditions which made it possible for them to play a specific role.

The study of the history of the struggle of peoples for national liberation and freedom is of particular significance. It is important to show the role of the proletariat as a consistent fighter for the true national interests of peoples, for the sovereignty of national states, as the leader of all patriotic forces. There was a time when the bourgeoisie fought for national interests. This was the case, for example, in the United States of America in the years of the war for independence. The adoption by the U.S.A. of the Declaration of Independence was, as G. M. Malenkov emphasizes, an act of historic progress. However, the present ruling circles of the U.S.A., acting contrary to the true national interests of the American people themselves, rudely violate the sovereignty and independence of other countries. The working class of the capitalist countries leads the struggle of the popular masses for national independence, against encroachments on this independence on the part of the American imperialists.

It is the duty of Marxist historians to expose in a more profound manner the reactionary role of the contemporary imperialist bourgeoisie, and show how, in its pursuit of maximum profits, this bourgeoisie carries on a policy of ruthless exploitation and terror against the workers of its own country and cruelly oppresses the people of the colonial and dependent countries. We must not, however, characterize the role of the bourgeoisie as identical in all countries and at all times. Thus, one must not transfer characteristics of the imperialist bourgeoisie of

today o
opment
of the t
l), divi
tricity
revoluti
English
sion to
with th
(p. 68)
geoisie
class, t
Histori
bourgeo
into a
tionary
progress
quality
decades
Party C
that th
contem
differen
bourgeo
change
tionary
ple and
propos
key to
the bo
histori
Our
histori
of the
social
velopm
torian;
superi
over l
limite
freedo

today on to earlier stages of the development of the bourgeoisie. The authors of the text-book, *Modern History* (Vol. I), diverge from the principle of historicity in speaking of a peasant-plebeian revolution threatening the rule of the English bourgeoisie soon after its accession to power in the 17th century with the proclamation of a republic (p. 68). They forget that the bourgeoisie was then the vanguard social class, the banner-bearer of progress. Historians should point out how the bourgeoisie of Western Europe turned into a reactionary and counter-revolutionary class from a revolutionary and progressive class, and how its reactionary quality has been intensified in recent decades. In his speech at the 19th Party Congress, J. V. Stalin emphasized that the face of the bourgeoisie under contemporary conditions is substantially different from what it was earlier. The bourgeoisie "has become different, has changed greatly, has become more reactionary, has lost its ties with the people and thereby weakened itself."⁸ This proposition of J. V. Stalin's gives us the key to an understanding of the role of the bourgeoisie at various stages of its historic development.

Our researchers should take a strictly historical approach to the evaluation of the political superstructure and its social role in various stages of the development of the capitalist system. Historians should know the immeasurable superiority of Soviet socialist democracy over bourgeois democracy, reveal the limited class character of bourgeois freedoms which safeguard the political

supremacy of the bourgeoisie and should expose the regime of lawlessness and violence that protects the imperialist system. At the same time we must recognize the comparatively progressive character of bourgeois democracy by comparison with an absolute monarchy or a fascist regime. It is for this reason that the description of the Danish Constitution of 1866 as a reactionary constitution in the aforementioned modern history program, is a departure from the principles of historicity. Universal male suffrage, freedom of conscience, press and assembly and the other bourgeois-democratic freedoms proclaimed in this Constitution had a progressive, not a reactionary, significance. Progressive forces today are defending bourgeois-democratic freedoms from the attacks of imperialist reaction.

* * *

Soviet historians pay little attention to the study of social ideas and teachings and do not always treat their role in history correctly. The portrayal of the bankruptcy of all trends of non-proletarian Socialism, of the decline of the influence of bourgeois ideology on the masses, of the uncontrollable growth of the influence of the all-conquering ideology of Scientific Socialism which is so radically different from all preceding social teachings—is a major task of historical science. Some Marxist historians have blotted out the boundaries between the pre-Marxist period of social thought and Marxism and do not show the significance of the great revolution effected by Marx and Engels in the social sciences.

Errors are committed of an opposite nature, too, when our comrades

⁸ J. V. Stalin, *Speech at the 19th Party Congress*, Gospolitizdat, 1952, p. 11 (in Russian).

do not perceive that many representatives of pre-Marxist social thought, including Utopian Socialists as well as idealist philosophers, played a progressive role in their day. We must remember that Marxism did not develop detached from the science that preceded it but leaned on this science for support, critically revising its results. The leftist view to the effect that Marx and Engels "had nothing to take from the philosophical, political, economic theories of the past,"⁷ is at variance with the truth and with the statements in the classics of Marxism themselves. Some researchers characterize Hegel and other idealist philosophers as nothing but reactionaries and assign the Neo-Hegelians to the reactionary camp as well. Thus, in G. Krupnitsky's *Questions of Historical Materialism in the Works of Marx and Engels, "The Holy Family" and "German Ideology,"* it is incorrectly asserted that Hegelianism was in its entirety "a banner of reaction in all the major countries of Europe." It must not be forgotten that Lenin, fully in accordance with the facts, characterized the Neo-Hegelians of the beginning of the 40's of the 19th century, as radical representatives of the German bourgeoisie who tried to draw atheistic and revolutionary conclusions⁸ from Hegel's philosophy.

A serious flaw in the works of the historians is the underestimation of the role played in the lives of peoples by traditions formed over the generations. F. Engels remarked that people make history under definite premises and conditions. "Among these the economic are in the final analysis the decisive conditions. But political conditions, etc., even the traditions that live in the minds of people, play a certain

role too, although not the decisive one."⁹ Revolutionary, progressive traditions, the presence of which facilitates the forward advance of society, are of particular significance.

Let us recall the history of Germany, for example. The history of Germany, just as the history of any other country, is a history of class struggle, reflecting progressive and reactionary tendencies. The task of Marxist historians is to throw light on the history of predatory German imperialism which has appeared in the role of instigator of two world wars. The roots of the plunderous policies of the German monopolies, being revived today with the aid of the American imperialists, must be uncovered. But it would be incorrect to observe only the acts of the reactionary forces in the whole of modern and current German history. The role of the progressive forces should be shown, and of the progressive traditions in the history of the German people and, in particular, the role of the German working class. "Our Party," remarked A. I. Mikoyan, "has studied deeply and used to the full the experience of the German revolutionary working-class movement. The founder of our Party, Lenin, pointed out that for almost half a century the German working class was 'an example of Socialist organization for the entire world.' This was during the first fifty years of the century-long existence of Marxism."¹⁰ Marxist historians should give a full account of the democratic and revolu-

⁷ *Questions of Philosophy*, No. 1, 1947, p. 174 (in Russian).

⁸ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 30 (in Russian).

⁹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Moscow, 1952, p. 468 (in Russian).

¹⁰ "Comrade A. I. Mikoyan's Speech at the IV Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany of April 1, 1954," *Pravda*, April 2, 1954.

ary traditions of which every people has a right to be proud.

There are a number of serious errors in works on the history of modern and current international relations. In some of them the significance of the contradictions among the imperialist powers is belittled and the role of individual imperialist states is exaggerated. The authors of a number of works consider problems of foreign policy and international relations in isolation from internal history, from the struggle of classes and parties, from the entire socio-economic situation in a country and from an analysis of the whole system of states. As far back as in the years of the 1st World War, V. I. Lenin noted that only a thorough analysis of all these circumstances makes it possible "to understand how the present war undeviatingly and inevitably emanated out of this system."¹¹ A one-sided approach to an analysis of the history of foreign policy and international relations does not ensure a truly scientific understanding of the historic process, its conformity to objective law and its deep roots.

• • •

Recently a conference of teachers of modern and current history was held, called together by the Ministry of Education of the U.S.S.R., information concerning which we carry in this issue of our magazine. The situation in research in the field of modern and current history was pointed up in I. S. Galkin's speech at this conference and future tasks were noted. The speaker and the comrades who took the floor during the discussion, pointed out with justification that the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the

U.S.S.R., the Ministry of Higher Education, the offices of the deans of the departments of history and the departments of universal history, are themselves not paying sufficient attention to a profound working out of the problems of modern and current history. It was also correctly noted that these problems are poorly treated in the pages of this magazine.

A serious difficulty in the way of the further growth of research in the field of modern and current history is the scarcity of source materials available to the wide circles of scholars, especially to those working in outlying parts of the country. Up to the present there has been no publication of compilations of documents reflecting the internal history of capitalist countries, the history of the working class and national liberation movements. The publication of the series *Minutes of the Congresses and Conferences of the First International*, undertaken as far back as 1934, was interrupted after the issuance of the first two volumes. Of the minutes of the General Council of International Association of Workers preserved, only the minutes for March-June, 1871, and those only in part, have been published. The first volume of the proceedings of the Paris Commune came out back in 1933 but the second volume has not been published to this day. Source books on the history of little accessibility to researchers, of the period of the Second International have not been published. Documents of the Communist International are of little accessibility to researchers, scattered as they are through the periodicals of past years. The many-volumed publication of the diplomatic documents of the Czarist government, *In-*

¹¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 363 (in Russia).

ternational Relations in the Epoch of Imperialism, remains unfinished. Only a small portion of the correspondence between Marx and Engels and public figures, has been published.

Historians of modern times make insufficient use of the wealth of materials in the Moscow and Leningrad archives. In a number of cases access to these materials is extremely difficult.

An insufficiently profound understanding of Marxist-Leninist theory on the part of our scientific personnel and an inadequate ability to apply Marxist methodology to specific historical research, are felt in the treatment of the problems of modern and current history. The scholastic, dogmatic approach to the study of Marxist theory, deep-rooted in our higher schools of learning and in our graduate schools, and not yet completely surmounted could not but have an effect on their scientific production. A major condition for rapidly overcoming existing defects and setting up new, genuinely scientific research in the field of modern and current history is the lifting of the ideological and theoretical standards of research personnel.

The expansion of conflict in opinions and of scientific criticism, of free discussion on controversial issues—these are tried and tested expedients for the development of all sectors of science. To this day discussions in research in-

stitutes and in our magazine on questions of modern and current history, are rare. But there are many important and controversial questions. It is the responsibility of research institutes and of our magazine to bring them up at the proper time and put them up for discussion.

We must fight resolutely for the purity of Marxist-Leninist historical science, against bourgeois influences, for true historicity in scientific research, for training our scientific personnel in the spirit of principled Communist stands and scientific honesty and to speak out against all manner of objectivists as well as against "conjuncturers"* and vulgarizers of Marxism. It is the duty of Marxists, wrote V. I. Lenin, "to portray the true historical process correctly and accurately."¹² Only under this condition can Soviet historical science successfully combat bourgeois ideology.

The Soviet public, as well as the progressive forces engaged in struggles abroad, expect new major works confirming the Marxist world-view, from Soviet historians. The guarantee of the future flowering of historical science and the creative growth of its specialists, lies in steadfast loyalty to a militant, creative Marxism.

¹² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, p. 147 (in Russian).

* People who use historical events to advance arbitrarily their own thesis.—Ed.

FIRE I

By Ro

Fire in
tury,
NewThe
anti-So
tions to
the des
war is
the So
Comm
Jewish
best-seHer
anti-So
work,
Theod
and c
and d
ingtonBut
rope
with
of wa
woul
heaps
econ
sons
lives
bar V
end t
and
Unio
rate,
of g
Whi

Book Reviews

FIRE IN THE ASHES

By Robert Friedman

Fire in the Ashes: Europe in Mid-Century, by Theodore H. White. Sloane, New York. \$5.00.

The grim determination of certain anti-Soviet quarters to reject all solutions to international tensions save only the destruction of the Soviet Union by war is exemplified by the reaction in the Social-Democratic *New Leader* and *Commentary* (organ of the American Jewish Committee) to the still-current best-seller, *Fire in the Ashes*.

Here are two journals professionally anti-Soviet in character. And here is a work, by the foreign correspondent Theodore H. White, which is avowedly and demonstrably anti-Soviet in bias and dedicated to a whitewash of Washington's foreign policy in the cold war.

But White's study of Western Europe since World War II concludes with the statement that the "solution" of war could only mean that "our cities would, in the process, become rubble heaps, our children die and our entire economic life collapse." And, for reasons which we will go into, he believes that—starting with agreement to bar West German rearmament and to end the Indo-China war—the U.S. can and should negotiate with the Soviet Union a long series of "deals"—"separate, individual adjustments at points of greatest mutual irritation." What White envisions, in short, although he

avoids the term, is a lengthy period of co-existence between competitive societies.

It is this view which is castigated by Peter Meyer's review in *Commentary* as failing to recognize the "inescapable central fact of the present world situation," that is, that the existence of the Soviet Union and of Communism is "fundamentally and essentially irreconcilable with the security of the free world." The struggle must end with the extinction of one protagonist or the other, insists Meyer, and "this may come about as the result of a war. . . ."

As for the *New Leader's* reviewer, Robert Donlevin, he mourns that "the saddest thing about this book is not its detailing of one man's aberrations. It is the wide acceptance which it has gained through the good offices of the Book-of-the-Month Club and our leading critics. Only time will tell whether this means that the American people have been sufficiently softened up to swallow another subtler, piece-meal Yalta."

One need not labor the point that objections of the *New Leader* and *Commentary* variety to Mr. White's bid for American-Soviet settlement are born of a brutal and rigid determination to destroy the Soviet Union, at whatever cost. The fact that their fire is in this instance directed against one whose own anti-Soviet bias is glaring

only underscores the significant rifts which are developing in the anti-Soviet camp.

One may properly ask how and why it is that White could cap a volume of, at times, lyrical praise for the purposes and alleged achievements of Washington's cold war with his recommendations. The answer is to be found in his book itself, although it has to be extracted from a lush heap of adjectives about the "free world" and the overtired rhetoric about "Soviet aggression" with which Mr. White bludgeons his readers.

One could compile an impressive list of passages (although minute in relation to the book's full text) refuting White's own distortions about Washington's role, the Soviet Union, the Communist movement, etc.

Is the Soviet Union the hellish failure of Mr. White's conception? Yet we find him at one point citing the "stupendous industrial and technical progress of the Soviet Union since the war." He adds that "never in the entire history of the Russian people have they known a swifter period of industrial achievement or a longer unbroken movement forward than that since the year 1945." Mr. White even suggests that our grandchildren may have to face the disconcerting possibility that in the world of tomorrow, "Russia could be the world's prime industrial power and America the second."

Was the Marshall Plan the heartening impetus for the renaissance of West European capitalism which Mr. White pictures it to have been? He himself, at one point, says: "The workers could see only that what had been saved was the status quo, that the recovery had preserved their discomfort and given its fruits to the privileged. In the slums

the Communists held on to their workers even through the happiest days of the Plan."

Is the Communist movement the Hearstian stereotype of evil plotters Mr. White repeatedly conceives it to be? Yet he quotes the acknowledgment of the former head of the French police, that, "For fifteen years the Communists have pulled to their ranks the finest young people of France."

Is the Washington-sponsored West German government the ideal soil for a revived democracy? White offers glowing tribute to the "men of Bonn." Yet (although he carefully neglects to mention how many Nazis have been placed in Government posts by the men of Bonn) White finds it necessary to admit that a majority of West Germans now believe, according to recent polls, "that there was more good than bad in Hitler."

One could extend the list of contradictions in *Fire in the Ashes*. But is it not clear that it is the facts behind Mr. White's admissions—so at variance with the anti-Soviet, anti-Communist slanders which surround them—that Mr. White was forced to heed?

Is it not obvious that it is the defeat, not the pretended success, of Washington policy in Western Europe; the progress and vitality, not the alleged decline and decay, of the Soviet Union and the European working class and peace movements, which have led Mr. White to his sober conclusions as to the advisability of genuine negotiations? It should be said that Mr. White is not unaware of the many contradictions which beset him, and he has tried valiantly to rationalize a goodly number, although with poor success.

Thus, having shaken the specter of "Soviet aggression" at the reader

throughout his book, and unwilling to topple his own edifice of lie upon anti-Soviet lie, White explains that it is possible now to contemplate settlements with the Soviet Union because it is "more relaxed" since Stalin's death. However, it appears elsewhere that the Russians were "relaxed" a long time ago, since Mr. White generously observes that: "It is questionable, looking back, that the Red Army's garrison divisions [in Central Europe] were ever deployed for attack at a preconceived date. It is more likely that they represented an insurance policy. . . ."

White himself lays another wreath on the tomb of the Big Lie about the Soviet "timetable" for aggression when he notes that at the NATO parley in Lisbon of 1952: "Finally, the old concept of a Soviet timetable of attack and war was set aside. The favorite American date of the year of peril—1954—was abandoned. Instead, implicitly, the conferences recognized that perhaps never would there be a showdown year with the Russians. . . ."

White's most strenuous efforts at rationalization are devoted to the contrast between his picture of vainly attempting to reconcile a Western Europe restored to vigor and his judgment that ". . . in the chief area necessary for American security—Western Europe—the fiber of life has rotted and weakened so that it can resist the Communist message only with difficulty."

Mr. White's solution for what ails Western Europe is European Union—although he nowhere explains how "Union" could miraculously cure, for half a continent, the very ills which the ruling classes of France, Italy, England and the rest have been unable to cure on a national level. The interest of these classes in "Union" is not in

terms of comity, but rather imperialist rivalry.

Although McCarthyism has rocked Europe with its portent of American fascism on the rise, White, in two minor and passing references, pays only scant attention to the junior senator from Wisconsin. Yet, as his concluding paragraphs suggest, he is well aware that anti-Soviet war carries with it not only the threat of physical destruction but also the destruction of democracy.

Undoubtedly those who desire a peaceful solution to American-Soviet tensions will welcome from any quarter, including such works as Theodore White's, evidence of support for this goal which is essential to the very existence of mankind. (It is true that White has not rounded out his thesis to include the no less significant need for full recognition of People's China, normalization of East-West trade, and outlawing of the hydrogen bomb.)

But the primary question in evaluating his work, in terms of its whole, is whether the dominant note of anti-Marxist distortions can help the general American reader come to grips with the real truth about "Europe in mid-century." Undoubtedly it does not, even though it may be argued that appeals for American-Soviet settlements are more persuasive from one who underlines his anti-Soviet bias at every turn.

One must reject this argument, however. Needless to say, it is not adherence to Communism which we are demanding of Mr. White, but rather an understanding which is prepared to toss the Big Lie about Communism and the Soviet Union into the oblivion to which, as an outmoded instrument of a dangerously wrong foreign policy, it rightfully should go.

New and Recent Titles

HOW THE CRADLE OF LIBERTY WAS ROBBED	\$.05
by Joseph Morton	
THE LABOR MOVEMENT IN THE SOUTH DURING SLAVERY	.20
by Herbert Aptheker	
BEN DAVIS—FIGHTER FOR PEACE	.25
by Claudia Jones	
DECISION IN CHINA	.05
by John Pittman	
COEXISTENCE OR NO EXISTENCE	.05
by Adam Lapin	
THE REAL RUSSIA	.05
by Joseph Clark	
WHAT HAPPENED IN GUATEMALA	.10
by H. S. Travis and A. B. Magil	
DANGER—DEPRESSION!	.05
by Bernard Burton	
THE AMERICAN WAY TO JOBS, PEACE, EQUAL RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY	.05
Program of the Communist Party	
THE NOVEMBER ELECTIONS AND THE RIGHT FOR JOBS, PEACE, EQUAL RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY	.15
by Pettis Perry	
THE COMMUNIST PROGRAM	.15
by Betty Gannett	

Books

MARX AND ENGELS ON MALTHUS	\$2.25
Edited by Ronald Meek	
FORBIDDEN FREEDOM	Paper \$.75; cloth \$1.50
by Cheddi Jagan	
LOOKING FORWARD	Paper \$1.50; cloth \$2.00
by 19 International Authors	
REALISM IN ART	Paper \$1.50; cloth \$2.50
by Sidney Finkelstein	
AFRICA, AFRICA	Paper \$.75; cloth \$1.50
by Derek Kartun	

ORDER FROM YOUR BOOKSHOP OR
NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

\$.05

.20

.25

.05

.05

.05

.10

.05

.05

.15

.15

\$2.25

\$1.50

\$2.00

\$2.50

\$1.50

N. Y.
